Connections

The Quarterly Journal

Spring 2005

Partnership for Peace Consortium of
Defense Academies and Security Studies
Institutes

Table of Contents

The Partnership for Peace Consortium's Combating Terrorism Working Group (CTWG) took on the work of creating this issue of Connections. The CTWG develops strategically integrated and balanced perspectives on international and regional security issues. It combines academic, public policy, and military expertise to create a dynamic, intellectual, and practical research approach to terrorism, counterterrorism, weapons of mass destruction, and homeland security issues. Each area of research is critical for understanding the international security environment and provides the underpinnings necessary for policy analysis.

Thinking Creatively in the War on Terrorism – Leveraging NATO and the Partnership for Peace Consortium

Colonel Russell D. Howard *

Introduction

"The New Terrorism" is a term commonly heard since September 11. Several terrorism experts have written on this topic, including Walter Laqueur, who wrote a book titled "*The New Terrorism*," and Gideon Rose, who authored an article by the same name. *The 9/11 Commission Report* addresses the "foundations of the new terrorism" and Matthew Morgan has an article in *Parameters* titled "The Origins of the New Terrorism." RAND has a book out on "*Countering the New Terrorism*" and I have a chapter in one of Reid Sawyer's and my books titled, "Understanding al Qaeda's Application of the New Terrorism – The Key to Victory in the Current Campaign." So much, in fact, has been written about the new terrorism that the term has real meaning and, at least in academic and operational circles, is generally understood.

While the "new terrorism" has become an accepted part of the discussion on terrorism, new and novel methods for defeating it have not. Instead, rehashed Regan-era strategies found in works such as Sean Hannity's *Deliver Us From Evil: Defeating Terrorism, Despotism, and Liberalism*, do-nothing strategies like those espoused by Alan Kay in "Defeating Terrorism," or America-is-at-fault strategies as described by Katy Kelly in "Defeating Terrorism: One Step, Look in the Mirror" are more common.

Defeating Terrorism: Shaping the New Security Environment," the second book I co-authored with Reid Sawyer, breaks some ground on this topic by articulating novel approaches for defeating the new terrorism, but these ideas were developed from a largely American and consequence management perspective.

Over the past two years, it has been my privilege to co-chair, along with Dr. Rohan Gunaratna, the Partnership for Peace Consortium's Combating Terrorism Working Group (CTWG), a body whose charter calls for seeking new ways to address "the new terrorists" and the threat of "new terrorism." The following article reflects my experience and shared learning with the CTWG, which encourages out-of-the-box thinking. This article also draws on my preparation for teaching a course in European Politics at the United States Military Academy as well as a new sense of respect for the opportunities for information sharing among both new and old allies in greater Europe and Central Asia.

---

* Col. Russell D. Howard is the Head of the Department of Social Sciences and the Director of the Combating Terrorism Center at the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York.

The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government. The paper is approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

This article suggests three approaches for cooperative efforts to address terrorist threats. The first concerns the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which is an essential tool with which the United States and its key allies should coordinate counterterror operations. As one pundit explains, "September 11 and the ensuing conflict require NATO leaders to think boldly and creatively about how to keep the alliance relevant."[1] The second suggested approach is for greater use of NATO special operations forces. NATO special operations forces are the primary military forces within the alliance that can, and should, operate multilaterally and cooperatively in the war on terror. Third, greater use should be made of NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) organization. The original strategic rationale for the partnership, enhancing stability and practical cooperation among the countries within the NATO periphery, has become even more compelling in the context of the war on terrorism.[2]

NATO

Less than 24 hours after the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States, America's allies in NATO agreed to invoke the alliance's Article 5 defense guarantee – that an "attack on one" was an "attack on all."[3] However, NATO has remained on the sidelines throughout much of the U.S.-led Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). In Afghanistan, the "military capability gap" between NATO and U.S. forces prompted the U.S. to request assistance from select NATO allies (mostly those with special operations capabilities) on an individual basis, not from NATO as a multilateral alliance. And, though some NATO members provided important assistance in defeating the Taliban, Afghanistan was pretty much an American show.

Europeans understood the rationale behind going after al Qaeda in Afghanistan after 9/11, however the war in Iraq demonstrated the difficulties inherent in attempts to reach international consensus on exactly what are legitimate targets of a counterterror operation.[4] NATO member states could not agree on whether Iraq should be categorized as a terrorism problem or whether the U.S. had the right to take action in Iraq without authorization from the UN Security Council.[5] In fact, the Iraq war has complicated the process of gaining and maintaining broad European and international support for counterterrorism actions.[6]

Lack of capability or political consensus is a plausible reason for the lack of NATO support for the GWOT. However, the primary reason may be more academic. Ac-

---

1 Philip H. Gordon, "NATO and the War on Terrorism, a Changing Alliance," *The Brookings Review* 20, no. 3 (Summer 2002), p. 37.

2 Jeffrey Simon, "Partnership for Peace: Charting a Course for a New Era," *Strategic Forum*, no. 206 (March 2004), p. 2.

3 Philip H. Gordon, p. 1.

4 Nora Bensahel, *The Counterterror Coalitions: Cooperation with Europe, NATO, and the European Union* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2003), p. 22.

5 Nora Bensahel, p. 17.

6 Richard A. Clarke and Barry R. McCaffrey, "NATO's Role in Confronting International Terrorism," *Atlantic Council Policy Paper* (June 2004), p. viii.

cording to a recent Rand report, NATO has not yet been able to reorient itself from its Cold-War mindset to meet the challenges of terrorism.[7] This assessment may be a bit harsh. NATO has undertaken a number of steps to address terrorism, including the establishment of an internal terrorism task force to coordinate the work of many different offices within the NATO staff.[8]

> NATO is also pursuing several initiatives that are designed to improve its long-term counterterror capabilities, including adopting a military concept for combating terrorism, launching the new capabilities initiative, considering a NATO Rapid Response Force, addressing WMD threats, improving civil-military emergency planning and consequence management, and enhancing cooperative relationships and training with partners.[9]

The post-conflict reconstruction phase of the Afghanistan campaign has provided both a "useful model and a key test for NATO in meeting the challenges of terrorism and the new international security environment."[10] In January 2002, NATO forces were invited by the newly established Afghan government to operate under UN mandate as the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Since its deployment, ISAF has been under the command of NATO members; first the United Kingdom, then Turkey.[11] "On 11 August 2003, NATO took over command of ISAF and since then has been responsible for its coordination and planning. This is NATO's first operation outside the Euro-Atlantic area."[12]

Other efforts are also underway to better enable NATO to contribute to the long-term counterterrorism effort. At NATO's Prague Summit on 21-22 November, 2002, heads of state and governmental representatives of NATO member countries adopted many measures that will strengthen NATO's preparedness against terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).[13] Some of these measures include better cyber-defense efforts, creating a NATO rapid response force of 21,000 elite forces, streamlining command functions to increase responsiveness, focusing on defense against biological and chemical weapons, improving civil-preparedness of member countries for managing the consequences of possible WMD attacks, and enhancing NATO's relations with other international organizations so that information is shared and appropriate action is taken more effectively in the common fight against terrorism.[14]

Despite these efforts many feel that NATO could do more to confront international terrorism. According to a recent Atlantic Council Policy Paper titled "NATO's Role in

---

7 Nora Bensahel, p. ix.
8 Ibid., p. 25.
9 Ibid., p. 25.
10 Richard A. Clarke, p. 26.
11 NATO's Contribution to the Fight Against Terrorism, *NATO Issues* (28 Oct. 2004), accessed from http://www.nato.int/terrorism/index.htm, p. 2.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.

Confronting International Terrorism," NATO has significant comparative advantages that are under-optimized in a counterterror context. According to co-authors General Barry McCaffrey and Richard Clarke, NATO should play a major role in the following counterterrorism functions: generating political will, providing intelligence, managing coordination and integration efforts, interdicting terrorist recruitment, financing, supply and operations, preventing terrorist operations, managing the consequences of terrorist attacks, arranging security assistance, educating the population, particularly potential sources of recruitment, and organizing research and development.[15] Clearly, NATO's ability to operationalize this comprehensive list of counterterror competencies would be of great benefit to the global effort against terrorism. Unfortunately, my own view is that the list is too comprehensive for three reasons.

First, in Europe terrorism is viewed as a crime that most Europeans believe can best be addressed by crime-fighting procedures and tools rather than overt military methods. One result of this belief has been a disconnect over the potential role of NATO in fighting terrorism.[16] "While some U.S. policy makers see the Alliance as having a role in helping coordinate military training and doctrines relevant for fighting terrorism, many Europeans greet such suggestions with skepticism – not surprisingly given their doubts about the military response to terrorism generally."[17] Second, the U.S. does not need to draw on NATO for its military competencies and will most likely choose to avoid giving NATO more than a minimal role in future military operations unless those operations are in a NATO country.[18] Instead of working multi-laterally with NATO, the U.S. will work unilaterally with individual NATO member states whose military capabilities are either compatible or complimentary to those of U.S. forces. Furthermore, the ability to reach a consensus about a greater NATO role in counterterrorism efforts has been complicated by U.S. military action against Iraq.

> It was easy to reach an international consensus on the need to go after al Qaeda, particularly after the September 11 attacks, because most states perceived al Qaeda as a fundamental threat to their sovereignty. Yet few other potential targets of the counterterror campaign will inspire such a unified international response. Iraq demonstrated the difficulties of trying to reach international consensus on which groups and states are the legitimate targets of counterterror operations.[19]

Third, while most members believe NATO needs to expand its counterterrorism authority and capabilities—particularly in consequence management—some do not. For example, France argues that NATO's role in counterterrorism is sufficient as it is

---

[15] Richard A. Clarke, p. 14.

[16] David L. Aaron, Ann M. Beauchesne, Frances G. Burwell, C. Richard Nelson, K. Jack Riley, Brian Zimmer, "The Post 9/11 Partnership: Transatlantic Cooperation against Terrorism," *Atlantic Council Policy Paper* (December 2004), p. 12.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Nora Bensahel, p. 32.

[19] Ibid., p. 22.

now and that consequence management operations should be handled by the European Union.[20]

A lack of consensus and the capabilities gap most likely render the Atlantic Council list of "comparative advantages" unachievable at this time. Therefore, and unfortunately, expectations regarding further commitments from NATO in the fight against international terrorism should be reduced. However, there are two areas where existing cooperation could and should be expanded. First, increased use of NATO special operations forces (SOF) in the campaign against international terrorism should be considered. Second, NATO should take full advantage of the relationships developed through the Partnership for Peace (PfP) in order to work with interested nations on security assistance and other security measures related to the struggle against international terrorism.[21]

Special Operations Forces

Highlighted by President Bush at the NATO Summit in Prague in 2002 as one of NATO's most important capabilities,[22] SOF provide commanders a critical edge by supplying a variety of niche capabilities and the ability to develop new capabilities rapidly.[23] During Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan, special operations forces from Denmark, France, Germany, Norway, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and Greece played critical roles.[24] "Special forces from these countries often operated under U.S. command in a wide variety of missions, which included hunting down fleeing members of al Qaeda and the Taliban, gathering intelligence, and advising the Northern Alliance."[25] In November 2001, the United Kingdom was the first NATO partner to provide (SOF) forces to OEF, but other partners followed soon after and were used extensively in Operation Anaconda (in the mountains of eastern Afghanistan) and in a series of raids that followed.[26]

> These special forces were extraordinarily important to the success of the overall operation, easing some of the burden on U.S. special forces and often offering unique

---

[20] Ibid., p. 52

[21] Richard A. Clarke, p. viii.

[22] "Bush Calls for New NATO Capabilities," *BBC News* (20 Nov. 2002), accessed from http://64.233.161.104/search?q=cache:f_Eh_-C1dSEJ:news.bbc.co.uk/go/rss/-/1/hi/world/europe/2494557.stm+NATO+Special+Operations+Forces+IRAQ&hl=en.

[23] John Jogerst, "What's So Special about Special Operations Forces," *Aerospace Power Journal* (Summer 2002), accessed from www.airpower.au.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj02/sum02/jogerst.html. See also, James Graff Brussels, "What's NATO For," *Time* (Nov. 17, 2002), accessed from http://www.time.com/time/europe/magazine/article/0,13005,901021125-391501-1,00.html.

[24] Nora Bensahel, p. 11. See also, "NATO: Contributions to the War on Terrorism," *U.S. Department of State Fact Sheet* (31 October 2002), accessed from www.state.gov/p/eur/rls/fs/14627.htm.

[25] Ibid.

[26] Ibid.

capabilities. U.S. military officers particularly praised the capabilities of the Norwegian special forces, for example, because their extensive mountain training proved useful in Afghanistan's rocky terrain.[27]

Partnership for Peace

NATO's Partnership for Peace program provides a useful framework for initiating and building a range of useful counterterrorism activities.[28] The (PfP) was established in 1994 to foster cooperation with the states of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. It was also a "training vehicle" for aspiring NATO members. However, the character and purpose of the PfP has changed significantly in the past few years. For example, ten previous members of the PfP are now full members of the NATO Alliance (Hungary, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Romania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania) and the remaining members are not likely to be candidates for NATO membership in the near future.[29] Therefore, the PfP might have to reorient its activities so they focus less on preparing for NATO membership and more on leveraging its institutional framework in other areas. One possible direction for future cooperation would be to address common threats such as terrorism.[30]

In fact, at the Prague Summit in November 2002, NATO approved the Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism (PAP-T), which commits partners to the following: intensifying consultation on armaments and civil emergency planning; enhancing preparedness for combating terrorism; increasing the exchange of banking information; improving border controls; and enhancing consequence management and civil emergency planning.[31] According to Clarke and McCaffrey, the plan has yet to achieve very much, "in part due to the diverse nature of the Partnership countries." The Istanbul Summit in October 2004 provided an opportunity to review and invigorate the implementation of the PAP-T, but it will be some time before the "reinvigoration" can be assessed.

Jeffrey Simon writes, "To keep the Partnership for Peace relevant and effective over the next decade, partners need to focus on developing capabilities to combat terrorism and other transnational threats."[32] I agree, and one of the principle vehicles that can be used to develop these objectives is the Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academies and Security Studies Institutes (PfP Consortium). The PfP Consortium is an international organization dedicated to strengthening defense and military education and research through amplified institutional and national cooperation. Cur-

---

[27] Ibid.

[28] Richard A. Clarke, p. 36.

[29] The remaining PfP members include: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Croatia, Finland, Georgia, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

[30] Nora Bensahel, p. 33.

[31] For the full text of the Partnership Action Plan Against Terrorism see: http://www.nato.int/docu/basictxt/b021122e.htm.

[32] Jeffrey Simon, p. 2.

rently, the PfP Consortium consists of more than 350 organizations based in 42 of the countries comprising the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) region. It was originally proposed by former U.S. Secretary of Defense William Cohen and his German counterpart, former Minister of Defense Volker Ruehe, at a 12 June 1998 meeting of the Defense Ministers of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC-D). They envisioned the PfP Consortium as an activity "in the spirit of PfP," that would, "…strengthen defense and military education through enhanced national and institutional cooperation." Specific objectives of the initiative included increasing the number of individuals in government and private sectors with defense and security policy expertise, promoting professional military education in participating nations, encouraging collaborative approaches to defense education, and involving non-governmental institutes, universities, and similar bodies, as well as governmental defense academies and security studies institutes in the activities of the consortium. Consortium activities include an annual conference, working groups that meet at the expert level, a Web site and a scholarly journal.

Presently, the PfP Consortium has ten working groups.[33] The Combating Terrorism Working Group (CTWG) is co-chaired by Dr. Rohan Gunaratna and me. As its name implies, CTWG focuses specifically on combating terrorism. It has 23 members from 17 countries. All in the group have terrorism, counterterrorism, or homeland security positions in their respective governments or academic institutions. The CTWG's mission is to develop an internationally recognized body of terrorism experts to better understand international, regional, and domestic terrorist threats, to educate future leaders who will have counterterrorism responsibilities, and to provide policy analysis and assistance to leaders dealing with current and future terrorist threats. The group publishes (as we have in this issue of Connections), it teaches, as it did at the NATO School's inaugural Terrorism Course in November 2004, and it provides policy guidance as most members help shape policy in daily jobs in their own countries. We could do more.

We could work on common counterterrorism interoperability doctrine for border guards, interior ministries, and police. Along with the PfP Consortium's Curriculum Development and Advanced Distributive Learning Working Groups, we could develop simulations, act as role players, and play the "red team" for PfP and NATO counterterror exercises. Developing a core course curriculum in counterterrorism studies for undergraduate or graduate military academies is another core competency of the CTWG. Other PfP Consortium working groups, particularly the Security Sector Reform and Regional Stability (Southern Caucasus, Central Asia, and Southeastern Europe) Working Groups, individually, or with other groups, could add substantively to the development of capabilities for combating terrorism and other transnational threats.

The possibilities are endless and PfP Working Groups are cheap. In fiscal year 2004, the total cost of the Combating Terrorism Working Group was $23,900. As vol-

[33] The working groups are as follows: Advanced Distributed Learning, Curriculum Development, Security Sector Reform, Regional Stability in Southern Caucasus, Regional Stability in Southeast Europe, Regional Stability in Central Asia, Euro Atlantic Security Studies, Impact of Information Technology on National Security, Military History and Combating Terrorism.

unteers in an "organization of the willing," members of PfP Working Groups do not receive compensation for their work. The consortium pays for modest travel and per-diem costs for members from PfP countries. Members from NATO or other countries are self-payers who rely on their home organizations, or in some cases themselves, to cover the costs of meetings and travel. The incentives for being a member of a working group are varied. Some believe the interactive dialogue is important to continued stability, others like the opportunities for expression through panels, meetings, and publications. Upward mobility seems to be another incentive for CTWG members. Three of the group's members have been promoted to jobs of significantly more responsibility in the past few months. Leveraging the PfP Consortium and its member groups in the campaign against international terrorism would be a win-win situation for the US, NATO, PfP member states, and members of the working groups.

Conclusion

This paper advocates a more prominent role for NATO in the global effort to confront terrorism. Like General Barry McCaffrey, I believe NATO has and ought to continue to have an important role in the coordination of aspects of Western national responses, particularly—though not exclusively—those in which military forces are going to play a primary or supporting part.[34] However, this paper recognizes the capability and political limitations that temper the support NATO can actually give. Two areas of potential support that could be useful but are not controversial or adversarial are the NATO special operations community and the NATO sponsored Partnership for Peace Consortium.

[34] Richard Clarke, p. vii. Multiple conversations with General Barry McCaffrey, the Olin National Security Chair in the Department of Social Sciences at the United States Military Academy, where I am the head of the Department of Social Sciences.

Responding to the Post 9/11 Structural and Operational Challenges of Global Jihad

Rohan Gunaratna *

Introduction

The efficiency and effectiveness of state, societal, and international responses against Islamic radicalism and its by-product, terrorism, are grossly insufficient. The post-9/11 environment has witnessed an escalation rather than a diminution in threat. While the pre-9/11 environment witnessed an average of one attack every year by Al Qaeda, the post-9/11 era has brought an attack by Al Qaeda or its associated groups once every three months. In some theatres, such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Chechnya, and Saudi Arabia, the attacks are more frequent.

Our knowledge and understanding of Islamist groups have grown several-fold in the wake of the September 11 attacks. As a result of several hundred debriefings of Al Qaeda detainees, communication intercepts, and recoveries from Afghanistan and other safe havens, we now know many of its structural and operational details. Nonetheless, the traditional concepts and tools we are using to fight terrorism have proved inefficient and ineffective against the new wave of terrorism. After a reappraisal of the threat, this article will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the various approaches and strategies for combating terrorism.

The Context

As opposed to clearly-defined terrorist groups and their support bases, most twenty-first-century governments are confronted with amorphous terrorist networks. The formation of partnerships—loose cooperative networks and alliances between terrorist groups—has increased the staying power of terrorist organizations and their ideologies. Over three years before George W. Bush formed a global coalition to combat Al Qaeda and its associates in October 2001, Osama bin Laden formed the World Islamic Front for Jihad Against the Jews and the Crusaders in February 1998.[1] The World Islamic Front for Jihad against the Jews and the Crusaders, known as *Al-Jabha al-Islaamiyya lil-Jihad Dudda al-Yahood wal-Saliibiyeen*, is the largest alliance of Islamist groups ever assembled.

The expanding ideological and operational linkages between local, regional, and global terror networks are forcing governments to belatedly develop a better understanding of who is talking to whom and who is working with whom. Instead of only

---

* Rohan Gunaratna is the author of *Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), and is currently an associate professor at the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies in Singapore.

1 "World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders," released by Al Qaeda, February 1998.

monitoring and reporting, even the security services—the guardians of nations—are moving towards a truly operational agenda. Due to the growing linkages between domestic and foreign terrorist groups, governments have no option but to aggressively target and erode the ideological, personnel, and physical infrastructures of threat groups and their resilient networks. To be successful, governments should move from traditional cooperation to collaboration. A network of terrorist networks can be effectively targeted only by a network of government networks.

Unless governments realize that terrorism is a common threat that requires an international as well as a comprehensive response, they will fail to stem the global rise in terrorism. To reduce the threat of political violence, governments should closely monitor and counter both the rapid development and transfer of terrorist capabilities across regions, conflicts, and groups.

Background

Two landmark events, both of which took place in 1979, precipitated the global rise of Islamist extremism and terrorism.[2] After the successful defiance of one superpower and the defeat of another, the successes of the Iranian revolution (1979) and the anti-Soviet multinational Afghan campaign (1979–89) instilled the belief among a segment of Muslim youth that they could take on the United States. A year before the Soviet military—the world's largest—withdrew in humiliation from Afghanistan, Dr. Abdullah Azzam, a Palestinian-Jordanian cleric who was the principal ideologue of the Afghan anti-Soviet campaign, conceptualized *Al Qaeda Al Sulbah* (The Solid Base) as the vanguard of the Islamist movement. When Al Qaeda was founded by Azzam and his deputy and protégé Osama bin Laden in March of 1988, the Palestinian-Jordanian scholar wanted the group to play a leadership role in conflict zones where Muslims were suffering.[3] Al Qaeda evolved from the Afghan Service Bureau (*Maktab-il-Khidamat*), an organization established by Azzam and bin Laden at the height of the anti-Soviet campaign in 1984. Therefore, Al Qaeda rank-and-file members directly benefited and drew from an earlier generation of organizational and operational expertise and experience. However, the true strength of Al Qaeda is in its appealing ideology of global *jihad* both for Al Qaeda and other Islamist parties and groups.

Today this ideology—drawn from historical events, and tested by fire in Afghanistan, Chechnya, and Iraq—continues to resonate in the Muslim world. These events remain the principal sources of inspiration for the Islamist rank-and-file directly engaged in the fight, as well as for the wider support base sustaining the struggle. In addition, the Iranian revolution, the anti-Soviet campaign, and now the resistance in Iraq have politicized several hundred thousand Muslims worldwide. Their aftereffects con-

---

[2] For a survey of Islamist fundamentalism, see Lawrence Davidson, *Islamic Fundamentalism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998).

[3] Reuven Paz, *Tangled Web: International Networking of the Islamist Struggle* (Washington, D.C.: Washington Institute for Near East Policy, 2002), Appendix 1. "Al-Qa'idah al-Sulbah."

tinue to radicalize and mobilize Muslim territorial and migrant communities worldwide. Even today, after the total destruction of the Al Qaeda training and operational infrastructure in Afghanistan, neither Al Qaeda nor other Islamists have had difficulty recruiting members or replenishing its losses, either in material (firearms or finances) or personnel (dead and injured). Al Qaeda and other groups have managed to build in the strictest secrecy a robust and resilient organizational structure.

The global fight against Islamist extremism and terrorism will be the defining conflict of the early twenty-first century. Osama Bin Laden has built an organization that functions both operationally and ideologically at the local, national, regional, and global levels. Defeating Al Qaeda and its associated groups will be a key challenge that will dominate not only the agendas of the international security and intelligence community, law enforcement authorities, and national military forces, but a range of other actors in the foreseeable future. To terrorize Western governments, their societies, and their friends in the Muslim world, violent Islamist ideologues such as Abu Qatada, Abu Hamza Al Masri, Abu Muhammad Al Masri, Safar Al Hawali, and Salman Al Ouda have recruited and generated support from territorial and emigrant Muslim communities around the world. Even after allied and coalition troops, led by the U.S., have destroyed its training and operational infrastructure in Afghanistan, Al Qaeda, which has now transformed from a group to a movement, poses an unprecedented terrorist threat to international peace and security. Although Bin Laden is likely to be killed or die of illness, he has crafted and popularized an ideology that continues to inspire and instigate his Muslim followers to oppose the "enemies of Islam." The largely military response of the international community during the first two and half years after 9/11 has failed to reduce the threat. In fact, the terrorist threat has escalated substantially since September of 2001.

The governmental and societal response against the background of the evolving terrorist threat after 9/11 demonstrates that the contemporary wave of terrorism will gather momentum. Despite billions of dollars having been devoted to fighting terrorism, the threat persists, and is more severe than before. Combating terrorism has become a top national security priority. Nonetheless, terrorist campaigns are intractable. They require a comprehensive approach versus a single-pronged attack, and a shared versus a unilateral response.

Post-Al Qaeda Threat

Three years after the attacks of 9/11, Al Qaeda *per se*—a group that in October of 2001 had an estimated membership of only 4000 members—is operationally weak, and is no longer able to mount 9/11-style attacks on Western soil. Nonetheless, several Middle Eastern, South Asian, Southeast Asian, Central Asian, and African groups have adopted Al Qaeda's technologies, tactics, and techniques. Although Al Qaeda's strength is limited to a few hundred members today, its ideology of a global *jihad* is inspiring and instigating at least three-dozen Islamist groups worldwide. Al Qaeda's single biggest contribution has been its ability to spur Islamist groups worldwide to fight at two levels: against the near or domestic enemy—their own governments—as well as against the distant or the far enemy – the U.S. and its allies. While refusing to die, Al

Qaeda—the most hunted terrorist group in history—is contributing to the sustenance of a global Islamist insurgency.

In the post-9/11 strategic environment, multiple new groups have emerged. In power vacuum left in Iraq in the wake of the fall of the Hussein regime, the space available for the Islamist groups to grow has further expanded. With increasing space and resources, the Islamist threat is growing exponentially. With the intention of reducing the terrorist threat, the international community continues to forge and implement a wide range of security and counter-security measures. The military action in Afghanistan has dismantled the Islamist training infrastructure, and intensified intelligence and law enforcement measures in target countries have reduced the immediate threat for the next one to two years. Nonetheless, the anti- and counter-terrorist measures offer no permanent solution. While terrorist capabilities have suffered, their intentions remain the same. As the events of 3/11 in Madrid demonstrated, after painstakingly analyzing the post-9/11 security architecture, the terrorists identified its loopholes and gaps, and attacked Europe.

As a result of the U.S.-led coalition intervention in Afghanistan, both Al Qaeda and its associated members have dispersed from the core of Afghanistan and Pakistan into lawless zones around the world. These regions include Iraq, especially its border with Iran; Somalia, a conflict of international neglect; Yemen, where only 35 percent of the nation's territory is under government control; Kashmir, a conflict zone bordering Afghanistan; the Myanmar–Bangladesh border; the southern Philippines; and other conflict zones. Both Al Qaeda and its associate members are using these bases to launch attacks against the U.S. and its allies.

Post-Afghanistan Terrorist Architecture

In place of Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, the former head of the Al Qaeda military committee, several commanders have emerged in Southeast Asia, South Asia, the Persian Gulf, North Africa, Horn of Africa, the Levant, and the Caucasus. While some of them have been killed or captured, others still operate. For instance, Isamuddin Riduan (alias Hambali) was captured by the Thai Special Branch II in Central Thailand on 11 August 2003, and Khalid Ali Al Haji (alias Hazim Al Sh'ir)—Al Qaeda's chief of Gulf operations—was killed by the Saudi security forces in Saudi Arabia on 15 March 2004. Fazul Abdullah Muhammad (alias Haroon) – the chief of East Africa operations, however, is still alive and at large. After Khalid Sheikh Muhammad was captured in Pakistan by its Inter-Services-Intelligence and the CIA on 2 March 2003, a *de facto* operational commander of the Al Qaeda network has emerged.

After the U.S. invasion of Iraq, and especially after the gruesome beheading of Nick Berg, Ahmad Fadil Nazal Al-Khalayleh (alias Abu Musab Al Zarqawi), a Jordanian from Zarka, set himself up as a rising figure in the Al Qaeda network. Although his main base of operations is in Iraq, he has built a network that extends into Europe and North America. Given the extent of the networks he has been able to assemble since 9/11, he may today be considered the *de facto* operational chief of the Al Qaeda movement. Despite his differences with Osama bin Laden over the targeting of Shia

Muslims, Al Zarqawi has managed to absorb multiple Islamist support networks or transform them into operational networks.

Al Zarqawi: The Next Generation?

Al Zarqawi, a veteran of the anti-Soviet multinational Afghan *jihad*, was not known to the outside world in the 1980s. He came to the attention of international security services in the late 1990s, after he started to work with Al Qaeda in 1999. While jailed in Jordan from 1992–97, Al Zarqawi came under the ideological sway of the Jordanian cleric Abu Muhammad Maqdisi, and thereafter of Abu Qatada, who is based London.[4] From 1997 to 1999, Al Zarqawi plotted to overthrow the Jordanian government and attempted to conduct operations against Israel. Like the three-dozen Islamist groups that have received support from Al Qaeda, Al Zarqawi also received facilities and funds from Al Qaeda to train Jordanians and Palestinians, nationalities that had not previously figured prominently in Al Qaeda's membership. He established Al Tawhid in Europe, primarily in Germany, and joined forces with Ansar Al Islam in northern Iraq.

After September 2001, Al Zarqawi established a working relationship with several other groups in the region and beyond. For instance, an Al Zarqawi cell in the Pankisi Valley in Georgia provided training to North Africans who had been recruited to conduct chemical and biological attacks in France and the U.K.[5] In preparation for targeting Europe and beyond, training and experiments in building chemical and biological weapons were also conducted in the Khurmal chemical plant and training camp in an area controlled by Ansar Al Islam in the Halabja district of Suleimaniyeh Province in Kurdish Iraq. In addition to groups in Iraq, Al Zarqawi has either absorbed or begun to influence several other networks in Europe. As such, the Salafi Jihad networks influenced or controlled by Al Zarqawi have become the most pressing terrorist threat to the European continent and North America. Due to an excessive focus on Al Qaeda by governments worldwide, other groups, such as the Islamic Group of the Moroccan Combatants (GICM), or new networks, such as those organized by Al Zarqawi, have emerged.

The New Face of Al Qaeda

In waging global *jihad*, Al Qaeda plays a specific role. Using its magnified position, it seeks to promote a "clash of civilizations" between the West and Islam. As the proclaimed vanguard of the Islamic movements, Al Qaeda's intermittent attacks on symbolic, strategic, and high-profile targets are intended to inspire and instigate both Islamists and the wider Muslim community to enter into perpetual conflict with the West. After Al Qaeda attacked America's most iconic targets on 9/11, the group had achieved its primary aim. Both the September 11 attacks and the U.S. response mobi-

[4] European intelligence services monitored Said Mansour, a Moroccan living in Denmark, facilitating the introductions between Maqdisi and Abu Qatada.

[5] Interview with Investigative Judge Jean-Louis Bruguiere, February 2004.

lized over thirty violent Islamist groups into periodically attacking the United States or its allies and friends.

With the events of 9/11, both the frequency and scale of the threats posed by terrorist groups dramatically changed. Prior to September 2001, terrorism was perceived as a public nuisance and a law and order problem. After that date, terrorism was a national security issue. Due to the potential for mass destruction and mass disruption, terrorism remains on top of the national agenda, or is at least on the political agenda, of the targeted states. In order of priority, most national security agencies place terrorism first, followed by organized crime, and then proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Threats Beyond Al Qaeda

Although governments continue to focus on Al Qaeda as a group, the real terrorist threat is now embodied by the Al Qaeda network, or movement. Since 9/11, the bulk of the terrorist attacks that have been carried out around the world have not been conducted by Al Qaeda, but by its associated groups, such as Jemmah Islamiyah, Ansar Al Islam, the Al Zarqawi group, Salafi Group for Call and Combat, Abu Sayyaf, Special Purpose Islamic Regiment, Islamic International Brigade, Riyudes-Salikhin Reconnaissance and Sabotage Battalion of Chechen Martyrs, Lashkar-e-Toiba, Jayash-e-Muhammad, etc. Many of these groups were indoctrinated, armed, trained, and financed by Al Qaeda or the Taliban in Afghanistan and other conflict zones throughout the 1990s.

Today, Al Qaeda has lost operational control of many of the groups it assisted when Afghanistan was a terrorist Disneyland from February 1989, after the Soviets withdrew, until the U.S.-led intervention in October 2001. Despite Al Qaeda's loss of command with the disruption of its Afghan haven, the associated Islamist groups of Al Qaeda continue to use the ideological and logistical infrastructure built by Al Qaeda during the last decade. In addition to possessing both increased motivation and capabilities to attack the West, violent Islamists are determined to target Middle Eastern regimes they perceive as un-Islamic. Islamist strength is growing in Saudi Arabia and Yemen, the two countries that have produced the largest number of Al Qaeda members. On average, pre-9/11 Saudi Arabia witnessed one terrorist attack each year. Since the U.S. invasion of Iraq in March 2003, Saudi Arabia has experienced a terrorist encounter or attack every month.

Ideological, Logistical, and Operational Linkages

Al Qaeda interfaces with a number of Islamist groups around the world at the local level. As a direct result of this relationship, these local groups are becoming increasingly violent, and some are becoming as violent as Al Qaeda. There are marked differences in ideology and strategy between these disparate Islamist groups, but many of them feed off each other and—more importantly—learn from one another. Al Zarqawi wanted to target the Shia Muslims in Iraq in order to create a civil war within Iraq, but Bin Laden always campaigned for an inclusive rather than an exclusive policy. Nonetheless, Al Qaeda, and especially Bin Laden, is still held in respect and awe by many

Muslims working for and with Zarqawi. Faraj Ahmad Najmuddin (a.k.a. Saleh Krekar, Abu Sayed Fateh, Fateh Krekar, and Mullah Krekar), the founder of Ansar Al Islam who is currently living in Norway, said in 2000 that Bin Laden represented the crown of the Islamic nation. Ansar Al Islam was established by the merger of Jund Al Islam (Soldiers of Islam) and the Islamic Unity Movement, a faction of the Islamic Movement of Iraqi Kurdistan.[6]

The late Ibn ul-Khattab, the long-time commander of the Islamic International Brigade in Chechnya, described Osama bin Laden as "one of the major scholars of *jihad*, as well as being a main commander of the *mujahidin* worldwide." Khattab added:

> The West, and the rest of the world, are accusing Osama bin Laden of being the primary sponsor and organizer of what they call 'international terrorism' today. But as far as we are concerned, he is our brother in Islam. He is someone with knowledge and a *mujahid* fighting with his wealth and his self for the sake of Allah. He is a sincere brother and he is completely opposite to what the disbelievers are accusing him of. We know that he is well established with the *mujahidin* in Afghanistan and other places in the world. What the Americans are saying is not true. However, it is an obligation for all Muslims to help each other in order to promote the religion of Islam…. He fought for many years against the communists and is now engaged in a war against American imperialism.[7]

The penetration of local and regional conflicts by transnational Islamist groups such as Al Zarqawi's network and Jemmah Islamiyah has given more local extremist groups new capabilities, and has increased the staying power of the transnational organizations. Until recently, many in the West perceived the conflict in Chechnya not as an Islamist campaign but as a separatist movement. Even now, many Western governments permit Chechen groups to disseminate propaganda, raise funds, and procure supplies on Western soil. Similarly, Kashmir, Algeria, Mindanao in the Philippines, Iraq, and other conflict zones have been effectively penetrated by Al Qaeda and other transnational networks. Little did governments realize that, after the loss of their bases in Afghanistan, Islamists would simply migrate to these conflict zones to compensate for the destruction of their Afghan facilities.

Today it is difficult to completely separate some of the regional conflicts, which have local grievances and indigenous roots, from the movement of global *jihad*. Local conflict zones—from the Philippines, to Kashmir, to Yemen, to Somalia, to Algeria—have been used by Al Qaeda and its associated groups. For instance, Al Qaeda influenced the Southeast Asian groups with their ideology of attacking not only their local governments but also the United States and its allies. After Al Qaeda supported these smaller Southeast Asian organizations with training, funding, and ideology, some are beginning to behave like Al Qaeda. After Jemmah Islamiyah (JI) started to work with Al Qaeda, the leader of JI in Singapore, Ma Salamat Kasthari, began plotting to hijack

---

[6] Among the CNN recoveries from the Al Qaeda registry in Afghanistan, I have identified and examined two videotapes by the Islamic Movement of Iraqi Kurdistan.

[7] Ibn-ul-Khattab, *Europe: We are still at the beginning of Jihad in this Region* (London: Azzam Publications, 27 September 1999).

an Aeroflot aircraft from Bangkok, Thailand, and crash it into the Changi International Airport in Singapore. This is clearly an instance of an Al Qaeda tactic being adopted by a local Southeast Asian group. Many local Islamist groups never even considered the tactics of mass casualty attacks against Western targets or suicide attacks until Al Qaeda began to exert an influence over them.

Understanding the Challenge

Since the U.S.-led intervention began in Afghanistan on 7 October 2001, Al Qaeda and its affiliated groups have successfully sought and generated wider support for its campaign against the U.S. and its allies. Although not organized by Al Qaeda, there were worldwide demonstrations immediately after the initial U.S. and U.K. air strikes from heavy bombers, and after U.S. Navy aircraft and Tomahawk cruise missiles struck targets near Kabul, Kandahar, and Jalalabad. To attract recruits and support, Al Qaeda and its associate groups continue to build confidence among Islamic youth**,** stressing the impressive record of the Islamists. During the last two decades, Islamist extremists successfully fought the Soviet Union and the Northern Alliance (primarily backed by Russia) in Afghanistan**,** the Russians in Chechnya**,** and the coalition troops in Iraq. In Islamist literature and propaganda, "holy war by the brothers against the infidel West" is presented as a continuation of a Muslim's duty. The decade-long anti-Soviet Afghan campaign culminated in the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the end of the Cold War. Al Qaeda and its associated groups present Islamism as a political ideology that can fight against—and defeat—yet another superpower.

Although the heavy bombing disrupted and degraded the physical infrastructure of Al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan,[8] segments of the Muslim territorial and emigrant communities from Australia to the Middle East and Canada provide recruits and funding that have somewhat cushioned the loss.[9] The future survival of Islamist networks will depend on the continuing appeal of their radical ideology that thus far has proven capable of sustaining a fledgling global support network. In the virtual absence of counter-propaganda, both literate and illiterate Muslims view the ideology of global *jihad* as compatible with Islamic theology.

To counter the ideological appeal of the Islamists, the anti-terrorist coalition needs both a strategic vision and tactical direction. The anti-terrorist coalition currently lacks the capacity to counter Al Qaeda's broad strategy, as formulated by Ayman Al-Zawahiri, Bin Laden's principal strategist. In his last will, titled "The Knights Under the Prophets Banner," Al Zawahiri charted the future direction of the Islamist movement.[10] As the U.S. builds its multinational coalition and deploys its troops in Afghanistan, the

---

[8] Philip Smucker, "Al Qaeda's Greatest Escape: The Military and the Media on Terror's Trial" (Washington, D.C.: Brassey's, 2004). Smucker's account provides operational details of Al Qaeda's great escape against the backdrop of the U.S.-led coalition intervention.

[9] Michael Isikoff, "9-11 Hijackers: A Saudi Money Trail: The Feds Probe a Possible New Saudi Link to Al Qaeda," *Newsweek*, 22 November 2002.

[10] Ayman Al Zawahiri, "The Knights Under the Prophet's Banner," Internet version in English, released in November 2001; made available by *Al-Sharq al-Awsat*, 2 December 2001.

Philippines, Yemen, and Georgia, Islamists are continuously building multinational alliances of terrorist groups from the Far East to the Caucasus. Advancing the concept of the universality of the battle, Al Zawahiri has successfully widened the conflict from the national or regional to the global arena. Al Zawahiri sought to counter U.S. initiatives by expanding Al Qaeda's existing alliance, made up of the "jihad movements in the various lands of Islam as well as [Afghanistan and Chechnya] that have been liberated in the name of jihad for the sake of God."[11] To quote Al Zawahiri, the alliance represents a

> growing power that is rallying under the banner of jihad for the sake of God and operating outside the scope of the new world order. It is free of servitude to the dominating western empire. It promises destruction and ruin for the new Crusades against the lands of Islam. It is ready for revenge against the heads of the world's gathering of infidels, the United States, Russia, and Israel. It is anxious to seek retribution for the blood of the martyrs, the grief of the mothers, the deprivation of the orphans, the suffering of the detainees, and the sores of the tortured people throughout the land of Islam, from Eastern Turkestan to Andalusia [the Muslim state in Spain].[12]

In an effort to mobilize the "Muslim nation," Al Qaeda projected the confrontation in Afghanistan as a battle between "Islam against infidelity." Reviewing the lack of support by Islamist movements immediately after 9/11, Al Qaeda emphasized the need for perseverance, patience, steadfastness, and adherence to a firm set of principles. In keeping with the belief that the key to victory is the example set by the movement's leadership, Al Qaeda placed the responsibility for the campaign on the leaders, and the responsibility for the quality of their leadership on the membership. To the words of the Koran, "O ye who believe. Endure, outdo all others in endurance, be ready, and observe your duty to Allah, in order that ye may succeed." Al Zawahiri adds,

> [i]f signs of relaxation and retreat start to show on the leadership, the movement must find ways to straighten out its leadership and not to permit it to deviate from the line of jihad. The loyalty to the leadership and the acknowledgement of its precedence and merit represent a duty that must be emphasized and a value that must be consolidated. But if loyalty to the leadership reaches the point of declaring it holy, and if the acknowledgement of its precedence and merit leads to infallibility, the movement will suffer from methodological blindness. Any leadership flaw could lead to a historic catastrophe, not only for the movement but also for the entire nation. Hence comes the importance of the issue of leadership in Islamic action in general and jihad action in particular, and the nation's need for a scientific, struggling, and rational leadership that could guide the nation, amidst the mighty storms and hurricanes, toward its goal with awareness and prudence, without losing sight of its path, stumbling aimlessly, or reversing its course.[13]

---

[11] Ayman Al Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner—Meditations on the Jihadist Movement," *Al-Sharq al-Awsat* (in Arabic), London, 2 December 2001.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

Al Zawahiri justifies an escalation in the methods of strikes and tools of resistance by patiently stressing four points in his post 9/11 book, *Knights Under the Prophet's Banner–Meditations on the Jihadist Movement*.[14] First, he emphasizes the need to inflict maximum casualties against the opponent, for this is the language understood by the West, no matter how much time and effort such operations take. Second, Al Zawahiri stressed the need to concentrate on martyrdom (suicide) operations as the most successful way of inflicting damage against the enemies of Islam and the least costly to the *mujahedeen* in terms of casualties. Third, he required that the targets as well as the type and method of weapons used be chosen with a view to having an impact on the structure of the enemy, an impact sufficient to stop its "brutality, arrogance, and disregard for all taboos and customs." Fourth, Al Zawahiri stressed that a focus on "the domestic enemy alone will not be feasible at this stage," meaning that local Islamist groups must strike not only domestic but also foreign targets, both on their own soil and overseas.

Considering the limitations under which Al Qaeda operates, its post-Taliban exhortations urge Islamist groups other than Al Qaeda to engage in mass casualty terrorism. Aware of the depletion of resources on its side, Al Qaeda has called for a change in the method of strikes and the choice of targets against the superior coalition forces to "keep up with the tremendous increase in the number of its enemies, the quality of their weapons, their destructive powers, their disregard for all taboos, and disrespect for the customs of wars and conflicts."[15] Al Qaeda significantly increased the popularity of suicide terrorism—a time-tested tactic for killing, maiming, and injuring opponents in substantial numbers—by launching the first Islamist suicide attack on Western soil. In a pre-recorded Al Qaeda video message, the UA93 hijacker Ahmed Ibrahim Al Haznawi (who planned to target the U.S. Capitol) proclaimed: "The time of humiliation and subjugation is over…. But, today we are killing them in the midst of their homes. It's time to kill Americans in their heartland."[16]

As most Islamist groups are territorially bound, they are unlikely to follow Al Qaeda's exhortation. Nonetheless, Al Qaeda sleeper cells located in Europe and the U.S.—both newly formed cells and cells introduced from overseas—are likely to strike targets on Western soil. As a priority, Al Qaeda has called to shift the campaign to the continental U.S. However, unprecedented law enforcement and intelligence cooperation, the intensified hunt for Al Qaeda cells, and the increased level of public vigilance in European and North American countries has made it difficult for terrorists to mount

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid. Because coalition forces attacked during Ramadan, Al Qaeda said that the "enemy" has a "disregard for all taboos, and disrespect for the customs of wars and conflicts."

[16] "The Wills of the New York and Washington Battle Martyrs," Al Qaeda video, where Al Zawahiri takes credit for the 9/11 attacks with footage of a confession by Ahmed Ibrahim al-Haznawi, one of the hijackers of UA 93 that crashed in Pennsylvania, pleading with God to accept him as a martyr, against the backdrop of a montage of the WTC on flames. Clip released by Al Jazeera to Western networks on 15 April 2002; complete film telecast on Al Jazeera on 18 April 2002.

operations in these states. Nonetheless, conventional deterrence—capture, arrest, trial, imprisonment, humiliation, and injury or execution—of terrorists is unlikely to permanently protect the West from terrorism. As long as the operational, logistical, and ideological infrastructures of a terrorist group or network remain intact, terrorism will threaten both the Muslim world and the Western world. As we have seen with the decline of Al Qaeda as a group, the organizations that perpetrate terror are neither invincible nor impervious to destruction. By understanding the operational and ideological techniques of Al Qaeda and its affiliated groups, counter-measures can be developed to disrupt, degrade and destroy them. By painstakingly detecting the worldwide physical infrastructure and human networks of extremist Islamists, their organizations can be dismantled and their leading figures incapacitated. However, can the long-term strategic threat posed by violent Islamists be neutralized by military means alone?

By means of comparison, Islamist organizations of the past fizzled out because they did not have battle-tested structures. Previously, Islamists relied on village, clan, and tribe-centered organizations based on traditional loyalties. The Islamists of the twentieth century lacked a modern, robust, resilient organizational structure. By adapting pre-existing models and seamlessly adjusting them to modern requirements, post-modern Islamists have built organizations that are flexible and dynamic. Al Qaeda's politically clandestine structure is built on the idea of internationalism. Using techniques drawn from Leninism and operating on the Marxist militant model, Al Qaeda and its associate groups use battle names, adhere strictly to a cell structure, follow the idea of a cadre party, maintain tight discipline, promote self-sacrifice and reverence for the leadership, and are guided by a program of action.[17] Al Qaeda and its allies are self-reproducing. and therefore hard to defeat. As there is no historical precedent to Al Qaeda or its networks, the past offers very little guidance. The success or failure of the U.S.-led anti-terrorist campaign will depend on the ability and willingness of the U.S. and its coalition partners to learn as they proceed. In an ever-changing dynamic environment, only by minimizing failures and maximizing successes can they prevail against a determined enemy that is willing to die as well as kill. Specialists in counter-revolutionary warfare and counter-terrorism lack a plan and a model to fight Al Qaeda and its affiliates, who together constitute the premier global terrorist network. In the Bush or Blair cabinets, there is no equivalent to Ayman Al Zawahiri, a strategist with a vision and a mission.

Threat and Response Cycles

The threat of terrorism has steadily escalated since the end of the Cold War. In the years that followed the fall of the Berlin Wall, state sponsors lost control over non-state armed actors. An ideological vacuum resulted, and with the confrontation between the U.S. and the USSR coming to an end, the black and gray markets were flooded with vast quantities of conventional and unconventional weapons. Furthermore, the increased pace of globalization heralded an era of inexpensive travel and communication. Both within and outside the world's conflict zones, terrorist groups

[17] For red models, see Noemi Gal-Or, *Revolutionary Terrorism, Encyclopedia of Terrorism*, Volume 1, 194–96.

developed front, cover, and sympathetic organizations to take advantage of the forces of globalization. These organizations, taking the guise of human rights, humanitarian, commercial, economic, social, cultural, media, labor, recreational, political, religious, and other community bodies were able and willing to exploit both their communities and other resources. Due to the sustained suppression of terrorist groups and their support bases in the global south of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, many members and supporters of terror groups moved to the West.

Exploiting the liberal values of the West, foreign terrorist groups created vast support networks on Western soil that funded terror campaigns from Algeria to Sri Lanka. Terrorists even tapped into grants or aid given by Western countries. Following the Cold War practice of monitoring spies, Western governments monitored terrorist groups operating in their countries, but did little to erode their strength. Until 9/11, most foreign terror groups used the West for refuge and support activity and not to conduct terrorist attacks against Western states. Many Western governments—notably Canada, Australia, and New Zealand—observed the support activities these groups conducted, but took no action. After 9/11, with the sustained call by Osama bin Laden that it was "the duty of the Muslims to wage jihad," many support cells have been transformed into attack cells.

Since the East Africa embassy bombings of August 1998, the threat of a mass casualty attack in the U.S. had been apparent, but Washington lacked sufficient domestic or international support to intervene in Afghanistan. With the Soviet withdrawal in February 1989, Afghanistan replaced the Syrian-controlled Bekaa Valley in Lebanon as the world's premier terrorist training center for about forty guerrilla and terrorist groups. With no vital interests at stake in this remote corner of Asia, the West was oblivious to the suffering of the Afghan people, who had endured death and destruction for two decades. Human civilization progressed in many directions in the last century, but like a shadow, the conflicts it neglected and ignored are returning with a vengeance. With the continuing international neglect of Afghanistan, the global center of gravity of terrorism gradually shifted to Afghanistan throughout the 1990s. Although terrorist groups consistently grew in strength, size, and influence throughout the 1990s, governments failed to understand the developments on the ground. For instance, the lead U.S. law enforcement agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, had placed organized crime above terrorism on its list of priorities. Similarly, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency closed down a number of its overseas monitoring stations, and did not invest adequately in agent placement or recruitment operations.

A multitude of other factors also helped create the conditions that allowed 9/11 to happen: U.S. disengagement from world affairs; the Western myth that controlling its borders will protect itself from the rest of the world; international neglect of protracted conflicts, etc. Traditionally, the development of counter-measures has been a reaction to a breach of security. European governments, for instance, developed elite forces to combat terrorism in response to Germany's failure to prevent the Palestinian Liberation Organization's massacre of Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympic Games in Septem-

ber of 1972.[18] Thirty years later, the primary locus of international terrorism had shifted from the Middle East to Asia, but terrorist groups could still conduct long-range deep penetration operations to strike the West. The horror, fear, and anger generated by the September 11 attacks spurred unprecedented levels of security, intelligence, and judicial cooperation worldwide. To combat Bin Laden's alliance, the World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Crusaders and Jews, the international community has belatedly formed an anti-terrorist coalition. At the heart of the Islamist alliance is the ideology of global *jihad* articulated by Al Qaeda and its associates. At the core of the counter-terrorist coalition are the Western and Asian liberal democracies—North America, Europe, Australia, and Japan—the wealthiest and most powerful governments that can sustain a protracted campaign against terrorism in the years ahead.

In international politics, the West is the leader. It leads the international community, it sets the standards, and in many cases it provides the resources. Until September 2001, both the extant and the emerging terrorist threats were poorly understood. As Afghanistan gradually turned into a terrorist haven, the world looked the other way; Western and other governments failed to forecast probable future developments. Until 9/11, the Western response to terrorism had been reactive. The Western mindset was that of a fisherman instead of a hunter. In the fisherman model, government enforcement authorities wait to respond until an attack occurs. Many government agencies had to wait for a lead to start an investigation; counter-terrorism operations were lead-driven and not intelligence-driven. Following the hunter metaphor, after 9/11, government enforcement bodies, working closely with their intelligence counterparts, proactively targeted terrorist cells engaged in planning and preparing operations. The U.S. mindset was forced to change after 9/11, and the European mindset after 3/11 – the Madrid train bombing. Unfortunately, in order for countries to develop robust measures, their governments and societies had to first be affected by terrorism. Otherwise, legislation had no public support, and politicians lacked the courage to do what was necessary to combat terrorism.

As the counter-terrorism response model that would be emulated by the rest of the world, the Western response *had* to be right. The West was regarded as the standard bearer in this regard. For instance, elite counter-terrorism units were created only after the Munich Olympics in 1972. After the German police failed to counter the attack by the Black September Organization (a faction of Fatah, the military wing of the PLO) and their taking of Israeli hostages, the German government created GSG9, and the French government soon thereafter created GIGN. Other governments, including Italy, Spain, and countries outside Europe, followed suit. The West was resourceful; as such, it had greater staying power in the counter-terrorist struggle. In conflict zones such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Euro-Atlantic Alliance, NATO, is committed to a long-term presence. Similarly, the West had technological superiority; its technical intelli-

[18] Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1998); 124, and Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State's Response* (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 190.

gence agencies had global coverage and collected the largest volume of intelligence.[19] Until the West develops an appropriate model to fight terrorism, the rest of the world will lack the leadership and the commitment to do so on their own part.

Problems of Response

To sustain campaigns of politically motivated violence (insurgency, terrorism, guerrilla warfare, assassination, sabotage, ethnocide), their proponents and perpetrators build support networks as well as operational networks. While support networks generate financing and help recruit members, operational networks prepare and execute attacks. When fighting terrorism, it is essential that both governments and their publics understand that operational cells cannot survive without support cells. When responding to terrorism, therefore, government must engage and neutralize both the terror group itself and its support base to a point where the organization becomes operationally ineffective. Usually, the range of measures necessary to operationally shut down an organization includes neutralizing the leadership and simultaneously dampening public support to ensure that the group does not revive. The approaches target both the terrorist group—especially the top tier of leadership—and the support base. Since extremist ideology and support networks ensure the survival of the group, targeting these components is critical. The intelligence community, military forces, and law enforcement agencies alone cannot combat terrorism and extremism.

In a terrorist support network, propaganda is the key to recruitment and generation of support. Terrorists enjoy disproportionately vast support networks. For instance, Muhammed Mansour Jabarah, a Canadian who was assigned to coordinate the Al Qaeda attacks in Southeast Asia, was recruited by Sulaiman Abu Gaith, a Kuwaiti, who showed him

> propaganda videos about the war in Chechnya and told him about Abdullah Azzam, one of the founders of extremist Islamist philosophy. Jabarah returned to Canada, but his heart was already with jihad…. Jabarah began raising money in southern Ontario for the Islamic fighters in Chechnya, which he sent to Abu Gaith. … Abu Gaith released a videotaped statement in which he called the 9/11 attacks 'a good deed … the Americans should know that the storm of plane attacks will not abate, with God's permission. There are thousands of the Islamic nation's youth who are eager to die just as the Americans are eager to live.'[20]

However, governments tolerate terrorist support networks, as they pose no direct and immediate threat. Furthermore, most Western liberal democracies, such as Canada, as well as emerging democracies—governments in the global south that seek to emulate the West—tolerate terrorist propaganda.

---

[19] Rohan Gunaratna, "The Terrorist Threat to the Continent," presentation at a meeting of the Special Committee of NATO, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Copenhagen, 27 May 2004.

[20] Stewart Bell, *Cold Terror: How Canada Nurtures and Exports Terrorism Around the World* (Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, 2004), 194–95.

The Internet as a Primary Communication Tool

To a large extent, counter-terrorism policies, structures, and practices have developed during the last thirty years to fight terrorist operational cells, not support cells. But, since terrorists are like sharks that rapidly move in search of fresh opportunities, they are exploiting the Internet as a new domain. Despite the Internet's status as the principal method by which the post-9/11 terrorist ideologues indoctrinate new recruits, the legislation to target terrorist and extremist Web sites is still in its infancy. In addition to reinforcing their belief system, Islamists use the "Internet for five primary purposes: propaganda, recruitment, indoctrination, fund-raising, [and] psychological warfare."[21] The Internet provides terrorist organizations and their support bases

> easy access, little or no regulation, censorship, or other forms of government control, potentially huge audiences spread throughout the world, anonymity of communication, fast flow of information, inexpensive development and maintenance of a Web presence, a multimedia environment (the ability to combine text, graphics, audio, and video, and to allow users to download films, songs, books, posters and so forth), and the ability to shape coverage in the traditional mass media, which increasingly use the internet as a source for stories.[22]

Exemplifying how the Internet has been used as a platform for politicizing, radicalizing, and mobilizing terrorist support activity, an analyst states: "Potential recruits are bombarded with religious decrees and anti-American propaganda, provided with training manuals on how to be a terrorist, and—as they are led through a maze of secret chat rooms—given specific instructions on how to make the journey to Iraq."[23] In one particularly graphic exchange in a secret Al Qaeda chat room in early September 2003, an unknown Islamist user, with the user name "Redemption is Close," wrote, "Brothers, how do I go to Iraq for Jihad? Are there any army camps and is there someone who commands there?" Four days later he received a reply from "Merciless Terrorist": "Dear Brother, the road is wide open for you—there are many groups, go out for someone you trust, he will be the protector of the Iraqi regions and with the help of Allah you will become one of the *mujahidin*."[24]

U.S. Web sites, chat rooms, and discussion groups were used by U.S.-based support cells to target American interests. For instance, a posting on Yahoo!QoqazGroup on 25 February 2003 called upon Muslims who work for the American military to disclose targeting information to the *mujahedeen*. In the urgent appeal, the requested targets included the locations of American military personnel, logistics support, and weaponry, as well as the location of American oil interests and the routes of ships serving those interests. The poster of this message was "Abu Banan," a frequent poster

---

[21] Madeleine Gruen, "White Ethnonationalist and Political Islamist Methods of Fund-raising and Propaganda on the Internet," in *The Changing Face of Terrorism*, ed. Rohan Gunaratna (Singapore: Eastern Universities Press, 2004), 127.

[22] Gabriel Weimann, "www.terror.net: How Modern Terrorism Uses the Internet," United States Institute of Peace Publication No. 116 (March 2004), 13.

[23] Weimann, " www.terror.net," 13.

[24] Ibid., 8–9.

to the discussion group. Such information, if it were provided, could lead to significant fatalities and casualties among American and allied troops. Similarly, a member of the same discussion group, Khalid Jbaihi, another frequent poster, provided a detailed response to a specific request for information on how one could go train for *jihad* in a Laskar-e-Toiba training camp in Pakistan. Beginning October 2001, the U.S.-led global coalition dismantled the training camps of Al Qaeda and several other Islamist groups in Afghanistan. To partially compensate for this loss, alternative camps were established in Pakistan, where Laskar-e-Toiba, a group affiliated with Al Qaeda, provided training. At the time that Khalid Jbaihi made these frequent postings to Yahoo!QoqazGroup, the FBI notes that he was a computer science student at New Mexico State University in the U.S.

Saudi doctoral candidate Samy Omar Al-Hussayen of Moscow, Idaho, frequented multiple electronic platforms in pursuit of *jihad*.[25] Al-Hussayen promoted [26] Sheikh Salman Al-Ouda and Sheikh Safar Al-Hawali, the two Saudi sheiks associated with Al Qaeda,[27] and its leader Osama bin Laden.[28] In addition to evidence of having provided support for two campaigns, in Palestine and Chechnya,[29] the FBI recovered Hamas fund-raising literature and images of Ibn-ul-Khattab[30] and Shamil Basayev[31] from Al-

[25] The overwhelming evidence of Al-Hussayen's role is based on files recovered from Al-Hussayen's home computer; FISA intercepts; records obtained from OLM; files recovered from the service providers Interland and Yahoo; files obtained from Internet archives for Web sites; and documents seized during the search of Al-Hussayen's home. I examined the contents of two of the twenty-one computers seized by the FBI.

[26] FISA intercept [B67a], 15 January 2003.

[27] "Bombing Saudi Arabia, National Guard Facility Riyah [sic], Saudi Arabia on 11/13/95," Telex from FBI Atlanta to Director FBI; based on fax received by CNN Atlanta at 11.36 PM on 14 November 1995; Operation "Blessed Kaaba" and Operation "Aqsa Mosque," In the Name of God, the Magnificent the merciful, Statement Number (2) and (3) respectively, The Islamic Army for the Liberation of Holy Places, n.d. n.p.; The Formation of the Islamic Army for the Liberation of the Holy Places, In the Name of God, the Magnificent the merciful, Statement Number (1), The Islamic Army for the Liberation of Holy Places, n.d. n.p. All the documents were provided by the U.S. Department of Justice.

[28] Both directly and through Al Qaeda fronts, Osama bin Laden repeatedly publicized the views of these two Saudi sheiks and called for their release from Saudi custody. Furthermore, the U.S. and other governments recovered substantial information and propaganda produced by these two men in Afghanistan and Pakistan, especially that of Al-Ouda. The recoveries included audiotapes of Al-Ouda and one CD bearing Al-Ouda's name, and an English synopsis recovered from a suspected Al Qaeda safe house in Islamabad, Pakistan; IB96 and Afghanistan Tracking Number AFGP-2002-803723. Two cassette tapes of Al-Ouda found in the former home of Osama bin Laden in Kandahar City, Afghanistan, labeled AFGP-2002-801184.

[29] File obtained from the service provider Interland on 13 October 2000; file obtained from Al-Hussayen's home computer on 10 November 2000; file obtained from Yahoo!, 9 February 2000; and file recovered from Al-Hussayen's home computer, 15 June 2000.

[30] File obtained from Yahoo!, 13 June 2000.

[31] File obtained from Yahoo!, 11 February 2000.

Hussayen's computer. Furthermore, Al-Hussayen distributed articles, interviews, broadcasts, and *fatwa* (legal decrees) calling for and justifying suicide bombings.[32]

Terrorist ideologues and their supporters use the World Wide Web and books to disseminate information and misinformation in their campaign to politicize and radicalize Muslims against the West. Before plotting the bombing of two night clubs in Bali, where 202 people were killed, the Al Qaeda strategist Imam Samudra claimed that "to understand jihad" he read a number of books including by Sheikh Safar Al-Hawali,[33] Sheikh Salman Al-Ouda,[34] and number of articles from Internet sites, including "www.Azzam.com, www.qogaz.Net, www.abubaseer.com, www.jehad.net, www.khurasaan.com, www.Azfalrasas.com, www.jihadurspur.net, [and] www.makt habah.net."[35] The case of Imam Samudra illustrates how the terrorist practice of *jihad* is inspired and instigated by reading the writings of Islamist ideologues in books and on the Internet.

Compared to terrorist operational infrastructures, terrorist support infrastructures have greater staying power. As long as governments are unwilling and unable to target terrorist support and conceptual infrastructures, terrorism will continue to flourish. To challenge the contemporary wave of terrorism, governments must think beyond selfish national interests and traditional military strategy. That is, governments must be prepared to work closely with other governments on a day-to-day basis and develop the critical thinking and new structures to fight both the violence and the extremism that promotes the violence.

From Cooperation to Collaboration

With the globalization of terrorism throughout the 1990s, the nature, quality, and scale of international cooperation in combating terrorism has changed dramatically. In combating both domestic and international terrorism, the increased coordination in international counter-terrorism efforts has proved to be one of the most important pillars of effective response. The factors driving contemporary international cooperation include the increased reach of terrorist organizations and the severity of the terrorist threat. Due to increased globalization, terrorist groups have been able to operate overseas with relative ease. Many groups have either established support or operational cells in other countries, and some groups cooperate with like-minded groups worldwide. While the Al Qaeda group has developed a global reach, the Al Qaeda movement has become the classic example of a terrorist conglomerate.

---

[32] IRS John P. Pulcastro, File 265C-SU-55418-197, FBI Investigation on 11/8/2002 at Spokane, Washington, 19 November 2002.

[33] "[Arabic title] (Condemnation of Kissinger), Syaik Dr. Jafar Hawali, which contains data on U.S. brutality and robbery in two Islamic holy places (Haramain)," Imam Samura Police Interview, 16 December 2002.

[34] "The fatwa by Syaikh Dr. Salman ŒAudah concerning the U.S. crimes against the Islamic world (states)," Imam Samudra Police Interview, 16 December 2002.

[35] Imam Samudra Police Interview, 16 December 2002.

In addition to expressing an interest in conducting mass fatality and casualty attacks, terrorist groups are developing their capabilities to conduct mass disruption attacks.[36] Some groups, such as the Abu Musab Al Zarqawi network, have successfully acquired, developed, and are likely to use chemical, biological, and radiological agents in the immediate future. To those who lived in the belief that terrorists would not kill, maim, injure, and traumatize in large numbers, the events of September 11 provided ample evidence of current and future terrorist intentions.

After 9/11, the scope of matters addressed, the range of actors, and the scale of cooperation changed dramatically. The areas of interaction include security and intelligence, law enforcement, military, judicial, diplomatic, and political cooperation. In addition to the post-war alliance—the Australia–Canada–U.K.–U.S.–New Zealand system—the number of actors cooperating in the fight against terrorism has increased. The civilian and military intelligence agencies of the NATO countries—the largest collectors of counter-terrorism intelligence—are working together with countries outside North America and Europe to combat terrorism. Despite past and present ideological differences, Russia and China have cooperated with the United States. Except Egypt, which has bilateral ties with governments in NATO, the Mediterranean countries—including Mauritania, Morocco, Algeria, Jordan, and Israel—have become dialogue partners with Europe and North America. Even Libya, Sudan, and Iran, former active sponsors of terrorism, have provided information to the U.S. and to other states. For instance, in the case of the Abu Musab Al Zarqawi network, Iran cooperated with Jordan. Although Syria remains designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, Damascus has selectively cooperated with the U.S. on occasion.

With respect to Al Qaeda and its associates, the U.S. government is cooperating with 120 countries, and Britain is cooperating with nearly 100 countries; similarly, Pakistan is cooperating with 70 countries. Still, the bulk of the collaboration—and the bulk of the operational work—is carried out between the Anglo-Saxon countries, followed by third country partnerships: New Zealand with Singapore, Australia with New Zealand, U.S. with Israel, U.S. with Pakistan, U.K. with India, etc. With Middle Eastern and Asian countries providing sound and timely intelligence to the West, the traditional barriers to the West sharing intelligence with the Muslim world have been broken. Despite setbacks, such as the unilateral U.S. invasion of Iraq, its failure to mediate the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, or the Abu Ghraib prison abuse scandal, counter-terrorism cooperation has continued.

Cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts is gradually transforming from coordination to collaboration. Traditionally, security and intelligence services share information on the movement, finances, and weapons of terrorists. As terrorists began to operate across borders, security services coordinated the timing of their counter-terrorist operations. Today, security services are moving from coordinating on operations into collaborating on the targeting of terrorist networks. The areas of collaboration include

[36] Gilbert King, *Dirty Bomb: Weapons of Mass Disruption* (New York: Chamberlain Bros., 2004).

exchanges of personnel, joint training, joint and combined operations, sharing of expertise, sharing of experience, transfer of resources, and development of common databases. In addition to security services, law enforcement agencies are building relationships with their counterparts by sharing data, posting their officers overseas, and engaging in joint training and investigations. In addition to the FBI increasing the number of officers posted around the world, state and local law enforcement authorities such as the New York Police Department have posted intelligence officers to Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. On the frontiers of law enforcement cooperation there has been a sea change both in mindset and practice. For instance, instead of case building and successful prosecution, for the first time police officers are being rewarded for turning terrorists and their supporters into informants.

The exchange of information remains at the heart of counter-terrorism collaboration. Traditionally, only heads of services or designated persons exchanged information. Due to the severity of the threat, cooperation today is both formal and informal. Counter-terrorism officials are willing to bypass government rules and regulations to share especially time sensitive intelligence with their counterparts. As a request for a bank account or a phone intercept may take several months or years through the traditional legal channels, officials who realize the threat are willing to dispense with the bureaucracy and informally help their counterparts. In Camps X-ray and Delta, foreign counter-terrorism intelligence officers received access to detainees from their own countries and other foreign countries. In sharing intelligence, it is not the appointment or the rank of the requesting party but "who you know and how well you know that person."[37] The development of such informal connections between intelligence agencies is critical in a security environment where threats take shape rapidly, and where intelligence gathered on one side of the world may only be useful on the other side.

As a function, counter-terrorism intelligence has traditionally fallen within the security services domain. With this work being the sole area of responsibility of these agencies, counter-terrorism intelligence functions have been closely held, and among some services they are still being quite jealously guarded. Nonetheless, in countries that have directly suffered from terrorism, the security and intelligence services have decided to share intelligence among the different agencies—internal, external, civilian, and military—as well as with their law enforcement and military counterparts. For instance, Shin Bet, Israel's internal security service, operates within Israel and in the Occupied Territories in an intelligence capacity and overseas in a security role. Due to the high level of threat Israel faces every day, Shin Bet will share information and work closely with the Israeli military intelligence, a service that works both inside Israel and overseas. On a daily basis, Shin Bet and military intelligence will share intelligence with the Mossad, Israeli's foreign intelligence agency, which is responsible for both collection and covert action overseas. Unfortunately, government agencies begin to cooperate with other agencies even in their own country only if they have directly ex-

[37] Interview, Lt.Col. Mike Dolamore, head of the Counter Terrorism School, U.K., December 2002.

perienced terrorism and perceive that they are under continuous threat. Intra-agency cooperation is crucial to domestic inter-agency cooperation. Domestic interagency cooperation is the building block of international interagency cooperation. With the globalization of terrorism and the rapid development of terrorist networks, governments have no option but to build frameworks for multi-lateral, multi-agency cooperation.[38] Without developing multi-agency intelligence collection and sharing mechanisms, it will be difficult for current and future governments to target terrorist networks before they strike.

The Principal Actors

The actors that cooperate in the counter-terrorism arena include security and intelligence services, law enforcement agencies, military forces, judicial bodies, diplomatic offices, and political leaders.

Security and intelligence. The exchange of information between security and intelligence services across the world has been the most established form of cooperation. The Anglo-Saxon and the Western European services have cooperated closely since World War II. Until 9/11, cooperation was largely restricted to the sharing of information on espionage targets. Joint covert action was rare in the 1990s, although an exception was the CIA's cooperation with their Croatian and Egyptian counterparts to capture Fouad Talat Kassim, the operational leader of the Egyptian Islamic Group. Prior to September 2001, the security services in the West rarely collaborated with services outside the West. After 9/11, Western services have been forced to work closely with their Middle Eastern, Asian, and African counterparts on terrorism. As terrorism is increasingly perceived as a common threat, security and intelligence services across the world have collaborated, conducting joint operations against terrorist targets worldwide.

Law enforcement. Traditionally, police, customs, immigration, coast guard, and other law enforcement authorities shared information on criminal matters. Law enforcement agencies shared counter-terrorism responsibilities only when the threat increased. Even INTERPOL and EUROPOL began to focus on terrorism only at the turn of the century. Until 9/11, many law enforcement officers in countries that did not periodically suffer from terrorism firmly believed that counter-terrorism was the responsibility of the security and intelligence community. With the exception of New York and Washington, even today many state and local police departments believe that

[38] A real-life example is a case where an Asian intelligence agency may recruit a student traveling to the Middle East to study. A Middle East station of a European intelligence agency, collaborating with the Asian agency, will manage the informant. Another real-life example is how a European agency will recruit a European Muslim and assign him to infiltrate a group of Muslims traveling to Iraq to fight coalition forces. Upon arrival in Iraq, the European Muslim will be arrested by U.S. troops. The informant will be isolated, debriefed by coalition forces on the networks facilitating and the routes used to transport fighters to Iraq, and then either freed to develop an even better understanding of the Iraqi battlefield or transported back to the host country for future operations.

counter-terrorism is the responsibility of the main American federal law enforcement agency, the FBI. However, where enlightened leaders head up law enforcement efforts, the state and local authorities are beginning to develop counter-terrorism capabilities very similar to those they developed to fight white-collar, violent, and organized crime. A few police departments share with their intelligence counterparts the burden of not only policing and response but also collection and analysis of counter-terrorism intelligence. Rather than relying on a federal authority to collect intelligence in their own state, the involvement of state agencies in everyday collection and analysis has increased the quality of intelligence produced. Any authority or agency is only as good as the extent to which it is in constant contact with developments on the ground: observing and detaining suspected and known terrorists, raiding and seizing their safe houses, interrogating and debriefing detainees, recruiting terrorists, and planting informants in terrorist groups and their support bases. Within federal, state, and local law enforcement authorities, the scale of cooperation has grown particularly on matters pertaining to terrorism.

Military. The failure of the intelligence and law enforcement communities to effectively fight terrorism at home forced the U.S. to deploy its military in a counter-terrorism role. Compared to the very small number of terrorists killed or arrested and successfully prosecuted by the U.S. government on U.S. soil throughout the 1990s, the number of persons who became terrorists grew exponentially overseas. Furthermore, U.S. law enforcement could not effectively conduct operations against Al Qaeda or its host the Taliban without the support of the U.S. military. Al Qaeda's continued use of Afghanistan as a base of operations after September 11 forced the U.S. to deploy its military to dismantle the terrorist training and operational infrastructure in Afghanistan and replace the Taliban regime. As a result of the campaign in Afghanistan, the knowledge of terrorism within coalition military forces has multiplied several times. Prior to 9/11, counter-terrorism was the function of only a few military forces. Even within the Defense Intelligence Agency of the U.S. Department of Defense, or the Defense Intelligence Staff of the U.K.'s Ministry of Defense, the staff dedicated to counter-terrorism functions was under 100. Cooperation in counter-terrorism between the military intelligence agencies was limited in a very few cases, and non-existent in most others. Even within NATO, the post-Cold War focus was on the conventional military threat. Except the Special Committee of NATO (a meeting of heads of security and intelligence services of the Euro-Atlantic area), which focused on espionage until the late 1990s, appreciating and responding to the terrorist threat was not a priority. With the formation of coalitions in Afghanistan and Iraq, Western militaries are sharing counter-terrorism intelligence and conducting joint and combined operations, primarily overseas. As the military is numerically large, law enforcement and intelligence services are tapping into the expertise developed by their military counterparts.

Judicial. With terrorism having become globalized, it became necessary for the ministries and departments of justice of different countries to work together. Many terrorist groups are aware of the difficulties and differences between various criminal-justice and prison systems, and they exploited them to survive and succeed in their operations. As France frequently complained, several violent Islamist groups were oper-

ating in the U.K., even after 9/11. Likewise, when the PKK was targeted in Germany, it moved its infrastructure to Brussels and to other European cities soft on terrorism. Similarly, several violent Islamist groups found safe haven in the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, and in Canada. The incompatibility of criminal-justice systems and different legal standards has hindered judicial cooperation over the years. During the post-Cold War period, governments began to harmonize their legislation, mostly on criminal matters. In the post-9/11 environment, most governments prefer rendition to extradition, which involves a lengthy process. Only some governments in Europe—especially the U.K. and Germany—insist on extradition. As the ministries and departments of justice are increasingly involved in counter-terrorism, some have created separate counter-terrorism divisions. Most judicial bodies have belatedly developed the appropriate legislation to fight terrorism. For instance, due to the lack of any applicable law, the Australian government could not detain Abdul Rahim, the Australian Jemmah Islamiyah leader who left Australia one week after JI had killed 88 Australian citizens in Bali, Indonesia. The increased and continuing threat is driving governments to be more committed to developing timely legislation as well as common standards and practices, at least regionally. Nonetheless, even in developed Europe, due to the diverse legal systems on the continent the difficulties are numerous, and progress has been limited.

Diplomatic. The first line of action against foreign terrorist groups operating overseas is diplomacy. For instance, the diplomatic and political tools of government are essential to exert pressure on other governments that actively or tacitly permit the operation of foreign terrorist groups and support bases on their soil. In many ways, the events of 9/11 were a result of continued U.S. failure to persuade Pakistan to intervene in Afghanistan, force the Taliban to abandon Osama bin Laden as an ally, and to shut down the foreign training camps. Although it failed to achieve the desired results, the American and British governments succeeded in persuading Khartoum to expel Bin Laden from Sudan in May 1996. Diplomatic measures supported by economic carrots and military sticks can yield the desired results. Traditionally, foreign offices have cooperated on counter-terrorism, primarily on matters of international law pertaining to terrorism. For instance, foreign ministries and departments of governments have worked closely on developing and implementing international and regional conventions. Furthermore, certain Western governments—notably the United States—have used the diplomatic channel to extended specialist training and other forms of assistance to other states, especially law enforcement agencies in developing countries. In addition to its own academy, the FBI has a separate academy for training foreign law enforcement officers. After 9/11, both the U.S. and some of the major powers have tied both foreign aid and grants to counter-terrorism cooperation. In addition to receiving non-NATO ally status, Pakistan received several hundred million dollars in aid in exchange for working closely with the U.S. in targeting Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and their associates. Many foreign offices have created counter-terrorism divisions, and some foreign offices have even appointed counter-terrorism ambassadors.

Political. With the attacks of September 11, terrorism shifted from a nuisance and a law and order issue into a national security threat. When heads of government and

state, or even ministers and secretaries of departments and ministries meet, terrorism is placed on their agenda. A new area of cooperation that has emerged after 9/11 is between political leaders. The successful cooperation between George W. Bush and Tony Blair on Iraq facilitated U.K. support for the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Through direct and personalized communication, leaders tend to bypass the lengthy bureaucratic process and make executive decisions and action on behalf of the state. For counter-terrorism initiatives to be effective, the sustained commitment of the nation's political leadership at the highest level is crucial.

Policies, Practices and Procedures

At the operational level, the success of terrorism depends on secrecy. Similarly, success in the fight against terrorism at an operational level depends on secrecy. Terrorism can be fought at two different levels: tactical and strategic. At a tactical level, to reduce the immediate threat, governments should target the terrorist cells. If the terrorist network is transnational, governments need to share time sensitive, often source-based intelligence with other governments. Unlike during the Cold War, most contemporary terrorist groups have developed transnational networks today. When fighting transnational networks, many operational agencies have developed liaisons with their domestic and foreign counterparts. Counter-terrorism cooperation in sensitive areas such as intelligence has been bilateral between most countries; the U.S. government, for instance, continues to share intelligence with its coalition partners, but in most cases only provides information that pertains to each individual country.

At the strategic level, to change the security and political environment, governments and international organizations can develop domestic legislation, bilateral and regional agreements, and international laws. Such measures take time to materialize, and cannot be conducted in secrecy. Counter-terrorism cooperation has been largely multilateral on judicial matters, especially the twelve United Nations conventions.

The nature of the terrorist threat is such that a government can approach another government, even a state with which it has no diplomatic relations, to enlist its cooperation. Therefore, at the tactical level, cooperation can be *ad hoc*. To formalize cooperation, a nation may sign a memorandum of understanding with another government. However, in order to change the environment enough to make it hard for a terrorist group to operate, a government—when dealing with a number of governments—can develop agreements. Therefore, at a multilateral level, cooperation can be sustained. The building block of international cooperation is national interagency cooperation. Prior to 9/11, the British intelligence agencies shared less than 5 percent of their intelligence with the British law enforcement authorities. Two years after 9/11, MI5, MI6, and GCHQ share about 30 percent of their intelligence with British law enforcement agencies. At Thames House, the headquarters of MI5, the British government created the Police International Cooperation Unit, headed by a New Scotland Yard officer, to share intelligence with police forces outside the U.K.

For the counter-terrorism policy of a target state to be successful, it must apply its national power throughout the entire life cycle of a terrorist group in order to reduce its

strength and influence. By using results from conflict observatories, an intelligent government should be able to know when a dispute will break out into violence. A worthwhile investment is to proactively prevent the formation of conflicts by addressing the root causes that spawn violence. Nonetheless, most heads of government and state are not leaders but crisis managers.

As the events in Southern Thailand in early 2004 demonstrated, most governments react to violence after the event. Although members of Puzakha, an Islamist group, raided a government armory and took with them between 300–400 firearms in January 2004, the Thai government did not actively start hunting the raiders to recover the weapons until the members of the group began to mount attacks in Southern Thailand in April 2004. Most governments will leave political unrest to law enforcement until violence becomes a political and public issue.

In the age of post-modern terrorism, the cost of a successful terrorist mega-attack is very high. It affects the nation's image, tourism, investment, travel, etc. As such, the best road to success in fighting the contemporary wave of terrorism is to prevent a terrorist attack, rather than to conduct an "excellent" post-blast investigation, identify and arrest the perpetrators, financiers, facilitators, or supporters. Instead of governments investing billions of dollars in responding to a terrorist attack after it has occurred, it is vastly preferable to prevent terrorist acts before they can take place.

The key to prevention is in training, education, and awareness. In the first phase, it is necessary for governments to train law enforcement officers—especially police, customs, and immigration officers—to be aware of the pre-attack indicators of a terrorist incident. For instance, a police officer who raids an apartment on a tip, or stops a vehicle for speeding, should be trained to look for suspicious indicators that may signal a terrorist attack in the planning and preparation phases. Similarly, an officer on the street—the traffic cop, beat cop, or the police officer at a static or mobile checkpoint—should be able to detect, for instance, a suicide bomber. In the second phase, government should invest in public education, increasing public understanding of the threat. By periodically releasing threat information to the public domain, the government can help ensure that the public will be alert. If the government can maintain a state of alertness without alarming the populace, the public will be the eyes and the ears of the state, an extension of the law enforcement machinery.

Intelligence-driven, highly trained tactical counter-terrorism units dedicated to neutralizing terrorist cells planning, preparing, and executing terrorist attacks have proved highly effective. But in most cases, these units lack the intelligence they need to act. As such, in most cases they respond after an event—a kidnapping, a hostage-barricade situation, or a hijacking—and with limited success. As terrorists are increasingly willing to die, responding to an event after the terrorists have taken control of a venue or have hijacked an aircraft or kidnapped an individual may yield limited success. Even if the terrorist attack team is highly trained and experienced, the chance of rescuing the victims may be slim. Furthermore, if the attack team is willing to die, the

chance of success will be diminished.[39] Demonstrating the global spread, increasing lethality, and popularity of suicide terrorism as a tactic, from 2000 to 2003, 312 suicide attacks worldwide produced 5354 deaths.[40] In the Moscow theater siege in October 2002, suicide terrorists from the Islamic International Brigade and the Riyudes-Salikhin Reconnaissance and Sabotage Battalion of Chechen Martyrs took 979 hostages. The rescue operation led to the death of 128 persons.[41]

As the precise time and location of an attack is highly unlikely to be available, governments should invest in building informant networks, undercover programs, witness protection programs, and creating a "hunter" mindset among the counter-terrorism community. Only by anticipating threats and committing to a proactive investment aimed at prevention instead of a wasteful reactive approach can governments effectively fight, deter, and reduce the threat of politically motivated violence. Since it is difficult to generate precise intelligence on each and every terrorist operation in the planning and preparation phases, governments should seek to build awareness among both law enforcement officers and the public to detect and disrupt a terrorist operation before it is launched.[42] Even three years after 9/11, the level of training and retraining of the average police officer is poor.[43] Less than 5 percent of the police officers in the U.K. have been trained and equipped to respond to a CBRN attack. Therefore, training, educating, and raising the awareness of the counter-terrorism community (intelligence, law enforcement and military personnel) and the public is at the heart of fighting the contemporary wave of terrorism.

New Threshold Terrorism

Security and intelligence services and law enforcement agencies have thwarted over one hundred terrorist incidents since September 2001. Although conventional terrorist attacks will likely continue to dominate the terrorism landscape, the coming years will witness additional low-probability, high-consequence attacks as well. To remain effective, terrorist masterminds are formulating strategies and tactics of operating below the intelligence radar screen. The likelihood that terrorists will attempt to conduct attacks using chemical, biological, and radiological agents has grown. In March and April 2004, the Jordanian security service foiled a plot that involved a coordinated simultaneous attack on high-profile symbolic and strategic targets in Jordan involving multiple

---

[39] Scott Atran, "Genesis of Suicide Terrorism," *Science* 229 (7 March 2003): 1534 (reprint edition).

[40] Scott Atran, "Individual Factors in Suicide Terrorism," *Science* 304 (2 April 2004): 47–49; see www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/304/5667/47/DC1, Table 1.

[41] Adam Dolnik & Richard Pilch, "The Moscow Theater Incident: Perpetrators, Tactics, and the Russian Response," *International Negotiation* 8:3 (2003).

[42] In Israel, 95 percent of suicide attacks are detected and disrupted. Even with the best intelligence network, Israel's military intelligence and internal security agency have been unsuccessful in detecting each and every attack.

[43] Nick Allen, "Lack of Training: Terrorist Attacks: We Need More Training – Police," *The Scotsman*, 15 May 2004.

chemical-laden vehicles. Had the chemical bombs exploded, they would have killed at least 20,000 people living within a half-mile radius, and maimed and injured another 80,000. A terrorist cell led by Al Zarqawi, the most active terrorist in Iraq, had purchased twenty tons of chemicals and was planning to execute the operation when they were detected.

The attack team Al Ashara, or "The 10," intended to launch a suicide operation against the royal palace, the security services' headquarters, leisure centers frequented by Americans recuperating during military exercises, the Israeli and U.S. Embassies, and other Israeli targets on the Jordan–West Bank border. During the operation to capture members of the terrorist cell, four members were killed. Azmi al-Jayousi, the head of the Jordanian cell, met with Al Zarqawi, first in Afghanistan and then in neighboring Iraq, to plan the bombings. Zarqawi, who has a $10 million reward on his head from the U.S. government, gave al-Jayousi about $170,000 to buy the chemicals and organize the operation. Another Jordanian, car mechanic Hussein Sharif Hussein, confessed that al-Jayousi had asked him to buy vehicles and modify them so that they could crash through the gates and walls of the targets. Although Zarqawi denied any involvement in the operation in a statement, it is very likely that he was the mastermind.

Conventional terrorist attacks will probably continue to be the most frequent form of attack, but it is very likely that Zarqawi-inspired cells scattered throughout the Middle East and Europe will try to repeat an operation of this scale in the coming years. With the increased difficulty of transporting conventional firearms and explosives to target countries after 9/11, Al Qaeda and its affiliates are moving in a significant way toward using chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) agents. In addition to developing CBRN sensors for early detection, penetration of terrorist organizations and periodic arrest and debriefing of terrorists could help prevent such attacks. For instance, timely intelligence from Abu Zubaidah, an Al Qaeda detainee, led the U.S. and Pakistani intelligence communities to disrupt a post-9/11 operation by the Al Qaeda-trained Muslim convert Jose Padilla to use a radiological dispersal device, or "dirty bomb," on U.S. soil (Padilla, a U.S. citizen, was known by the alias Abdullah al Muhajir).

Instead of investing billions of dollars in protection—reflective of a reactive mindset—it is necessary to invest in seeking out the enemy to prevent an attack. The answer to combating new threshold terrorism does not rest only with developing protective suits, detection equipment, vaccines, and antidotes, but in an entire range of measures. They should include a deeper understanding of terrorists' willingness to kill and die. Although terrorist groups' capabilities to mount high-impact attacks have suffered, their intentions to attack have not. The challenge is to target both the physical and conceptual infrastructures of the terrorist organizations. The West is best at tactically going after terrorist cells, not seeking to alter the mindset of terrorists. The Western approach is insufficient to reduce the threat, especially in the middle to long term.

Combating terrorism should be a partnership between the East and the West, rather than a burden to be borne only by the West. Since the bulk of Islamist terrorists originate from the Muslim world, and specifically the Arab world, people from this region

are perhaps more likely to have the know-how and the tools to successfully counter the terrorist mindset. By working with community and religious leaders, as well as with Arab and Asian Muslim governments, leaders and thinkers should seek to send the message that violent or extreme *jihad* will only bring misery and pain to Muslims. The West must work with the rest of the world—especially the Muslim world—to ensure that the fight against terrorism is not a clash of civilizations but a contest between moderate and extremist versions of Islam. The West must seek to work closely with moderate Muslim intellectuals and progressive parties in Muslim states. Only by empowering them over the extremist ideologues and the violent groups can the terrorist threat be challenged directly, on its own terms. Without planting seeds of peace in the minds of Muslims, both in the Muslim territorial communities of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia and in expatriate and refugee communities, support for extremism and terrorism will remain and grow.

Muslims in the diaspora and emigrant communities are equally or even more susceptible to supporting and participating in terrorism. To target the conceptual infrastructure of the violent Islamists, it is equally important for Western governmental and non-governmental organizations to work even more closely with Muslim leaders living in Western states. Only by creating a powerful ethic and norm against the use of violence, and building and sustaining a culture of toleration and moderation, can extremism and violence be marginalized.

The Islamist Vision and Mission

In many respects, the violent Islamists are ahead of their opponents. The most influential terrorist theoretician, Al Zawahiri, who understands both the East and the West, consistently thinks several steps into the future. For instance, immediately after U.S. troops entered Afghanistan, Al Qaeda anticipated how the U.S. would use intergovernmental, governmental, and non-governmental actors to strengthen its position in Afghanistan, especially since the Afghan people had been suffering for two decades. The restoration of normalcy was dependent on the Western powers working with a multitude of other actors. To justify targeting these entities, Al Zawahiri identified the following categories as being Western "tools to fight Islam":[44]

- The United Nations;
- Muslim regimes that work with the West;
- Multinational corporations;
- International communications networks;
- Data exchange systems;
- International news agencies;
- Satellite media channels;

[44] Ayman Al Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner - Meditations on the Jihadist Movement," *Al-Sharq al-Awsat,* in Arabic (London, 2 December 2001).

- International relief agencies.

Since Al Zawahiri's call, construction workers, members of the media, and Red Cross personnel have been killed in Afghanistan, aid and relief workers have been murdered in Chechnya, and the UN HQ has been bombed in Iraq. The events in Afghanistan, Chechnya, and Iraq amply demonstrated that Al Zawahiri's edict was being followed. The past three years have also borne witness to Al Zawahiri's claim that, in the face of the anti-terrorist coalition, an alliance made up of the *jihad* movements in the various "lands of Islam" would arise. This meant that the threat to these agencies would not only come from Al Qaeda, but also from its associated groups located in Asia, the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, and also those operating in the West. An insight into Bin Laden's thinking immediately in the wake of 9/11 informed us that the focus of the next wave of attacks would be on economic targets. He argued that

> I say the events that happened on Tuesday 11 September in New York and Washington, that is truly a great event in all measures, and its claims until this moment are not over and are still continuing…. According to their own admissions, the share of the losses on the Wall Street Market reached 16 percent. They said that this number is a record, which has never happened since the opening of the market more than 230 years ago. This large collapse has never happened. The gross amount that is traded in that market reaches 4 trillion dollars. So if we multiply 16 percent with $4 trillion to find out the loss that affected the stocks, it reaches $640 billion of losses from stocks, with Allah's grace. So this amount, for example, is the budget of Sudan for 640 years. They have lost this, due to an attack that happened with the success of Allah lasting one hour only. The daily income of the American nation is $20 billion. The first week they didn't work at all due to the psychological shock of the attack, and even until today some don't work due to the attack. So if you multiply $20 billion by one week, it comes out to $140 billion, and it is even bigger than this. If you add it to the $640 billion, we've reached how much? Approximately $800 billion. The cost of the building losses and construction losses? Let us say more than $30 billion. Then they have fired or liquidated until today, or a couple of days ago, from the airline companies more than 170,000 employees. That includes cargo plane companies, and commercial airlines, and American studies and analysis have mentioned that 70 percent of the American people even until today still suffer from depression and psychological trauma, after the incident of the two towers, and the attack on the Defense Ministry, the Pentagon – thanks to Allah's grace. One of the well-known American hotel companies, Intercontinental, has fired 20,000 employees – thanks to Allah's grace. Those claims cannot be calculated by anyone due to their very large scale, multitude and complexity—and it is increasing thanks to Allah's grace—so watch as the amount reaches no less than $1 trillion by the lowest estimate—thanks to Allah's grace—due to these successful and blessed attacks. We implore Allah to accept those brothers within the ranks of the martyrs, and to admit them to the highest levels of Paradise.[45]

[45] Tayseer Allouni [Kabul correspondent of Al-Jazeera], transcript of previously unaired interview with Osama Bin Laden on 21 October 2001. Translated from Arabic by the Institute for Islamic Studies and Research; available at www.alneda.com.

The next round of attacks—bombings of the Sari and Paddy nightclubs in Bali in October 2002, of the Neptune Paradise Hotel and a chartered aircraft of tourists in Mombasa, Kenya in November 2002, and of a branch office of the Hong Kong Shanghai Banking Corporation in Istanbul in November 2003 in Istanbul—demonstrated the threat international terrorism posed to the economic health of nations around the world. In selecting future targets, violent Islamists will take into account the national economies of its enemies, and the potential economic impact of an attack.

Considering the increased threat that governments pose to Islamist terrorist groups, underground Islamist terrorist groups as well as legitimate political parties will play decisive roles. Instead of Islamist terrorist groups alone shouldering the burden of politicizing, radicalizing, and mobilizing Muslims, Islamist political parties are taking over the duties of propaganda, recruitment, and fundraising. This frees the terrorist groups to concentrate on the planning, preparation, and execution of attacks. The doctrine of Al Qaeda calls upon them to "expose" the "rulers" who fight Islam; to highlight the "importance of loyalty to the faithful and relinquishment of the infidels in the Muslim creed"; to hold "every Muslim responsible for defending Islam, its sanctities, nation, and homeland"; to caution against the "*ulama* of the sultan and reminding the nation of the virtues of the *ulama* of *jihad* and the imams of sacrifice and the need for the nation to defend, protect, honor, and follow them"; and to expose "the extent of aggression against our creed and sanctities and the plundering of our wealth."[46]

Preventing Islamists among Muslim diaspora communities in North America, Europe, and Australasia from non-violently advancing their political aims and objectives is difficult. While operating in an environment of tight security and vigilance, Al Qaeda's post-Iraq strategy is designed for Islamist parties to conceal themselves beneath the veil of legitimate politics and to produce a generation of recruits and supporters to sustain the fight in Iraq. Until favorable conditions emerge, Al Qaeda will operate through mosques, madrasas, community centers, charities, and bookshops in Western Europe and North America.

Afghanistan and Iraq

The lack of commitment on the part of the international community to the efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq has prevented the creation of state-of-the-art twenty-first-century nation-states in Asia and in the Middle East. Several years after the initial Western intervention in Afghanistan and invasion in Iraq, the security situation on the ground remains tenuous. When the Taliban leader Mullah Muhammad Omar joined forces with Osama Bin Laden in October 2001, the anti-U.S. force multiplied. Similarly, Hezb-i-Islami leader Gulbaddin Hekmatiyar joined forces with the Taliban and Al Qaeda. Compared to Al Qaeda, a foreign force, the Taliban and Hezb-i-Islami enjoy signifi-

[46] Al Zawahiri, "Knights Under the Prophet's Banner."

cant support in Afghanistan.[47] Today, Al Qaeda—essentially an Arab organization—is able to infiltrate, probe, and strike targets because of the linkages it has developed in the Afghan community through its alliance with members of the local Taliban and Hezb-i-Islami forces. The situation would have been very different had Pakistan prevented the Taliban, a regime that was more closely allied to Pakistan than to Al Qaeda, from joining its forces with Al Qaeda. Similarly, without thinking ahead, the U.S. government disbanded the Iraqi army, the only national institution that could have operated effectively across the Sunni, Shia, and Kurdish regions of the country. The shortsighted decision to disband the Iraqi army, a traditional foe of the U.S., has strengthened the insurgents in Iraq and weakened the multinational coalition.

The international outrage following Al Qaeda's multiple attacks on America on 9/11 provided the global community a framework for fighting a multi-headed hydra. Nonetheless, the unilateral U.S. invasion of Iraq has weakened the coalition against terrorism and given a new lease on life to Islamist extremist terror groups worldwide. Despite these initial drawbacks, the U.S., its allies and its friends have learned some valuable lessons. Two successive tiers of Al Qaeda's operational leadership have been virtually obliterated. However, the character of the multigenerational Islamist campaigns ensures the survival of Al Qaeda and its affiliates. The Islamist groups have adapted to the new security environment, replacing its losses and wastage, and continuing the fight. Al Qaeda's interface with Islamist guerrilla and terrorist groups worldwide has prolonged its own life cycle and also re-oriented its counterparts to target the U.S. and its allies. Although the pressure on its leadership in Afghanistan has severed Al Qaeda's command and control of its vast global terrorist network, the post-Iraq environment has created new and strengthened networks that are exerting influence and control over Al Qaeda's support structures.

---

[47] It was an unfortunate alliance, and one that could have been disrupted, had the U.S. allowed more time for Pakistan to negotiate with the then Islamic Emirate of Afghanistan to hand over Bin Laden to Islamabad immediately after 9/11. The U.S.-led anti-terrorist coalition initiated its campaign without providing adequate opportunity for diplomatic efforts by Pakistan to drive a wedge between the Taliban and Al Qaeda. The U.S. was looking for a clear and physical target at which to vent its anger and revenge; if they could not have Bin Laden, at least the Taliban seemed like a target with a high enough profile to satisfy the Bush Administration. Although the Taliban and Al Qaeda combined forces in combat against the Northern Alliance, the relationship had its ups and downs. At the request of the Pakistani Inter-Services Intelligence agency (ISI), after the East Africa bombings the Taliban imposed restrictions on Bin Laden's activities, particularly his terrorist operations and press interviews. Although not strictly enforced, these measures led to significant tensions, creating pro- and anti-Bin Laden divisions within the Taliban. Under the leadership of Mullah Omar, the Taliban would not have handed over Bin Laden for trial to a non-Islamic court. However, the Pakistanis could have prevented the formation of the Taliban-Al Qaeda alliance. Had the U.S. intelligence community developed an accurate assessment of the relative numerical strengths of Al Qaeda and the Taliban, and had it understood the implications of unity between a relatively unpopular Al Qaeda and a popular Taliban, it could have avoided the air strikes.

After the loss of Afghanistan, "a liberated land of *jihad*," the Islamists desperately needed a new theater from which to wage *jihad*. Without another "land of *jihad*," it was impossible to physically and psychologically train a new generation of fighters. The United States' unilateral invasion of Iraq produced the ideal conditions for *jihadis*. The influx of foreign fighters—both guerrillas and terrorists—bringing with them virulent ideologies and tactics, such as suicide terrorism, has fuelled the Iraqi insurgency. The blueprint for fighting in Iraq was crafted by the Saudi-born Al Qaeda ideologue and operative Yousef Al Aiyyeri. Aiyyeri, a former bodyguard in Sudan, instructor at the Al Farooq training camp in Afghanistan, and later webmaster of Alneda.com, the Al Qaeda website, was killed on 31 May 2003. Urging Muslims to fight the "invading crusader," Al Aiyyeri wrote that if democracy were established in Iraq, it would be the death of Islam. Most Muslims who have come to Iraq to participate in the insurgency—estimated at a few thousand—have come from the Levant, countries neighboring Iraq, the Gulf, and North Africa.

A few hundred cradle and convert Muslims from Europe have also arrived in Iraq to support and train insurgents, fight, and attain martyrdom. In time, in the true spirit of *jihad*, Asian and North American Muslims will join them. Rich Muslims in Western Europe are helping poor Muslims from Eastern Europe to travel to Iraq. Diaspora Muslims in Germany, France, Italy, and the U.K. are encouraging and funding migrant Muslims—many without proper identity documents—from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, and Poland to go to Iraq for *jihad*. This third-country recruitment includes Bosnia-Herzegovina and the rest of the Balkans. Communication is conducted via one-on-one meetings and the Internet. Some *jihadis* travel by road through Turkey and Syria under the guise of providing humanitarian assistance, sell the vehicle at the Iraq border, and enter the new land of *jihad*.

Unlike the Arabs who went to wage a guerilla war against the Soviets in Afghanistan, these European Muslims are learning terrorist tactics from the moment they arrive in Iraq. When the Arab *mujahedeen* returned home to the Middle East from Afghanistan, they tried to topple the "false Muslim" rulers and "corrupt Muslim" regimes and replace them with Islamic states. When the European Muslims return home to Europe from Iraq, they will engage in terrorism against the West. Just as Afghanistan, Bosnia, and Chechnya produced the last generation of *mujahedeen*, Iraq will produce the next generation of terrorists and extremists. The Western response to the lands of *jihad* will determine the future trends and patterns in Islamist terrorism and extremism.

Prognosis

The threat of Islamist terrorism will not diminish in the short term. Unless and until Western government leaders and bureaucrats better understand radical Islam, the threat of terrorism and extremism will grow. Addressing the tactical aspects—approaching the issue like a technician—will only lead to an escalation of the threat. Along with targeting the terrorists' operational and support infrastructures, governments must also seek to target their conceptual infrastructures. Along with neutralizing terrorist cells that are planning, preparing, and supporting operations, it is necessary to target ex-

tremist ideologies and ideologues. At the heart of the fight against terrorism is the effort to counter extremism, the virulent ideologies that generate funds, recruits, and—more importantly—justify violence. In addition to countering propaganda, the international community should seek to change the reality that gives rise to terrorist movements. The conflicts in Palestine, Kashmir, Chechnya, Mindanao, Afghanistan, and now Iraq provide the ideological rationale and fuel for extremism and terrorism.

The key to fighting the contemporary wave of terrorism is in the development of a holistic approach, in which enduring non-military political, economic, and informational strategies should be given priority. Furthermore, whatever military measures are undertaken should be coordinated with non-military measures. The reason for U.S. failure in Iraq is that only a handful of the U.S. military's generals were able to envision fighting an unconventional opponent in an unconventional manner. As opposed to Iraq, the U.S.-led coalition in Afghanistan developed intelligence dominance, due to the widespread cruelty of the Taliban and the presence of a viable alternative—the Northern Alliance—on the ground. Iraq has demonstrated to the world that, without winning hearts and minds, winning firefights and battles assures no real victory.

Along with fighting the physical enemy, working on the enemy mind and his actual and potential support base is critical. How many U.S. personnel at Abu Ghraib prison in Baghdad understood that every Iraqi tortured and released from detention would turn out to be an enemy who would galvanize countless others to join the cause? Investing billions of dollars in the military realm while neglecting or ignoring the social, cultural, and religious realities offers no chance for victory. Without winning the goodwill of the Iraqi public, Iraq will be a lost cause for the Western coalition. Iraq should offer to the world the critical object lesson that war-fighting alone is inadequate for an army to succeed in its mission.

The unintended consequences of the U.S. invasion of Iraq have created a dangerous situation that the world will have to live with for years to come. Democracy cannot be imposed from outside on a people not ready to embrace it. The best the West could hope for is to economically develop the Middle East and empower the Muslims themselves to fight for greater levels of political representation and participation. With upward social mobility, people in the region will push for leaders worthy of representing their ideas and values. Investments in education and the market economy are more likely to work than the imposition of a Western system of governance. Furthermore, establishing a democracy is likely to create the opportunity for Islamist political parties to capture political power. Just as American pressure on the Shah of Iran to reform facilitated the Iranian revolution, America's project to democratize the Middle East and Central Asia is likely to embolden the Islamist groups that will threaten the very Muslim regimes and rulers that are pro-Western in orientation.

A reassessment of U.S. policy in the Middle East is essential to reduce the level of instability and violence in the region. America's noble intentions of trying to create a free Iraq have created—in the heart of the Middle East instead of on its periphery—a new land of *jihad*. Just as the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan produced the conditions for the creation of a generation of terrorists, Iraq's fallout will destabilize the region—and the world—for a decade at least. In the same way that Afghan alumni trav-

eled abroad to destroy America's iconic landmarks, Iraqi alumni will seek to harm the United States, its allies, and its friends in the coming months and years. Buoyed by the rising tide of anger, suffering, and resentment in the Muslim world, Islamism will flourish, just as communism did in the last century.

Only through an effort to change the reality of regional conflicts where Muslims are suffering can the threat of terrorism be diminished. In the meanwhile, terrorist ideologues and propagandists will continue to dishonor the name of Allah and his great religion. Most moderate Muslims will be reluctant to challenge the terrorist ideologues and propagandists who misinterpret and misrepresent Islam, because they fear reprisals from the extremists and terrorists. Furthermore, the moderates will be challenged by the extremists—and even by observant Muslims who do not share the extremists' beliefs—as to why they had not spoken up for the Palestinians, Kashmiris, Chechens, and other suffering Muslims. Due to the enshrinement of freedom of speech and similar values in liberal Western democracies, Islamist ideologues will continue to offer a corrupt version of Muslim religious texts, including the Koran, in their effort to politicize, radicalize, and mobilize Muslims against the West. Therefore, the challenge facing the West and the Muslim world from the Islamist terrorists and their ideologues is both formidable and persistent. Given the dynamism of the situation, a greater understanding of the opponent, a deeper knowledge of the issues, and a sustained investment in training and education are essential to win the fight.

Future Research

For counter-terrorism initiatives to be effective, they must be driven by intelligence. Basic research is intelligence. The state of terrorism research has changed rapidly in the last decade. Traditionally, most terrorism analysts focused on international terrorism, as opposed to domestic or national terrorism. Furthermore, their interest was in European and Middle Eastern groups and left-wing and ethnonationalist ideologies. Very few specialists worked on Asia. New Scotland Yard did not consider South Asian groups—including Pakistani organizations—important. Al Qaeda was neglected by political scientists, who specialize in specific geographic regions. Middle Eastern specialists were narrowly focused on Middle Eastern groups that were active in the Middle East.

Neither political scientists nor scholars of religion paid adequate attention to religiously motivated violence. Until the second half of the 1990s, terrorism analysts conducted their research by reviewing terrorist literature and government reports. Only a handful of researchers ever interviewed serving and detained terrorists, their family members and friends, supporters and sympathizers, or extremist ideologues. Until 9/11, there were only three databases that recorded worldwide incidents of domestic terrorism. As incidents of international terrorism declined throughout the 1990s, governments believed that the threat of terrorism was declining.

Many academics in the field were against the use of the word *terrorism* prior to 9/11. Only a few understood that it was a concept, like *democracy*. Government and academic institutions working on terrorism research have grown dramatically recently.

Although terrorism research centers have proliferated since September 2001, most of these centers are located in the West, and their focus is very much on the threat to the West. Two exceptions are the International Policy Institute for Counter Terrorism Research at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya in Israel, which was created in the Middle East, and the International Center for Political Violence and Terrorism Research at the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies in Singapore, in the Asia-Pacific.

Along with the research centers, the number of scholars working on political violence has increased several-fold since 9/11. Very few, however, had actually specialized in terrorism research. At the time of the Bali bombings, Australia had only two trained specialists on terrorism, and both worked for the government. Rather than continuing to engage in statistical trend analysis of incidents, more scholars started to engage in functional and regional analysis. Some looked at suicide terrorism and functional issues, and others began to examine North Africa and other regions that have been affected by terrorism. More than ever before, counter-terrorism research centers are developing the basic building blocks of terrorism research: terrorist group, personality, and attack profiles. Due to data protection laws, North American, European, and Australasian institutions had difficulty in collecting and analyzing data relating to individual terrorists until they were convicted. Similarly, the West faced difficulties in developing profiles of extremist groups and their leaders – that is, groups that preached violence but did not directly engage in violence.

Before September 11, most academics that worked on political violence engaged in "ivory-tower research" – research for the sake of research, and with limited policy application. But now governments are cooperating with private research institutions. For instance, Steve Emerson's Investigative Project and Rita Katz's SITE Institute conducted research for the U.S. and Swiss governments, respectively. Hard pressed for time, government analysts mostly work at the tactical end. It is imperative for terrorism analysts from the academic and policy communities to work together, because government analysts lack the resources to work at the strategic end. Neither the think tanks of the elite forces, including the U.S. Delta Force or the British SAS, or Western intelligence services systematically analyzed the terrorist training manuals recovered from Afghanistan and elsewhere for terrorist technologies, tactics, and techniques. The training manuals offered a condensed view of what the terrorist knows, and what he is capable of; they also offered a glimpse of what the terrorists are incapable of and their limitations.

By educating special forces, commandos, airborne troops, and other elite forces regarding terrorist devices and their modes of operation, it is possible to better prepare government troops designated for front-line operations before they are forced to learn under battle conditions. At all levels, solid training and education—both formal and informal—is essential to ensure sound decision- and policy-making, whether it is by a head of state or a soldier conducting a raid. As much as decisive leadership, research and education are essential for military forces, law enforcement authorities, and intelligence services to make better, more informed judgments at the levels of policy, strategy, operations, and tactics.

Between Minimum Force and Maximum Violence: Combating Political Violence Movements with Third-Force Options

Doron Zimmermann *

Introduction: Balancing the Tools of Counter-Terrorism

In most liberal democratic states it is the responsibility of the police forces to cope with "internal" threats, including terrorism, since in such states terrorism is invariably defined as a criminal act rather than a manifestation of insurgent political violence. In many such instances, the resultant quantitative and qualitative overtaxing of law enforcement capabilities to keep the peace has led to calls by sections of the public, as well as by the legislative and executive branches of government, to expand both the legal and operational means available to combat terrorism, and to boost civilian agencies' capacity to deal with terrorism in proportion to the perceived threat. The deteriorating situation in Ulster in Northern Ireland between 1968 and 1972 and beyond is an illustrative case in point.[1]

Although there have been cases of successfully transmogrifying police forces into military-like formations, the best-known and arguably most frequent example of augmented state responses to the threat posed by insurgent political violence movements is the use of the military in the fight against terrorism and in the maintenance of internal security. While it is imperative that the threat of a collapse of national cohesion due to the overextension of internal civil security forces be averted, the deployment of all branches of the armed forces against a terrorist threat is not without its own pitfalls. Paul Wilkinson has enunciated some of the problems posed by the use of counter-terrorism military task forces, not the least of which is that

> [a] fully militarized response implies the complete suspension of the civilian legal system and its replacement by martial law, summary punishments, the imposition of curfews, military censorship and extensive infringements of normal civil liberties in the name of the exigencies of war. … the government finds it has removed all the constraints of legal accountability and minimum force, enabling the military commanders to deploy massively lethal and destructive firepower in the name of suppressing terrorism.[2]

---

* Doron Zimmermann is Senior Researcher with the Center for Security Studies at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH), where he heads a university-based research project on internal and international terrorism and also conducts applied policy research.

1 A good review of events from the perspective of the Irish Nationalist/Republican movement's perspective can be found in J. Bowyer Bell, *The Secret Army: The IRA* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications, 1997).

2 Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism Versus Democracy. The Liberal State Response* (London: Frank Cass, 2002), 103.

Probably the most illustrative contemporary rendition of a situation that spirals out of control because the military has been called in to tackle the terrorist problem is Edward Zwick's 1998 motion picture *The Siege*.[3] Provided one allows for artistic license, *The Siege* offers great insight into the nature of the subject: the point somewhat allegorically made in the film is that, when surgery is required, a sword is not the right instrument with which to perform the operation. At the end of the day, the question remains of what is to be done. If the first, democratically sound option (e.g., the police) is for a variety of reasons not equipped to deal with the problem, and the second, *ultima ratio* option (the military) may well defeat the purpose of the exercise due to its very nature—at the heart of which lies the use of maximum force—then maybe we need to seek a third option. A third option also implies a third force.

Paramilitary Formations in Historical Context

The debate concerning what a third-force capability should be is ongoing, but it has received added urgency due to recent events in international relations. Over the years, suggestions have ranged from militarizing the police to constabularizing the armed forces. More important, and as an extension to the logic of this debate, which may be summarized as a desire for the best of both worlds, the idea of *paramilitaries*—groups with some characteristics of both the police and the military—has at some stage also entered the discussion as a viable solution.[4] To cut a long etymological (if not definitional) debate short, the term *paramilitary* came into use some six decades ago when British journalists used it to "describe Nazi-sponsored groups of enforcers that policed movement rallies and disrupted those of their opponents."[5] Admittedly, paramilitaries combine both the inherent weaknesses and strengths of police and military forces. But it is precisely for this reason that paramilitaries not only pose a risk in the context of a proportional response to terrorism; they also offer the greatest potential for shaping up to be the long sought after, well-calibrated countermeasure to terrorism, in that they can best fulfill the requirements of the liberal democratic state. They arguably remain the best option to effectively combat terrorism that we have at present.

The critical issue beyond the immediate choice of means, however, is not exclusively one of finding an appropriate and balanced solution in the context of highly politicized civil-military relations alone, but one of guaranteeing proportionality to the threat. Even more to the point, it is a question of how to make the response capability *both* adequate and democratically controllable (and hence politically viable). In order to better discuss the subject of how best to respond to political violence and terrorism

---

[3] Edward Zwick, dir., *The Siege* (Los Angeles: 20th Century Fox, 1998). For more information on *The Siege*, visit the relevant entry in the Internet Movie Database (IMDb) at http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0133952/, accessed on 26 May 2004.

[4] For a brief discussion on the nature of paramilitaries, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paramilitary, accessed on 5 May 2004.

[5] Andrew Scobell and Brad Hammitt, "Goons, Gunmen, and Gendarmerie: Toward A Reconceptualization of Paramilitary Formations," *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 26:2 (Winter 1998): 213–27; at 219.

on the ground, we need to selectively investigate the historical background of third-force paramilitaries in order to achieve an organic understanding of the subject. This should be done with a view to assessing the utility of paramilitary units in the role of third-force counter-terrorist options.

Antecedents in Antiquity and Early Modern History

That the past has a way of shaping the present is a truism that applies to the combating of political violence. In search of a tool to effectively fight political violence and terrorism that would prove both operationally effective and, to a lesser extent, politically viable, a variety of approaches have been attempted through the centuries. Significantly, the antecedents of today's governmental paramilitary units must be sought in the age of antiquity rather than in the period after 1945, when such formations became better known. Then as now, insurgency and subversion were usually directed at either unpopular indigenous governments or against occupying powers in the wake of conquest. In the event that incumbent powers in the past were not willing to sacrifice the civilian population alongside the insurgents, means other than wholesale eradication or forced migration had to be found. One way of achieving a level of precision in rooting out political violence movements was the employment of allied local forces; they were usually given a supporting, auxiliary role in conventional war, as well as in counter-insurgency operations, in the pursuit of which they featured even more prominently.

Starting in the Roman Republic, the *auxiliarii*, who were tasked with border defense and whose principal role during and following campaigns was to assist the "regular" Roman military, were recruited from among subject peoples within Rome's power orbit.[6] The employment of irregular troops in the role of supporting or specialized forces and their integration into regular army establishments created a precedent followed by another empire centuries later. In the course of suppressing the Jacobite rebellion of 1745–46 in Scotland, Lord Loudon's irregular Highland companies were formed and deployed with the express purpose of mopping up Jacobite pockets of resistance after the Battle of Culloden (16 April 1746), as well as with countering Jacobite clan guerilla attacks subsequent to the end of conventional military operations in the autumn of 1746.[7] The British Empire used the lessons learned in the course of eventually suppressing the intrepid Jacobite clans in the Scottish Highlands with devastating effect during the Seven Years' War (1756–1763), in the course of which irregulars fought on both sides of the conflict.[8] Despite running the risk of committing a gross anachronism, it can be contended that the eighteenth century saw widespread

---

[6] For further reference on the *auxiliarii*, see http://library.thinkquest.org/22866/English/Leger.html?tqskip1=1, accessed on 26 May 2004.

[7] Doron Zimmermann, *The Jacobite Movement in Scotland and in Exile, 1746–1759* (Basingstoke: Macmillan/Palgrave, 2003); see especially the chapter entitled "Suppression and Resistance: Hanoverians and Jacobites in 1746–1747," 21–47.

[8] For more on the uses of irregulars by the British army at home and abroad, see Peter E. Russell, "Redcoats in the Wilderness: British Officers and Irregular Warfare in Europe and America, 1740 to 1760," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 35:4 (1978): 629–52.

use—even the institutionalization—of irregular units with distinct paramilitary characteristics in regular armies, at least in the manner that we would understand the term today.[9]

Paramilitaries in the Second World War and Cold War Periods

The use of such irregular paramilitaries flowed and ebbed after the French Revolution, but the need for irregular, and increasingly specialized, groups did not disappear. As a matter of fact, quite the contrary is true. In the course of the Second World War, the so-called commandos of the British army—usually regular soldiers seconded to special units deployed far behind enemy lines—had an impact on the Allied war effort. As early as November 1941, an American officer visited Britain in order to evaluate the British commandos. In due course, the precursor to the CIA, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), used similar units with great success in France, where they helped prop up the *Maquis* against the Nazi occupation, and in Norway, where small Allied paramilitary units wreaked havoc with German rail supply lines. Significantly, when the idea of using specialized troops struck home in the U.S. during the war, it was cast not in terms of regular military personnel being used in unorthodox ways, but rather in terms of drawing highly skilled human resources from regular military units for the purpose of redeploying them as combatants who were *not* members of the armed forces. Operatives in such paramilitary units were taught a variety of skills critical to classical independent, long-range reconnaissance missions, such as aerial and maritime insertion, demolitions, unarmed combat, sabotage, and managing the logistics of local resistance movements.[10]

In the context of the Second World War, however, paramilitaries also featured in one of this conflict's darkest chapters. Axis powers, especially the Nazi regime, adhered to the ideology of "blood and soil," and reveled in a cult of racialist purity and fascist-influenced, contrived virility. Inarguably most sinister incarnation of this mentality was a paramilitary unit known as the *Schutzstaffel* (SS), run by Heinrich Himmler, which acted as a separate, quasi-sovereign entity and operated according to its own rules within the Nazi state. The original purpose of the SS was to control all other Nazi governmental structures, including other paramilitaries (e.g., the *Sturm Abteilung*, or SA) and the regular military (the *Wehrmacht*). "Being a kind of party police both by precept and function, the *raison d'etre* of the SS was loyalty to the Führer."[11]

---

[9] Ian F.W. Beckett, *Modern Insurgencies and Counter-Insurgencies. Guerrillas and their Opponents since 1750* (London: Routledge, 2001), 2–5.

[10] Major D.H. Berger, "The Use of Covert Paramilitary Activity as a Policy Tool: An Analysis of Operations Conducted by the United States Central Intelligence Agency, 1949–1951," (n.p.: 1995), 7–8; available at www.globalsecurity.org/intell/library/reports/1995/BDH.htm, accessed on 1 April 2004.

[11] Gerhard Rempel, "Nazi Paramilitary Groups: SA and SS," 3; available at http://mars.acnet.wnec.edu/~grempel/courses/germany/lectures/26paramilitary.html, accessed on 19 May 2004.

In contrast to the Allied paramilitaries and commandos, the SS, especially the *Waffen-SS*, had more in common with the original concept of the *auxiliarii*, in that they were frequently integrated into regular army corps and served as security assistance forces in combat operations in the front line of battle rather than behind enemy lines. Moreover, the praetorian function of acting "as a bulwark against overthrow by the … Army" or any other competing government organization is one that has been replicated many times since, with paramilitary organizations frequently singled out to play a key role to this end.[12] A more recent but no less notorious example of this type of praetorian paramilitary formation employed to control and intimidate rival government organizations and civil society alike is that of the notorious Haitian Tontons Macoutes.

After the erstwhile Allies of the Second World War became estranged from each other along an East–West divide in 1947, the U.S. and British governments were quick to realize the potential of paramilitary formations in both the maintenance of internal security—up to and including counterinsurgency assignments—in the face of Communist subversion and in special operations behind the descending Iron Curtain. The widespread endorsement of paramilitaries in the service of foreign policy during the Cold War helps explain the later proliferation of paramilitaries into other, derivative spheres of statecraft and policy, such as counter-terrorism.

The Truman Doctrine, which President Truman promulgated before the U.S. Congress in March 1947, promised beleaguered states assistance against Communist incursion. Coupled with the increasing need to avoid direct confrontation between the emerging superpowers, this doctrine also rapidly and emphatically introduced paramilitaries to the variegated battlefields of the Cold War.[13] The immediate necessity for internal security assistance, as enunciated by Truman, was carried over into the next phase of the Cold War when, on 21 December 1954, U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower ordered a landmark undertaking known as NSC 1290-d. The express purpose of NSC 1290-d was to systematically "organize, train and equip local police and other internal security forces to combat Communist subversion in the underdeveloped countries."[14] Confronted with comparable challenges, France and Britain also bent their efforts to the interdiction of subversive forces in Third World states whose regimes were on friendly terms with the West, especially in Southeast Asia.[15] The use of paramilitary forces in a crucial role in internal security assistance was yet again endorsed in NSC Action Memorandum No. 162, which dealt with the "development of U.S. and Indigenous Police, Paramilitary and Military Resources."[16]

---

[12] Scobell and Hammitt, "Goons, Gunmen, and Gendarmerie," 214.

[13] Andreas Wenger and Doron Zimmermann, *International Relations. From the Cold War to the Globalized World* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003), 19.

[14] William Rosenau, "The Eisenhower Administration, U.S. Foreign Internal Security Assistance, and the Struggle for the Developing World, 1954–1961," *Low Intensity Conflict & Law Enforcement* 10:3 (Autumn 2001):1–32; cited passage at 12.

[15] Ibid., 15.

[16] NSC Action Memorandum No. 162 is available at www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pentagon2/doc116.htm, accessed on 17 May 2004.

The CIA paramilitary program was enacted even before the U.S. government's internal security assistance program came to prominence in the 1950s. Throughout the Cold War and beyond, the CIA's investment in the use of paramilitaries in behind-the-lines operations was considerable, reaching from Albania to Poland to Guatemala. Plans in the U.S government to use special operations paramilitaries came to fruition in 1948. Against the backdrop of the Soviet war scare, the CIA received a mandate from the U.S. National Security Council "broadening the scope of covert activity to include political, economic, and paramilitary operations," which also enshrined the key advantage of using paramilitaries for behind-the-lines operations: the concept of plausible deniability.[17] This last point should also be borne in mind when considering counter-terrorism operations under adverse conditions, or in hostile territory. Be that as it may, the list of countries that have seen CIA paramilitaries in action is long and continues to grow, with the most recent example being Afghanistan.

Paralleling the course of the U.S. paramilitary effort, the British army also developed a similar non-military capability. In contrast to the CIA program, however, the British experience with paramilitaries was short-lived. One reason for cutting short a promising British paramilitary experiment was that the

> informal or independent initiatives [e.g. in Palestine and in Malaya] raised the issue of control, unwittingly reinforcing wartime criticisms. This may have contributed, at least in part, to the decision to concentrate special operations within a formally-constituted regular regiment of the Army.[18]

Yet another significant difference between the U.S. and British paramilitary programs was that, while the former was constituted with an eye to countering external support for subversive activities in the context of an internal security assistance program—and by implication to hit the enemy on his own turf without having to assume responsibility for what could be construed by the other side as an act of war—the British program built on a long-standing military tradition of dealing with local rebellions in the British Empire, and hence was highly specialized. Consequently, the British Special Air Service (SAS), founded in 1950, left its mark on the age of decolonization as a highly effective counter-insurgency tool. As a result of this development, British counter-terrorism operations to this day are assigned to the Counter-Revolutionary Wing of the SAS regiment, and thus are handled by the military, not the police. The British choice of a military response to terrorism is therefore just as much a product of historical development (including relatively harmonious civil-military relations after

[17] Berger, "Use of Covert Paramilitary Activity," 23–24.

[18] David A. Charters, "From Palestine to Northern Ireland: British Adaptation to Low-Intensity Operations," in Armies in Low-Intensity Conflict. A Comparative Analysis, ed. David Charters and Maurice Tugwell (London: Brassey's Defence Publishers Ltd., 1989), 209. For an excellent account of the SAS in Malaya, see Peter Dickens, *SAS. Secret War in South-East Asia. 22 Special Air Service Regiment in the Borneo Campaign, 1963–1966* (London: Greenhill Books, 2003; first pub. 1983).

1689) as the refusal of a majority of European states to contemplate military options is the result of their own respective past experiences.

Third-Force Paramilitary Options Against Terrorism: Four European Examples

France, Italy, Spain and, later, Germany have all adopted paramilitary counter-terrorism solutions because of their respective historical experiences, which at one time or another brought their professional armies face to face with policing duties, exposed their inherent weaknesses in dealing with this task, and—from the eighteenth century onwards—highlighted the need for a military-strength or equivalent constabulary force to combat banditry and nip rebellion in the bud.

The Italian Case: The Carabinieri

Probably the best-known example of a paramilitary formation in the service of an early modern European state is the Italian corps of the Carabinieri. Also known as *La Benemerita* (the well-deserving), the Carabinieri can look back upon an exemplary service record and a rich history, tracing their origins to the volunteer *Dragoni di Sardegna*, first embodied in 1726.[19] Functionally, the Carabinieri are part and parcel of the Italian Department of Defense; administratively, the corps is subordinated to the Italian Ministry of Internal Affairs.[20] As we will see, this bipartite membership of the Italian paramilitary force in both civil and military government organizations is a pattern replicated in the French and Spanish cases (but not in the German).

The Carabinieri are an organization with policing duties distinct from the regular police (*Polizia di Prevenzione*), and were only recently formally absorbed into the Italian armed forces, not unlike the army, air force, and navy. Counter-terrorism falls into the bailiwick of both the regular police and the Carabinieri, but it is the Carabinieri who (until 1998) had the lead in counter-terrorism investigations: they currently exercise more of a coordinating role in the course of investigations, although they do retain a critically important role in live operations. On the operational level, the Carabinieri established a special force for deployment in counter-terrorism operations in December 1990, the *Raggruppamento Operativo Speciale* (ROS).[21] The ROS is recognized as a highly competent special operations paramilitary. Notably, the advantage that the ROS holds over its equivalent in the regular police, the *Nucleo Operativo Centrale di Sicurezza*, is that the ROS is reasonably interoperable with units in the armed forces, an ability that arguably provides it with potential access to assistance services otherwise only available through the branches of the armed service, such as strategic air support for operations in dynamic environments.

---

[19] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carabinieri, accessed on 1 April 2004.

[20] See www.carabinieri.it/Multilingua/ENG_P24-24_Governing_Bodies.htm, accessed on 13 May 2004.

[21] Giuseppe de Lutiis, "Terrorism in Italy: Receding and Emerging Issues," in *Confronting Terrorism. European Experiences, Threat Perceptions and Policies*, ed. Marianne van Leeuwen (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2003), 102–103.

The Spanish Case: The Guardia Civil

Following the death of General Francisco Franco in late 1975, the fledgling Spanish democracy was beset by a number of grave problems left over from the era of the Fascist state, not the least of which was separatist and ideologically motivated political violence. Another legacy of the Franco era was the existence of two militarized internal security organizations: the Policia Nacional and the Guardia Civil. In fact, regular army units patrolled the proverbial Spanish hotbed of separatist violence, the Basque Provinces, until 1981, when they were replaced by units of the Guardia Civil.[22] Established in 1844, the Guardia Civil was originally modeled on the French Gendarmerie, which at least in part explains its paramilitary nature. It was reconstituted in 1940, whence it derives its current profile.[23] For all intents and purposes, the Guardia Civil has retained its military character through the democratization process that has been underway in Spain since 1982. As a Gendarmerie-like paramilitary force, the Guardia Civil's duties are the policing of rural areas and the maintenance of the peace in urban communities of less than 20,000 inhabitants; they are also responsible for patrolling highways and for protection of critical government premises in the capital.[24]

With the sea change in Spanish politics following the general elections of 1982, when the Socialists came to power in a climate of political restiveness, the role of the army in the maintenance of internal security was further circumscribed. The new Spanish Ministry of the Interior elected to formally demilitarize the state response to political violence movements, and hence to employ the Guardia Civil as its principal tool in the protracted fight against a resilient, even burgeoning, movement of internal terrorism.[25] The main reasons for this shift favoring the Guardia Civil were, on the one hand, that they "are administratively part of the army, but are placed in the Ministry of the Interior chain of command for operational purposes" and, on the other, that there was "remarkable discipline already existing within that agency."[26] Like other European paramilitary corps, the Guardia Civil had to develop a special branch in order to adequately address the challenge of terrorism; the distillation of the Guardia Civil's operational counter-terrorism competence is vested in its special-forces wing, the *Grupos Antiterroristas Rural* (GAR). Thus, not unlike the Italians, the Spanish have chosen a solution that is formally civilian and effectively military in terms of its training, organization, equipment, and outlook.

---

[22] Fernando Reinares, "Democratization and State Responses to Protracted Terrorism in Spain," in *Confronting Terrorism*, ed. van Leeuwen, 66.

[23] Thorsten Stodiek, *Internationale Polizei. Ein empirisch fundiertes Konzept der zivilen Konfliktbearbeitung* (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2004), 69.

[24] Fernando Jimenez, "Spain: The Terrorist Challenge and the Government's Response," in *Western Responses to Terrorism*, ed. Alex P. Schmid and Ronald D. Crelinsten (London: Frank Cass, 1993), 126.

[25] Ibid., p. 126.

[26] Ibid., p. 125; Reinares, "Democratization and State Responses," 66.

The French Case: The Gendarmes

Historically, the French can be said to take pride of place among Europe's paramilitaries: the Gendarmes, literally "men-at-arms"—or, in their proper appellation, the "sergeants-at-arms"—served as the executive branch of the French medieval justice system under the grand seneschal of the realm.[27] They were organized into brigades—that is, properly embodied as a formal military unit—as early as 1720. Like the Italian and Spanish paramilitaries, the Gendarmerie's various roles, such as the policing of the countryside and small urban areas, derived from historical mandates, for example that of keeping the king's peace on French highways through the centuries. Following the Revolution, Napoleon Bonaparte wrote of the Gendarmerie: "*C'est la manière la plus efficace de maintenir la tranquillité ... une surveillance moitié civile, moitié militaire, répandue sur toute la surface du pays qui donne les rapports les plus précis*…."[28]

More recently, the French paramilitary also played a critical role in the gradual retreat of empire before and during the era of decolonization, with its members serving in Indochina and Algeria. Similar to its fellow European paramilitary organizations, the Gendarmerie—with its strong *esprit de corps*, military culture, and institutional experience in fighting threats to internal security (i.e., including Indochinese and Algerian)—was a natural choice to take the front line in the fight against terrorism. The task of the French paramilitary is also impressive in terms of its breadth: criminal investigations, crowd control, the protection of critical infrastructures, and investigations concerning the military both inside and outside of France, and especially those relating to foreign interventions. Like the Italian Carabinieri and the Spanish Guardia Civil, the Gendarmerie is administratively a part of the armed forces but is effectively directed by the Ministry of the Interior.

Unlike the other two corps, however, the Gendarmerie is structurally congruent with the armed services branches in that it maintains its own aerial and maritime and other specialist branches. Furthermore, the contemporary Gendarmerie's nation-spanning network and specialist personnel enable it to procure vital logistical support, provide intelligence and operational security, and to field trained operational interdiction capabilities.[29] As early as 1974, the Gendarmerie created its own special operations group, the *Groupe de sécurité et d'intervention de la gendarmerie nationale*, in response to the terrorist attacks on the 1972 Olympics in Munich. Within this group, the *Groupe d'intervention de la gendarmerie nationale* (GIGN) was given the special task of disrupting terrorist attacks and resolving hijacking situations. The GIGN proved their mettle in the Djibouti bus affair (February 1976), drugging the hostages to clear a low-risk line of fire for their special weapons systems operators.[30] Since then, events in

---

[27] See http://www.defense.gouv.fr/Gendarmerie/index.html, accessed on 1 June 2004.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Nathalie Cettina, "The French Approach: Vigour and Vigilance," in *Confronting Terrorism*, ed. van Leeuwen, 81.

[30] See http://www.specwarnet.com/europe/gign.htm, accessed on 1 June 2004.

France and attacks on French interests abroad have irrefutably proven the necessity for a well trained and adequately armed specialized counter-terrorism branch.[31]

The German Case: The Bundesgrenzschutz

The final of the four examples reviewed here is arguably the most instructive in relation to the development of third-force paramilitaries in the combating of terrorism. Against the backdrop of the murder of eleven Israeli athletes during the Olympic Games held in Munich in 1972, and the clear failure of the ordinary police in the face of aggressive terrorist action, the Federal Republic of Germany was faced with the problem of creating the capability to tackle similar problems in the future. Ironically, the greatest impediment to a more forceful operational counter-terrorism solution at the time was the constitutionally ensconced, rigid division between the German military and the police, known as the *Trennungsgebot*. In the case of Germany, the *Trennungsgebot* was the direct result of the widespread conflation of the police and the military in the Third Reich, a practice that was fostered by the Nazi regime.[32]

The dramatic events that took place in the Olympic village in front of running cameras, and subsequently at the Fürstenfeldbrück airport near Munich, created tremendous pressure to act proactively to halt future terrorist attacks. Circumstances also helped weaken the historical German post-war reticence regarding firm policies and government actions that might be interpreted as being militaristic. Caught between a disastrous police failure and the impossible prospect of a politically unfeasible military deployment, the then-minister of the interior, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, instructed the liaison officer of the Federal Border Protection Agency (Bundesgrenzschutz) in his ministry, Colonel Ulrich Wegener, to create a counter-terrorism force – but one that would be neither part of the police nor part of the military.[33]

Wegener was quick to realize the opportunity offered by the combination of civilian institutional and paramilitary advantages in the Bundesgrenzschutz. Founded in 1951, the Bundesgrenzschutz is essentially the Federal German police force. Originally, its principal task was to guard the 1300-km border it shared with Soviet-occupied territory during the Cold War. After 1972, the mandate of the Bundesgrenzschutz was expanded to include that of supplying the security and intervention reserves for the police forces of the West German *Bundesländer*, or provinces. It was out of this mandate that the Bundesgrenzschutz derived its special operations function.[34]

---

[31] Jeremy Shapiro and Bénédicte Suzan, "The French Experience of Counter-terrorism," *Survival* 45:1 (Spring 2003): 67–98.

[32] For reference on the troubled relationship between the "Trennungsgebot" and current counter-terrorism efforts, see Sylvia-Yvonne Kaufmann, "Ein Orwellscher Ueberwachungsstaat darf in Europa nicht entstehen," PDS press release of 18 March 2004, available at http://www.linxxnet.de/aktuell/19-03-04_sicherheit-eu.htm, accessed on 3 June 2004.

[33] Cf. http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/Ulrich%20K%20Wegener, accessed on 1 June 2004.

[34] Stodiek, *Internationale Polizei*, 64–65.

What makes the example of the Bundesgrenzschutz so interesting with respect to the discussion about third-force options is its development and nature: in the early days of the Federal Republic of Germany, this unit, which predated the establishment of the regular Bundeswehr, was conceived of as the first step in the rearmament of the post-war West German state. From the inception of the Bundesgrenzschutz, its character and equipment (as opposed to its legal role and formal constitution) were that of a paramilitary.[35] In particular, the Bundesgrenzschutz was originally far more heavily armed than the police, being able to field armored vehicles, while also permitted to deploy light ordnance, bear heavy small arms, as well as use hand grenades. Until 1994, members of the Bundesgrenzschutz were even accorded the legal status of a combatant. Being neither a constabulary police force in the traditional sense nor formally a military unit, the Bundesgrenzschutz—because it was *by definition* a civilian unit—provided Wegener with a politically acceptable tool to fight terrorism both on German soil and abroad that could also satisfy most contemporary force saturation requirements beneath the threshold of war.

At the time, Wegener went to great lengths in order to study with the two best military special operations forces—the British Special Air Service and the Israeli Sayeret Matkal—and to incorporate the lessons learned in the formation of a homegrown counter-terrorism unit fully embedded in the Bundesgrenzschutz. The Grenzschutzgruppe 9 (GSG-9) was founded on 17 April 1973, and ever since it has acquitted itself well with respect to operational efficiency and in satisfying political concerns relating to its paramilitary character.[36] With GSG-9, the quandary of the *Trennungsgebot*, as well as the credibility problems that plagued the first option while rendering the second unacceptable in the context of a counter-terrorism mandate, was overcome by creating a third, civilian option imbued with many unique strengths that were otherwise the exclusive preserve of military organizations. The singular value of GSG-9's story, however, is that a precedent for a democratically acceptable (that is, non-military) and accountable domestic and external intervention force was set that has since served as a model for other states, and may yet convince many more countries of its applicability.

Military, Police, and the Paramilitary – Third-Force Option Reviewed

The history of paramilitary formations reviewed earlier and the four examples scrutinized above suggest that paramilitaries, because of their nature rather than in spite of it, offer great benefits as counter-terrorism intervention tools. This section will focus on some of the typical problems experienced by the police and the military in the line of duty, specifically those pertaining to counter-terrorism tasks, and will attempt to demonstrate how paramilitary third-force options can help overcome some of these difficulties by offering the best characteristics from both worlds.

[35] Ibid., 66.

[36] See http://encyclopedia.thefreedictionary.com/GSG-9, accessed on 1 June 2004.

The Constabularization of the Military vs. the Militarization of the Police

Since the end of the Cold War, military organizations in the West and elsewhere have been on the lookout for new horizons and responsibilities. Initially, the sudden vacuum left by the absence of the bipolar global conflict led to questions about the purpose of maintaining armed forces establishments at Cold War levels in terms of manpower and armament. Since that time, several responses have emerged in the ongoing debate surrounding the appropriate uses of the armed forces, ranging from robust peace support operations (PSO), to stabilizing forces, to humanitarian intervention. Whatever tasks these labels seek to designate, the fact remains that military organizations in both the East and West since 1990 have had to face a host of new challenges, some of which have pushed them to their limits (and beyond). Among these newly encountered complex situations are those that require regular troops to assume policing duties, often in challenging and difficult circumstances. This constabularization of the military has forced significant changes on an organization geared toward the waging of war: the ability to win a war in the Clausewitzian sense is predicated upon an army's ability to unleash maximum violence – a concept that is diametrically opposed to the constabulary requirement of the use of minimum force.[37]

Essentially, as Karl Haltiner has so cogently argued, the argument put forth by Morris Janowitz in his seminal work *The Professional Soldier* for a military force "committed to the minimum use of force, and … viable international relations, rather than victory," has been grossly misunderstood.[38] For, as Haltiner is quick to point out, Janowitz' observation was not directed at a new kind of military organization, but instead described a novel applied ethics of soldiering.[39] Considering the history, constitution, and organizational makeup of contemporary military organizations, and against the backdrop of their traditional propensity to use overwhelming force in the fulfillment of their duty, reeducating members of the armed forces to comply with such an ethic is a gargantuan task that, by way of comparison, would make the implementation of the Geneva Conventions pale into insignificance. Such a fundamental change will neither happen overnight nor succeed through anything less than deep-seated reforms aimed at the transformation of armies into something completely new, which may as a consequence also causally impact the military's structure and organization.

As a hierarchical, top-down organization, the army would have to espouse principles that are anathema to itself in order to empower regular combatants to individually act in accordance with a constabulary/stringent peace-keeping ethic, such as flat hierarchies and the devolution of decision-making responsibilities to subalterns and non-commissioned ranks, if not to ratings and privates.[40] The short-term constabularization

[37] Grant Wardlaw, *Political Terrorism. Theory, Tactics, and Counter-Measures* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 90.

[38] Quoted in Karl W. Haltiner, "Polizisten oder Soldaten? Organisatorische Dilemmata bei der Konstabularisierung des Militärs," *Österreichische Militärische Zeitschrift* 3 (2001): 291–98; at 292.

[39] Ibid., 292.

[40] Ibid., 292–93.

of the military, especially if viewed in the light of the challenges that have arisen in the context of the recent deployment in Bosnia and Kosovo, would therefore appear impractical.[41] For reasons of constitutional propriety, and because of concerns relating to the preservation of civil liberties, this observation applies even more pertinently to internal policing duties by the military in liberal democracies – especially if the military in question is one's own.

Reinforcing the impracticability of Janowitz's model, Wardlaw maintains that "the police and the army have significantly different roles, functions, and philosophies, which enable them to perform in quite different spheres. It is argued that this division is functional and that dysfunction would arise if *uncontrolled* overlap developed between the two organizations."[42] This potential for dysfunction, however, also applies to the police, and thus the obverse side of the problem discussed above is the militarization of the police. Historically, militarized police forces have been put to dubious uses by still more questionable autocrats, for example, in the case of the Chinese People's Armed Police (PAP) that was responsible for crushing the pro-democracy movement in Tiananmen Square (4 June 1989).[43] Arguments militating against the deployment of an overly powerful and heavily armed police for internal security duties abound, not least because they recall and appear to substantiate the prospect of the police state. In that sense, from the point of view of civil liberties, the militarization of the police is at least as problematic as the deployment of the military for internal security duties is controversial. But, to use Wilkinson's nomenclature, would the same be true of a *carefully* calibrated, implemented, and politically reviewed overlap of the police and the military for the express purpose of proactively fighting terrorism? (We may recall that the establishment of GSG-9 would meet these parameters.)

In between the typical problems encountered by the military and the police in the course of having to take on tasks for which they are organizationally unsuited, there is another insidious problem: both organizations (but predominantly the military) are prone to take recourse to contracted security assistance forces.[44] The recent scandal in Iraq's Abu Ghraib prison, where civilian contractors with a paramilitary character abused prisoners alongside ordinary troops, bears out this point. For this reason, and for our purposes, it is unacceptable that a counter-terrorism paramilitary unit be established, maintained, and directed by any body other than a sovereign government.

---

[41] The half-way constabularization of the military in Kosovo was not least the result of a lack of trained police in the province. Arguably, constabularizing a military force under situational pressures created by an absence of professional police is a recipe for disaster. See Linda D. Kozaryn, "NATO Chief Says More Police Vital in Kosovo," *American Forces Information Service*, 8 February 2000, available at http://www.dod.mil/cgi-bin/dlprint.cgi?http://www.dod.mil/news/Feb2000/n02082000_20002083.html, accessed on 8 June 2004.

[42] Wardlaw, *Political Terrorism,* 90; italics added.

[43] Scobell and Hammitt, "Goons, Gunmen, and Gendarmerie," 218.

[44] Ariana Eunjung Cha and Renae Merle, "Line Increasingly Blurred Between Soldiers and Civilian Contractors," *Washington Post*, 13 May 2004; available at www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A22547-2004May12?language=printer, accessed on 13 May 2003.

The primary argument advanced on behalf of the police is that, while the armed forces are an inappropriate tool for internal security missions, the police force is ideally equipped to discharge domestic security duties. It has been suggested that police forces, as opposed to their military cousins, are also better suited to keeping the peace and maintaining internal security because they are essentially a bottom-up organization.[45] The police offers unique assets, such as legitimacy, community proximity due to organizational decentralization and the traditional respect accorded to its constabulary powers (not least those regarding investigation and arrest), and considerable institutional memory, which also brings the experience so vital in the context of an internal security portfolio, which is traditionally its preserve.

Under normal conditions—that is, where the police discharge duties that do not bring its members face to face with situations akin to warfare—this has become a proven truism. At the same time, the very strengths extolled above are at the core of police forces' inherent weakness when confronted with large-scale counter-terrorism operations. Tore Nyhamar has described a select number of dilemmas arising from the nature of police organizations involved in confronting serious terrorist challenges in the Norwegian context:

> The Chief of Police on the nearest district on land has no qualifications to lead what will be a military operation… The military might be asked to carry out a highly dangerous and difficult operation under the leadership of someone who is not qualified… The Chief of Police will be the one responsible for the outcome of the situation, even though the leadership will inevitably drift back to the military, creating a fault line between authority and responsibility.[46]

Nyhamar's point can also be applied to many liberal democratic states besides Norway that share similar civil-military structures and relations. Moreover, according to Nyhamar, "inertia reigns because the police do not want to cede authority to the military, and the military does not want to discuss situations in which it might have to play a subordinate role to the police."[47] At the end of the day, the intractable question of which organization is to take the operational (not to mention the overall) lead in the fight against terrorism is intricately linked to the pros and cons of police and military organizations with respect to their suitability to carry out counter-terrorism activity. The question is also played out against the backdrop of concerns within the liberal democratic state pertaining to civil liberties and political acceptability, and of concerns about the defense of the state relative to adequacy, doctrine/operational principles, and ethics or outlook. Neither option satisfies all requirements; both are possessed of unacceptable or problematic characteristics, while both also possess indispensable assets. In

---

[45] Haltiner, "Polizisten oder Soldaten?" 292– 93.

[46] Tore Nyhamar, "Norwegian Counter-Terrorism Policy in a Changing International Security Environment," unpublished draft paper presented on the occasion of the *First International Expert Conference on National Counter-Terrorism Policy*, 24-26 March 2004, Center for Security Studies, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 18. Quotation by kind permission of the author.

[47] Ibid., 20.

a comparable dead-end, one commentator noted that "[t]he suggestion is also being voiced that we should consider the establishment of a so-called 'third force' – a para-military organization which occupies the middle ground between police and army."[48]

The Third-Force Option As a Viable Alternative to Police and Military Inadequacies in the Combating of Serious Terrorist Violence

Not surprisingly, the pragmatism inherent in the suggestion for a third-force option came to fruition in a country where push quite literally has come to shove. The five-decades-long experience with low intensity conflict, protracted terrorist attacks by political violence movements, and—in the absence of a viable political solution in the foreseeable future—the ongoing process in verifying the best means to meet security challenges has compelled the state of Israel to innovate. Apart from the well-known British example of the SAS, the Israeli Sayeret Matkal units have become legendary for their secrecy and prowess, and for simply doing the impossible. The best-known example of an Israeli counter-terrorism operation is one that too many writers have spilled too much ink over: the raid on Entebbe on 27 June 1976.

Conversely, what has—and understandably so—not been broadly advertised are the failures of the Israeli counter-terrorism effort. For our present purpose, one in particular stands out: the Mahalot Massacre. On 15 May 1974, three heavily-armed men seized a school in northern Israel, trapping a few dozen teachers and pupils on the premises. Sayeret Matkal and Sayeret Golani, two Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) infantry special operations units specializing in long-range reconnaissance missions, were given the task of ending the hostage situation. The reason for the use of the two Sayerets at that time was simply that they represented Israel's highest standard of operational counter-terrorism expertise. In the course of events, a series of mistakes occurred that can arguably be attributed to the essentials of military training and its inappropriate application in a hostage crisis. The death toll was high: twenty-one children and four adults, at least two of whom were killed by friendly fire.[49] This is not to say that military training cannot be put to good and proper use in a hostage situation or other civilian-type scenario, but rather that any counter-terrorism capability in such a context must of necessity meet the requirements of the situation. In this case, the capabilities required would have been the surgical-tactical set of skills germane to a "pure" counter-terrorism outfit, such as GSG-9 or SAS-CRW.

Between Maximum Violence and Minimum Force: The Birth of Unit YAMAM

Following the Mahalot debacle, the government formed the Horev Commission (named after General Amos Horev) to investigate the special forces' failure. The commission's report states that they discovered a number of serious deficiencies, starting with inadequate training and, worse, insufficient inter-unit coordination due to the clannish *esprit de corps* of the units involved that percolated down through the ranks. It

[48] Wardlaw, *Political Terrorism*, 91.

[49] See http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Society_&_Culture/special.html, accessed on 8 June 2004.

was especially this last item that was responsible for considerable rivalry between the two units.[50] Among the structural recommendations made by the Horev Commission was that the responsibility for domestic counter-terrorism be taken out of the hands of the IDF; it was to be passed on to the police and the frontier guards (MAGAV).[51] On 26 January 1975, the government passed its Resolution 411, which removed the responsibility for domestic counter-terrorism from the military to the civilian branch. According to one commentator, the rationale for the governmental decision to give MAGAV the lead role in domestic counter-terrorism efforts was that "it's a paramilitary, half-breed organization."[52] Furthermore, the "personnel are selected and delivered by the IDF, but its orders and chain of command are via the police. Since the future unit was to be [a] domestic civilian unit but with a strong military focus …, it was placed under MAGAV."[53]

The high standards to which Unit YAMAM, MAGAV's special counter-terrorism force, was trained did not prevent it from becoming involved, albeit only passively, in Israel's greatest hostage rescue failure ever, the so-called "Beach Road" incident, in the course of which thirty-five civilians were killed in action and two hijackers were apprehended alive. In this instance, as in later incidents, the circumstances surrounding the IDF's Sayeret forces' intervention in a domestic terrorist hostage situation after the Mahalot Massacre was highly controversial, and were again tied to pronounced inter-service rivalries that permeate the Israeli security establishment. Unit YAMAM, however, did fully justify the faith placed in it by the advocates of a third-force option. In March 1988, armed men hijacked a bus near Dimona, the site of Israel's principal nuclear research facility; the commuter bus carried mostly married women and children. The "Mother Bus" incident, as it became known, has since become a benchmark for counter-terrorism hostage rescue missions. The balance sheet of the operation was three hijackers killed against three hostage fatalities as a result of *hostile* fire.

Conclusion: The Shaping of a Counter-Terrorism Instrument

How was such a dramatic improvement in performance possible? The explanation is quite simple. The YAMAM cadre was recruited straight from elite military and civilian organizations, such as Sayeret Golani (elite infantry special forces), Sayeret Duvdevan (IDF counter-terrorism specialist unit) and, rarely, from the "blue" police. As mentioned previously, and as was realized in the course of the Second World War, the politically advantageous distinctiveness of third-force options was vested in such units' recruiting of specialists across the board of extant security organizations and the recruits' *civilian* redeployment.[54] Although it still does not appear to attract the cream of

[50] The Israeli Special Forces Home Page, "Unit YAMAM," 4; available at www.isayeret.com/units/civi/yamam/article.htm, accessed on 6 May 2004.

[51] For the MAGAV, see http://www.fact-index.com/m/ma/magav.html, accessed on 8 June 2004.

[52] "Unit YAMAM," 5.

[53] Ibid., 5.

[54] See Scobell and Hammitt, "Goons, Gunmen, and Gendarmerie."

the IDF's crop, YAMAM's admissions policy was and remains based on individual merit and training; its commanders' challenge really is to render military and civilian counter-terrorism operators philosophically compatible and operationally and technically interoperable in order to harness the full spectrum of their respective assets. Moreover, the YAMAM operational profile is geared towards surgical operations in a predominantly static environment (e.g., bus takeover, house entry and seizure), which can be likened to classical police operations, and contrasted with complex, dynamic special operations deep behind enemy lines (e.g., independent counter-insurgency missions with limited or no resupply).[55]

This mandated profile has permitted YAMAM from the outset to hone its skills to perfection for use in the domestic counter-terrorism context; arguably, within the confines of their purview they are almost without peer. At the same time, Unit YAMAM is no glorified police special weapons and tactics (SWAT) formation, as its members are much more likely to be experienced military special forces operators, and their equipment, not unlike that of the GSG-9, is frequently military-grade and thus considerably heavier than that used by the police. Nevertheless, its personnel base and high concentration of know-how has also given Unit YAMAM the ability to operate in more dynamic, war-like situations, such as in border security counter-terrorism missions, for example against infiltrators.

The bottom line is that, given the opportunity, the Israeli government realized the insufficiency of a purely military solution for combating incidents requiring a high degree of precision and extra circumspection due to the frequently acute potential for collateral damage. From the very beginning, Unit YAMAM was an experiment, wedding together disparate forces, commanded in the field by military ranks but fully under a civilian chain of command. Achieving the full integration of military and civilian combat capabilities and the optimal fusion of military and police special operations command structures was never without its problems, but it was certainly worth it. Despite the deeply entrenched tradition of the IDF as the principal force provider in cases of serious terrorist violence, the Israeli authorities grasped that something else—something new—was needed to meet the challenge of terrorist attacks inside the country's borders. Even beyond the national borders, the finely honed skills and pinpoint accuracy of a civilian paramilitary third-force option was, whenever required by the reality on the ground, to be preferred over the harder punch and superior pull of a classical military special forces capability.

All of these critical services could be provided by an optimum combination of civilian and military special operations cultures, bringing together a diverse knowledge base and, not least, instilling the necessity of using an adequate—even a minimum—amount of force, but always with the *ultima ratio* option of massive force escalation. The probability that future terrorist violence will remain in the median range (e.g., heavy small arms and explosives)—which frequently falls between the force saturation levels of the military and the police—renders the consideration of a third-force option,

[55] "Unit YAMAM," 11.

with its civilian mandate and specialist knowledge, the best operational (and most politically viable) model for a democratically controllable, accountable, and acceptable counter-terrorism tool.

Terrorism—A Cultural Phenomenon?

Ana Serafim *

Introduction

This article is aimed at providing a cultural perspective on contemporary terrorism. I will examine not domestic terrorism, but rather the form of terrorism we are confronted with today: terrorism with global reach, terrorism without borders and any conceptual limitations, terrorism that defines death and destruction as achievements in themselves.

In my view, the ideological terrorism (such as the Red Brigade and the Baader-Meinhof Gang) that plagued many Western societies in the 1970s and 1980s, the nationalist and ethnic discontent that has been and continues to be the greatest inspiration for terrorists, and the religiously motivated forms of terrorism all have a cultural aspect. Still, I will not focus particularly on any of these types of terrorism, but I will rather try to find out what is culturally distinct about today's brand of global terrorism and which solutions, if any, can we find in the realm of culture that will help us in the struggle against terrorism. This is not because I underestimate the many and various manifestations of terrorism, but because I am interested in today and tomorrow more than in yesterday. I am also particularly interested in this new type of terrorism because I think that contemporary forms of terrorism are more cultural in origin and nature than ever.

Analyzing culture as a category is not an easy task, and it is not a purely scientific enterprise. What people think, how they think, and the way they react to events are all influenced by culture. Even terrorists are products of culture. Thus, regarding a definition of culture, most readers will probably be able to agree with me only on the fact that there is much disagreement about the meaning of *culture*, both as a word and a concept. I interpret culture in the usual social-scientific sense of beliefs, values, and lifestyles on the world scene, with special attention to religion as a central component. Obviously, culture is not only about religion, but it is also true that the most prominent cultural dimension of twenty-first-century terrorism can be found in religion. In particular, the events of September 11 are deeply rooted in religious and cultural tensions sharpened by the end of Cold War. So the focus of this article will be particularly on religion, because I think that changes taking place in the area of religion throughout much of the world are also working to reinforce the cultural differences between societies, and differences between cultures are helping to facilitate (in my view) the rise and development of terrorism.

It is a tendency in Western society, which is politically oriented, to assume that there is a rational pragmatic cause for acts of terrorism, and a corresponding belief that, if the particular political grievance is addressed properly, the phenomenon will fade. However, when the roots of a terrorist movement are not political (or economic),

* Senior adviser, Ministry of National Defense, Romania; member of Combating Terrorism WG, PfP Consortium.

it is naïve to expect political gestures to change the hearts of radicals. Attempts to deal with the terrorist threat as though it were divorced from its intellectual, cultural, and religious wellsprings are doomed to failure.[1] In short, I would not argue that terrorism is purely a cultural phenomenon, but I take as a theorem that modern terrorism has significant cultural aspects in its objectives, causes, methods, and consequences.

All readers will agree with Martha Crenshaw's observation that terrorism is not justified by any group identification or affiliation: moral, cultural, religious, or ethnic.[2] Still, it is obvious that culture underpins and influences terrorists' thoughts and actions, so it seems logical that terrorism is *perceived* differently and is *used* differently by different cultures.

I will focus in particular on two main cultures, Islamic and Western Judeo-Christian, because I think it is in the interface between these two that the so-called "new terrorism" is flourishing. I will not argue here in favor of or against Islam or Christianity as competing cultures and sets of values in relation to terrorism, but I will try to offer an objective approach in order to better understand and eventually bridge the gap between the two cultures, a gap that, in my view, could possibly be widened by the phenomenon of modern terrorism.

Perceptions of Terrorism in Different Cultures

After September 11, the historic cultural difference between the West and the Muslim world re-emerged as one of the principal frontiers of cultural suspicion. While terrorism—even in the form of suicide attacks—is not by definition an Islamic phenomenon, it cannot be ignored that the lion's share of terrorist acts, particularly the most devastating, in recent years have been perpetrated in the name of Islam. This fact has sparked a fundamental debate both in the West and within the Muslim world regarding the link between these acts and the teachings of Islam.

Perceptions of Terrorism within Islamic Culture

Most Western analysts are hesitant to identify terrorist acts with the central teachings of one of the world's great religions, preferring to view them instead as a perversion of a religion that is essentially peace-loving and tolerant. Moreover, an interpretation that places the blame for terrorism on religious and cultural traits runs the risk of being branded as bigoted and Islamo-phobic.[3]

Muslims often accuse Western analysts of misinterpreting Islam and ignorance about its real essence. *But if these critics do not wish to see their religion associated with contemporary terrorism, then they need to be reminded that it is not "the others" who initially misunderstood and misjudged Islam, but rather the terrorists themselves.* They have sent scholars all over the world looking everywhere—including in their re-

---

1 Shmuel Bar, "The Religious Sources of Islamic Terrorism," *Policy Review* 125 (June & July 2004), available at: http://www.policyreview.org/jun04/bar.html.

2 Martha Crenshaw, "The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century," *Political Psychology* 21:2 (June 2000).

3 Bar, "Religious Sources of Islamic Terrorism."

ligion—for explanations of their actions. It is not the case that Islam itself is a danger, but we have the duty to investigate any possible source of inspiration and motivation for terrorists, in order to try to defeat the threats we currently face. Thus, I will investigate what Daniel Pipes calls the "terroristic version of Islam."

Terroristic Version of Islam

Martin Kramer, a research professor in Middle East affairs at Tel Aviv University, has written that "Islamism" is Islam reformulated as a modern ideology. Whereas Islam is traditionally viewed as being comparable to Judaism and Christianity, Islamism is a response to ideologies that emerged in the modern West, such as communism, socialism, or capitalism. It has a political agenda; it is an effort to draw meaning out of Islam that can be applied to problems of contemporary governance, society, and politics. We therefore may ask if there are any historic similarities between Bin Laden, et al., and Martin Luther and the Reformation. In his own eyes, Bin Laden may see himself as a profound reformer of Islam, just as Luther was in the history of Christianity, but most scholars of Islam describe Bin Laden's vision as a highly distorted and retrograde version of the faith.

According to Daniel Pipes, militant Islamism derives from Islam but is a misanthropic, misogynist, triumphalist, millenarian, anti-modern, anti-Christian, anti-Semitic, terrorist, jihadist, and suicidal version of it.[4] Still, what I hope to examine is not the political dimension of Islamism, but its cultural elements. To Islamists, living by the *sharia* (religious law) is the key both to the moral life and to the regeneration of the Muslim faith. The ideology of Islamism is given coherence by its focus on this one element.[5]

The basic sentiment expressed by contemporary Islamist terrorists was also present in the Muslim Brotherhood, a political movement that started in Egypt in 1928 with the goal of restoring Islamic laws and values in the face of growing Western influence. At about the same time, another group of radical brethren was taking shape in Saudi Arabia, advocating the puritanical interpretation of Islam known as *Wahhabism*. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt and the Wahhabi radicals in Saudi Arabia both rose out of an Islamic religious movement called the *Salafiyya*, which held that the practice of Islam had become corrupted and needed to be reformed to reflect the original seventh-century form of Islam practiced at the time of the Prophet Muhammad. This extreme interpretation of Islam would eventually influence a new generation of violent radical Muslim groups, including the Taliban, Al Qaeda and Egyptian Islamic Jihad. Although all these trends and religious movements have been present for almost a century, they never seemed to achieve the level of extremism and the global reach that can be found in the language of today's terrorists. This new quality is due to the fact that terrorist discourse has evolved and exploited religious concepts in order to advance their political and cultural agenda.

---

[4] Daniel Pipes, "Aim the War on Terror at Militant Islam," *Los Angeles Times* (6 January 2002).

[5] Martin Kramer, "Is Islamism a Threat? A Debate," *Middle East Quarterly* (September 1999).

The message of terrorist organizations is not Koranic, but heretical. Four main concepts are of interest for my approach.

- *Dar al Islam/Dar al Harb*. The underlying element in the radical Islamist worldview is a-historic and dichotomist: perfection lies in the ways of the Prophet and the events of his time; therefore, religious innovations, philosophical relativism, and intellectual or political pluralism are anathema. In such a worldview, there can exist only two camps—Dar al-Islam ("The House of Islam," i.e., the Muslim countries) and Dar al-Harb ("The House of War," i.e., countries ruled by any regime but Islam)—which are pitted against each other until the final victory of Islam. The radical Muslims carry these concepts to their extreme conclusion.[6]
- *Ummah*. This is an ancient Arabic term that denotes the totality of Muslims in the world at any given time; in this sense, it refers to much more than our word religion usually comprehends.[7] In Islamic terms, *ummah* means what secular diplomats call the international community. The two terms correspond in internal variety, geographical dispersion, and potentially global ambition.
- *The Great Caliphate* calls for the replacement of all secular leadership with religious leaders in any country having Muslim majorities. This would include Egypt, Turkey, Pakistan, Indonesia, all the Emirates, Sudan, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria, Morocco, Yemen, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan, and finally what Muslims call the "occupied territory" of Israel.
- *Jihad* is such an important concept to Islam that it is almost regarded as a sixth pillar. It is also the most misunderstood of all aspects of Islam. Most Islamic scholars interpret *jihad* as a nonviolent quest for justice: a holy struggle rather than a holy war. The word *jihad*, they argue, actually means "striving" in the spiritual sense. It means that a Muslim's real daily striving is to become pure in spirit and to resist sin and evil. All of the Koran's chapters except one begin with the phrase "Allah is merciful and compassionate." So if Islam is such a compassionate and tolerant religion, why then do the militant/extremist Islamists continue to resort to the use of violence?[8] Compassion and tolerance, after all, are not part of the common Western perception of *jihad*, at least as it is used by terrorists. They are interpreting *jihad* to mean a holy war, departing from the notion that a Muslim's duty is to keep up the struggle against the spiritual enemies of Islam.

Today's *jihadis* are calling their war the "Third Great Jihad," and are doing so within the framework of a time line that reaches back to the very creation of Islam in the seventh century. This constitutes part of their attempts to recreate the dynamics that gave rise to the religion in the first two hundred years of its existence. *Jihad* represents

---

6 Bar, "Religious Sources of Islamic Terrorism."

7 Jack Miles, "Theology and the Clash of Civilizations," *Cross Currents* 51:4 (Winter 2002).

8 Ivar Hellberg, "Notes on Islam," Course presentation, MDD-12 Defense Diplomacy Course - July 2004, Cranfield University, United Kingdom.

the chance to overcome the shame of Islam's long decline from glory and superiority over the West into the decay and decadence represented by current Arab governments.

All these concepts are illustrative for my discussion, simply to show how things have changed. If, at the beginning, *jihad* was considered just a holy war in the House of Islam, it then became a mobilizing concept justifying political activities, and finally emerged as an efficient terrorist activity in its own right. Due to these new interpretations of the teachings of Islam, we today have arrived at a completely erroneous (in the Muslim view) perception of Islamic culture. Many Muslim scholars say that Osama Bin Laden and other Islamic fundamentalists do not represent the real Islam. If that is the case, then how can one distinguish between the real Islam and the distortion of it?

Who does represent true Islam: "Will the real Islam please stand up?"[9]

Islam represents an ethical, ideological, ideational, and cultural phenomenon. It is both a belief system and a code of conduct based on a hierarchy of values, norms, standards, laws, and institutions; it represents a way of life, a world system, and a social movement for historical change.[10] *Still, there is a tendency to not judge Islam by its books, but by what is done in its name*. The problem is that Islamism has, in some respects, become more visible than the real Islam.

Why is it that the Islamist message seems unitary, while the perception of Islam is so diverse, even among Muslims themselves? Within Islam, the unifying influence of faith (insofar as Sunni and Shia can be said to be united) is outweighed by other societal differences. Even within the Arab world, where a more or less common language (to a significant extent), common culture and historical experience are added to shared religion, there is no immediate likelihood of unity. In addition, most Muslim violence is directed against co-religionists. So Muslims are not united, a fact that some observers attribute to the teachings of Islam itself, arguing that they make Muslims confrontational. How does the Muslim world perceive terrorism? Does the Muslim community see it and feel it the way we do? Saddam Hussein was the only state leader to praise the attacks of September 11. Many Muslim-majority countries are members of the U.S.-led coalition fighting terrorism. Moreover, Al Qaeda also targets Muslim governments, such as those in Egypt and Saudi Arabia, that it sees as godless. Still, do the populations of those nations really support the coalition against Bin Laden and its member states? Talking with people from Muslim communities, they shared with me their view on that specific issue: maybe the political leaders are in favor of supporting the Americans in the war against terrorism, for political and strategic reasons, but the ordinary people are not. What is more, there are Muslims who morally support the terrorists, and think their war is right. One confusing problem is that one may find this trend even among Europe's fifteen million Muslims. To take but one example, in the UK, a recent poll has shown that 13 percent of British Muslims surveyed would "regard further attacks by Al Qaeda or similar organizations on the U.S. as justified." We may also re-

[9] Miles, "Theology and the Clash of Civilizations."

[10] See "Islam and Terrorism: What Does Humanity Need; Confrontation or Cooperation?", available at: http://www.jamaat.org/iat/humanity1101.html.

member that the attacks of September 11 were popular on Arab streets, where they were met with spontaneous celebrations and reportedly made Osama a popular name for newborn boys.

To what extent is the Islamic world the target of terrorism? Some authors say that the war being waged by Bin Laden and his followers is as much against Islam as it is against the West. Al Qaeda and its allies represent a perversion of Islam, and are engaged in a campaign to change Islam itself.[11] This analysis is borne out by terrorist attacks in Central Asia and Morocco, in Saudi Arabia, Algeria—and some in Iraq—that have been directed against fellow Muslims, who have abandoned what the extremists view as "true Islam." Still, the primary targets of today's terrorists remain modernity, Christianity, America, and the West, which in the Islamist perspective make up a single unholy stew.

Now we will shift to the other side of the equation. Why is Western culture perceived in this way by the Muslim world? How "alien" is Western culture from Islamic culture?

Perceptions of Terrorism in Western Judeo-Christian Culture

The West is no longer a mere geographic proposition; it has also taken on cultural and civilizational dimensions. It obviously differs from all other civilizations in that it has had an overwhelming impact on all other civilizations in the world that have existed since 1500.[12] The West's popular culture is global in its reach, but in many parts of the world it is widely regarded with suspicion, and met with varying degrees of resistance. Within the Islamic world, the West has been stereotyped as the embodiment of arrogance, exploitation and irresponsible individualism.[13]

A first distinction between Islam and Christianity occurs with regard to the place and role of religion within society. Many of the cultural features of Western societies are the result of the "privatization of religion" in the Christian world. The modern form of governance, democracy, is about privatization, and thus everything in Western societies—including religion—became a private issue. Indeed, religion in Western societies is largely restricted to the private sphere. It is substantially independent from government, and its role is reduced to the private life of each individual.

Islam, on the other hand, is a pervasive religion. It regulates every aspect of human life. Western culture is completely different. It gives first priority to the human individual. Societies that are structured around the pursuit of religious objectives can appear illogical to societies like ours, based as they are on individual rights and freedom.

---

[11] David F. Forte, "Religion is Not the Enemy," *National Review Online* (19 October 2001), available at: http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-forte101901.shtml

[12] Josh Burek, "The Clash of Civilizations: a reading guide," on-line resources and expert commentary on Samuel P. Huntington's essay (quoting Vincent Ferraro); available at: http://www.csmonitor.com/specials/sept11/flash_civClash.html.

[13] Simon Murden, "Cultural Conflict in International Relations: The West and Islam," in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 377.

But the values that are prized by these societies are completely different. One observant Muslim told me once, "My country is above myself and above my family. My country is my religion." Individual freedom is not their main concern – they care most about their fellow Muslims and their countries. Westerners cannot comprehend how "rational" people can "joyously" destroy their lives and the lives of innocent civilians in America and Israel and elsewhere in the world. They do not understand the psychology that drives suicide bombers to their deaths in order to bring honor and paradise to them, their families, and Muslims everywhere. We cannot conceive of a culture that encourages young people to slaughter themselves for the perceived benefits of the afterlife. These concepts are totally alien to Western thinking.

On the other hand, Western values such as individualism, liberalism, human rights, equality, liberty, democracy, free markets, and separation of church and state often have little or no resonance in Islamic culture. Western efforts to propagate these values produce instead a reaction against "human rights imperialism" and a reaffirmation of indigenous values.

Is Christianity as such a target of terrorism? Modern terrorism is religious only in means, not in its targets. What we see is that terrorists are targeting values, rather than religion.

Terrorists are not fighting against the Christianity as a religion, but rather against the products of Christian culture, which are Western values.

If this is the case, then it might be asked exactly in what way Western culture challenges Islamist terrorists. This question bring me to the next point of my analysis, where I hope to shed light on what is cultural about contemporary terrorism, and from what perspective can we define terrorism as a cultural phenomenon. As I said in the introduction, I consider twenty-first-century terrorism to have cultural objectives, causes, means, and consequences.

What Are the Cultural Aspects of Contemporary Terrorism?

First of all, I consider the terrorist agenda to be at times primarily social and cultural, not political. Among the cultural objectives terrorists have on their agenda, I would include:

1. *Reject and destroy Western culture*. Today's terrorists are seeking the elimination of Western secularism and values, and of those who support them.[14] In the eyes of Islamic fundamentalists, the openness of Western culture and its values are repulsive. There are numerous books and articles that point to this antipathy toward the Western world, either because of a broad cultural incompatibility or a specific conflict between Western consumerism and religious fundamentalism.[15] Western values are seen as contaminating Islam, and therefore there is a perceived cultural

[14] Stephane Lefebvre, "Perspectives on Ethno-nationalist/separatist Terrorism," *Conflict Studies Research Centre Monthly*, Issue M29 (May 2003).

[15] Well known examples of such articles are Samuel Huntington's "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (Summer 1993); and Benjamin R. Barber's "Jihad vs. McWorld: Terrorism's Challenge to Democracy," *Atlantic Monthly* (March 1992).

duty to fight against this influence. Terrorists want to insulate their societies from penetration or "corruption" by the West.

2. *Defeat globalization*. Associated with Western values is the process of globalization. Globalization is what terrorists dislike most, and this is because globalization is not only about exporting and importing prosperity, but also values. Pope John Paul II suggested what these values might be in an address earlier this year in which he spoke of globalization as not just an economic fact, but a "cultural phenomenon" as well: "Those who are subjected to it often see globalization as a destructive flood threatening the social norms which had protected them and the cultural points of reference which had given them direction in life. Globalization is moving too quickly for cultures to respond."[16] Fear and rage in the face of threats to established beliefs and ways of life—threats seen as originating above all in America's liberal, consumerist culture—are a large part of the dynamic driving Islamist fury today.
3. *Fighting the infidels, unifying the ummah*. This new form of terrorism is more intent on punishment for perceived wrongs, destruction of the existing order, the quest to create Islamic states by the imposition of the *sharia* law. Today's militant form of Islam seeks to rid the Middle East of all Western influence and establish an Islamic state. Fundamentalists believe that violence, including killing civilians, is justified as a means to restore *sharia* and maintain Islamic cultural identity. And Islamists not only want to preserve their identity, but also to either convert or punish nonbelievers.
4. *Targeting societies becomes a terrorist objective.* What appears to be emerging today is a desired goal to devastate an entire society, not simply to politically influence an audience. If traditionally the objective of terrorists' political violence was to influence government structures or states, the new form of terrorism is oriented toward the society that they want to change: the society itself has become the main target.

There is also a cultural motivation behind contemporary terrorism. Terrorists are fighting their war because of a religious commandment. September 11 occurred because of a religious commandment to wage *jihad* and work toward the establishment of *sharia*. Terrorism therefore became a culture that gave the poor and the hopeless a basis for self-worth: to fight for their faith.

Islamist terrorists are also fighting out of a sense of cultural frustration. The cultural anger against the West is quite explicit, and is clearly invoked as a motivation for terrorist acts. Their hate is not limited in time and space. Once asked what the *jihadis* will do if U.S. forces finally pull out of Iraq, one terrorist said: "We will follow them to the U.S."[17] Their level of frustration is high because they are looking at the past. As

[16] Russel Shaw, *The Catholic Response to Terrorism* (30 September 2001), available at: http://www.osv.com/whatthechurchteaches/whenevilstrikes/shaw.asp.

[17] Michael Ware, "Meeting the Jihad," *Time*, 5 July 2004.

Francis Fukuyama wrote, the days of Islam's cultural conquests are over, and fundamentalists cannot accept it.[18]

Terrorists also exploit globalization in order to justify their activities. Kashima reverses the role of globalization in modern terrorism, from a violent intrusion that provokes terroristic opposition, to a neutral medium that terrorists use to advance their violent agendas. He claims that globalization offers an opportunity for terrorists to gain publicity for their political agenda, to place it on the "communal common ground of the people who engage in public discourse" about it. As Carl Ratner has written, "Globalization makes terrorism an 'attractive' political strategy for some."[19]

Terrorism is also cultural in its approaches and means; the first such instrument that comes to mind is the religion of Islam itself. One question therefore arises: Is religion a weapon of terrorists? Some analysts agree that, although some terrorist organizations may have a religious and political face, they have built their strength on terrorist tactics, which have nothing in common with religion.

I disagree with this perspective. I think that the believers—the human capital of terrorist organizations—are the main weapons of terrorism, and therefore I would argue that religion becomes an organizing principle, a mobilizing factor, and therefore can be seen as a weapon of terrorists. By appealing to deeply ingrained religious beliefs, radical leaders succeed in motivating the Islamist terrorist, creating for him a social environment that provides approbation and a religious environment that provides moral and legal support for his actions.

Terrorists are also using religious ideological centers to teach extremism, which raises the question of whether these *madrasas* are centers of education or nurseries of terrorism. It is well known that religious indoctrination is a pre-condition for creating good militants. It can be safely assumed that the great majority of Muslims in the world have no desire to join a *jihad* or to politicize their religion. However, it is also true that, insofar as religious establishments in most of the Arabian Peninsula, in Iran, and in much of Egypt and North Africa are concerned, radical Islamist ideology does not represent a marginal and extremist perversion of Islam but rather a genuine and increasingly mainstream interpretation. Many religious schools in these countries impart only religious education (along with a minimal level of general education, which tends to produce semiliterate religious scholars). They promote negative thinking and propagate hatred and violence in society.

We may also see today the global means of the new forms of terrorism. Because of globalization, terrorists have access to more powerful technologies, more targets, more territory, more means of recruitment, more financial resources, and more easily exploited sources of rage than ever before. This new terrorism is using global and modern means to achieve its ends. Extremist ideologies are spread through websites and videotapes, and the use of information technologies such as the Internet, mobile

---

[18] Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Free Press, 1992), 45–46.

[19] Carl Ratner, "A Cultural Critique of Psychological Explanations of Terrorism," *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin* 38:1-2 (2004), 18–24.

phones, and instant messaging has extended the global reach of many terrorist groups.[20]

Along with the material results of terrorist attacks, we are at present also confronting the cultural consequences of terrorism, such as:

1. *Negative impact on Western societies.* Although terrorism is generally unsuccessful in reaching its political objectives, it often does succeed at the tactical and strategic levels, instilling fear and confusion and impacting societies by causing tremendous physical destruction and grave bodily harm. It is an interesting situation: contemporary terrorists have society as a whole as a target, because in democracies the individual and society both play a very important role within the state, as well as on the international scene. It is no longer effective to simply kidnap people or kill political representatives. When the society as a whole is the target, the efficacy of terrorist activity is by far enhanced. The impact of terrorism on Western societies becomes therefore very important. A terrorist attack such as the one of September 11 may have profound political, social, and economic consequences for the targeted society. It can inspire widespread anxiety, anger at the government for failing in its primary mission of providing security, and popular demand for draconian measures that could shake a political system and fundamentally alter the society's lifestyle.[21]
2. *Terrorism as an "intellectual fashion."* What we also see today is that subcultural elements crop up in contemporary intellectual fashion, along with extremist policies. Terrorists are becoming popular, and this is not only among the illiterate. We witness today an "intellectual attraction" to terrorism, to the use of intellectual means of propaganda, and therefore to a certain level of attention being paid to the "intellectual nature" of the new terrorists. This is a dangerous trend as, over the long term, the popularization of extremist views cannot augur well for the security of any state or society. This kind of "intellectual terrorism" can be worse than physical terrorism.
3. *Copy-cat influence on other types of terrorism*. All types of terrorism are profoundly influenced by the form of terrorism we currently face. For instance, the influence of Al Qaeda on Muslim separatist groups active in their home countries is growing. It is a worrying trend, as each Al Qaeda attack becomes a recruiting poster for terrorism in general, no matter the specific type.
4. *Clash of ideologies/cultures/civilizations.* One of the main consequences of modern terrorism is the controversial "clash of civilizations" that Samuel Huntington suggested in 1993. The essence of this thesis is that the great divisions among humankind and the dominant source of conflict in the future will be cultural. Re-

[20] Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism," in *Defeating Terrorism–Shaping the New Security Environment,* ed. Russell D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer (New York: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2004), 39.

[21] Brian Michael Jenkins, "Countering Al-Qaeda," in *Defeating Terrorism*, ed. Howard and Sawyer, 134.

> ligion discriminates sharply and exclusively between people, and the main cultural fault line in the world occurs where the West meets Islam. Were the September 11 attacks, from a Huntingtonian perspective, part of a clash between Islamic and Western civilizations? Bin Laden and his terror network see it that way. Al Qaeda considers its terrorist campaign against the U.S. to be part of a war between the *ummah* and the Judeo-Christian West. For Al Qaeda, the fight is against Western civilization as a whole. Islamic scholars say that it is a fight between the vast majority of progressive Muslims and the miniscule percentage of radical Muslims. According to Rohan Gunaratna, it is not a clash of civilizations but a clash among civilizations, a fight that must essentially be fought within the Muslim world.[22]

Many experts say that the new form of terrorism cannot be reduced to a clash of civilizations. Still, we see a continuously growing gap between Islam and Western civilization. Anti-Western feelings openly manifested in the Muslim world are generating an increase in Western hostility towards Islam in general. Western societies, the main victims of contemporary terrorism, are exposed to the danger of an increasingly hateful attitude toward Muslim communities. If you go in the streets in Western countries and ask ordinary people what they feel about Muslims, they will make—even if not deliberately—an association between the current threat to their security and the Muslim world. The more terrorist attacks take place, the greater the anti-Muslim resentment on the part of the targeted populations.

Having in mind all these cultural aspects of terrorism, it is logical to consider how terrorism might be fought using cultural means. What is the role of culture in the fight against terrorism?

Cultural Approaches to Fighting Terrorism

It has been assumed that understanding terrorism crucially affects the responses to it. Therefore, in order to comprehend the motivation for these acts and to draw up an effective strategy for a war against terrorism, it is necessary to understand the religious-ideological factors that underlie it, and which are deeply embedded in Islam. Consequently, counter-terrorism begins on the religious-ideological level, and must adopt appropriate methods. The cultural and religious sources of radical Islamic ideology must be addressed in order to develop a long-range strategy for coping with the terrorist threat to which they give birth.

To this end, I suggest there is an urgent need for a more effective, meaningful, and all-embracing dialogue between the Muslim and the Western worlds in order to bring about a better understanding of each other's interests and aspirations. Therefore, the Muslim world must take the course of openly learning from the West and confining the role of religion to the private sphere. A reformist movement in Islam is required, an interpretation of Islam that combines a proper respect for Muslim traditions with a

[22] Rohan Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda—The Pioneering Vanguard of the Islamic Movements," in *Defeating Terrorism*, ed. Howard and Sawyer, 20.

willingness to embrace the opportunities and obligations for development offered by the modern world.

There is a need for an Islamic Reformation, to allow modernization to take place; as Rohan Gunaratna has pointed out, this is a battle within Islam itself, rather than between Islam and the West. I think that progress has been made already in this direction, by bringing the subject of Islam into the public debate within the Muslim world itself.

Another effective approach would be to engage Islam—and therefore theology should become a topic in international diplomacy—not as a security issue, but as tool to better understand each other. Because of the secularization of the state in the West, Western governments when dealing with one another do not expect to be required to deal with one another's religious leaders. It is different in the case of the Muslim world, where religious leaders typically have a far greater influence on the public than civilian leaders do.[23] So theology should become of interest for makers of policy and diplomacy.

Promoting moderate Islam should be another approach taken by the West. The best way of managing the fundamentalist challenge is to initiate a serious dialogue with moderate Islamic groups that may foster in the long term, if not the democratization of their regimes, at least a marginalization of their radical elements. Moderates must win in the struggle within Islam. Every precaution should be taken not to antagonize moderate elements in the Muslim community, and therefore it is important to know if it is power or weakness that moderates Muslims, and act accordingly.

Integrating Islam within the Western community is also important. Gert Weisskirchen, the foreign policy spokesman for Germany's Social Democrats, spoke about the need to Europeanize Islam.[24] But is it possible for Europe to Europeanize Islam, or for America to Americanize Islam?

Some argue that, in the years ahead, it should be the voice of Western Muslim communities that should be heard rather than that of Bin Laden. Western Muslim communities can make a difference, due to their connections to and understanding of Islamic culture. These communities can serve as a link between the Islamic and Western worlds. Still, it has been shown that many terrorists belong to these communities. Expatriate and refugee communities remain vulnerable to ideological penetration and recruitment, and they still identify themselves with the struggles in their homelands. Until and unless host governments develop a better cultural understanding of the threat and target terrorist propaganda—both its producers and their tools—the threat from within will persist.[25]

A crucial element of the cultural front in the fight against terrorism is reforming the education system in the Muslim world. Extremists primarily come from societies where there is a high level of extremist teaching. Social change must be encouraged and promoted, with an emphasis on education. There are serious problems caused by the religious schools. Terrorists make use of these schools to disseminate ideologies

[23] Miles, "Theology and the clash of civilizations."
[24] *Time*, 29 March 2004, 28.
[25] Gunaratna, "Defeating Al Qaeda," 5.

that are contrary to the teachings of Islam. It is not religion that is taught there, but politics: the politics of hatred.

When asked which is the best measure of whether you are winning or losing a war on terrorism, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, said that the best way is "to monitor whether the numbers we are killing and deterring are greater than the numbers the Madrasas are producing and Al-Qaeda is recruiting." Here stands the difference between two approaches: "hard," or military power, used by Westerners to defeat terrorism, and "soft," or cultural power, used by terrorists to win. This has to change. In the same way that terrorists are using now more and more hard power, those fighting them should focus on soft power. Joseph Nye, one of America's leading thinkers on foreign policy, has advocated for the use of soft power in order to improve America's image in the Middle East. He argues that the spread of information and American popular culture has generally increased global awareness and openness to American ideas and values.

Soft power worked with Communist Europe because of a common history, a shared religious heritage, and a similar cultural framework. But in the Middle East, there is a great disparity on all of these issues. Can efforts based in soft power really take root in Muslim societies? It is more difficult to wield soft power where there are deep cultural differences. For instance, it is almost impossible to think that Western values could be spread among the radical Islamists who abhor democracy, who believe that human rights and tolerance are imperialist inventions, and who want to have nothing to do with deeper Western values which are not those of the Koran as they interpret it. But the target of soft power should, again, be the large Muslim communities that are not yet radicalized, and the uneducated masses. In this regard, illiteracy is another important aspect to be dealt with. Destitute and illiterate young people, in my view, are the easiest target for recruitment by terrorist organizations, because they are the easiest to manipulate.

Conclusion

To conclude, a cultural approach to terrorism may not offer any concrete solution to it, but it definitely can provide us with a far more insightful and effective strategy to understand the concrete cultural issues involved in terrorism. Comprehending both the conditions that provoke terrorism as well as the ideological and cultural objectives that guide the terroristic response to these conditions will make us better prepared to understand the reasons for terrorism and to fight against it.

As it seems that there is no purely political or military solution to terrorism, it is reasonable to try to approach it differently. Nobody wants to antagonize the Muslim community. The United States has avoided portraying its campaign against Al Qaeda and the Taliban as a crusade against Islam, and it is not my intent to make Islam into a security issue either. Instead, I agree with those analysts who describe the enemy as an ideology, a set of attitudes, a belief system organized into a recruiting network that will continue to replace terrorist losses unless defeated politically, economically, and culturally. Therefore, if states do not have policies towards religions, they do respond to

ideologies, so it is important to develop hard power solutions in relation to Islamism and soft power approaches to Islam. Hard power is needed to eliminate the Islamist threat, while soft power is needed to attract the moderates, appease militant Islamists, and to promote a true alternative to Bin Laden in the world where he originated.

Islamic fundamentalism is a threat to Western culture, in the same way that Western culture is perceived as a threat to the Islamic world. It is always about misperceptions, misunderstandings, and ignorance about each other. But when people of one culture perceive those of another not just as alien but also as threatening, serious conflict is likely.[26]

I don't know if it is a clash of civilizations that we are facing today, but I do realize that there is a gap between the Muslim and the Western world, and I do think that terrorism increases that gap. This chasm needs to be narrowed, and cultural means may contribute to the effort. Without being blind to the dangers of militant fundamentalism, we must remain aware of the moral distinction between discrete religious sects like Wahhabis and terrorist groups like Al Qaeda and Islamic Jihad.

By continuing to maintain that moral bright line between terrorism and Islam, we help to legitimate all the varied and peaceful traditions of Islam, *including those that oppose fundamentalism.* This permits us to precisely isolate and destroy terrorists, while working on a multifaceted program to blunt and reduce militant fundamentalism within Islam.[27] Understanding the diversity of Islam gives those of us who are not Muslim a valuable tool to facilitate our dealings with Muslims, and is therefore a step that is much too important to ignore or deny.[28]

To conclude, viewing terrorism purely as a cultural phenomenon would be too extreme. Indeed, contemporary terrorism has cultural features, and may be taken as a cultural phenomenon, but the point is that, so far, the terrorism of the twenty-first century is the manifestation of only an isolated part of a culture, not of the whole. Just simply associating the two words seems inadequate to me. This is because I don't want to conflate a positive word with a complete negative one. Still, as we have seen, they meet somewhere. Therefore, I would argue that the form of terrorism we are facing today is rather a non-cultural, sub-cultural, or an a-cultural phenomenon. And, indeed, this sub-cultural phenomenon could well nourish "a clash of civilizations."

---

[26] Murden, "Cultural conflict in international relations," 375.

[27] Forte, "Religion Is not the Enemy."

[28] Llewellyn D. Howell, "Act of war: terrorism in the Clash of Civilizations," *USA Today Magazine* (July 2002), available at: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1272/is_2686_131/ai_90683547.

Terrorism and Civil Aviation Security: Problems and Trends

Jangir Arasly *

General Trends in Present-Day Terrorism

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 marked the start of a new period in modern history. This period is one characterized by instability, unpredictability, and the re-shaping of complex systems, including both traditional and new types of challenges and threats. Of particular significance in the last and most dangerous category is, beyond any doubt, the emergence of terrorism as a truly global threat.

It has to be kept in mind that terrorism, as an independent and self-reproducing socio-political phenomenon of violence, can be seen throughout the history of human civilization. However, in the twenty-first century, terrorism has evolved into a major geopolitical factor, capable of causing a systemic crisis at the global level. Some of the distinctive (albeit not unique) characteristics of modern terrorism—also labeled "international terrorism," "new wave terrorism," "mega-terrorism," "fourth-generation terrorism"—are as follows [1]:

- Qualitative change of content;
- Shift to a strategic approach and a particular type of warfare;
- Perpetual reproduction and build-up;
- Transformation into mass movements;
- Permanent dynamics;
- Fluid, mutable nature—convergence;
- Increasing importance of non-state actors;
- Growing professionalization;
- Escalation of technological sophistication;
- Weapons of mass effect, techno-terrorism;
- Increasing reliance on information technologies and networks;
- Cyber-terrorism, psycho-terrorism.

The above-mentioned elements make it possible to identify the overall scope of a modern global process that some politicians and experts in terrorism are referring to as

* Jangir Arasly is an advisor on International Issues to the Minister of Defense of Azerbaijan, and a member of the PfP Combating Terrorism Working Group.

1 Jangir Arasly, paper presented to a meeting of the Combating Terrorism Working Group of the PfP Consortium, Sarajevo, February 2004.

"World War Four."[2] Among the basic players in this process—along with nation-states—are non-state actors, including terrorist structures, networks, and movements.

It should be noted that the conflict outlined above is closely connected to another, no less significant and all-encompassing phenomenon – the process of globalization. Its most crucial aspect—even more than the revolution in information technologies—is the spread of the "transportation revolution" around the world, which paves the way for the rapid and free movement of people, commodities, and services on a global scale. Recognizing this, civil aviation is the aspect of this revolution that has wrought the greatest change. Nowadays, air transport is in position to convey people and cargo to the remotest corners of the Earth, from anywhere else, in a journey of slightly over twenty-four hours. It is important to note that aviation is today's most dynamic, fastest developing area of transportation. An eloquent testimony to its importance and pace of development are the following quantitative indices: there are approximately 10,000 air transport companies presently operating in the world, using more than 15,500 passenger airliners (ignoring cargo planes and light aircraft) and landing at over 5,000 airports.

Regretfully, this positive tendency also has a negative side. By virtue of its functional significance and vulnerability, civil aviation is increasingly becoming the focus of the operational activity of different terrorist structures as a subject (rather than an implement) of their actions. This, in turn, makes it critical to take practical steps toward tightening the level of security in the area of civil aviation.

Genesis and Operational Chronology of Terrorism in Transport Aviation

It should be noted that the appearance of terrorism has practically concurred with the rise of aviation as a mode of transportation. The first registered incident of aviation terrorism goes back to 1930, when Peruvian insurgents seized an airplane to scatter propaganda leaflets.[3] But this practice did not become customary in the subsequent four decades, primarily owing to the effect of global factors (World War Two, etc.).

The starting date of modern aviation terrorism, as we see it now, is 22 July 1968, when three gunmen from the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked a passenger airliner of the Israeli airline El Al on a flight from Rome to Tel-Aviv, and demanded to exchange hostages for their comrades-in-arms who were imprisoned in Israel.[4] This operation, although it was the twelfth case of civilian aircraft seizure in 1968, was qualitatively different in its content and ultimate aim. It was the first time that an aircraft had ever been hijacked not out of criminal motivation or for personal reasons, but with the specific goal of *politically pressuring* an opponent and using the incident as a *propaganda message* to bring a political cause to the world's notice. It was a deliberate creation of a crisis situation and an immediate threat to the

---

2 J. Aras, *World War Four. The Handbook on Non-government Paramilitary Systems* (Baku: Sada publishing house, 2002), 6.

3 O. Gubarev, *Secrets of Air Terrorism* (Moscow: Veche, 2002), 11.

4 Bruce Hoffman, *Terrorism. The Insight* (Moscow: 2003), 77.

lives of hostages that contributed to shaping a favorable political and psychological context for coercing an opponent into direct talks (which is *a de facto* form of recognition) and complying with demands. It is no mere coincidence that late 1960s and the early 1970s were marked by explosive growth in the number of terrorist acts directed at air transport, most of which followed a typical pattern: armed seizure of an airliner; hijacking to a safe airport; and issuing demands of a political nature under the threat of execution of hostages.

Later, in the 1980s, the dangerous tendency toward the further spread of aviation terrorism as a tool of political pressure and propaganda came to an end. Contributing to this were various factors, including:

- Deployment and rapid improvement of the technical means of airport security, which made it difficult for terrorists to covertly carry arms and ammunition on board airliners;
- Creation and effective use of special anti-terrorist teams (as deployed in the rescue of hostages in Mogadishu, Entebbe, etc.);
- Implementation of countermeasures by some states against leaders of terrorist structures as retribution and reprisals for already committed acts of aviation terrorism;
- Changes in public awareness, namely the perception of hijacking as an explicitly terrorist act, rather than as an "act of struggle for freedom."

Although the trend toward aviation terrorism had stalled, the tendency toward the politically motivated hijacking of airliners did not disappear. Starting in the mid-1980s, a qualitatively different form of terrorism appeared in the realm of aviation. This new phenomenon was also shaped and supported by shifts in the media sector, which accelerated the growth of its significance.

The hijacking by Lebanese Hezbollah terrorists of a TWA Boeing 727 airliner in July 1985—followed by a two-week-long hostage drama, the transfer of the seized plane between different airports in the Middle East, the murder of one of the passengers, and interviews with released hostages—was uninterruptedly broadcast by the major television networks in the United States. As a direct result, following the broadcasts of the episode, over 850,000 Americans declined going abroad for fear of an act of terror; another 200,000 decided to spend their holidays in the homeland. In a ripple effect, 50 percent of previously reserved American tours to Italy and 30 percent of tours to Greece were canceled, which essentially damaged the economies of these countries as well.[5] This example is illustrative of changes in the dynamics of aviation terrorism, since it extended beyond an attack on a single branch of transportation and took on two new dimensions: economic and psychological warfare.

[5] Hoffman, *Terrorism*, 182.

Current Dynamics of Aviation Terrorism

In considering the examples discussed above, it is no mere chance that the largest terrorist attacks the world has ever seen—the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington—were committed by hijacking civil airliners. For the first time, the airplanes were steered by suicide pilots. Instead of being employed as leverage for negotiations or as a platform for putting forward demands, the airliners were used as *weapons* (in effect, manned cruise missiles) designed for defeating specific targets. The replacement of an unavailable class of weapons with other, available means is one of the fundamental principles of *asymmetric warfare*. In the meanwhile, to refuse talks or to elaborate demands against the backdrop of combat operations is an eloquent summation of the state of *total war*. This fact gave many experts cause to consider September 11, 2001 as the starting date of World War Four.

Present-day terrorism, when viewed as a particular type of war, increasingly assumes new forms, attributable to the military, economic, financial, and cultural-civilization asymmetries that arise when post-industrial and traditional societies are engaged in global conflict. It is the practical inability to endure direct confrontation with the regular military forces of developed countries that pushes non-state actors in the direction of non-conventional (i.e., terrorist) operational approaches.

The following examples may be cited. Two terrorist attacks in October 2002—the bombing of two night clubs on Bali, Indonesia, and the attempt to shoot down an Israeli passenger aircraft in Kenya with a portable SAM—resulted in substantial decrease in the number of Western tourists, who traditionally spend their vacations in warm locales, in these parts of the world. Note that these synchronous operations, mounted at an interval of two weeks, not only caused damage to the tourist and entertainment sectors (which account for no less than 10 percent of spending in Western economies). The most affected sector at first proved to be air companies, which work as transport operators for tourist agencies. The same month's attack against a French supertanker off the coast of Yemen led to a temporary hike in prices in the oil markets worldwide, which also damaged the airlines, because they had to purchase jet fuel at higher rates.[6] Thus, it is entirely safe to argue that terrorism is a highly effective instrument of economic warfare.

It should be noted that the air transportation sector is on the front lines of the war against terror. An indication of this fact is the large-scale systemic crisis that has affected the world's leading airlines following September 11, whose consequences have not yet been resolved. A number of well-known companies (Sabena, Swissair, etc.) failed to survive under *force majeure* circumstances, while other companies had to go to incredible lengths to survive. For instance, several major passenger carriers in the United States have filed for bankruptcy protection and, on the other side of the Atlantic, according to a special decision of the government, British Airways was declared exempt from paying basic taxes. Without this provision, the operation of the leading

[6] J. Aras, interview with the *Echo* newspaper, 15 July 2003; available at: http://www2.echo-az.com/archive2/623/foreign.shtml.

national airline of Great Britain would be unprofitable and, hence, senseless from an economic point of view. According to forecasts for 2004, this year British Airways is projected to lose another $900 million, and 13,000 jobs (out of 45,000) will need to be cut.

An eloquent testimony to the scope of the terrorist threat to the functioning of the world's air traffic system proved to be the events that occurred between 24 December 2003 and 5 January 2004 (the Christmas and New Year holidays, when the size of the passenger flow sharply rises). A starting point of the crisis was "reliable" information from "unidentified" sources within intelligence services about a high alert level concerning potential hijacking of airliners by Al Qaeda operatives. As a result, numerous flights of various airlines were canceled, several airports closed, readiness in air forces was heightened (jet fighters made repeated sorties to accompany suspicious airplanes), an elevated level of preparedness for acts of terror—Code Orange—was imposed on the entire territory of the United States.[7] In particular, flights from the U.S. to London, Mexico, and Paris were canceled or delayed. No less than six flights from Paris to Los Angeles were canceled as well. A backward wave of threats, according to unidentified information channels, was registered just a month later, in early February. As a consequence, British Airways flights to Washington and Air France flights to Los Angeles were postponed again.[8]

The immediate consequences of this crisis in civil aviation were the complication of registration and examination procedures for passengers and the institution of armed air marshals to escort commercial flights (this measure resulted in political tensions between the U.S. and some other states).[9] The direct damage caused by the disruption of flight schedules and heightened security measures amounted to several tens of millions of USD; the secondary consequences (psychological depression and panic among potential passengers) are subject to no material calculation. In analyzing this incident, scores of counter-terrorism experts have assumed that this crisis in world air traffic was provoked not by real factors but rather by deliberate misinformation spread by terrorist structures through the exchange of false operational plans via e-mail in imitation of an actual threat.

Bearing further witness of the power of rumor to disrupt the world aviation system is a recurrent series of hoax threats that took place in September–October 2004. Following anonymous telephone calls regarding alleged explosives onboard, seven flights operated by Olympic Airways, Singapore Airways, El Al, and Lufthansa were either suspended or canceled. Air force jet fighters were alerted again, anti-terrorist units, police, rescue, and medical structures were mobilized, and the result was damage in the millions of USD. Thus, immediate actions are not necessary to disrupt the aviation system; rather, the mere threat of actions under the rubric of international terrorism imposes an effective combined formula of direct economic and psychological pressure on opponent.

---

7 *Arab News*, 3 January 2004. [a periodical daily newspaper, London]

8 *Fox News*; story available at: http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,110006,00.html.

9 *Arab News*, 7 January 2004.

Classification of Threats

Analyses of the modern dynamics and tendencies of international terrorism as a whole, and its numerous particular aspects, make it possible to single out the following categories of the existing threat framework as they relate to civil aviation:

- Aircraft hijacking for retention/exchange of hostages;
- Aircraft hijacking for movement/transfer;
- Aircraft hijacking for annihilation/destruction;
- Direct action against aircraft from outside;
- Direct action against civil aviation ground infrastructure;
- Peripheral categories of actions.

Category of actions	Object of actions	Aim of actions
Hijacking for retention	Passengers	Attaining political, propaganda, and psychological results; not connected to causing direct damage
Hijacking for movement	Aircraft	Transferring of terrorists from one geographic point to another
Hijacking for annihilation	Aircraft + passengers	Inflicting material, political, and psychological damage
Direct action against aircraft	Aircraft + passengers	Inflicting material, political, and psychological damage
Direct action against ground infrastructure	Ground infrastructure (and, more rarely, aircraft or passengers)	Inflicting material, political, and psychological damage
Peripheral categories	Aircraft (and, more rarely, passengers, crew, ground infrastructure)	Various

Hijacking for Retention. Passengers on board of an airplane are the primary objects of this category of actions. The aim is to achieve political, propaganda, and psychological effect (show of force and presence; pressuring state structures and public opinion; attraction of maximum attention; compliance with conditions and demands). A classical act of terror in the form of the forcible seizure of hostages on board of an aircraft and a demonstrative threat to their lives poses a practically unsolvable political and moral-psychological dilemma for the state, which is faced with the necessities of suppressing terrorism and saving the lives of hostages as diametrically opposite tasks.

As effective means of pressure, this form of terror provides terrorists with an ample "window of opportunity," following which they are in a position to attain their goals.[10] There are tens of episodes where the hijacking of passenger airliners has been committed for the above-mentioned considerations. One example took place in November 1991, when a group headed by Shamil Basayev seized an Aeroflot Tupolev-154 airliner at the Mineralniye Vody airport and hijacked it to Turkey, establishing as a precondition for the release of the hostages the cancellation of the state of emergency that had been imposed by the Russian government in the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic.

Hijacking for Movement. The airplane as a means of transportation is the primary target of this category of actions, with passengers acting as an additional factor enhancing safety guarantees for terrorists. The aim is to ensure the movement of terrorists from a territory that they are restricted or prohibited from exiting for some reason to another geographical point. In this category, seven acts of seizure of passenger airliners were committed in the USSR in 1990 alone in an effort to leave the country on the grounds of personal, political, or economic motivation. In some countries, this category of terror acts remains a marginal method of the migration of individuals, taken separately, or of small groups of persons with identical ideas. In particular, thirteen cases of hijacking of passenger airliners to Taiwan were registered in China from 1993–98.[11] In March–April 2003, two Antonov-24 passenger planes were hijacked from Cuba to Florida. In some cases, acts of terror of this sort end with grave consequences that were unexpected by the organizers. In particular, the seizure and hijacking of an Ethiopian Airlines Boeing 767 in November 1996 by a group of separatists, owing to the inadequate training of the terrorists, ended with a crash-landing into the Indian Ocean off of the Comoros Islands, and the subsequent death of 125 passengers and crew members.

Hijacking for Annihilation/Destruction. Using an aircraft itself as a weapon for hitting a previously selected target is a primary object of this category of actions; passengers act as a factor, ensuring that an additional level of overall damage will ultimately result from the attack. The aim is to incur direct material damage to an adversary, in combination with collateral political and psychological damage. This category of actions is directly attributable to the parameters of asymmetrical warfare. The first operational precedent occurred in December 1994, when gunmen from the Algerian terrorist organization Armed Islamic Group (GIA) captured an Air France Airbus A-300 with 240 people on board in an attempt to explode it over Paris. It was a rescue operation at the intermediate landing point in Marcel mounted by a SWAT team that helped avoid potentially grave consequences.[12]

---

[10] J. Aras, *Terrorism: Yesterday, Today and Forever* (Baku: Sada publishing house, 2003), 108–109.

[11] Aras, *World War Four*, 585.

[12] E. Kozhushko, *Modern Terrorism: An Analysis of Modern Trends* (Moscow: Harvest, 2000), 330.

In October 2002, terrorists attempted to hijack a Saudi Airlines Airbus A-320 with the purpose of crashing it into a U.S. air base at Al-Udeid in Qatar. The culminating mega-terrorist attack within this category was the capture of four passenger airliners on 11 September 2001 and their subsequent use as cruise missiles against targets in Washington, D.C. and New York City. It should be noted that, despite heightened safety measures at airports and the introduction of appropriate technologies, the threat of this absolute use of aviation terrorism does not decrease, but rather increases. An eloquent testimony to this fact is the information that has been gathered about Al Qaeda operatives' testing of innovative techniques of seizing and hijacking airplanes, aiming to realize in practice a form of kamikaze (airplane as a delivery vehicle, suicide pilot as guidance unit).[13] That is why it is not surprising today to see SAM firing units and radar arrays in capitals around the world, from Washington to Colombo, to thus protect key government facilities against "uninvited guests."

Direct Actions against Aircraft. Both airliners and passengers/crew on board are targets of this category of attack, whose aim is to destroy an aircraft in the air and annihilate people in order to incur material, political, and psychological damage. In practice, terrorists prefer to use improvised explosive devices (IED) and man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS), such as shoulder rocket-propelled grenade launchers (RPG), anti-tank guided missiles (ATGM), heavy and light machine-guns, anti-material sniper rifles, and assault rifles.

Improvised explosive devices with timers or barometric-work mechanisms of detonation proved to be effective means of destroying airliners in the 1980s. A requirement, however, was to place the explosives inside the target before departure, usually by putting them into unaccompanied luggage or transferring them to third persons without notifying them. As a result of the use of such explosives in particular, terrorists succeeded in destroying the airliners and passengers/crews of Pan American Flight 103 (Lockerbie, Scotland, December 1988, 271 casualties) and French UTA Flight 722 (Niger, July 1989, 170 casualties). There was also an attempt of this sort of terror act on board an Israeli Boeing-747 (London, 1986), where an explosive was deliberately placed by terrorist Nizar al-Hindaui in the luggage of his bride without his notifying her. With the improvement of technical and administrative measures of control of baggage and passengers, the threat of such acts of terror diminished in the early 1990s, although it has not been fully removed, especially since adversary parties have sought to find new, non-traditional forms of carrying and placing IEDs on airliners. In particular, an innovative step of this kind was the attempt at destroying an American Airlines aircraft bound from Paris for Miami in November 2001 by the terrorist John Reid, who placed a plastic explosive charge in heels of his own shoes.

Nowadays, the difficulty of placing the means of destruction directly on board of an airliner due to the intensification of technical security measures has been circumvented by a fundamentally new factor, in the form of such weapons as man-portable air de-

[13] Rohan Gunaratna, "Al-Qaeda Adapts to Disruption," *Jane's Intelligence Review* (February 2004).

fense systems. Used from outside an aircraft rather than from inside, MANPADS are presently one of the most serious threats to civil aviation. Contributing to this are the characteristics of this type of weapons:

- *Utility*: MANPADS constructively combine the functions of missile launch and guidance inside the same device.
- *Small size*: These weapons are easy to covertly move and store. The Soviet-made Strela-2 SAM (weight 13.6 kg, length 1.5 m) can easily be placed in a bag for golf clubs. A two-man team is required to transport most MANPADS and put them into combat readiness.
- *Simplicity*: The average time of high-level training for a MANPADS operator is five weeks (this includes practice launches; if a simulator is available, the term of training is three weeks).
- *Reaction time*: To bring the equipment into combat readiness for subsequent application against air targets, only several minutes are required.
- *Technical specifications*: MANPADS guidance systems (optical, infrared/thermal, radar) are designed to ensure high probability of hitting a target at heights up to approximately 3000 m. Impact on a jet engine by a missile from an SA-18 Igla (weight of warhead is 1.18 kg) during take-off or landing offers a 100 percent guarantee of the airliner's being disabled, and subsequent disaster.[14]
- *Tactical specifications*: Makes it possible to employ weapons using the protective features of a locality in the area of attack. Launch may be carried out from wooded areas, building roofs and windows, moving cars, etc.
- *Low cost*: Their relatively low price and wide distribution ensure that MANPADS are available on international arms black market to any interested player. Depending on market conditions, prices for these weapons range from $5,000 for a Strela-2 to $20,000 for a U.S.-made Stinger.

According to Pentagon estimates, there are 750,000 missiles and thousands of firing units currently in existence in the world, with a considerable portion being sold on the black market, deployed in armed conflict zones, and supervised by non-state actors, including insurgent and terrorist groups. In particular, the whereabouts and status of more than 1,000 Stinger SAMs, delivered through CIA channels to the Afghan *mujahedeen* in the 1980s to fight Soviet troops, remains unknown. According to indirect information, not less than 200 of the above-mentioned MANPADS are currently owned by various NSA groupings, ranging from Al Qaeda to the Kurdish Workers' Party. A portion of the 200 firing units and 2000 Strela-2M and Igla missiles that were left after the collapse of Marxist regime in Nicaragua are at the disposal of the narco-terrorist insurgent organization Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC). It should also be noted that no more than 1,000 out of 5,000 missiles for the said weapon that were deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the armed conflict of 1992–95, have

[14] A. Karpenko, *Russian missiles: 1943–1993* (St. Petersburg: 1993), 85.

been used, withdrawn, bought out, or destroyed; the status of others remains uncertain. In general, no less than twenty-seven terrorist groups presently possess either U.S.-made Stingers, Soviet/Russian-made Strelas and Iglas of various modifications, British-made Blowpipes, French Mistrals, Swedish RBS-70s, Chinese HN-5s, or Pakistani Anzas, etc.[15]

A steady tendency toward the use or threatened use of MANPADS against civil aviation finds its parallel in an operational chronology of related incidents:

- On 28 October 2002, two missiles (supposedly Strela-2) were fired from a car at an Israeli El Al Boeing-757-300 on take-off from the airport in Mombasa, Kenya; due to missile malfunction and premature explosion, the aircraft was not practically damaged and kept on flying.
- In August 2003, three men from the Middle East were detained by FBI officers when trying to bring Igla-M SAM (NATO codename SA-18) missiles into the United States; a presumable aim of the delivery was to mount a terrorist attack against a civil aircraft.
- On 24 October 2003, an El Al Boeing-767, bound from Tel-Aviv to Los Angeles with 193 passengers on board, was diverted to a secondary airport due to urgent intelligence information about a prepared attack against the airliner using a portable SAM to be launched from a previously selected position in the area of the intermediate landing airport in Toronto.[16]

A clear illustration of the seriousness of this issue is a statement of the commander of the U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM), Lieutenant General John Handy: "In the course of global war against terrorism, the MANPAD threat is the greatest threat we have ever been faced with."[17]

It is necessary to add that terrorists are constantly seeking new, technically innovative and deadly methods to destroy aircraft from the ground. A striking confirmation of this effort was an attempt by an unknown (presumably domestic) terrorist to use a laser beam to affect the sight of an airliner's pilot during a landing in Salt Lake City in September 2004.

Direct Actions Against Ground Infrastructure. The target of this category of terrorist attacks is the supporting ground infrastructure of civil aviation. The aim is to incur material, political, and psychological damage and reaffirm the fact of war. Static technical infrastructure (passenger and cargo terminals, hangars, fuel tanks, air traffic radar, and other facilities), as well as aircraft on the ground remain vulnerable targets for assault with the purpose of takeover or destruction. This element of the terrorist threat framework is widespread. Confirmation can be found in two selective operational episodes in the context of the current civil wars in Sri Lanka and Colombia.

---

[15] J. Aras, *Terrorism*, 119; Thomas B. Hanter, "The Proliferation of MANPADS," *Jane's Intelligence Review* (September 2001).

[16] *Izvestia*, 27 October 2003.

[17] USNI Military Databases; available at www.periscope.com. Quote from 20 November 2003.

On 24 July 2001, a group of suicide combatants from the insurgent/terrorist organization Liberation Tigers of Tamil-Eelam (LTTE) conducted a surprise attack under cover of darkness on the international airport and an adjacent military airfield in the Sri Lankan capital Colombo. As a result of a fierce seven-hour battle, three Airbus passenger aircraft (2 A-330 and 1 A-340) belonging to Sri Lanka Airlines, as well as six aircraft and two helicopters of the Sri Lankan air force, were destroyed, and another three Airbus airliners were damaged. In addition, a building of the passenger terminal was destroyed, and an electricity power station and two aviation fuel storage tanks were burnt. The cost of the destroyed aviation equipment alone amounted to $400 million.[18] Note that the entire operation was carried out by just one raiding party, made up of twelve to fifteen gunmen, armed with automatic weapons, grenade launchers, and explosive charges.

In February 2004, Colombian security forces detected and defused four gas balloons laden with explosives and a remote control device, which were covertly deployed by a subversive group of the insurgent/terrorist organization Revolutionary Armed Forces of Columbia (FARC) from a road alongside a runway at the airport in Valdupar. Terrorists planned to launch their devices pending the arrival of Alvaro Uribe, the President of Colombia.

Incurring damage to civil aviation on the ground is not solely a method at the disposal of large armed groups, and may be applied not only to the infrastructure, but to passengers and personnel as well. In particular, groups of terrorists—numbering only three gunmen each—from the Japanese Red Army (JRA) and the Armenian Secret Army for Liberation of Armenia (ASALA) conducted armed attacks on passengers at airports in Tel-Aviv and Paris in 1968 and 1983, killing twenty-six and five people, respectively. In July 2002, a U.S. citizen named Hisham Hidayat, acting absolutely independently, on the grounds of national enmity and religious fanaticism, committed an armed assault on passengers being registered at an El Al counter at Los Angeles International Airport, killing two passengers and wounding three. This last case was possible due to the negligence of the airport security service, in spite of the fact that this service has been acting under the heightened state of alert imposed in U.S. airports after 9/11.

Peripheral Categories. This category does not pertain to acts that are specifically terroristic in nature, but to acts that, by their parameters (criminal character), or their immediate and long-term consequences, are compatible with terrorism. Targets of this category of actions are largely aircraft, and more rarely passengers, crew, and the supporting ground infrastructure of civil aviation. Its aims are different from posing a direct or indirect threat on board of an airliner, and are differently motivated. These include:

- Use of civil aviation by figures of international terrorism for transportation (that is, for indirect support of terrorist activity);

[18] Jane's Information Group; see http://www.janes.com/security/international_security/news/misc/janes010724.

- Use of civil aviation by figures of transnational organized crime as means of carrying out illegal activities;
- Forcible actions on board airliners on the basis of deviant social or psychic behavior of individual passengers or groups of passengers.

Participants in international terrorism at all levels often use civil aviation for its intended purpose: transportation. Civil aviation is the fastest and most convenient means of concealed transit on the basis of legal or forged travel documents, especially when one wants to cover considerable distances in a short time. Note that airliners and passengers are subject to no danger in this case; the danger is realized on the territories of the destination (or other) countries, which are targets of terrorist operations. There is also a probability that civil aviation is used as a means to transport operational documents, propaganda materials, and—to a lesser degree—weapons, ammunition, explosives, and radioactive and poisonous substances (although the latter are more likely transported via cargo aviation). Another aspect, although less widespread and yet likely, is the use of civil aircraft as a means of bringing terrorists and hostages to a certain geographical point following the commission of an act of terror *beyond the sphere* of civil aviation (example: the episode of taking secondary school pupils as hostages in the North-Ossetian Autonomous Republic of Russia by a gang led by Paul Yakshiyants in 1988).

The current active convergence of international terrorism and transnational organized crime is a relatively new factor in the sphere of indirect threats to aviation security. It should be noted that civil aviation is objectively sphere of interest to criminal entities, who are engaged in such activities as illegal migration, drug trafficking, money laundering, and smuggling weapons, ammunition, works of art, etc. A certain portion of the operations and movements of criminal organizations are carried out using regular passenger flights within the framework of normal passenger and cargo flows under the cover of both legal and forged documents. The threat posed by organized crime may be regarded as indirect, in consideration of the fact that a basic task of organized criminal networks is the movement of subjects and items of criminal activity (people, drugs, cash, etc.) between remote geographical points as covertly and rapidly as possible. Owing to the fact that transnational criminal organizations have joined forces with international terrorists and are part of their financial resource base, the involvement of these criminal groups cannot be ignored in the light of the struggle against terrorism.

Deviant social behavior on the part of individuals or groups on board airliners may under certain circumstances create conditions that can either cause an aviation disaster or threaten the life of passengers. These are primarily acts of hooliganism caused or aggravated by alcoholic or narcotic intoxication. Specific categories of passengers—fans of soccer teams or and music groups, youth tourism groups, crews of fishing boats, etc.—represent a source of heightened danger. The combination of the sedative effect of alcohol and the feeling of impunity often displayed by members of such groups is frequently a trigger for increased aggression. This is confirmed, for example, by a virtual riot that took place between tourists on board of an Aeroflot flight from

Hurghada (Egypt) to Moscow in 1996. The numbers bear out the point: 300 cases of hooliganism were reported on British Airways flights in 2003, and 126 cases on Aeroflot flights.[19] Whereas 1994 saw 1,132 reported cases of the violation of airline behavior rules worldwide, the figure had risen to 5,416 by 1997 (as recorded by the International Aviation Transport Association).

Actions on board of an aircraft carried out by passengers with mental illness pose a particular danger to the lives of passengers. In one instance, a mentally-ill Italian national, Stefano Sabarini, having proclaimed himself the founder of a new religion, was captured in March 1999 on an Air France Airbus A-320 bound for Paris from Marcel, and again in November 2002 on an Alitalia Airbus A-320 bound for Paris from Bologna.[20] This is a striking illustration of the ineffective work of European security services in the area of civil aviation, as they failed to prevent a person who was widely known to be dangerous from boarding the flights. In November 2002, a mentally-ill Israeli citizen, Taufik Al-Furka, tried to hijack an El Al flight bound from Tel Aviv for Istanbul, but his attempt was prevented by security agents on board. In March 2003, Ozgur Gekaslan, from Turkey, seized and hijacked a Turkish Airlines aircraft to Athens. The investigation and medical examination identified in both cases evidence of mental disorders, aggravated by an array of social and personal problems. In considering the particularly dangerous character of the above-mentioned actions, which were fraught with potentially grave consequences both for civil aviation and a wider scale, there is good reason to classify these peripheral threats as actions that fall under an enlarged definition of terrorism.

Difficulties in Air Transport Security in Azerbaijan

Arising from the general tendencies outlined above are threat parameters in the realm of air transportation that are of particular importance for Azerbaijan, due to the country's unique position in the global system of terrorist threats. Of critical importance is the fact that Azerbaijan is situated at the junction of several unstable geopolitical areas (Caucasus, Caspian basin, Black Sea basin, Central Asia, Middle East, the Persian Gulf). In addition, it possesses considerable energy resources (oil and natural gas) and is a participant in several international geo-economic projects.[21] Such a concurrence of factors is, beyond any doubt, reflective of the country's growing importance in terms of incipient global trends of the twenty-first century in the spheres of economics and security. At the same time, the nation's position has its seamy side, particularly a growing threat that Azerbaijan is increasingly near to the focus of operational activity of different terrorist entities, particularly participants in the global conflict whose structural format has been altered in the wake of 9/11.

---

[19] *Izvestia*, 27 April 2004.

[20] Aras, *World War Four*, 556.

[21] J. Arasly, presentation at a meeting of the PfP Consortium's Combating Terrorism Working Group, West Point, September 2003.

This is true in the area of civil aviation security as well. Azerbaijan's geographical location primarily accounts for its significance in the flow of international traffic, including air transportation. It was dynamics that resulted from the continuing conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as the development of oil resources in the Caspian Sea, that provided the initial impetus to reorient additional passenger and cargo air routes through Azerbaijan. On the other hand, the above-mentioned factors also contribute to an unstable military-political background in the region as a whole. Further complicating the issue is the as yet unsettled conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and the aggravation both of regional (Chechnya, Abkhazia, the Kurdish question) and global problems (international terrorism, transnational organized crime, migration). The point is that Azerbaijan runs the risk of being pulled into the political and operational vortex of several transnational and local terrorist groups that are operating on the regional stage. Those groups that offer the greatest danger are:

- A conglomeration of Armenian terrorist groups, previously operating under the banner of the Armenian Secret Army for Liberation of Armenia;
- Regional structures of the transnational Al Qaeda network;
- Structures of the separatist Kurdish Worker's Party (PKK) and the Congress of Democracy and Freedom of Kurdistan (KADEK) and its local branches;
- Internal factions of the Iranian opposition group Mojahedin-e-Khalk, which are currently operating independently from the central group;
- Structures of the Iraqi religious-political group Ansar al Islam;
- Various structural elements of the Chechen separatist movement.

This essay does not aim to examine the operational parameters, ideologies, or political motivations of these organizations. Still, it is appropriate to note that all of them have previously been known to employ terrorism against civil aviation. Also, one cannot ignore the global fact that Azerbaijan is located in a region that has become an operational-transit zone for transnational organized crime.

Conclusion

While making no claims to offer a comprehensive and thoroughly expert analysis, the author dares to consider matters relating to the struggle against terrorism from the perspective of civil aviation, and to make some recommendations for actions that should be taken. Below are the functional categories into which these actions may be sorted:

1. *Improvement of the air transport security system*. This would include toughening procedures relating to the purchase of airline tickets and to the registration and examination of passengers and cargo to rule out bringing individuals and articles on board that could pose even the slightest threat to passengers' safety. It would also involve increasing technical standards of control and security, forming exclusive security zones around airports, and improving the all-around training of security service employees.

2. *Improvement and introduction of technical protection measures for aircraft.* Provides for the use of electronic means of protection against MANPADS launches.
3. *Introduction of preventive measures aimed at averting acts of terror.* This would include the creation of databases on potentially dangerous passengers; more stringent pre-screening for members of radical political organizations, religious sects, criminal groups, those who are already or likely to become intoxicated, those skilled in hand-to-hand combat, etc.; and more thorough vetting of flight crews and technical personnel employed by the airlines.
4. *Coordination of efforts and expansion of interaction between civil aviation bodies and state security services.* This would involve forging closer ties between airlines and civil aviation authorities and the armed forces, special and secret services, law enforcement, immigration, and customs agencies within the framework of combating international terrorism and organized crime.
5. *Improvement of the international legal mechanism of counteracting aviation terrorism.* Current conventions are not enough to properly coordinate the actions of states to combat terrorist threats on civil aviation.
6. *Expansion and deepening of the interaction between relevant professional structures at the regional and international levels.* This includes rendering organizational, financial, and technical assistance to separate states that are located in areas of heightened risk in terms of air transport and traffic operations.

I am aware that putting these suggestions into effect is difficult not only from the organizational and financial standpoint, but also on political, moral, and ethical grounds as well. Taking fingerprints and scanning retinas of airline passengers, and using armed air marshals on flights are all adverse to the principles of democracy and individual freedom. This can simply be added to the list of the numerous negative consequences of the phenomenon of international terrorism. To sum up, I must ultimately arrive at pessimistic conclusion: terrorism will exist as long as humanity does. Even worse, its trajectory is currently on the ascent. Hence, the problem of air transport security is more critical than ever before.

Narcoterrorism in Southeastern Europe

Lucia Ovidia Vreja *

The dramatic attack against the United States on September 11, 2001, besides its tragic consequences in terms of the loss of human lives and material damage, constituted a wake-up call for the international community regarding the spectacular dimension and the new form that international terrorism had assumed. After that event, huge efforts on the part of national and international actors were directed towards defeating this global peril. Yet one aspect of the fight against terrorism seems to be overlooked: the connection between terrorism and organized crime.

The magnitude of the organized crime phenomenon in southeastern Europe, the presence of well-established networks, and the huge profits obtained through organized criminal activities—especially drug trafficking, the financial backbone of most criminal organizations—all make organized crime and narcotics dealing very attractive activities for terrorists and terrorist groups. Given the efforts of the international community after September 11th to freeze the funds and assets of Al Qaeda or Al Qaeda-related terrorist groups, it is very likely that we will witness an increase of these groups' involvement in organized crime activities in order to raise new funds. However, raising money for mounting new attacks, or for maintaining their infrastructure, recruiting and training new members, etc., although very important, are not the only reasons for terrorist groups' participation in organized crime. Equally important are the well-organized networks that are already in use by criminal groups, which could be exploited by terrorist individuals or organizations for extending their infrastructure; recruiting new members; moving people, equipment, and funds without being detected; and establishing new instruction bases.

Southeastern Europe is characterized by a high level of organized criminal activity, especially drug trafficking, along with some presence of terrorist groups, including Al Qaeda (mainly in the Western Balkans). In this context, it is hard to believe—and it would be a mistake to consider—that terrorist groups would not make use of the networks of criminal activity that already exist in the region. Therefore, this analysis will offer a brief assessment of the dimension of drug trafficking activity in southeastern Europe and an examination of the possible connections between this criminal activity and its networks and terrorism, based on the imperative that the region, mainly the Western Balkans, should not be allowed to become a "safe haven" for terrorists.

Defining the Problem

Transnational organized crime is a major problem in southeastern Europe, and one that is a very complex phenomenon, "overlapping and linked with warlordism and terrorism," meaning that any attempt to deal effectively with any one of these problems re-

* Lucia Ovidia Vreja is Fellow Researcher at the Institute for Political Studies of Defense and Military History, Ministry of Defense, Romania.

quires "dealing with the others as well—either at the same time or sequentially—because each one feeds off the other."[1] Organized crime takes many forms and involves a wide variety of criminal activities,[2] yet I will focus here on one crime market that is considered to be one of the major threats in most European countries; drug trafficking.

Even though organized crime—including drug trafficking—and terrorism are often seen as separate phenomena, raising disputes over the best methods of countering them, the link between the two is undeniable. It is true that terrorists and drug traffickers have different long-term objectives (e.g., political goals for terrorists, and economic ones for drug traffickers),[3] yet they often share some short-term goals; nearly every terrorist group raises some money from the drug trade. The present study starts from the definition of "narcoterrorism" as referring—according to the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration[4]—to terrorist acts carried out by groups that are directly or indirectly involved in cultivating, manufacturing, transporting, or distributing illicit drugs. Therefore, the term refers to groups that use drug trafficking to fund terrorist activities. Usually, this cooperation between terrorist groups or networks and organized crime networks will assure the former the financial and logistical support. Moreover, the terrorist groups and the illegal criminal networks provide support for each other, so it can be said that it is useless to discuss terrorism separate from organized crime.

As illicit drug trafficking is extremely profitable, it is "also linked to international terrorist organizations that need money to finance their activities. By forging advantageous relationships with drug traffickers or becoming actively involved in the drug trade themselves, terrorist groups such as Hezbollah or Al Qaeda use money from drug sales to further their political agendas."[5]

According to institutions that deal with this issue, it is certain that organized crime, and especially drug trafficking, represents the most important source of financing for

---

1 Dennis J. D. Sandole, "Combating Crime in Southeastern Europe: An Integrated, Coordinated, Multi-level Approach," paper presented at the 4th Reichenau Workshop of the PfP Consortium Working Group on Regional Stability in South East Europe, on *Crushing Crime in South East Europe: A Struggle of Domestic, Regional and European Dimensions*, Reichenau, Austria, 16–19 May, 2003.

2 *Summary of the Organized Crime Situation Report 2004. Focus on the Threat of Cybercrime*, Provisional Report (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, Octopus Program, 6 September 2004), 4.

3 *Terrorism: Q & A/ Narcoterrorism*, available at: http://www.cfrterrorism.org/terrorism/narcoterrorism.html.

4 Asa Hutchinson, *Congressional Testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism and Government Information about Narco-Terror: The World Connection Between Drugs and Terror*, 13 March 2002; available at: www.usdoj/gov/dea/pubs/cngrtest/ct031302.html.

5 The National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, *Drugs and Terror: Just the Facts. The Links Between the Drug Trade, Drug Traffickers and Terrorists*, available at: http://www.drugstory.net/pdfs/DandT_Fact_Sheet.pdf.

terrorist groups, providing up to 30–40 percent of their funds.[6] It is even accepted that the main threat to national security is not terrorism sponsored by certain states anymore, but from terrorist acts carried out by "unregimented networks," groups or individuals increasingly motivated by the money obtained through organized criminal activity, mainly the traffic in illegal drugs.[7] The forms of terrorist groups' involvement in the drug trade vary from selling drugs as such; to collecting taxes from people who cultivate or process illicit drugs on lands that terrorists control; to support from states funded by the drug trade (such as Afghanistan – whose former Taliban rulers earned an estimated $40–50 million per year from taxes related to opium, Albania in past years, Syria, or Lebanon).[8]

Although terrorists do not need much money to mount an attack, they do need large sums of money for maintaining their infrastructure and expanding their operations. As Phil Williams of the University of Pittsburgh explained, profits are only a means for terrorists, and "not an end in themselves. Money is raised for both macro (strategic) and micro (operational) levels. The macro level is expensive and includes terrorist infrastructure, terrorist training, and terrorist's efforts to acquire WMD and to buy government support. The micro level is where cells engage in drug trafficking, credit card fraud and robberies in order to fund operations."[9]

For terrorists, drug trafficking is quite an easy way to earn substantial sums of money, as well as to gather or distribute large sums of cash without being detected by authorities, given the well-organized and hard-to-detect financial networks of the narcotics trade. According to the UN, the traffic in illegal drugs represents a $400-500 billion annual business, equal to 8 percent of the world's total trade.[10] Given the fact that after September 11th, many steps were taken to block terrorist funding and put pressure on the state sponsors of terrorism, the conclusion could be drawn that the level of drug trafficking related to terrorist groups' financing has increased, or at least is likely to increase.

The relation between terrorist organizations and drug-trafficking groups is a "mutually beneficial one that allows exchanges of drugs for weapons, use of the same smuggling routes, use of similar methods to conceal profits and fund-raising." Moreover, almost all of the terrorist groups "identified as being involved in narcotics trafficking

---

6 *Combating the Financing of Terrorist Organizations* (in Romanian), Romanian Intelligence Service, available at: www.sri.ro/biblioteca_art_cfot.html.

7 *Romania and International Terrorist Groupings* (in Romanian), Romanian Intelligence Service, available at: www.sri.ro/biblioteca_art_rgti.html.

8 *Terrorism: Q & A/ Narcoterrorism*, available at: http://www.cfrterrorism.org/terrorism/narcoterrorism.html.

9 Phil Williams, "Organized Crime and the State: A Framework for Analysis," paper presented at the conference on *Organized Crime and the Corruption of State Institutions*, organized by The Center for International and Security Studies at University of Maryland, College Park, MD (18 November 2002).

10 Peter Reuter and Victoria Greenfield, "Measuring Global Drug Markets," *World Economics* 2:4 (October-December 2001), 160.

also reportedly have had contacts with Al Qaeda, which is known to be actively engaged in drug-trafficking activities."[11] In this context, the issue of the drug trade and its networks is a very serious one, raising many questions regarding future steps that can be taken to prevent this phenomenon.

The Drug Trade in Southeastern Europe

According to experts, drug traffickers and terrorists tend to flourish in failed states with ineffective governments that have been destabilized by war and internal conflicts.[12] Nevertheless, even transitional countries are used as traffic routes for illegal drugs, and once they are established, these networks tend to become increasingly well organized and hard to detect.

Southeastern Europe is a very complex region that has experienced conflict and political instability since the beginning of 1990s, which created the necessary conditions for the establishment of criminal networks as well as for the development of criminal activities, including drug trafficking. Although the involvement of the international community has helped the region to become more closely integrated with the rest of Europe and resolve most of its ethnic conflicts, the threats for regional security coming from this area are now mainly related to organized crime. Yet, in spite of the fact that southeast European countries have proven in the recent past a substantial willingness to cooperate in stabilizing the area, the fight against organized crime remains one of the key challenges the countries in the region face today. The Western Balkans (including Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro, Albania and, to a certain degree, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) is still considered "the gateway of organized crime to Europe,"[13] which raises the specter of the potential of terrorist activities in, or emanating from, the area. Aside from the scope of organized crime—especially drug trafficking—in southeastern Europe, there are many voices concerned about the presence in Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, and Albania of individuals and groups linked to terrorist networks, including Al Qaeda.[14] Moreover, organized crime activities in the entire region are assumed to support terrorist groups, especially via financial assistance.

It is obvious that the greatest peril directly or indirectly connected with terrorism in the region is to be found in organized crime, which represents not only a funding source for terrorism but also a basis for recruitment of new people and support for its existence. The strategic position of the region, between Western Europe and the Middle East, adds a new dimension to the link with terrorism.

---

[11] Rex A. Hudson (Project Manager), "A Global Overview of Narcotics-funded Terrorist and Other Extremist Groups," Report Prepared by the Federal Research Division, May 2002, 1.

[12] *Terrorism: Q & A/ Narcoterrorism*.

[13] "EUHR Javier Solana's Intervention on Organized Crime in South-Eastern Europe," London Conference on Organized Crime in South Eastern Europe, London, 25 November 2002.

[14] International Crisis Group, *Bin Laden and the Balkans: The Politics of Anti-Terrorism*, ICG Balkans Report No. 119 (9 November 2001); available at: www.crisisweb.org.

Drug trafficking has become so crucial to the cause of Albanian separatism that certain towns populated by Albanians (such as Veliki Trnovac and Blastica in Serbia, Vratnica and Gostivar in FYRO Macedonia, and Shkoder and Durres in Albania) have become known as the "new Medellins" of the Balkans.[15] The so-called "Albanian Mafia," consisting largely of ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, "have for several years been a feature of the criminal underworld in a number of cities in Europe and North America, being particularly prominent in the trade in illegal narcotics."[16] Since the mid 1990s, "Albanian nationalists in ethnically tense Macedonia and the Serbian province of Kosovo have built a vast heroin network, leading from the opium fields of Pakistan to black-market arms dealers in Switzerland, which used to transport up to $2 billion worth of the drug annually into the heart of Europe." In 1995, more than 500 Kosovar or Macedonian Albanians were in prison in Switzerland for drug or arms trafficking offenses, and more than 1,000 others were under indictment.[17]

At the same time, the profits gained through illegal activities are often used for financing terrorism; most often, financing for both local conflicts and terrorist activities draws on illicit activities as one of its main sources, especially the drug trade. For instance, according to the Center for Peace in the Balkans, it has been confirmed that terrorism in the Balkans has been primarily financed through narcotics trafficking. Heroin is the most profitable commodity on the Western market, as a kilogram of heroin, worth $1000 in Thailand, wholesales for $110,000 in Canada, with a retail street value of $800,000.[18]

Thus, southeastern Europe is a bridge between the Middle Eastern and Central Asian drug producers and the Western European drug consumer market. Via the Balkan route, heroin travels through Turkey, FYRO Macedonia, Kosovo, and Albania to the Western European markets. The Albanian drug dealers, for example, ship heroin from Asia's Golden Crescent, frequently from Afghanistan, which is still a huge producer of opium poppies, as it produces over 70 percent of the global supply of heroin and 80 to 90 percent of the heroin found in western and eastern European markets.[19] From there, the heroin passes through Iran to Turkey, where it is refined, and then transported by the Balkan/Albanian drug dealers. According to the U.S. State Department, anywhere from four to six tons of heroin move through Turkey every month.[20]

---

[15] *Balkan – Albania – Kosovo – Heroin – Jihad*, Research Analysis (Toronto: The Center for Peace in the Balkans, May 2000), available at: www.balkanpeace.org/our/our3.shtml.

[16] "The Kosovo Liberation Army: Does Clinton Policy Support Group with Terror, Drug Ties? From 'Terrorists' to 'Partners,'" U.S. Senate Republican Policy Committee, 31 March 1999.

[17] Ibid.

[18] *Balkan – Albania – Kosovo – Heroin – Jihad*.

[19] Michel Chossudovsky, "The Spoils of War: Afghanistan's Multibillion Dollar Heroin Trade," 5 April 2004; Center for Research on Globalization, available at: www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO404A.html.

[20] *Balkan – Albania – Kosovo – Heroin – Jihad*.

Terrorism Connections in Southeastern Europe/Western Balkans

After September 11th, the question of the potential for terrorist activity in (or emanating from) the Balkans was raised, based on the presence of a large Muslim population in Bosnia, Kosovo, Macedonia, and Albania. And such a potential terrorist threat could be significant.

Although the activity of terrorist groups in the Balkans is hard to uncover, and the connections between these groups and drug lords are difficult to prove, the evidence must not be ignored. Moreover, the common factors that exist for all the Balkan countries—e.g. inefficient governance, poor public security, weak rule of law, pervasive economic backwardness, institutional corruption, and organized crime—are catalysts for producing an environment where international terrorist networks can easily conceal personnel and money.[21]

Yet, since September 11th, terrorist attacks were also carried out or thwarted in Macedonia and Bosnia, indicating that Al Qaeda is present in the Balkans.[22] Moreover, Albania, Bosnia, and Kosovo are considered to have become "European hotbeds of Iranian-backed Islamic terrorism and Al Qaeda in particular."[23] And this is not surprising, given the large Muslim population living in these countries and the trend of terrorists today "to move from Islamic countries where they have traditionally assimilated and found employment, to the long-established Islamic diasporas in other countries where they can network through religious and social systems."[24]

Some have even suggested that, "starting in the mid-August 2003, radical Islamist leaders elevated the role of the terrorism infrastructure in the Balkans as a key facilitator of a proposed escalation of conflict into the heart of Europe, Israel and the United States." For recruiting new cadres and strengthening their infrastructure in the Balkans, Al Qaeda leaders even nominated Shahid Emir Musaa Ayzi, a veteran of the war in Afghanistan who is close to the Al Qaeda elite and the Taliban leadership, to coordinate and run special recruitment operations in the Balkans, especially in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Albania, Kosovo, and Macedonia.[25] People connected to Al Qaeda have even

---

[21] International Crisis Group, "Bin Laden and the Balkans: The Politics of Anti-terrorism," ICG Balkans Report No. 119 (9 November 2001), 2.

[22] Brian Michael Jenkins, "Countering Al Qaeda," in *Defeating Terrorism: Shaping the New Security Environment*, ed. Russel D. Howard and Reid L. Sawyer (Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill, 2004), 133.

[23] "Europe May Face a New Wave of Domestic Terrorism," Richard Bennett Media - AFI Research, 7 April 2002; available at: www.btinternet.com/~nnjv/tereur070402.htm.

[24] Wayne A. Downing, "The Global War on Terrorism," in *Defeating Terrorism*, ed. Howard and Sawyer, 151.

[25] Yossef Bodansky, "Osama Bin Laden Focuses on the Balkans," in *Defense and Foreign Affairs Strategic Policy*, 19 September 2003, available at: www.balkanpeace.org/rs/archive/sep03/rs230.shtml.

tried to penetrate Romania, although they have reportedly been expelled before their efforts could take root.[26]

What is even more terrifying is that, due to lax institutional control and corruption practices, the countries of the Balkans are becoming points of "attraction to terror groups' interests."[27] This is especially the case with Al Qaeda, which is spreading its roots easily in the region, while this potential danger is "inadmissibly neglected" by the international coalition against terrorism.[28]

Despite their limited resources, since late 2001 the countries of southeastern Europe have actively supported the international coalition against terrorism. Albania, Serbia-Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Bulgaria, and Romania cooperated to combat organized crime and various forms of trafficking, enhance border security, and improve training for border security personnel.[29] Moreover, they have taken measures to arrest suspects, close and investigate NGOs suspected of financing terrorism, and freeze bank accounts of terrorist organizations. Yet the level of organized crime and corruption, the lapses in border security, and the institutional weaknesses in these countries still make them an attractive target for exploitation by terrorist and Islamic extremist groups.

Antonio Maria Costa, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), recently remarked that "the revenue generated by organized crime offers terrorist groups a steady flow of funding, making the effort to eliminate drug trafficking and to reduce drug abuse critical strategies in the global fight against terrorism."[30] According to Costa, "terrorists and warlords in Afghanistan, as well as insurgents in Central Asia, the Russian Federation, and along the trafficking routes on the former Soviet Union's southern rim all the way to the Balkans, share part of the es-

---

[26] Radu Timofte, Director of Romanian Intelligence Service, according to "Al Qaeda Made Its Way to Romania," *Novinite,* 30 March 2004; available at: www.novinite.com/newsletter/print.php?id=32808.

[27] "Al Qaeda 'Roots Easily' in the Balkans," *Novinite*, 28 April 2004; available at: www.novinite.com/newsletter/print.php?id=33960.

[28] "Danger of Islamic Terrorism in the Balkans," "Terrorism/Counter-terrorism," *Tuzla Night Owl*, 14 November 2003; available at: http://www.tfeagle.army.mil/tfeno/Feature_Story.asp?Article=72243.

[29] *Patterns of Global Terrorism-2003, Europe Overview*, Released by the Office of the Coordinator for Counter-terrorism, 29 April 2004; and *Patterns of Global Terrorism–2002, Europe Overview*, Released by the Office of the Coordinator for Counter-terrorism, U.S. Department of States, 21 May 2002.

[30] "UN Warns about Nexus between Drugs, Crime and Terrorism," *M2 Presswire*, 1 October 2004; The International Association for the Study of Organized Crime, available at: www.iasoc.net/news.htm.

timated $30 billion world heroin market."[31] As it has become increasingly difficult to "distinguish clearly between terrorist groups and organized crime units, since their tactics overlap," we are now witnessing "the birth of a new hybrid of 'organized crime/ terrorist organizations,' which requires cutting off the connection between crime, drugs, and terrorism."[32]

The states of southeastern Europe still "demonstrate characteristics that make them inviting targets for transnational criminal groups seeking favorable territory from which to operate," with drug trafficking representing the most profitable business for criminal groups.[33] Despite the democratic reforms in those countries, they are still considered to be hospitable to transnational crime and terrorism, very often due to corruption and the ease of penetration into state institutions.

For example, since the beginning of the 1990s, ethnic Albanian organized crime groups took advantage of the instability and war in the Balkans to become "the fastest growing ethnic criminal presence in Europe, with operations reaching as far as Australia and the United States, and becoming the direct distributors of an estimated 40 percent of heroin in West European markets."[34] Given the extent of this reach, it is clear that the local/regional criminal groups were closely cooperating with international crime organizations, even being suspected of connections with Arab groups and markets in the Middle East, which are often "protected" by the authorities responsible for combating such criminal activities. Even in Romania, the main anti-narcotics agency, the Directorate for Combating Organized Crime and Anti-Drug Operations, has itself been implicated in the drug trade.[35]

Accordingly, a substantial amount of terrorist activity has also occurred in parts of the former Yugoslavia. Since the beginning of the conflicts in the former Yugoslav territory, the most senior leaders of Al Qaeda have visited the Balkans, including Osama Bin Laden himself on three occasions between 1994 and 1996, and the Egyptian terrorist leader Ayman Al-Zawahiri has operated terrorist training camps, weapons of

---

[31] The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) estimates the total annual turnover of international trade in Afghan opiates at $25-30 billion. United Nations for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (UNDCCP), "Afghanistan: Opium Survey 2002 – Executive Summary," October 2002, 2 ; also "Area Under Opium Poppy Cultivation in Afghanistan Has Increased by Eight Percent, UN Says," 29 October 2003; United Nations Information Service, Vienna International Center, available at: http://unodc.org/unodc/press_release_2003-10-29_1.html.

[32] "UN Warns about Nexus between Drugs, Crime and Terrorism."

[33] Glenn E. Curtis (Project Manager), "Nations Hospitable to Organized Crime and Terrorism," Report Prepared by the Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, under an Interagency Agreement with the United States Government, October 2003, 32. Available at: http://loc.gov/rr/frd.

[34] Ibid, 33.

[35] Ibid, 46, according to the U.S. Department of State, Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs.

mass destruction factories, and money-laundering and drug-trading networks throughout Albania, Kosovo, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Bosnia.[36]

Their activities have been hidden under the cover of dozens of "humanitarian" agencies spread throughout Bosnia, Kosovo, and Albania, and their involvement in "heroin trafficking through Kosovo helped also to fund terrorist activity directly associated with Al Qaeda and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard."[37] On October 23, 2001, the imprisonment of operatives of two Al Qaeda-sponsored Islamist cells in Bosnia, who were linked to the heroin trade, called attention to the presence of narcoterrorism in the Balkans.

In 2001, it was estimated that the traffic in illegal drugs in the Balkans was part of the Taliban's estimated $8 billion annual income from global drug trafficking, predominantly in heroin, of which Bin Laden is alleged to have administered a substantial portion through Russian Mafia groups for a commission of 10–15 percent, or around $1 billion annually.[38] Moreover, it is estimated that Al Qaeda's "Balkan-directed funds" from "humanitarian" agencies and local banks, without "explicitly counting the significant drug profits," reached anywhere from $500 million to $700 million between 1992 and 1998.[39]

Frequently, there were reports that "Osama bin Laden was channeling, in 2001, profits from the sale of narcotics arriving in Western Europe via the Balkan route to local governments and political parties, with the goal of gaining influence in Albania or Macedonia or both," or that in 2002 "Al Qaeda had acted as a middleman in the movement of heroin from warehouses in Afghanistan via Chechen mafia conduits and into the Balkan narcotics pipeline, taking a percentage of the drug profits for this service."[40]

Connections between organized crime groups and terrorists are to be found not only in the former Yugoslavia, but also in Bulgaria and Romania. For example, in October 2004, Genica Boierica, a controversial businessman from the city of Craiova, was detained following a spectacular search by prosecutors from the Service for Organized Crime Prevention within the Prosecutor's Office under the High Court of Cassation and Justice. Boierica is charged with involvement in alcohol smuggling and illegal VAT refunds, and is also suspected of having connections with terrorists, mainly through activities that channel funds to terrorists. According to the prosecutors, Genica Boierica was brought before the court in 2003 together with an Arab citizen, Jamal Sadik Jamal Al Adi, and another two of his employees. These men were charged with having caused damage to the state of over 115 billion lei (over $3.5 million); be-

---

[36] Marcia Christoff Kurop, "Al Qaeda´s Balkan Links," *Wall Street Journal Europe*, 1 November 2001.

[37] Ibid.

[38] According to Yossef Bodansky, the former director of the U.S. House of Representatives' Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare, quoted in Marcia Christoff Kurop, "Al Qaeda´s Balkan Links."

[39] Ibid.

[40] Hudson, "Global Overview."

tween 1998–2000 Al Adi, under an assumed name, founded several phantom companies through which he manufactured and traded ethyl alcohol.[41] And this is certainly not the only example of connections between organized crime and terrorism in the region.

According to the Director of the Romanian Intelligence Service, there is no clear evidence of the presence of members of Al Qaeda or Islamic Jihad in Romania. Yet there is information on Arab citizens living in Romania who carry out financial activities in support of Al Qaeda or Islamic Jihad, as well as information regarding the involvement of certain terrorist organizations, such as the Kurdish Workers' Party (PKK), or Grey Wolves, in the drug trade, using routes that reach Germany and the Netherlands and cadres located in Romania.[42] On the drug trade in Romania, it is worth noting that in 2001 the seizure of cannabis resin in Eastern Europe reached 17,007 kilos, representing 2 percent of the world total, with the largest quantity being seized in Romania: 13,871 kilos, or approximately 1.53 percent of world total.[43] In 2002, in Romania there were also confiscated 202 kilos of heroin, 2 kilos of cocaine, 14,904 kilos of cannabis herb, 38 kilos of cannabis resin, 14,907 kilos of cannabis plants, and a large quantity of synthetic drugs.[44] These numbers speak volumes about the dimension of the traffic in illegal drugs in Romania, which is both a convenient route for drug dealers going to Western Europe and, increasingly, a consumer country as well.

Conclusions

Drug trafficking, considered separately from all other organized crime activities, has reached a high level in southeastern Europe, and the countries in the region are—however inadvertently—providing nurturing conditions for this activity. Moreover, those involved in the illegal drug trade, as well as in other organized crime activities, are proving to be very resourceful in preserving their networks by any means, including through cooperating with and receiving protection from terrorist groups. On the other side of the equation, terrorists are becoming increasingly involved in drug trafficking, as it proves to be not only a tremendous funding source but also a basis for life support: using illegal routes for recruiting new members, moving people and funds without being detected, establishing new instruction bases, etc.

While their motives may be different, drug traffickers and terrorists provide each other support, and the connections between them are undeniable. Southeastern Europe is one of the many proofs of those connections, with a high level of organized criminal

---

[41] Adrian Dinu, "Genica Boierica incatusat [Genica Boierica Imprisoned]," *Gazeta de Sud*, 4 October 2004.

[42] Radu Tudor, "Romanian Anti-terrorist Brigade Extends the Cooperation in the Fight Against Terrorism," *Jane's Intelligence Review* (January 2002).

[43] *Global Illicit Drug Trends 2003*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (New York: United Nations, 2003).

[44] *2004 World Drug Report*, Volume 2: Statistics, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (New York: United Nations, 2004).

activity—especially drug trafficking—and a not at all negligible active terrorist presence, including Al Qaeda, in the Western Balkans.

In 2005, organized crime, including drug trafficking and corruption, is nevertheless one of the major problems facing the entire southeastern European region. Bulgaria and Romania joined NATO recently, and have concluded the negotiation process with the European Union. Regardless of these major accomplishments, they are still confronted with the threat to their security posed by the high level of all forms of organized crime. The countries of the Western Balkans are in an even worse situation, due to their history over the past decade and their lack of experience in dealing with these problems. In the present context, "nobody can afford the luxury of a fractious Balkans," and this must be made clear to the United States and Europe, as they "feel compelled to divert political, military and financial resources away from the region and into their struggle against terrorism."[45] As the former NATO Secretary General Lord George Robertson put it, "the Balkans must not become another 'black hole' of terrorism like Afghanistan."[46] Correctly perceiving the importance of helping local actors to deal with this peril, on 2 December 2004 UNMIK appointed a special prosecutor for financial crimes, Andrea Stefano Venegoni, in Kosovo, the appointment being "directed at focusing prosecutorial resources on cases relating to corruption and financial crimes."[47]

Combating organized crime and drug trafficking should be part and parcel of the set of measures for defeating terrorism. Otherwise the criminal groups will only extend their already established huge networks, which will also work to the benefit of terrorist groups. It is true that organized crime in southeastern Europe—mainly in the Western Balkans—is "first and foremost a problem for the region."[48] Yet as long as organized crime constitutes a means of terrorist groups' penetration and establishment in the countries of the region, and also of obtaining sources of financing for terrorists and terrorist acts, it is also a problem for the international community.

Therefore, any successful strategy of combating organized crime depends on a determined and joint effort of the national governments in the region and the international community. The national governments have the crucial role in the process of drawing up a proper and solid strategy of combating organized crime through passing proper criminal legislation and implementing the laws. However, they should not be left alone in such an important endeavor. International and regional cooperation plays a very important role in drawing up a workable strategy for combating organized crime. As is well known, there is no country that can deal alone with organized crime and terrorist activities. Only through international cooperation could we hope to achieve—if not a complete annihilation of these phenomena—at least a reduction in their scope and effectiveness. Southeastern Europe, especially the Balkans, should not be disregarded in

---

[45] Misha Glenny, "Heading off Terrorism in the Balkans," *New York Times*, 16 October 2001.
[46] Ibid.
[47] "UNMIK appoints special prosecutor for financial crimes," ERPKIM Info Service, 2 December 2004; available at: www.kosovo.com/news/archive/ticker/2004/December_02/ 16.html.
[48] "EUHR Javier Solana's Intervention on Organized Crime in Southeastern Europe."

the international fight against terrorism as a region "hospitable to organized crime and terrorism," nor should organized crime be allowed to continue as an activity that provides life support to terrorism.

A Possible Path to Change in U.S.–Iran Relations

Mark Edmond Clark *

In 1999, I visited Belgrade one month before the start of Operation ALLIED FORCE as a guest of the Yugoslav Ministry of Foreign Affairs to hear the perspectives of key officials on the possibility of a conflict between Yugoslavia and NATO. While there, I heard Yugoslav officials offer the singular perspective that NATO would not use force, and that threats to do so were used only to get the regime of Slobodan Milosevic to respond to diplomatic efforts by the United States and the European Union. On a basic level, there was simply a refusal to recognize that the threat of attack from NATO was real.

This past September and October, I visited Iran as the guest of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to get an idea of where key Iranian officials stood regarding the possibility of a war with the U.S. over its nuclear energy program. It is true that Iran's religious leadership is conservative on external and internal affairs, and gives considerable weight to the opinions of government hard-liners on foreign and security policy, but they also listen to moderate officials who want peace. Indeed, moderates even have the ear of the Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who is the final arbiter on all matters of state. As Ali Jafari, of the Institute for Political and International Studies, stated, "The Guide provides audiences for all who can contribute on important issues."[1] Unlike Yugoslavia, a true diversity of opinion exists among officials on the nature of the current crisis with the U.S. and, to some extent, the EU. Iran certainly is not the fundamentalist, Islamic monolith that it is portrayed to be.

By reviewing both conservative and moderate views held by officials in Iran on issues pertaining to U.S.–Iran relations, this split in opinion can be illuminated. Further, such a review would seem to support the idea that, through the establishment of a positive dialogue with moderate decision-makers and scholars in Iran, and the offer of support for some of their initiatives, it may yet be possible to resolve the current crisis.

Nuclear Energy

Iran's nuclear energy program began under the secular regime of Muhammad Reza Shah. At that time, in the late 1970s, the U.S. made no requests for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to review Iran's program. After the Islamic revolution, however, Iran was placed under considerable scrutiny. The Iranians feel that they have been acting in good faith, and resent accusations of cheating. As A.A. Soltanieh, a renowned Iranian nuclear energy expert in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, noted, "under the statutes of the very treaties used to demand further compliance and verification

---

* Mark Edmond Clark is member and former fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations. His work concentrates on the Balkans, the Middle East and military affairs. His is a consultant for the Strategy Group and a frequent contributor to CIAO and other international affairs journals.

1 Personal conversation with Ali Jafari in October 2004.

from them by inspection, Iran is allowed to engage in far greater activities to develop its program."[2] Most recently, a uranium enrichment reading by the IAEA provoked an avalanche of calls from the U.S. for the review of Iran's activities. Mohamed El-Baradei, the director-general of the IAEA, erred when he claimed that astronomical levels of highly enriched uranium that were recorded at a nuclear facility in Iran were the result of enrichment activity. The IAEA found 70 percent enrichment through a swiping test, yet Iran admitted only to enriching to 1.2 percent as part of their program of centrifuge testing. Later, the IAEA confirmed the plausibility of Iran's argument that existing levels were the result of Iran's unwitting use of contaminated components acquired from China or Russia. Yet the U.S. ignored the report, and its accusations of cheating continue. Mahmood Sariolghalam of the National University of Iran opined, "Whenever we try to show that we are just like anyone else, the U.S. makes up things to avoid negotiations and this gives playing cards to the hard-liners in Iran."[3]

Conservatives in Iran believe that the U.S. has turned the nuclear energy issue into a political matter, and that no one should interfere with Iran's peaceful use of nuclear energy. Yet at the same time they are satisfied with the actions of the U.S. in insisting upon greater compliance and verification, as they feel these actions expose to the world how the U.S. is simultaneously politicizing and undermining the system of inspection and voluntary verification. Moreover, hard-liners would like to see the IAEA push Iran to make greater concessions, purely in order to increase friction between Iran and the West and establish an adversarial relationship with the IAEA. At the same time, however, they would also like Iran to acquire more technically sophisticated components, using all of the loopholes allowed under the statutes of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Moderates in Iran feel the global community should follow the rules, and that political uses of the IAEA should be abandoned. Ali Khorram, of the Institute for Political and International Studies, in observing IAEA challenges to Iran's veracity, has concluded, "This is a true crisis situation for Iran."[4] IAEA activity must be impartial, proficient, and credible. Moderates have sought to discourage the IAEA from giving the U.S. a technical role in its work. They demand that the IAEA only apply laws under statutes that exist in treaties that are currently in effect. They feel that resolutions are being made solely in response to Iran's particular case. There is the sense that there have been endless attempts to implement a double standard, which deeply concerns some moderates as they ponder future relations with the U.S. Mohammad Tajik, president of the Center of Strategic Studies and a formal advisor to President Mohammad Khatami, explained that, "We are committed to the NPT and CTBT, and whatever we do is under those treaties. We have no intention to get out of the NPT and CTBT."[5] Continual U.S. demands for Iran to acquiesce to its policy goals have been detrimental to the moderates' efforts on the nuclear issue; agreeing to such demands would be

[2] Personal conversation with A.A. Soltanieh in September 2004.
[3] Personal conversation with Mahmood Sariolghalam in Tehran in October 2004.
[4] Personal conversation with Ali Khorram in October 2004.
[5] Personal conversation with Mohammad Tajik in October 2004.

counter to their revolutionary ideals. Moderates as well as conservatives appear ready to defend Iran's sovereignty and its right to engage in activities within the scope of its treaty obligations.

In addition, moderates would prefer that Iran continue to allow inspections, and in return the IAEA should allow progress in the field to continue if no violations are found. The moderates have also placed faith in the Non-Aligned Movement in Geneva, which has tabled a complaint to the IAEA Board for review. This complaint notes that Iran has complied with existing treaties, and argues that the actions against it appear politically motivated.

Iraq

To the Iranians, overall U.S. activities in Iraq demonstrate that military commanders and U.S. policy makers possess "little understanding of the land." This has provided the opponents of the U.S. with a sense of advantage, and tactical errors by the U.S. only serve to enhance that feeling. Beyond failing to understand how to operate in Iraq, the U.S. appears hampered by its broader policy for Iraq of engaging in social engineering. The Iranians firmly believe that any effort to impose a political system on the Iraqi people will not work. The Iraqis, they note, have never accepted systems prescribed for them by other states in the past, and clearly there has been no real support from the Iraqi population for the U.S. approach. If the U.S. fails to abandon its mission of establishing democracy in Iraq, it will likely need to remain entrenched in the country in a quixotic attempt to succeed. U.S. hopes for avoiding such a circumstance have been placed in the January 2005 elections, which even UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan publicly doubted could be free and fair, let alone conducted in an orderly fashion. American hopes have also been bound up in the effort to create an Iraqi security force that could take on some security and stability operations currently carried out by U.S. forces.

Reza Cheginizadeh of the Center of Strategic Studies, who is an advisor to the Expediency Council led by former Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani, noted that conservatives and hard-liners in Iran would like to see the U.S. remain in Iraq indefinitely, so that the continuing occupation will feed the flames of Islamic radicalism. If some large-scale breakdown in order in Iraq occurred, the conservatives are convinced that radical elements, such as Moqtada Al-Sadr and his Mahdi army, will take control, making room for the influence of other states. Iran, they believe, would be included among them. The conservatives are opposed to the election process in Iraq. They would prefer that the elections occur as scheduled, with the hope that current or even worse security conditions will cause the elections to fail.

Some moderates are convinced that the project of building democracy in Iraq, which "was a loser from the start," has failed. At the same time, scholars such as Mohammad Tajik would like the planned elections to be "independent and under the [supervision of the] UN without pressure from any country at all. It would not suffice

for the U.S. to install a central government."[6] Through successful elections, the Iraqis may develop the sense that a viable state can rise out of the ashes of war.

Regarding the training and equipping of Iraqi security forces, moderates sense that U.S. efforts are wrongly focused on the insurgency. Trouble in the Sunni Triangle or the greater Al Anbar province does present a security concern, but the true threat to Iraq's future remains civil war. It could easily be triggered (many towns, such as Kirkuk, which once possessed a majority Kurdish population, are now dominated by Shi'a). Moderates also feel that the U.S. should establish security using regional partners, including Iran, but with the caveat that the U.S. must act in good faith in developing such partnerships.

Israel

Many in Iran theorize that Israel may attack nuclear facilities in Iran, as it did in Osirak, Iraq, in 1981, which would very possibly result in a conflict with both Israel and the U.S. By all accounts, Israel has been arming itself for a conflict, and the U.S. has been supplying Israel with conventional arms. Furthermore, the U.S.—and the global community in general—have closed their eyes to Dimona, the alleged Israeli nuclear weapons facility. Iranians sense that Israel has been afforded "special rights" by the U.S. (many Iranians remember from the era of Shah's regime what having "special rights" from the U.S. means). In their mind, the U.S. has taken a one-sided approach to Israel, an unreasonable position if the goal is regional security and stability.

Many Iranian conservatives are convinced that the U.S. will use Israel as its proxy in an attack on Iran. In response, they would retaliate, ending the problem once and for all. Indeed, conservatives are prepared to act by blanketing Israel with Shahab-3 rockets. In August 2004, Vice Admiral Ali Shamkhani, the Iranian Minister of Defense, explained that Iran might resort to pre-emptive strikes to prevent an attack on its nuclear facilities.[7] The commander of the Revolutionary Guard, General Mohammed Bager Zolqadr, also stated in August that, "If Israel fires one missile at Bushehr atomic power plant, it should permanently forget about the Dimona nuclear center, where it produces and keeps its nuclear weapons."[8]

Moderates see opportunities for a peaceful resolution of problems between Israel and Iran. Mahmood Sariolghalam of the National University of Iran went so far as to state that "90 percent of the problems Iran has with the U.S. have to do with the Israel issue."[9] Mohammad Tajik went further, stating "the current regime in Israel has caused a kind of harm to the U.S. among countries in the region."[10] Moderates sense that if Iran abandoned the status quo and adopted a less hostile policy toward Israel, the U.S. would define the Iranian issue differently. Yet, for that to ever happen, Israel must ac-

---

6 Personal conversation with Mohammad Tajik in October 2004.
7 *The New York Times*, August 20, 2004, p. 4.
8 Ibid.
9 Personal conversation with Mahmood Sariolghalam in October 2004.
10 Personal conversation with Mohammad Tajik in October 2004.

cept Iran's sovereignty, and must not use its considerable political influence in the U.S. to prevent it from having the same rights as other states. Fairness can only be established through a change in course. Due to the lack of any cooperation, Iran will maintain its distance, and will not change its position on Israel.

U.S. Policy on the Middle East

The stated goal of U.S. policy in the Middle East is to establish democracy in the region. However, the United States' implementation of this policy has been confused and uncertain. Iranians generally feel that U.S. policy has had a destructive effect in the region; the Bush Administration's actions in Iraq have simply given democracy a bad name. No state in the region supports the idea that democracy can be imposed by force. The idea of regime change as being central to the U.S. approach to establishing democracy among Middle Eastern states is viewed as overtly threatening by the leaders of those states.

Many Iranian conservatives conclude that current U.S. policy on, and recent U.S. actions in, the Middle East are simply a manifestation of a concealed agenda of engaging in a great crusade against Islam. This sense that an anti-Islamic bias drives U.S. regional policy provides further fuel to radical Islamism. It is the dream of hard-liners that a clash between the Western and Islamic worlds would occur. Indeed, conservatives in Iran are not intimidated by U.S. military power. The oversimplification of U.S. policy and decision-making related to Iran has perhaps led to the underestimation of Iran's true capacity to harm the U.S. and its interests. This may account for statements emanating from U.S. officials that appear to have the objective of provoking the Iranians to take hostile action against the U.S. If the U.S. were to respond to an Iranian attack against Israel, even if Iran acted in self-defense, hard-line elements like the Revolutionary Guards would be ready to strike at U.S. interests worldwide. The goal would be to present a direct challenge to the global hegemony of the United States. Reza Cheginizadeh of the Center of Strategic Studies in Tehran stated that many conservatives feel "[t]he U.S. can only understand force, it does not listen to powerlessness. If you wish to be listened to by the U.S., you must have a big gun and a big stick."[11]

With the U.S. and EU escalating measures in regard to possible sanctions on Iran's nuclear program, moderate officials in Iran have become increasingly concerned over how far things will go. Ali Khorram, a senior expert at the Institute for Political and International Studies of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, explained that Iran has acquired information suggesting that, "after June 2003, the U.S. began a time-line for an attack against Iran."[12] The degree to which the U.S. has pressed Iran on its nuclear energy program—as well as the crisis created by the U.S. condemnation of Iran for allegedly enriching uranium—has only served to give credence to theories that the U.S. will initiate hostilities at some point.

---

[11] Personal conversation with Reza Cheginizadeh in September 2004.

[12] Personal conversation with Ali Khorram in October 2004.

Nothing that the U.S. has done with regard to Iran has helped moderates push their agenda. It was vocal U.S. support for reformist politicians in the 2004 elections that caused the religious authorities to expel reformists from the election, and many from politics entirely. The U.S. has often rejected proposals aimed at initiating contacts. In the 8 November 2004 issue of *Newsweek International*, it was revealed that, during the last year, Iran, through Swiss diplomatic channels, offered to exchange members (or lists of members) of Al-Qaida currently held in Iran for members (or lists of members) of the People's Mujahedeen (now ranked twenty-fifth on the State Department's list of thirty-nine foreign terrorist organizations) in U.S. custody. The U.S. showed no interest.

As time passes, the U.S. will sink ever deeper into the quagmire of the Middle East, and will be likely to make more mistakes. Moderates in Iran hope that the U.S. will change course before it is too late. The moderates do not view Iran as a threat to the U.S. Rather, they want U.S. policy makers to recognize that Iran and the U.S. need each other. Some would prefer the U.S. to perceive Iran as a counter-balance to Russia, and as a potential regional power that can also bolster U.S. strategic interests in the region. Some think the first step of the United States should be to negotiate the end of sanctions in exchange for the termination of Iran's nuclear program. Mahmood Sariolghalam expressed the view that "the US government and Iran must take steps toward each other at the same time."[13]

U.S. Presidential Election

Iranian officials—both conservative and moderate—viewed the U.S. presidential election in November 2004 as critical. To conservatives, the U.S. elections represented a measure of the American public's respect for the people of other states. Support for the Bush Administration would indicate that American voters do not desire a change of course or progress. If President George W. Bush had lost his bid for re-election, his administration's actions would be seen as running counter to the people's wishes, and not reflective of them. Iranian conservatives believe that change in the U.S. could occur either through its recognition that the wrong course has been pursued, or through catastrophe. As Reza Cheginizadeh explained, hardliners feel that only through catastrophe would the American people "see the light."[14]

Moderates sensed prior to the election that a rapprochement could be reached, regardless of who won. Thus, in spite of the election results, moderates hold out hope that progress can be made in U.S.–Iran relations. The Iranians explain that they have had experiences with both Republicans and Democrats before, and that, except for some stylistic differences, their overall approaches have been consistent. Right now, however, they would like U.S. policy to move from the threat to act preemptively toward a stance of fair and balanced dialogue. U.S. attitudes and actions following the

[13] Personal conversation with Mahmood Sariolghalam in October 2004.
[14] Personal conversation with Reza Cheginizadeh in September 2004.

IAEA's next report on Iran has provided some indication whether there will be cooperation or confrontation. Moderates, of course, were hoping for cooperation.

Conclusion

In order for any dialogue to be established, the U.S. must begin by sending the right signals to Iran. Threats by American officials have been met with recalcitrance, and tend to galvanize public opinion in Iran against the U.S. Furthermore, U.S. media dominance and expertise in public relations ensures that U.S. positions, admonishments, and threats will be heard worldwide. American officials may feel the media is a safe, non-threatening vehicle for making such statements. However, Iran lacks the media capabilities of the U.S. government, and does not really want to use the media as a tool to exchange views with the U.S. Words from Washington are taken at face value in Tehran, and have served only to motivate conservatives and hard-liners to prepare for war.

If true evidence of treaty violations is ever found, the U.S. could hardly be asked to attempt to accommodate Iran. However, absent such evidence, it is unreasonable to continue to take steps that may poison the environment for a peaceful resolution of the current crisis. The ongoing situation in Iraq has done enough to convince many Iranians that U.S. intentions are not peaceful. Given the perspectives of moderate Iranians, such as those presented here, it is clear that they possess the requisite views and willingness to open a dialogue with the United States. In seeking contact with moderates, the U.S. should not expect immediate pronouncements in favor of its positions. Though they may have the ear of Iran's religious leadership, the moderates' political position is still weaker than that of the conservatives and hard-liners. Rather, they might assist the process of improving U.S.–Iran relations by providing more realistic approaches to effect change and find peaceful resolutions to issues. Indeed, through a positive dialogue, the moderates may make suggestions on the nuclear energy issue, but also on others, such as Iraq and terrorism. As A.A. Soltanieh, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, explained, "Iran had not originally planned to enrich uranium and terminated reprocessing ten years ago."[15] That point may be crucial in understanding Iran's intent and Iran's position. Moderates want to see a stable Iraq on their border, and may even seek to partner with the U.S. to support efforts to bring security and stability to Iraq. New offers to exchange terrorists may also be made.

The U.S. can either foster or destroy the opportunity to work with Iranian moderates. Without any communication whatsoever, a conflict between the U.S. and Iran becomes more likely. Thus, the final choice for war or peace really lies within U.S. hands. The initiation of small steps may lead to substantial changes. Making the transition to this approach will not be easy for either side. Before military options are selected and plans are initiated, full consideration must be given to finding peaceful solutions. For U.S. policy makers in particular, it would be best, given existing U.S. commitments globally and overall U.S. security, to ensure that American military

[15] Personal conversation with A.A. Soltanieh in September 2004.

power is used economically. When possible, more effective and efficient ways of resolving issues must be explored.

Disrupting Escalation of Terror in Russia to Prevent Catastrophic Attacks

Simon Saradzhyan and Nabi Abdullaev *

Executive Summary

The recent spate of deadly terrorist attacks in Russia has plunged the country into what President Vladimir Putin has rightfully described as a "total war" against the networks of terror. This article will analyze the trends in this war, and will conclude that the logical outcome of the ongoing escalation in number, scope, and cruelty of terrorist attacks in Russia will be an act of catastrophic terrorism.[1] The horrendous hostage-taking drama in the North Ossetian town of Beslan—in which more than 330, including 160 children, were killed—clearly demonstrates that ideologically-driven extremists have already passed the moral threshold between conventional terror acts and catastrophic terrorism.[2]

We will demonstrate that networks of these extremists are constantly expanding their capabilities, both organizational and operational, in this total war to inflict damage of catastrophic proportions on Russia either by conventional means or through the use of nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) materials. We will also demonstrate that the most violent and organized of these networks—the anti-Russian insurgents in the Northern Caucasus—are becoming increasingly motivated to resort to acts of catastrophic terrorism, as their current tactics of conventional attacks have failed to have any impact on the Kremlin's staunch refusal to negotiate either with the Islamist or secular wings of separatists in the region. The hostage-taking drama in Beslan in September 2004 is the latest evidence of the Islamist wing's preparedness to kill hundreds of non-combatants, including children, as well as sacrifice their own lives as they strive to win

---

* Simon Saradzhyan and Nabi Abdullaev are journalists in Moscow. Mr. Saradzhyan is affiliated with EastWest Institute's Global Security Program and Mr. Abdullaev is affiliated with Transnational Crime And Corruption Center.

1 This article acknowledges existing differences in the expert and academic communities on what constitutes a terrorist attack. For purposes of clarity and concision, this article relies on a definition of a terrorist attack commonly found among mainstream researchers of this subject. We define a terrorist act as an act of political violence that inflicts harm on non-combatants, but is designed to intimidate broader audiences, including state authorities, and is an instrument of achieving certain political or other goals. This essay defines an act of catastrophic terrorism as a terrorist attack involving the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear materials or weapons of mass destruction or conventional techniques to kill a significant number of people (1,000 or more).

2 This article will refer to those religiously-motivated and separatist insurgents who have the motivation and capability to stage acts of catastrophic terrorism as "ideologically-driven extremists," as distinct from "conventional insurgents," who would limit themselves to "conventional" guerilla warfare and terrorist attacks of limited scale.

this war and coerce Russia into negotiations and eventual withdrawal from the North Caucasus.

This essay will also identify other actors who are capable of assisting, if not leading, terrorist attacks of catastrophic proportions in Russia, such as apocalyptic and messianic sects and extremist secular parties. The latter have displayed preparedness for political violence, and the former have demonstrated their ability to disperse into decentralized networks of cells, often remaining below the radar of law-enforcement and security agencies. We will argue that members of both religious sects and fringe political parties can be recruited to assist in acts of terror, while further pressure on some of the sects can prompt their messianic leaders to order their subservient followers to try stage an apocalypse through catastrophic terror acts.

We will go on to demonstrate that corruption has emerged as a major security threat in this war with terrorist networks, and to analyze the trade-offs between civil liberties and securities in Russia, to conclude that unrestricted expansion of the repressive powers of the state security apparatus will not pay off in this war.

The article will conclude with policy recommendations that Russian authorities identify potential actors, analyze their capabilities and motivations, and then proceed to dismantle those who pose the gravest threat, while keeping the rest of agents of terror on the run.

Actors that Pose a Threat of Catastrophic Terror

Ideologically-driven extremists based in Chechnya and neighboring regions of the Northern Caucasus remain the most likely actors to perpetrate acts of catastrophic terrorism in Russia. These actors have already displayed formidable resilience, an ever-rising level of strategic and tactical planning for their attacks, and the capability and motivation to inflict massive indiscriminate casualties by, for instance, organizing an apartment bombing in the southern Russian city of Buinaksk in 1999.[3] Most recently,

[3] A Russian court sentenced two natives of Dagestan, Isa Zainudinov and Alisultan Salikhov, to life in prison for their involvement in the planning of a deadly apartment bombing in the Dagestani city of Buinaksk. Russian prosecutors insisted that it was Chechnya-based warlord Khattab who ordered the blast that killed sixty-two people, when a powerful bomb went off in front of an apartment building in Buinaksk on 4 September 1999. Simon Saradzhyan, "After One Year, Blast Probe Still Drags On," *The Moscow Times*, 15 September 2000.

Russian law enforcement officials also maintain that Khattab ordered the bombings of apartment buildings that killed some 220 people in Russian cities during the fall of 1999. One of the alleged bombers and a native of Karachayevo-Cherkessia, Adam Dekkushev, was arrested in 2002 and told investigators of the Federal Security Service (FSB) that it was this salafite-minded warlord who issued the order through his subordinate Sheikh Abu Omar, deputy chief of FSB Operations and Search Directorate Yevgeny Kolesnikov told reporters in Moscow on 17 July 2002 (*RTR* Television, 17 July 2002). Dekkushev also told investigators that the alleged terrorists had initially planned to bomb a dike in southern Russia to flood several settlements in hopes of killing thousands, but then changed their mind. Alexander Shvarev, "Zrya My S Rebyatiami Etim Zanimalis (We Should Not Have Been Doing This With Guys)," *Vremya Novostei,* 19 February 2003.

two female natives of Chechnya, acting by proxy of an Islamic radical group associated with Al Qaeda, blew up two planes to kill themselves and all other people on board.[4] However, the most horrendous casualties to date in a single attack were registered when a group of gunmen from Chechnya and Ingushetia took more than 1,200 people hostage in a school in a southern Russian town (Beslan) in September of 2004. After two days of a tense stand-off, the terrorists, who claimed to be acting on orders of the most notorious of the Chechen warlords, Shamil Basayev, detonated explosives and shot at hostages. More than 330 hostages were killed in explosions, shot by the terrorists or died in crossfire before the terrorists were overwhelmed by vigilantes and troops on 3 September 2004.

The capacity of the extremists in the Northern Caucasus for such attacks is vast. These groups include organized, well-trained and well-equipped guerilla fighters capable of carrying out simultaneous multi-object attacks on guarded facilities; in addition, the groups have access to an array of other powerful organizational resources through corrupt officials, sympathetic law enforcement agents, and links to organized crime and other terrorist organizations, including Al Qaeda. There is also no shortage of man-

---

According to Alexander Litvinenko, former Lt. Colonel of the FSB, however, it could have been the FSB that organized the apartment bombings. Litvinenko, who claims to have spoken to Gochiyaev, has not backed his allegations with any direct evidence, however. Yuri Felshitinskii and Alexander Litvinenko, *Blowing Up Russia: Terror From Within* (New York: Liberty Publishing House, 2001). Fragments from the book are available at http://2001.NovayaGazeta.Ru/nomer/2001/61n/n61n-s00.shtml as of 12 June 2002.

[4] After days of intensive search and analysis, the Federal Security Service (FSB) announced on 30 August that bombs had brought down two planes, which crashed almost simultaneously on 24 August, killing all eighty-nine people on board. "Today without a shadow of a doubt we can say that both airplanes were blown up as a result of a terrorist attack," Lieutenant-General Andrei Fetusov of FSB told a Russian news agency.

Initial examination of the crash debris offered no evidence to suggest that the planes had been brought down by terrorists, according to the FSB. However, as the search progressed, FSB investigators found traces of a powerful explosive in the debris of both planes. Amanta Nagayeva and Dzhebirkhanova, whose first name was not released, are the two Chechen women whose names were registered among the passengers of the two flights. Both worked in the Chechen capital of Grozny and shared an apartment there. While a Chechen police official told *Izvestia* that a background check on both women revealed no ties to the rebels, this newspaper managed to establish that Nagayeva's brother has been missing since he was detained by federal servicemen three years ago in Chechnya. Vadim Rechkalov, "Drugie Dve Shakhidki," *Izvestia*, 30 August 2004. On 27 August, a little-known group, named the Islambouli Brigades, claimed responsibility for downing both planes. The group had been earlier reported to have ties to Al Qaeda. A group with a similar name—the Islambouli Brigades of Al Qaeda—claimed responsibility for an attempt to kill Pakistan's prime minister-designate in July. Al Qaeda has reportedly cultivated ties with the radical Islamist wing of the Chechen separatists. President Vladimir Putin also said on 31 August that the downing of the planes highlighted the links between Chechen rebels and international terror networks. The FSB and other government agencies have refrained from blaming Chechen rebels for the attacks, which the Russian press speculated could have been carried out by two female natives of Chechnya that were among the passengers.

power that is determined and ready to sacrifice their own lives and engage in indiscriminate killing. These suicide bombers have become one of the most worrisome manifestations of the growing determination of Islamist extremists.[5] The religious motivations of the female bombers are often coupled with the desire for personal revenge for the loss of suicide bombers' relatives: in one such case, two wives and a sister of a killed Chechen warlord participated in successive deadly bombings.[6]

In addition to plotting and executing attacks using conventional arms, the extremists have also been seeking to acquire chemical and nuclear materials with the intent to use them in terrorist attacks. During Russia's first military campaign in Chechnya in 1994–96, Chechen separatists acquired radioactive materials,[7] threatened to attack Russia's nuclear facilities,[8] plotted to hijack a nuclear submarine,[9] and attempted to put pressure on the Russian leadership by planting a container with radioactive materials in Moscow and threatening to detonate it.[10] During the second campaign, they planted ex-

---

5 After the theater raid, Chechen suicide bombers led eleven attacks that reportedly claimed the lives of 295 people, mostly Russian civilians. Several attacks were averted. Shamil Basayev claimed responsibility for all the attacks, repeatedly acknowledging on the rebel website Kavkazcenter.com that he has trained some forty more female suicide bombers.

6 Sergei Dyupin, "Vdova ne Prihodit Odna (Widow Doesn't Come Alone)," *Kommersant*, 10 August 2004.

7 Chechen fighters removed several containers of radioactive materials from the Grozny branch of Russia's Radon nuclear waste collection site prior to the seizure of the facility by federal troops in January 2000, according to a Russian magazine's sources in the Russian Ministry of Defense. Yury Gladkevich, "Poshel v Gory (Into the Mountains)," *Profil*, 20 March 2000, quoted in "Radwaste Reported Removed from Radon Facility in Grozny," NIS Nuclear Trafficking Database, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies Nuclear Threat Initiative, available at http://www.nti.org/db/nistraff/2000/20000230.htm as of 19 June 2002.

8 Then-Chechen president Dzhokhar Dudayev warned that his fighters might attack nuclear plants in Russia in 1992 to discourage Moscow from trying to counter his republic's independence bid. He issued a similar threat again in 1995 when the military campaign was already underway in the republic. "Dudayev Grozit Perenesti Voinu v Glub' Rossii, (Dudayev Threatens to Transfer War Into the Depths of Russia)," *Vecherny Chelyabinsk*, 1 February 1995.

9 "V Chechne Nashli Plan Zakhvata Rossiiskoi Lodki (Plan to Hijack a Russian Submarine Found in Chechnya)," Lenta.ru, 4 February 2002; available at www.lenta.ru/vojna as of 4 July 2002. Also reported in "Nachalnik Operativnogo Shtaba Maskhadova Gotovil Plan Zakhvata Rossiiskoi Atomnoi Podlodki (Chief of Maskhadov's Operational Staff Was Preparing a Plan to Hijack Russian Atomic Submarine)," *RIA-Novosti*, 25 April 2002.

10 Chechen warlord Shamil Basayev tried to blackmail Russian leadership with a crude radiological device. Basayev began with threats to organize undercover attacks with radioactive, chemical, and biological substances against Moscow and other strategic sites in Russia unless peace negotiations, which began on 5 July 1995, proved successful.

plosives in chemical storage tanks, scouted Russian nuclear facilities, and established contacts with an insider at one such facility.[11] So far, these and other actions have failed to coerce the Kremlin into concessions or negotiations, a development that has contributed to further radicalization of the separatist movement in Chechnya, with even previously moderate figures pledging allegiance to the militant Islamist course.

The strongest manifestation of this evolution has been Chechen separatist leader Aslan Maskhadov's July statement that Russian cities are legitimate targets for the rebels, and that mass murder of Russian civilians would be a legitimate measure.[12] He also blamed Western governments for siding with the Kremlin on the Chechnya issue, adding that the separatist cause would not seek legitimacy with such a corrupt partner. The statement removes any constraints the extremists had placed on escalating the terror war, and opens a path for closer cooperation between the separatist wing and Islamists in implementing terrorist attacks.

The religious motives behind the separatists' anti-Russian resistance emerged at the end of the first military conflict in Chechnya in 1996, when several dozens of Arab Islamist fighters, led by the Jordanian-born warlord Emir Khattab, became involved.[13] A *de facto* independent Chechnya has served as a training ground for Wahhabi jihadists. Volunteers from Central Asia, the Caucasus, and the Volga region, as well as citizens of Saudi Arabia, Jordan, China, Pakistan, and Malaysia learned explosives techniques there, along with guerilla warfare and Wahhabi theory.[14] Alumni of Chechnya's training camps have become a core of the extended anti-Russian terrorist networks in Karachayevo-Cherkessia, Kabardino-Balkaria, Ingushetia, and Dagestan, actively participating in the anti-government insurgency, both by fighting in Chechnya and waging sabotage activities in their native republics.

The July 1995 talks failed, and four months later—on 23 November 1995—a Russian TV crew found a lead container filled with radioactive cesium-137, which had been planted by Basayev's men, in Moscow's Izmailovskii Park. In addition to tipping off the media, Basayev also claimed that his agents had smuggled in four more such packages, and that at least two of them contained explosives, which could be detonated at any time, turning the containers into "dirty bombs." Grigorii Sanin and Aleksandr Zakharov, "Konteyner Iz Izmailovskogo Parka Blagopoluchno Evakuirovan (Container Has Been Successfully Evacuated From the Izmailovskii Park)," *Segodnya*, 25 November 1995.

[11] "Tver Region. Captain of A Regiment Which Guards Kalininskaya NPP Is Suspected of Having Supplied Secret Information to Chechens," *Regnum,* 19 November 2002.

[12] The full text of the interview is available at Maskhadov's website, www.chechenpress.info/news/2004/07/18/08.shtml, last accessed 11 August 2004.

[13] Khattab reportedly was fighting against the Soviet Army in Afghanistan in the 1980s and retained connections to what later emerged as Al Qaeda. After the first war in Chechnya, Khattab set up at least seventeen training camps in Chechnya. Michael Wines, "Russia Releases Tape to Support Claim of Chechen Rebel's Death," *The New York Times*, 27 April 2002, A7.

[14] Gennady Troshev, "Emir Khattab: Shtrihi k Portretu" (Emir Khattab: Touches to Portrait)," *Krasnaya Zvezda*, 27 April 2002.

In Dagestan, Wahhabi extremists—led by a Dagestani warlord, Rappani Khalilov—are accused by local officials of carrying out the bombing of the Victory Day parade in Kaspiisk in 2002 that claimed the lives of forty Russian servicemen and civilians. His terrorist group, *Jennet*, has also proclaimed a war against the Dagestani police, and has audaciously executed more than forty police officers in the past two years.[15] Dagestani Wahhabis also led the first in a series of the apartment building bombings that led to the second Chechen war. Sixty people died in a blast in September of 1999, and Khattab was implicated by Russian officials in ordering the attack.[16]

In Ingushetia, the local Wahhabis participated in a June 2004 raid that was commanded by the leader of the Chechen Islamist extremists, Shamil Basayev, on police and military installations in Ingushetia. Sixty Ingush police officers and prosecutors were purposefully executed by the attackers, and about thirty civilians were killed in the crossfire.

In Kabardino-Balkaria, local Wahhabi leaders, the Shogenov brothers, helped Basayev to dispatch female suicide bombers to Moscow in 2003. In August 2003, Russian security services killed the Shogenovs in a massive crackdown on Islamist cells in the republic. However, the local Wahhabi organization *Yarmuk* apparently was not wiped out; in August, 2004, two police officers were killed in a confrontation with the Wahhabis near the republican capital Nalchik, and the ensuing search operation led to another clash, in which a cache of explosives was seized by law enforcement officers.[17]

The Wahhabi cells have also been active in the Muslim republics of Russia's central Volga region, Tatarstan and Bashkotorstan. In 1999, Tatar religious extremists bombed the major Urengoi-Pomara-Uzhgorod natural gas pipeline traversing the republic. Ten bombers have been sentenced to prison terms of between twelve and fifteen years.[18]

In Chechnya itself, the ideology of the resistance has been gradually shifting from separatism to *jihad*, in an apparent effort to expand the sympathetic constituency abroad, thereby gaining additional political and financial support for the cause. Thus, in August of 1999, Basayev and Khattab led two raids into the neighboring Russian republic of Dagestan under the proclaimed goal of establishing an Islamic state on the territory of the Caucasus.[19] The ensuing Russian military campaign is framed by the Islamist wing of the Chechen insurgency as a crackdown on true believers, while the

---

[15] Sergei Rasulov, "Diversanty Unichtozhayut Dagestanskih Militsionerov (Saboteurs Destroy Dagestani Policemen)," *Gazeta*, 11 March 2004.

[16] Nabi Abdullaev, "Buinaksk Apartment Bombers Convicted," *The Moscow Times*, 20 March 2001.

[17] Timur Samedov, "Prishol, Uvidel, Upustil (Came, Saw, Missed)," *Kommersant*, 20 August 2004.

[18] "Za Vzryv Gazoprovoda Vahhabita Prigovorili k 15 Godam Kolonii (Wahhabi Sentenced to 15 Years in Prison for Bombing Gas Main)," *RIA-Novosti*, 28 November 2002.

[19] The text of Basayev's Islamic Shura declaration of the Islamic State of Dagestan on 10 August 1999 can be viewed at the *Russky Zhurnal's* news archive at www.russ.ru/politics/news/1999/08/10.htm#7, last accessed on 6 May 2004.

extremists' struggle is depicted as *jihad*.[20] Religion has been since then primarily used by these extremists for legitimization of their actions and for framing their struggle as part of the worldwide *jihad*.[21]

As demonstrated above, the radicalization of the Chechen insurgency along religious lines has created the following strong motivations among extremists to commit catastrophic terror acts in Russia:

- The struggle began to be perceived as a defense of the extremists' basic identity and dignity.
- Losing the struggle would be unthinkable, with fighting against Russia becoming a holy duty.
- The struggle is at a stalemate, and cannot be won in real time or in real terms. It can be easily reconceived then on a sacred basis that evokes grand scenarios, blurring the notion of the sympathizing constituency behind the Chechen cause and allowing indiscriminate attacks on an open-ended range of targets.
- More importantly, even the extremists' switch to suicide bombings has failed to affect the Kremlin's hard-line policy towards them. This failure may—and probably will—push the frustrated leaders of the extremists to planning terrorist acts of catastrophic proportions.

---

[20] See Basayev's numerous statements on the rebel website Kavkazcenter.com.

[21] Reacting to this shift, the U.S. Department of State designated three Chechen rebel groups—Islamic International Brigade, Special Purpose Islamic Regiment, and Riyadus-Salikhin Reconnaissance and Sabotage Battalion of Chechen Martyrs—as foreign terrorist organizations in February 2003. The Chechen rebels' *jihad* doctrine is represented by judgments of the major ideologue of violent *jihad* and the mentor of Osama bin Laden, Palestinian Sheikh Abdullah Azzam, taken out of his work *Defense of the Muslim Lands*, and of a Muslim theologian Ibn Taymiyya (1263–1328), a favorite theorist of radical Muslims. Both encourage the participation of women and children in the fighting.

Operatives of another Al Qaeda-linked network, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, have been spotted in Russia recently. Three IMU members suspected in a March attack in Uzbekistan that killed forty-seven people were arrested in May and June of 2004 in Russia's Muslim-populated Volga regions.

Compared to other neighboring ethnic groups preaching Islam, the Chechens have not developed a indigenous school of religious thought and have retained many ancient animist traditions and beliefs. The extremely formalized and de-spiritualized Wahhabism that perceives *jihad* as external warfare (contrary to the Northern Caucasus' traditional sufi Islam, that views *jihad* as a struggle of a Muslim with his own vicious impulses) quickly took root among the Chechen youth, who saw it as a revolutionary and "purifying" doctrine.

Inside Chechen terror networks, the preaching of mullahs defines the rebels' modus operandi, since both sources of religious and operational authority coincide in their leadership, called the *Majlis-ul Shura* (People's Council). The *Shura* unites warlords, Wahhabi scholars, and Maskhadov's few foreign envoys. Any criticism from religious authorities from outside the rebels' cause is repelled by the *Shura*, which denies their legitimacy because of their siding with Moscow.

Another threat is posed by messianic and totalitarian religious sects operating outside the Northern Caucasus. On the surface, this threat currently appears far less robust than the menace of Islamist extremists in and around Chechnya. However, we should not underestimate the long-term destructive potential of messianic sects, as this threat may grow to deadly proportions as the Russian authorities accelerate pressure on them as well (due to reasons beyond conventional logic and analysis).

The demise of Soviet Union left an ideological vacuum, which religious groups that were well-established in pre-revolutionary Russia (such as the Russian Orthodox Church and Islam) but were suppressed under the Soviet regime were unable to fill completely. As a result, not only various "benign" traditional confessions began to reclaim believers or proselytes in the post-Soviet era, but also a number of what authorities have branded as sects or cults, seeking to establish new religions, began to scout for followers in Russia and other Soviet republics.

Federal government and Russian Orthodox Church experts estimated that there were anywhere between 300 and 500 of what they classified as "sects" operating in Russia as of 2003.[22] There were up to one million followers of sects and other "nontraditional" religious organizations in Russia, with 70 percent being young men between 18 and 27, according to a 2003 roundtable, which drew experts from the Interior Ministry and other government agencies as well as from the Russian Orthodox Church.[23] And, according to one of this roundtable's participants—the director of the Research Center for Development Strategies and National Security, Igor Oleinik—some of these sects have begun to develop ties with terrorist organizations. Alexander Dvorkin, Russia's leading expert on these religious groups, also notes the phenomena of "totalitarian sects merging with … terrorism" in his recent book.[24]

The Japanese doomsday cult Aum Shinrikyo has provided perhaps the most illustrative example of how a messianic sect can expand across Russia unhindered by law enforcement despite its efforts to recruit defense industry specialists and acquire WMD technologies. At one point, this cult, which dispersed anthrax spores in the Japanese capital in 1993 and sprayed sarin gas in the Tokyo subway in 1995, had more followers in Russia than in any other country, according to the U.S. Senate Government Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.[25] The cult actively recruited scientists and technical experts in Russia (among other countries) in order to develop weapons of mass destruction. Aum allegedly managed to recruit followers even among employees

---

[22] Materials of roundtable "Totalitarian Sects—Weapons of Mass Destruction. Program of Disarmament" held in Moscow in October 2003.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Alexander Dvorkin, *Totalitarnye Sekty. Sektovedenie* (Nizhni Novogrod, Russia, 2003).

[25] A report from the Russian State Duma's Security Committee put the number of Aum's Russian followers at 35,000, with eleven branches outside of Moscow and at least seven inside of the Russian capital. Staff of the Senate Government Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, "Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Case Study on the Aum Shinrikyo," 31 October 1995, available at www.fas.org/irp/congress/1995_rpt/aum/part06.htm as of 31 July 2002.

of the Kurchatov Institute.[26] The sect also managed to infiltrate the town of Obninsk, where the Institute of Nuclear Power Engineering is located, which had a functioning reactor until 2002.[27] In addition to recruiting followers, the cult also sought to acquire various weapons in Russia.[28]

It was only after the 1995 attacks in the Tokyo subway that Russia's law enforcement machine finally swung into action, with Aum's facilities across the country either raided or closed and the sect banned in the same year. Russian members of the sect demonstrated both their motivation and capability to stage acts of terror after the arrest of the cult's leader, Shoko Asahara, in Japan. Four activists planned to stage a series of terrorist acts and take hostages in Japan in 2000 to blackmail the Japanese authorities into releasing Asahara so they could covertly ship him to a secret location in Primorsky Krai's settlement of Slavyanka.[29] The crackdown has failed to break the will of some of Aum's Russian followers, and some 300 of the sect's members could have been still operating in Russia as of April 2004, according to a Russian television report.[30]

To date, Aum Shinrikyo remains the only cult that has been publicly known to seek WMD technologies in Russia with practical use in mind. However, there are other cults active in Russia, operating as networks of largely underground cells, virtually unhindered despite the fact that their leaders have preached that the "judgment day" is imminent and their followers have displayed readiness to sacrifice their lives.

The so-called White Brotherhood has proved, perhaps, the most sophisticated of messianic cults when it came to surviving a crackdown by authorities. This sect was established in Ukraine by an electronics engineer, Yuri Krivonogov, who studied methods of influencing the psyche at a KGB institute in the Soviet era.[31] The cult,

---

[26] For instance, there are references in the documents seized from Aum's "construction minister" Kiyohide Hakawa to the desired purchase of nuclear weapons. The documents contain the question, "How much is a nuclear warhead?" and lists several prices. Staff of the Senate Government Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, "Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Case Study on the Aum Shinrikyo," 31 October 1995, available at http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1995_rpt/aum/part06.htm as of 31 July 2002.

[27] S. Romanyuk, "Totalitarian Sects in Russia," *Observer* 5 (1999).

[28] Staff of the Senate Government Affairs Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, "Global Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Case Study on the Aum Shinrikyo," 31 October 1995, available at http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/1995_rpt/aum/part06.htm as of 31 July 2002.

[29] Dmitry Sigachev and his three accomplices were arrested by Russia's Federal Security Service in the summer of 2000, and subsequent searches of their apartments netted an arsenal of guns, photographs of populous areas of Tokyo and other Japanese cities, as well as enough explosives to stage twelve "powerful explosions." The four went on trial, and Sigachev confessed during one of the hearings in a Primorsky Krai court to having planned terrorist attacks in Japan. "A Member of the Russian Branch of Aum Shinrikyo Found Unfit to Stand Trial," *Kommersant*, 2002. Sigachev was sentenced to 8 years, while two of his three accomplices were sentenced to 6.5 and 4 years respectively.

[30] "Aum Shinrikyo Changed Its Name," *Vesti* news program, Rossiaya Channel, 16 April 2004.

[31] "White Brotherhood Zombifies Urals," *Rossiiskaya Gazeta*.

which stated its messianic ambitions in July 1990, quickly expanded into Russia, with branches operating in as many as forty-five Russian cities as of 1993. Members of this sect believed that Krivonogov's then wife Maria Tsvigun is simultaneously the mother, wife, and re-incarnation of Jesus Christ, and referred to her as "Mary David Christ." As for Krivonogov, he positioned himself as a re-incarnation of John the Baptist. The sect's doctrine said Tsvigun will at one point ascend to Heaven, with Judgment Day soon to follow. According to their teachings, only 144,000 faithful followers will survive the Judgment Day, and sermons delivered by its leaders contained calls to kill those who oppose the White Brotherhood. The sect's newspaper at one point called on the followers to prepare "as 12,000 souls should perish as sacrifice," and told them that it is "their duty to wash off the sins of unfortunate mankind with your blood."[32]

The cult's members planned a mass suicide on 24 November 1993 in the Ukrainian capital of Kiev. The suicide was to have coincided with the "assumption" of Tsvigun, but Ukrainian police cracked down on the sect two weeks earlier, after Tsvigun and her supporters tried to seize the Sophia Orthodox cathedral in Kiev. This helped to avert the mass suicide, but it should also not cast doubt on the followers' preparedness to sacrifice themselves. The fact that one sect member committed suicide after being expelled from the sect demonstrates how attached and subservient followers of the White Brotherhood are.[33]

More than 600 sect members, including Tsvigun, were detained in Ukraine in late 1993. To protest the arrests, more than 150 cult members went on a hunger strike. Tsvigun was tried and convicted in 1994, along with several other leaders of the sect, including Krivonogov. The sect was widely believed to have fizzled out in the wake of the convictions of its leaders and a ban slapped on the White Brotherhood by Ukrainian authorities.

However, these beliefs turned out to be groundless, as the sect continued to operate, largely underground. The sect continued to maintain a low profile when Tsvigun was released in August 1997 and Krivonogov walked free in 2000, but followers of Krivonogov have re-emerged in several Russian regions.[34] The sect has managed to

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] *New Religious Organizations of Destructive and Occult Character in Russia*, Second Edition (Belgorod: Missionary Department of the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1997).

[34] Followers of the sect re-emerged in the Vladimir region in August 2000. "Emissaries of the White Brotherhood Appear in the Vladimir region," *Mayak* radio station, 8 August 2000.

In a more recent development, two young women surfaced in the central Russian city of Oryol in May 2003 to praise Maria Tsvigun, whom sect members refer to as "Mary David Christ," and solicit donations. One of the women said there were only a few members of her organization in Oryol, but their number is growing. "Oryol: A Totalitarian Sect Re-emerges in the City," *Regnum* news agency, 12 May 2003.

survive despite the jailing of its leaders as—probably in accordance with a contingency plan—it became decentralized to operate in small cells, whose members in many cases practiced the techniques of underground activities and brainwashing new adepts. Members of the sect would live in rented flats with an average of fifteen to twenty people in each, and they would regularly change apartments. Activists were advised to spend not more than three days in one city, a practice that made the apprehension of the leaders and an examination of their activities difficult.

Such a structure and operational mode has allowed the White Brotherhood to retain its potential, which could be easily expanded the way a peace-time army regiment can be quickly brought up to full strength in case of war. The sect maintains a Web site that can be used to alert members in coded messages. Both Russian and Ukrainian law enforcement agents have expressed concern that there is a "high probability" that members of this sect have the capability to engage in anti-public and terrorist acts.[35]

Some totalitarian sects, such as the "New Generation Church," use systemic violence to subordinate their members. Leaders of this sect beat their followers, including children, killing at least one in the Siberian town of Aldan.[36] The fact that sects such as Aum and White Brotherhood have managed to recruit thousands of followers and operate across Russia has proved that messianic cults and groups—including Al Qaeda cells, whose leaders strive for catastrophic terrorism—can operate without the awareness of Russian law enforcement agencies.

The White Brotherhood leadership is known to have recruited members in Russia's depressed defense industry towns, and we can only guess what suicidal missions their leaders may assign to their followers if they are cornered in the current crackdown on "non-traditional" religious groups, which has outlawed even Jehovah's Witnesses in Moscow.[37] One sect, named "Mother of God Center," even had officers of the elite

---

The sect's followers were also seen in 2003 singing the praises of the White Brotherhood in suburban trains that shuttle between the Ural city of Yekaterinburg and neighboring towns. The local followers applied for registration as a religious organization in the Sverdlovsk region, but their application was rejected, probably in accordance with the Yeltsin-era law on religion. "Yekaterinburg: Followers of the White Brotherhood Re-appear in the Urals," *Novyi Region* news agency, 18 June 2003.

[35] *New Religious Organizations of Destructive and Occult Character in Russia*, Second Edition (Belgorod: Missionary Department of the Moscow Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1997).

[36] Alexander Dvorkin, *Totalitarnye Sekty. Sektovedenie* (Nizhni Novogrod, Russia, 2003).

[37] In June of 2004, the Moscow City Court prohibited Jehovah's Witnesses from engaging in religious activity under a provision that allows courts to ban religious groups considered to incite hatred or intolerant behavior. "City Court Backs Ban of Jehovah's Witnesses," *Associated Press*, 17 June 2004.

Special Forces Division, which is stationed in the Moscow region, serving as their "priests" to "baptize" their soldiers. This Russian-based sect also maintains a Praetorian Guard manned with physically fit men known as the "Legion of the Mother of God."[38]

Just as police and secret services in Japan failed to identify what Aum's real intentions were until the 1995 subway attack, it may prove difficult for Russian law enforcement and security agencies to discern whether the White Brotherhood and other messianic cults harbor similar messianic terrorism ambitions until they actually strike. It may also prove extremely difficult to locate and neutralize all branches of a messianic terrorist organization even after it strikes, as is the case with Al Qaeda cells in North America.[39]

Of course, one can accept the rather common notion that leaders of some such sects are rational and are positioning themselves as messiahs in order to achieve power through their followers. But it could just as easily be the case that they, like Asahara, truly believe in what they preach, and may one day order their followers to begin the Judgment Day, or their faithful themselves can decide it is time for such a day and try to stage an act of catastrophic terrorism. Whether it is the day Asahara is hanged or a leader of another sect is apprehended, we may learn only after a sect—some of which are known to have had nuclear weapons experts and special forces commandos among their members—stages such an attack, unless authorities act to both disrupt such cults and deny them the capabilities to carry out a catastrophic attack.

While they do not appear to be currently harboring any intentions to stage acts of catastrophic terrorism, activists from Russia's extremist youth organizations have showed the capability to slip through gaps in security arrangements to embarrass Russia's law enforcement community by their public attacks on top officials and infiltration into public buildings. The National Bolshevik Party, led by the writer Eduard Limonov, has excelled in carrying out symbolic assaults on government officials and facilities, ranging from throwing food at the Prime Minister Kasyanov in December 2003, to capturing the premises of the Health Ministry in Moscow in August 2004. In Russia, the NBP staged acts of protest against liberal economic reforms and the deconstruction of the welfare state. The party has also carried out several symbolic attacks in CIS countries, demanding more rights for the ethnic Russians living there. Police and

---

The first major step to curb "non-traditional" religious groups was made in 1997 when then President Boris Yeltsin signed into law a controversial bill on religion that critics said placed strict restrictions on freedom of worship in Russia. The law granted special status to Russia's conservative Orthodox Church. It also said faiths not registered with the state since 1982, when the Communist regime was in control, must register annually for fifteen years before they can proselytize, publish, or invite missionaries to Russia without restrictions. Dmitry Zaks, "Final Religion Bill Signed by Yeltsin," *The Moscow Times,* 27 September 1997.

[38] Dvorkin, *Totalitarnye Sekty. Sektovedenie*.

[39] Simon Saradzhyan, "Russia: Grasping Reality of Nuclear Terror," paper delivered at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard University, March 2003.

security officials have responded extremely harshly to these actions, stimulating the sense of victimization and glorification of the NBP activists.[40]

Using such tactics against the NBP, involving an excessively brutal response to symbolic protest, clearly helps the organization to accumulate a pool of young operatives who have no fear of potentially violent confrontation with the state. As NBP activists see no effect from their actions other than publicity and repression, some of them may start to wonder whether more serious attacks will have the desired impact on authorities and the public.

A more disturbing development is that hatred toward the government itself—which is understandably represented by its most powerful institution, the Federal Security Service (FSB)—has already led to several actual terrorist attacks against the agency by young leftist radicals. Although nobody died in these and other bombings of symbolic installations, several leftist extremists have been convicted over the past several years to prison terms as long as nine years.[41] The most notorious attack, against the FSB building in Moscow in April of 1999, was led by four female members of the Russian Communist Labor party. The party perceives itself as revolutionary, and blames the parliamentary Communist Party of the Russian Federation for cooperation with authorities.[42]

None of the above-mentioned political groups have apocalyptic scenarios in their doctrines. However, the set of skills and expectations acquired by some of their adepts may gradually transform them into violent political entrepreneurs whose experience and knowledge may be used by those masterminding massive terrorist attacks. This probability will increase as the government continues to crack down on these largely benign radicals, and their frustration with the futility of their own relatively nonviolent tactics grows.

Such scenarios have already played out in several capitalist societies, where ultra-leftist organizations could not earn any public attention to their causes without deciding to resort to terrorism. The examples include the Red Brigades in Italy, the Red Army Faction in Germany, Shining Path in Peru, and the Japanese Red Army.

Fortunately, neither of the groups of ideologically-driven extremists operating in North Caucasus have so far managed to acquire weapons of mass destruction while, apart from Aum followers, no Russian sectants or political radicals have sought such weapons. *While realizing that an attack with nuclear, biological, or chemical materials may fail to produce heavy casualties, however, the ideologically-driven extremists*

---

[40] See the party's website www.nbp-info.ru for examples of glorification of the party's activists and the chronicle of the government crackdowns on the party.

[41] Nabi Abdullaev, "4 Women Sentenced in FSB Bombing," *The Moscow Times*, 15 May 2003.

[42] Another member of this organization, Alexander Biryukov, was convicted in 2001 for another FSB bombing in 1998. A member of Russian Communist Youth Union of Bolsheviks, Andrei Sokolov, was convicted in 2001 for bombing the monument to the family of the Russian tsars in Moscow in 1997. The bombings and other acts of protest led the FSB to announce the existence in 1999 of the so-called New Revolutionary Alternative, an underground leftist umbrella organization that stood behind the attacks.

may start conceiving an attack on a conventional facility, which could lead to catastrophic consequences. Some conventional industrial facilities, for example, if attacked or sabotaged skillfully, could explode and cause widespread damage and a high number of casualties. Facilities such as fertilizer plants and industrial refrigeration warehouses could under certain conditions be turned into "weapons of mass destruction," according to a book on urban terrorism published in Russia.[43]

Corrupt and Ideologically-Driven Law Enforcement Agents as Force Multipliers for Extremists

Corruption and outright recruitment of law enforcement officers by extremists in the Northern Caucasus has emerged as a major security threat, as the investigations of almost every new terrorist attack unearth cases of corrupt or ideologically-driven police officers who have assisted the attackers. The latest in the deadly string of attacks was organized by an Ingush policeman who had switched sides after disappearing in Ingushetia six years ago, according to investigators from Prosecutor General's Office.

Officer Ali Tazieyv was serving in the Ingush police's guard department when he was kidnapped by Chechen gunmen in the fall of 1998. Tazieyv was thought to have died in captivity, and was even declared officially dead by an Ingushetian court only to resurface as a leader of the horrendous hostage-taking attack on the southern Russian city of Beslan, investigators told *Russian press*. Tazieyv had used a fake passport, which identified him as "Magomed Yevloyev," an alias used by Magas in his radio communications. Tazieyv led a group of Ingush and Chechen gunmen into the Ingush city of Nazran in June of 2004 to stage simultaneous attacks on a number of government buildings, military barracks, and an arsenal.

After these raids, four local policemen, including Lt. Magomed Aspiev, commander of a platoon of the Ingush OMON police commando force, and his deputy Alikhan Dolgiev were arrested on suspicion of assisting the attackers. Upon his arrest, Aspiev testified that Dolgiev had been recruiting policemen upon the orders of extremist commanders. A subsequent search in Dolgiev's house netted not only a cache of arms, but also brochures and books preaching extremist Wahabbism, an indication that this policeman might have been fighting for an idea rather than money.

More disturbingly, a senior detective in the Ingush police's internal affairs department reportedly used his ID to sneak notorious Chechen warlord Basayev in and out of Ingushetia in advance of the attack. In 2003–04, another police officer, Bashir Pliev, drove Basayev to Ingushetia in his own car, and also tipped him off to upcoming police raids and helped to deliver weapons.[44] Perhaps the highest-ranking of the alleged turncoats is the former interior minister of Ingushetia, Daud Korigov. Korigov, who served as the republic's interior minister from 1997–98 and held the rank of police colonel,

[43] *Terrorism in the Metropolis: Assessing Threats and Protecting Critical Infrastructure* (Moscow: PIR Center, 2003.

[44] Irina Khalip, "Provodnik Basayeva: Im Okazalsya Sotrudnik Otdela Sobstevennoi Bezopasnosti MVD Ingushetii," *Novazya Gazeta*, 18 August 2004.

gave rebels the use of a house he owned in the Chechen capital, Grozny, and was even seen there among the militants' captives, according to Vyacheslav Izmailov, a former army major who has worked on commissions to resolve kidnappings in Chechnya.[45]

There have also been cases in which Chechen extremists either changed their identity or surrendered to join pro-Moscow police forces in order to feed information to their accomplices, or even to participate in attacks staged by the extremists. Policemen have been repeatedly caught trying to sell arms to extremists, while cases of policemen either letting vehicles pass without inspection or issuing fake passports or residence registrations in exchange for bribes are reported almost monthly. Most recently, two policemen were arrested in Chechnya for not only selling arms to extremists, but also using their authority to ship these arms for them and give sanctuary to warlords.

It is this corruption that has in part prevented Russian troops, security services, and police from catching the most notorious of the Chechen warlords. For instance, several policemen were arrested for helping probably Russia's most wanted man, the warlord Shamil Basayev, to slip in and out of the Northern Caucasian republic of Kabardino-Balkaria last year. Basayev—who investigators believe to have ordered both the Beslan hostage-taking and the June raid in Ingushetia—lived for one month in a private house in the republic's town of Baksan.

And, while cases of conversion of policemen to extremist Islam on religious or other grounds (such as strong clan ties) have been mostly limited to the Northern Caucasus, corruption of law enforcement and other agencies is a region-wide phenomenon that allows terror groups to strike Russian cities hundreds miles away from their bases. A Kislovodsk court sentenced a local traffic police officer, Stanislav Lyubichev, to four years in prison for letting a shipment of explosives—a truckload of six metric tons of hexogen—drive by without checking it in 1999. These explosives were later allegedly used to blow up apartment buildings in Moscow in September of 1999, attacks that killed hundreds of people. More recently, a Moscow policeman was sentenced in February 2004 to seven years for registering Luiza Bakueva in Moscow in 2002 in exchange for a bribe. Bakueva went on to participate in the hostage-taking at the Dubrovka Theater (the "Nord/Ost" incident) in Moscow in October 2002.

Even more alarming is evidence that extremists could have tried to recruit an insider at a nuclear power plant which, if sabotaged, could wreak havoc of catastrophic proportions. In October 2002, the FSB detained a serviceman from a special unit that was guarding the Kalininskaya nuclear power plant in the Tver region. The FSB found in the officer a map of the plant with all "secret facilities" identified on it, as well as a list of coded phone numbers, the Regnum news agency reported. FSB agents managed to decode the phone numbers only to find out that they belonged to "natives of Chechnya." The agency said that the arrest of the captain, whose identity has not been released, coincided with the storming of the Dubrovka Theater in Moscow on 26 October 2002.

[45] Burt Herman, "Former cop allegedly among Russia school attack masterminds, one of many turncoats in law enforcement," *Associated Press*, 16 September 2004.

As demonstrated above, cases of policemen either switching sides or turning a blind eye after having been bribed by terrorists prove that corruption or outright conversion of law enforcement agents has become a routine practice for the networks of ideologically-driven extremists in the Northern Caucasus and other groups. Should these networks try to resort to catastrophic terrorism, their capability to stage acts will be multiplied by the presence of corrupted or converted law-enforcers in their ranks or assistance from them.

Civil Liberties vs. Security in the War on Terror

The reactions of top Russian officials and lawmakers after the Beslan terrorist attack in September 2004 once again confirmed Russia's choice of the security model that regards terrorism primarily as an assault against the state system, rather than against the rights of the state's citizens. Consequently, the scope of the anti-terrorist response is limited to the efforts of the state security services, with public oversight virtually being ruled out.

In reality, major terrorist attacks—like the hostage-taking raids in Moscow (2002) and Beslan (2004)—have prompted Russian lawmakers and senior executives to take legal and administrative initiatives that broadened the powers of the security services. These measures have increased the security services' funding, but not their accountability, particularly in terms of civil liberties. It is difficult to assess the incremental impact of this approach on interdicting terrorist attacks. What is increasingly clear, however, is that the efforts of Russia's security apparatus do not match the growing capabilities of the terrorists, and that the lack of public oversight and the diminishment of civil liberties results in decreasing chances for the effective overhaul of the security sector.

The futility of this approach is best demonstrated by the situation in Chechnya, which was explicitly declared to be the primary zone of the state's anti-terrorist operation, where all anti-terrorist measures are applied in full force, to an extent that the local population is virtually deprived of all basic civil liberties. In the meantime, in the face of these measures by the Russian state, Chechnya has become a region where terrorist actors can plan and prepare terrorist attacks almost unobstructed.

The Federal Law on Fighting Terrorism (adopted on 25 July 1998, and amended and supplemented on 7 August 2000 and 21 November 2002) is the main legal pillar of the Russian government's anti-terrorist effort. Its provisions—which are not limited by law in either time nor scope—allow officials in charge of the counter-terrorist operation to suspend indefinitely the rights to property and freedom of movement, as well as media freedom in the zone of the operation, the borders of which are defined exclusively by the head of the operation's headquarters, who is appointed by the government. The law provides no time limits for the imposition of this status.

The real-life application of this law in Chechnya has degenerated into a pattern of brutalizing the local population and expanding the support base for the terrorists. The lack of oversight and the virtual impunity with which they operate has allowed security officials to conduct operations in Chechnya that completely neglect due process, in-

cluding abducting, torturing, and summarily executing local civilians. The notion of impunity has been striking roots in the law enforcement community outside Chechnya as well, with reports of abductions and brutal torture of suspects mounting increasingly from Ingushetia, Dagestan, and to a lesser degree, from other regions.

An assault on the freedom of the media is another major aspect of the trade-off between civil liberties and security that has not had a positive effect on the anti-terrorist effort. A month after the Chechen rebels' raid on the Moscow theater, the Russian Duma, dominated by factions submissive to the Kremlin, which was not satisfied with the media coverage of the hostage drama, introduced amendments to the 1991 Law on Media and the Law on Fighting Terrorism, which would ban publicizing information "obstructing" the conduct of the anti-terrorist operation and opinions that were construed as obstructing the operation or vindicating the attack. These broad definitions could be applied to almost all independent commentary, and would allow officials to crack down on virtually any media organization involved in the coverage of terrorism. Vladimir Putin, under considerable pressure from the Russian media community, rejected the law, which had been overwhelmingly ratified by the State Duma in November of 2002. The television media community then voluntarily adopted a charter that included almost all the demands of the legislators.

In the case of the Beslan crisis, the adherence to this charter—which required that journalists broadcast only official information—has led to a deception of public in underestimating the number of hostages by a factor of three and more while overestimating the degree of preparedness on the part of crisis response units. Lack of preparedness was one of the leading factors that led to the extraordinary number of casualties in the incident, which was a record high for a terrorist attack in Russia. We believe that more critical and independent coverage—without reaching an extent that could obstruct the response effort—would prompt more responsible and timely actions from the officials responsible.

In the aftermath of the crisis, prominent legislators vowed new changes to the anti-terrorist law that would further impinge upon the people's freedom of movement and once again increase funding for the security sector. These laws highlight a trend which, if continued, would move Russia beyond the choice between the criminal justice model of fighting terrorism, which is commonly found among liberal democracies in the European Union, and the national security model, which has been adopted by the United States in the wake of the September 11 attacks. Arguably, Russia cannot return to a totalitarian state, which would of course be better armed to combat terrorism than a semi-democratic regime, However, the current trends to expand the security sector's powers can land Russia in a deadlock some halfway between democracy and totalitarianism which is the worst of all options for a nation trying to battle terror, according to a recently-published study of correlation between state model and efficiency in fighting terror.[46]

---

[46] Alberto Abadie, *Poverty, Political Freedom, and the Roots of Terrorism*, RWP04-043 (JFK School of Government, Harvard University, October 2004), available at http://ksgnotes1.harvard.edu/research/wpaper.nsf/rwp/RWP04-043/$File/rwp_04_043_Abadie.pdf.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As demonstrated in this essay, the threat of catastrophic terrorism in Russia is becoming increasingly real and imminent. It is a direct function of the existence of violent political actors and of the expansion of their organizational and operational capacities coupled with increasing availability of the means for catastrophic terrorist attacks (ranging from WMD and nuclear, biological, and chemical arsenals to potentially dangerous industrial facilities).

We argue that the Russian authorities have insufficient resources at their disposal to harden all of the potential targets, such as research reactors in cities and key industrial facilities. If the authorities do boost security at these facilities, given the creativity that terrorist groups have displayed, the latter would still be able to identify and select targets in the sprawling urban infrastructure that, if skillfully sabotaged, could cause massive casualties and damage.

We believe that a reorientation of security policy toward decreasing the number of potential terrorist actors and reducing their capabilities remains the only proactive approach that promises to decrease the threat of a catastrophic terrorist attack. This effort will require not only reforming the country's security apparatus, but also establishing effective public oversight over its work and boosting intelligence data exchange and other forms of cooperation between Russian law enforcement agents and their foreign counterparts.

Therefore, we recommend that the president establish a non-partisan commission that would bring together security, law enforcement, and public administration officials and independent experts to evaluate Russia's intelligence and law enforcement community. The panel needs to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of these agencies' structure, budgets, the skills of their leaders and other personnel, their interaction with the community, and their overall performance to determine whether these agencies are adequately financed and manned, empowered, fine-tuned, and focused on the interdiction of terrorism. The panel should also look into other countries' experiences in fighting terrorism and seek out best practices. The commission should look closely at both the EU states' criminal justice model of fighting terrorism and the United States' national security model to discern what advantages these models offer, with practical use in mind.

The panel should also share the non-classified core of its findings with the expert and academic community to formulate a full range of policy options and recommendations from which the leadership of the country can choose, be it such a daring option as a complete overhaul of the intelligence community, as recommended by the U.S. Senate's 9/11 Commission, or larger budgets for human intelligence. The president also needs to enhance civilian oversight of the law enforcement and security community to ensure they remain focused on implementing the enhanced anti-terrorist policies.

Beyond immediate and directly anti-terror related measures, we recommend a change in Russia's heavy-handed policy in the Northern Caucasus, to end abuses of the civilian population by police and troops, prevent ethnic strife, and defuse the political and economic frustrations that feed terrorism. The practice of forming entire elite

commando units of the Russian armed forces with natives that is currently used in Chechnya should be applied to the rest of the Northern Caucasus, which President Putin has rightfully described as both a "victim and springboard" of terrorism. It is critical, however, to ensure that these units observe Russian laws and human rights. Federal authorities also need to tame corruption among officials of law enforcement and other agencies in the region and elsewhere, in order to limit terrorist groups' capabilities and to prevent them from easily gaining access to both materials and targets.

Conditions for Securitization of International Terrorism in Central Asia

Irina Chernykh and Rustam Burnashev *

One trend that has gained particular prominence in current discourse on international relations is the increasingly active role of non-state actors. It has been asserted that these actors' spheres of operation are gradually shifting from the domestic and regional to the global level. Their actions are becoming sufficiently large in scope to transform the dynamics within a region and to change relations among regions and great powers, as well as relations among the great powers themselves. Thus, much current debate is directed at the role of non-state actors in international relations. After the events of September 11, 2001, special attention has been given in this discourse to one type of non-state actor in particular: international terrorism.[1]

A crucial step in the study of international terrorism is clarifying the terms in which it is formulated and defined in current debate within the field of international relations. From our vantage point, any analysis of these conditions must focus primarily on the regional level, which avoids making the problem overly universal and allows us to distinguish between the specific features of various regional contexts. In this article, we will analyze the conditions that have shaped a specific regional discourse, giving particular attention to international terrorism and using Central Asia as an example. We have chosen this region for two reasons. First, having been essentially on the periphery of much of present-day international relations, Central Asia has been drawn directly into the fight against international terrorism because of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. A second reason is that the actions of Central Asian countries are a demonstration of securitization in formulating approaches to international counterterrorism.[2]

---

* This article was written with support from the CARI HESP OSI Program (Budapest). Irina Chernykh and Rustam Burnashev are professors at the Kazakhstan-German University. Translated from the Russian by Language Services Branch, George C. Marshall Center.

1 Of course, the assertion that the starting point for "international" terrorism was September 11, 2001 is not fully correct. For example, "the first item on the agenda of the first meeting of the National Security Council under President Reagan was international terrorism.… Secretary of State Alexander Haig announced … that 'international terrorism will take the place of human rights' as the number one priority of the Reagan administration. A decade later George Bush … proclaimed in his Inaugural Address that terrorism and drugs would be the two primary targets of his administration." James Der Derian, *Antidiplomacy: Spies, Terror, Speed, and War* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1992), 73.

2 Buzan and Wæver define *securitization* as "the discursive process through which an intersubjective understanding is constructed within a political community to treat something as an existential threat to a valued referent object, and to enable a call for urgent and exceptional measures to deal with the threat." Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 491.

Of course, the regional approach does not fit all cases, and would be insufficient to analyze the position of the United States, for example, which is a world power. This approach is also limited to the subject at hand – non-state actors in international relations. By definition, such actors cannot be characterized in territorial terms, and in the modern system of international relations they have the opportunity to be active and circumvent the limitations imposed by national borders; they may also join forces, forming networks that can affect national, regional, and even global security dynamics. For example, although the objectives and motives of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (Islamic Movement of Turkistan) and the Uighur separatists in China are expressly domestic in nature, these *movements* are transnational and cannot be understood without reference both to regional security structures and to their interaction at the inter-regional and global levels. Therefore, the analytical underpinning of this article is regional security complex theory, which may be viewed as a matrix for regional studies and provides the opportunity to link the study of the situation within countries in the complex under investigation to relations among states and other international relations actors in this range, as well as to the types of interaction between this complex and neighboring ones and with the world powers.[3] The analysis will be structured according to these four levels. The key concepts in this theory are *securitization* and the *regional security complex*.[4] The concepts of *mini-complex,*[5] *unstructured security region,*[6] and *insulator*[7] are also important for this study.

A number of authors have applied regional security complex theory to the study of security dynamics in Central Asia. However, in most cases Central Asia is viewed either as an independent regional security complex, or as an integral part (sub-complex)

---

[3] For more on regional security complex theory, see: Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Could War Era*, 2nd ed. (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991); Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998); and Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers.*

[4] "*Regional security complex* – a set of units whose major processes of securitization, desecuritization, or both are so interlinked that their security problems cannot reasonably be analysed or resolved apart from one another." Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, 491; see also Buzan, et al., *Security*, 204.

[5] "*Mini-complex* – a formation with the characteristics of a security complex, but small in scale and usually composed at least in part of substate actors." Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, 490.

[6] "*Unstructured security region* – where local states are so weak that their power does not project much, if at all, beyond their own boundaries, and so generate insufficient security interdependence to form the essential structures of a regional security complex." Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, 492.

[7] "*Insulator* – a state or mini-complex standing *between* regional security complexes and defining a location where larger regional security dynamics stand back to back." Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, 490.

of the regional security complex that has Russia at its core.[8] It seems to us that this fails to fully convey the specific nature of the security environment in and around Central Asia, since Central Asia is more likely an *unstructured security region* and a *mini-complex* that serves as an insulator between East Asian, South Asian, and Middle Eastern regional security complexes and the security complex that Russia is attempting to build around itself. This approach explains the conditions for securitizing the struggle against international terrorism in Central Asia.

The research technique used in this work is Michel Foucault's "archeological" approach, in a form reconstructed by Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow.[9] According to this methodology, research should begin with a diagnosis of a given problem. Having identified the problem, the analyst considers the conditions (background practices) that made it possible to formulate and articulate the problem in discourse. The set of practices that create the background of a given discourse determine its four main characteristics:

1. What kind of phenomena may become the object of the discourse;
2. Who may assume the position of speaking subject;
3. What kinds of concepts may be acceptable in this discourse;
4. What theories may be pondered and formulated in the discourse.[10]

---

[8] For the former approach, see Bruno Coppieters, "The Partnership for Peace with Central Asia," in *Ethnic and Regional Conflicts in Eurasia,* vol. 3: *International Experience of Resolving Ethnic Conflicts*, ed. Bruno Coppieters, Eric Remacle, and Aleksei Zverev (Moscow, Ves' mir, 1997); Hooman Peimani, *Regional Security and the Future of Central Asia* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998); Lena Jonson and Roy Allison, "Central Asian Security: Internal and External Dynamics," in *Central Asian Security: The New International Context*, ed. Lena Jonson and Roy Allison (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press/ London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2001); and Rustam Burnashev, "Regional Security in Central Asia: Military Aspects," in *Central Asia: A Gathering Storm?*, ed. Boris Rumer (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 2002. For the approach that views Central Asia as being part of a Russocentric regional security complex, see Philip G. Roeder, "From Hierarchy to Hegemony: The Post-Soviet Security Complex," in *Regional Orders: Building Security in a New World*, ed. David A. Lake and Patrick M. Morgan (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press); and Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*.

[9] Michel Foucault outlined this approach in a series of landmark works that include: *Folie et deraison. Histoire de la foile a l'age classiqu* (Paris: Plon, 1961); *Naissance de la clinique* (Paris: P.U.F., 1963); *Les mots et les choses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966); and, most notably, *L'archeologie du savoir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969). The refinement of the technique that we are using draws on Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); see also Oleg Kharkhordin, "Foucault and the Study of Background Practices," in *Michel Foucault and Russia*, ed. Oleg Kharkhordin (Saint Petersburg: European University at Saint Petersburg/Moscow: Summer Garden, 2001), 51, 52.

[10] Kharkhordin, "Foucault and the Study of Background Practices," 52.

Ole Wæver uses a similar method of analysis to study integration structures in Europe.[11] Due to this article's limited scope, it will mainly present our findings based on this methodology rather than the procedure of the analysis itself.

Domestic Level

An understanding of the situation within the countries of a regional security complex is built primarily by dividing the countries into two groups: "powerful" and "weak." The spectrum of weak and powerful nations is determined by:[12]

- The degree of social and political unity between civil society and government institutions;
- The degree to which the state corresponds to the nation;
- The degree of statehood possessed by the country and the degree of stability in terms of internal order.

The type of state dominant in the region has tremendous influence on the dynamics of regional stability.

Central Asian states are weak, although not to an equal degree. One may generalize by saying that, to a varying extent, states in the region are typified by a low level of social and political cohesion and a narrow social base of support for existing political regimes (particularly among the "middle" class). This is less true for Kazakhstan, where the vast majority of the population is politically apathetic. Identification along ethnic lines is weak here, and is forced to compete with other forms of self-identity. Despite a well-developed state repressive machine (particularly in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan), Central Asian countries are all experiencing one drawback of statehood: their governmental and national bodies are self-sufficient, and serve more as forums in which sub-state actors compete among themselves to ensure their own security and/or to exert influence over the country.

The civil war in Tajikistan is the most revealing window to understand security dynamics in the states of Central Asia. This war graphically illustrated how a country's weakness may result in the failure of statehood, and ultimately in national disintegration. Competition between different forms of identity politics (religious, ethnic, subethnic, and clan-based) and their corresponding elites' struggle for power played an enormous role in sparking the civil war. The conflict was managed by balancing the interests of the opposing elites, with mediation by and under the influence of external

[11] Ole Wæver, "Identity, Communities and Foreign Policy: Discourse Analysis as Foreign Policy Theory," in *European Integration and National Identity: The Challenge of the Nordic States*, ed. Lene Hansen and Ole Wæver (London: Routledge, 2002); and Wæver, *European Integration and Security: Analysing French and German Discourses on State, Nation and Europe*, 2003, available at: www/polsci.ku.dk/courses/gamle_fag/Efteraar2002/Begreb_om_sikkerhed/European integration and security Feb 2003.doc.

[12] Buzan, *People. States, and Fear*, 96–107.

forces—including Russia, Iran, and Uzbekistan—and was shaped by events in Afghanistan, particularly the success of the Taliban movement in the autumn of 1996.

The weakness of one Central Asian country can be securitized not only by the elites of that country, but by those of neighboring countries as well (although the experience of the civil war in Tajikistan demonstrated a trend toward localizing combat activities within a single country, despite the fact that elements of irredentism and separatism were present in that conflict). For instance, the failure to effect economic and political reform in Uzbekistan was justified by the example of the war in Tajikistan, which was juxtaposed to the "calm and order" in Uzbekistan. Kazakh analysts regard the possibility of political destabilization in Uzbekistan as a major threat to their country.

All other things being equal, weak states and their ruling elites are more inclined toward securitization. For example, the weakness of Central Asian states leads to securitization when dealing with such issues as migration, the drug trade, religious extremism, and international terrorism.[13] This tendency toward securitization is largely driven by the fact that, when speaking about the security and stability of their country, the ruling elites equate themselves with the nation. The governments of Central Asian states are convinced that security and stability are to be prized above all other values. This is most vividly manifested in Uzbekistan, where any decision on economic and political reforms is viewed through the lens of whether or not they will help to maintain "order" in the country and keep the ruling elite in power. The argument is built on the premise that endowing the citizens with political rights would be too risky in light of the complexity of the external security situation. In this sense, securitizing "Islamic fundamentalism" and "international terrorism" plays into the hands of the ruling elites of Central Asian countries. The ruling regimes attempt to portray any manifestations of extremism in Central Asian countries as being international in nature.

The Regional Level

The regional level is defined by the degree to which countries making up the regional complex securitize one another's actions and by the degree to which one country perceives another to be a threat to its security. Emerging securitization relationships determine the *essential structure* of a regional security complex: the internal structure (polarity, which describes the distribution of power among the units, and social construction, which includes the patterns of amity and enmity among the units) and the external boundaries of the regional security complex.[14] In analyzing the security situation in Central Asia, it is impossible to clearly identify either the internal structure or the external boundaries of the regional security complex. Central Asia is considered to include Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan, but this is

[13] This is particularly typical of the works of political leaders in the Central Asian states, e.g. Nursultan Nazarbaev, *The Critical Decade* (Almaty: Atamura, 2003); or Islam Karimov, *Uzbekistan on the Threshold of the XXI Century: Security Threats, Conditions and Guarantees of Progress* (Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 1997).

[14] Buzan and Wæver, *Regions and Powers*, 53.

more a political convention than a reflection of any structural links that exist between these five countries and their neighbors.[15]

Internal Structures

By definition, in a regional security complex internal forms of interaction should be more important to the complex and its entities than external ones. It is typical for Central Asian countries to have looser ties among themselves than they have in their relationships with neighboring countries. Countries of the Central Asian mini-complex do not securitize one another, and accordingly do not ally against one another. The degree to which Central Asian countries' relations with Russia and China (for Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan) or Afghanistan (for Uzbekistan and Tajikistan) have been securitized was and is much greater. The stance of Turkmenistan, which is distancing itself from any processes in Central Asia, is very indicative of the weakness of interstate dynamics. Regional security initiatives, as a rule, remain unfulfilled (e.g., creation of a "Centrasbat"),[16] or are ineffective (e.g., the Central Asian Union).[17] Also obvious is the widely varying degree to which Central Asian countries securitize the same issues – for example, China or Afghanistan's influence on Central Asia, the opposition's role, or the activities of international organizations.

There is some similarity in the positions of Central Asian countries with respect to certain transnational and sub-state actors (particularly terrorist and religious groups) whose activities are perceived as being international in nature, and there is a tendency toward greater securitization of actions taken against these actors.[18] The dynamics of change in the content of treaties and agreements signed by Central Asian countries is quite revealing in this regard. While security arrangements adopted in Central Asia

[15] See Burnashev, "Regional Security in Central Asia," 139–41, for more detail on the impossibility of determining the internal structure and delineating the external boundaries of Central Asia as a region.

[16] The decision to establish the "Centrasbat" peacekeeping battalion was made in 1995. Centrasbat is a battalion consisting of 500 Uzbek, Kazakh, and Kyrgyz troops and tasked to carry out operations under the aegis of the UN. It was to be trained under NATO's Partnership for Peace program. However, this intent was not fully realized, and the Centrasbat disintegrated into national peacekeeping units. See Rustam Burnashev, "The Dynamics of NATO Presence in Central Asia: An Analysis Based on the Theory of Regional Security Complexes," in *The U.S. and Central Asia: The Realities and Future of Cooperation* (Almaty: Kazakh al Farabi Central University, 2004).

[17] The Central Asian Union was created in 1994 by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan. Tajikistan joined in 1998, and Russia in 2004. The Union's requirements were repeatedly violated by the institution of protectionist measures by member states. The name of the organization has changed.

[18] Officials in Central Asian states interpret any terrorist act as a manifestation of international terrorism. See, for example, the statement by the press secretary for Uzbekistan's foreign minister, Ilkhom Zakirov, on the terrorist acts in Tashkent and Bukhara committed on 28 and 29 March 2004 (RIA Novosti, 29 March 2004): "In this act one can see the continuation of events in Madrid and events taking place now in the south of Afghanistan."

from 1997–1998 (the Treaty of Eternal Friendship between Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan, and the Joint Statement by Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan on Measures to Establish a Regional Security System in Central Asia) were aimed at regulating interstate relations, documents signed in 1999 and later (for example, the 2000 Treaty between Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan on Joint Actions in the Fight Against Terrorism, Political and Religious Extremism, Transnational Organized Crime, and Other Threats to Stability and Security) focus on "new dimensions of international security," such as migration, demographic problems, trafficking in drugs and arms, transnational organized crime, and terrorism.[19]

Thus, since cooperation among Central Asian states is mainly focused not on relations within the mini-complex, but on addressing external challenges (perceived as threats), one can assert that patterns of amity and enmity among Central Asian countries have not yet taken shape. Relations that could be described as patterns of amity and enmity are not interstate in nature, but instead are being formed at the sub-state level: between ethnic groups, industrial and financial elites, and so forth. For this very reason one can agree with Lena Jonson and Roy Allison that the concepts of "amity" and "enmity" are overstated for the Central Asian context, and might be replaced by "friendship" and "suspicion."[20] For example, similar relations are manifested between sub-state actors connected to Uzbekistan and Tajikistan. Those relationships have deep historical roots and are expressed both in fairly aggressive rhetoric and mutual accusations, and in indirectly hostile actions (indirect support by some Uzbekistan elites and officials for the M. Khodabardiyev rebellion in Khudzhande in November 1998, and the Tajikistan government's support of units of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan in 1999 and 2000). However, these relations are unlikely to become interstate in nature.

External Borders

When defining "external borders," the following actors play a special role with respect to Central Asia:

- Russia, striving to form around itself a regional security complex that includes, among other entities, Central Asia (or individual countries from that mini-complex, primarily Kazakhstan).
- Afghanistan, which is an insulator between the East Asian and South Asian regional security complexes and Russia and Central Asia. Analysts and some political leaders are discussing the possibility of Central Asia (or individual countries in the complex, primarily Uzbekistan and Tajikistan) joining with Afghanistan to form a new regional entity.[21]

[19] A similar trend can be seen in the change in national security policy documents. Prior to 1999, the possibility of foreign aggression was securitized; now the focus is on such issues as migration, drugs, crime, and terrorism. See, for example, *Military Doctrine of the Republic of Kazakhstan* (2000) or the *Defense Doctrine of the Republic of Uzbekistan* (2000).

[20] Jonson and Allison, "Central Asian Security," 8.

[21] In December 2002, Afghanistan was invited to join the Central Asian Union as an observer.

- The Caucasus mini-complex/unstructured security region, which includes Azerbaijan, and which—along with some Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan), Russia, and Iran—forms the Caspian mini-complex. The Caspian mini-complex links Central Asia and the Caucasus, offering an alternative security unit.

The absence of internal structures and the weakness of interstate relations in Central Asia dictate the weakness of such regional entities as the Central Asian Union, as well as the absence of regional structures and security regimes.

The Inter-Regional Level

The inter-regional level of security is constituted of interactions between Central Asia and neighboring regional security complexes. At this level are the East Asian, South Asian, and Middle Eastern regional security complexes (including some regional powers belonging to those complexes); Turkey; and Afghanistan, which is regarded as an insulator.

China, Pakistan, Iran, and Turkey (and, to a lesser degree, Korea and Japan) account for the interaction, primarily on the national level, between the East Asian, South Asian, and Middle Eastern regional security complexes and Central Asia. All these regional security complexes and associated forces have their own internal dynamics, which are of more immediate importance to them than those of Central Asia. After the breakup of the Soviet Union and the "discovery" of Central Asia, it was expected that Central Asia would become the arena for a new "great game" involving a variety of inter-regional actors vying for influence. However, these actors displayed an unexpectedly low level of interest in Central Asia.

Afghanistan is of crucial importance in understanding the conditions under which international terrorism is securitized in Central Asia at the inter-regional level. The forms of security dynamics in Afghanistan and Central Asia are closely interrelated, and some countries in the mini-complex are strongly influenced by dynamics within Afghanistan. Moreover, most ties are determined by the weakness of Central Asian countries and the fragmentation of Afghanistan; these links are established through sub-state and transnational actors, such as criminal syndicates associated with drug trafficking, ethnic and sub-ethnic groups, guerrilla and gang-related groups, and religious movements.[22] The fragmentation of Afghanistan has allowed Central Asian governments to draw connections between the disintegrating state and the activities of terrorist and extremist groups, thereby lending those groups a more international flavor (e.g., the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan). It has been pointed out, for example, that

[22] See Ahmed Rashid, *Taliban: Islam, Oil and the New Great Game in Central Asia* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2000); Rashid, "Central Asian Elites, Suddenly, Shift Into Revolt," *Global Affairs Commentary: Foreign Policy in Focus* (2 May 2002); Rashid, *Jihad: The Rise of Militant Islam in Central Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); and Rashid, "Russia, China Warily Watch for American Intrusions in Central Asia," *Global Affairs Commentary: Foreign Policy in Focus* (3 May 2002).

it was on Afghan territory that the training camps for fighters in this movement were located. Central Asian countries securitized internal Afghan processes up until 2002, and this was the main reason for those countries to unite among themselves and with such powers as Russia and China. Such a level of interconnection between Central Asian countries and Afghanistan creates the possibility of the emergence of a new insulator zone including Central Asia and Afghanistan, especially if U.S. operations in Afghanistan weaken ties between Afghanistan and Pakistan.

The weakness of inter-regional ties is a driver for the weakness of international organizations as well, such as the Treaty on Collective Security of CIS Countries (1992) and the subsequent Collective Security Treaty Organization (2003), the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (2001), and others. At the same time, these organizations' format demonstrates Central Asia's lack of coherence since, on the one hand, not all Central Asian countries are members of those organizations, and on the other, these organizations include powers from outside the region (Russia, China).[23]

In this way, although the intensity of security dynamics in Central Asia is extremely low compared to the dynamics in surrounding regions (for example, there is much greater securitization of the Kazakhstan-China and Kazakhstan-Russia relationships than exists between Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan or Turkmenistan). Nonetheless, the level of interaction with neighboring regional security complexes is high not in absolute terms, but relative to the weakness of cooperation within the region.

The Global Level

The global level of security dynamics is defined by the interactions with and securitization of global powers, either superpowers (the United States) and/or great powers (China, Japan, Russia, and the EU). As opposed to the case of regional powers, the dynamics of global powers do not play out within a single region. Russia, China and the U.S. exert the greatest influence on Central Asia.

Russia's position is driven by how much it securitizes its desire to form a regional security complex (with Russia at its center) that includes, among others, the countries of Central Asia. Even though Russia is quite thoroughly integrated in the Central Asian security arena, especially in the sphere of military security, such a complex does not presently exist. On one hand, Russia is a weak state, and has no specific national strategy with respect to Central Asia. On the other hand, other external forces' involvement in Central Asia has proved to be less pronounced than was expected in the early 1990s, and has not been a factor prompting Russia to get involved in the mini-complex of the region.

Another factor affecting Russia's Central Asian policy is that Central Asia itself is not a single entity. Only some Central Asian countries—primarily Kazakhstan—can be included in the regional security complex being created around Russia. This is confirmed by the makeup of existing multilateral structures (for instance, the Collective Secu-

[23] At present, the members of the Collective Security Treaty Organization are Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, and Tajikistan. Members of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization are Kazakhstan, China, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

rity Treaty Organization or the Customs Union). In any case, Russia wishes to retain Central Asia as a stable buffer zone that functions as a natural *cordon sanitaire* against the proliferation of "new security threats," and to prevent Central Asia from becoming a source of such threats.

The processes of securitization and desecuritization in Russia are being accomplished by various sub-state actors that have varying degrees of influence on national policy. From this standpoint, its impact on the mini-complex creates a space for sub-state and transnational actors to operate whose ties are either along the lines of transnational organized crime (narcotics trafficking), or along financial and industrial lines (aluminum industry, aviation industry, oil and gas, cotton production). That Russia actively securitizes the issue of international terrorism—thus defining to a great extent Russia's ties to the Central Asian states—is of great importance in the context of this study. A major reason for the formation of the Collective Security Treaty Organization and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization was this commonality of approaches to securitizing international terrorism.

In contrast to Russia, *China* is a quite powerful state; however, for China, too, the domestic, regional, and global levels are more important that the dynamics linking it to Central Asia. In the Central Asian context, China acts in concert with Russia. On the global level, this cooperation is built on the fact that China acknowledges Russian leadership in Central Asia.[24] Thus far, China regards this as the best strategy to guarantee stability in the Central Asian mini-complex and thus to influence the Uighur rebels in Xinjiang.

That being said, China is gradually strengthening its position in Central Asia as the leading actor in the security and economic spheres. This trend is being formalized by the Shanghai Cooperation Organization,[25] demonstrating that Russia recognizes that it is unable to single-handedly determine Central Asia's role and place in the world.

The *United States* dynamic intersects with the security dynamic in Central Asia, primarily at the inter-regional level—through the East Asian and South Asian regional security complexes—as well as the global level, as defined by U.S. interaction with the great powers, Russia and China. It also intersects with such global problems as terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, organized crime, and drug trafficking.

---

[24] Stephen Blank, "The new Russo-Chinese 'Partnership' and Central Asia," *Central Asia and Caucasus Analyst* 16 (August 2000), available at: www.cacianalyst.org./Headline1.htm; and Dmitri Trenin, *The End of Eurasia* (Moscow: Carnegie Moscow Center, 2001), 130, 203.

[25] The activities of this entity, known since 1997 as the "Shanghai Five" were directed at resolving border issues between China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. After Uzbekistan joined in 2001 and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization was actually institutionalized, its sphere of activities expanded and now encompasses both economic and security issues, including the fight against terrorism, the drug trade, fundamentalism, and separatism (see the Shanghai Convention on the Fight Against Terrorism, Separatism and Extremism of 2001).

The military actions taken by the U.S. in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks and the formation of the anti-terrorism coalition led by the United States created special conditions for the emergence of a new debate on international security, in which the fight against international terrorism occupies a central position. Reference in the discourses of all nations to the threat of international terrorism and the fight against it has become legitimate in the international community.

Central Asia has been drawn directly into the fight against international terrorism through Operation Enduring Freedom and due to its proximity to Afghanistan. This has enabled the ruling elites of the Central Asian states to strengthen authoritarian regimes by securitizing international terrorism and making declarations about terrorist groups' activities within their borders. What is important to note is that the emphasis is being placed on the *international* nature of these groups, since this makes it possible to ignore the domestic causes of terrorism and the conditions in which they emerged. Thus, U.S. policy in Central Asia has brought about a change in security dynamics at the inter-regional and global levels, but it has not had a similar impact at the intrastate and interstate levels. U.S. actions are diminishing the possibility of bringing the inter-regional complex dynamic to bear at the level of the mini-complex, and yet remain insufficient to serve as an alternative source of domination; instead, they work to strengthen the states and power structures in Central Asia.[26]

Conclusion

Analysis of international terrorism issues according to regional security complex theory makes it possible to identify the following conditions that shape the main ways that problems of international terrorism are formulated and articulated in Central Asian discourse:

- The weakness of Central Asian states and the absence of the basic structures of a regional security complex create the space necessary for non-state actors to operate.
- The authoritarian nature of Central Asian regimes promotes the securitization of the fight against international terrorism in order to justify limiting political and economic freedoms, strengthening power structures, and maintaining existing regimes.
- The international community's acceptance of a discourse in which the central theme is the fight against international terrorism, and the nature of the international organizations currently arrayed around Central Asia, driven by the activities of the great powers, create conditions that encourage securitization of the fight against international terrorism.

[26] S. Frederick Starr, "The War Against Terrorism and U.S. Bilateral Relations with Central Asia," Testimony to the U.S. Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on Central Asia and the Southern Caucasus, 13 December 2001, available at: http://www.cacianalyst.org/Publications/Starr_Testimony.htm.

Speaking of the main characteristics of the discourse that is currently taking shape in Central Asia (in the context of this article), it may be noted that this discourse assumes international terrorism as its subject, while at the same time it inhibits the possibility of stating and defining the domestic causes of terrorist acts directed against existing political regimes. The extremist actions that manifest themselves periodically, driven by latent tensions in society, are interpreted by the ruling elites as acts of international terrorism. A discourse in which a central position is occupied by the fight against international terrorism also stands in the way of a clear determination of the issues of human rights and civil liberties.