

imum Standards for
ers, see <http://www.unhcr.org/refugees/mentprisoners.htm>
ent (2012) Annual
International see
annual-report/2012

biological origin (ABOs)
warfare
Homeland Security
terrorism
Terrorism Accord
terrorism
Laden
terrorism
terrorism
terrorism
terrorism
terrorism of mass destruction

- Defining Terrorism
- The Goals of Terrorism
- The Prevalence of Terrorism
- Foreign Terrorist Groups
- Responses to International Terrorism
- The Future of Terrorism
- Summary
- Comparative Criminal Justice at the Movies: *Syriana* (2005)
- Critical Thinking Exercise: *Fighting Terrorism through Antidrug Investigations?*
- Discussion Questions
- For Further Reading
- Web Pages for Chapter

- Outline the key historical events in the development of terrorism
- Clarify the reasons behind the complexity of defining terrorism
- Explain the different goals of those involved in terrorist activity
- Describe the prevalence of domestic and international terrorism in the world today
- Explore the responses to terrorists and terrorism on the national and international levels.

At 11:35 p.m. on the evening of May 1, 2011, President Barack Obama uttered these words: "Tonight, I can report to the American people and to the world that the United States has conducted an operation that killed Osama bin Laden, the leader of Al-Qaida, and a terrorist who's responsible for the murder of thousands of innocent men, women, and children." With this late-night announcement came the details of the event that had occurred hours earlier when the President gave the order for a team of U.S. Navy SEAL Team Six to fly into Abbottabad, a Pakistani suburb 75 miles from Islamabad, the country's capital. According to official accounts, after a brief firefight the SEALs had shot and killed the leader of al-Qaida and four others, including one of bin Laden's sons, in the presence of one of his wives. The Americans took possession of bin Laden's body, moved it briefly to Afghanistan for identification, and then buried it at sea within 24 hours, in accordance with Muslim practice.

It is unclear at this time what impact the death of bin Laden will have on the operations of his terrorist organization, called *al-Qaida*, or on the broader issue of terrorism in the United States and around the world. Unfortunately, it appears from news reports that terrorism has only become more prevalent and complicated over the past decade. And for many, living with and fighting against terrorism is not a new or recent phenomenon. For example, what can be called "modern" terrorism has been a part of daily life in the Middle East for decades.

But whether terrorism strikes in the Middle East, Asia, Europe, or North America, we cannot underestimate its impact. Most painful and obvious are the tremendous loss of life and astronomical economic costs associated with terrorism. Just consider the costs of 9/11. Almost 3,000 persons were killed or missing. Lower Manhattan lost nearly 30 percent of its office space. The physical assets lost and cost of rescue and cleanup totalled over \$27 billion. Wall Street shut down for a week, then opened and lost 15 percent, or

\$1.2 trillion in financial investments (9/11 Commission Report, 2004).

The cost of the "war on terror" and concealed enforcement efforts has been immeasurable and probably directly or indirectly affected the lives of every person on the planet. Consider that following the 9/11 attacks, the U.S. government immediately allocated \$4 billion to protect the aviation industry and then formed two large federal agencies, the Transportation Security Administration and the Department of Homeland Security. Only three years after 9/11, conservative estimates placed the cost of combating and preventing terrorism in America, including the military interventions in Afghanistan, at \$500 billion, or 20 percent of the federal budget (Zalman, 2010). Also consider the increased transaction costs and inefficiencies in the economy by terrorism, and the fact that increased spending on security necessarily diverts labor and resources away from productive private sector activity and toward necessary, but less productive, government activity (Joint Economic Committee, 2002).

If the economic numbers are not unfathomable enough, imagine trying to measure the psychological effects of terrorist events. Behind every bombing and innocent victims are hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of stories about people injured and lives lost forever. Anger and animosity have been directed against certain ethnic and religious groups. People that were once allies have expressed distrust for each other, stating that each has not done enough to recognize and prevent such events. On the societal level, fear has become a palpable emotion that has changed the way people live their daily lives.

What we do know is that the main causes of terrorism have changed little over time. Because of advanced technology and globalization, there are merely new players and new adversaries who spread this worldly scourge. And it has become clear that no matter how they are explained,

the background, definition, prevalence, and purposes of terrorism. We will proceed with some ways that countries from around the world have responded to terrorism and conclude with terrorism issues that may surface in the years to come.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF TERRORISM

Terrorism has an ancient lineage and has traditionally been a tool of groups trying to terrorize a population or overthrow a regime either through military means or in a more clandestine fashion. Ancient history tells us that the Assyrians organized military in the ninth to the seventh centuries B.C. to conquer large populations and terrify its enemies (Barghothi, 2009). In the first century A.D., terror was used by the Roman Empire through the brutal suppression of Spartacus's followers after the Servile War of 73–71 and later by the Romans in conquered territories (Martin, 2003). Terror and assassination were also used by the Jewish Zealots, who opposed Roman rule in Palestine, in the first century A.D. The Zealots were crushed by the Romans, and the Jews were banished from Palestine, beginning the long period of Jewish forced exile, or diaspora (Schlagheck, 1988; Barghothi, 2006).

In seventh-century India, a group called the Thugs was formed; their goal was for their victims to experience terror and to express it visibly for the goddess of Kali, the Hindu goddess of terror and destruction (Rapoport, 1984). The Thugs lasted over seven centuries and killed millions of people using their typical method of execution—strangulation (Barghothi, 1996). A third group, active from the eleventh through thirteenth centuries, were the Assassins, who were supporters of Hasan al-Sabbah (d. 1124) and Islam in the Persian area; they used the dagger and the reward of martyrdom to promote their terrorist objectives

(Barghothi, 1996). Interestingly, the word *assassins* is allegedly derived from the word *Hashassins* because of the drug hashish, which some believe to have been consumed by the followers of al-Sabbah prior to committing acts of violence. Another term to describe the early assassins was *fedayeen*, which is still a term used by modern Middle Eastern revolutionaries who believe that their sacrifice will guarantee them entry into paradise.

The English term *terrorism*, which originally comes from the term *regime de la terreur*, was first coined by philosopher Edmund Burke during the French Revolution and the Jacobean Reign of Terror of 1793–1794 (White, 2009). A century later, a group of Russian terrorists called the Narodnaya Volya used similar tactics in an effort to overthrow the czar, eventually assassinating him by using a bomb in March 1881 (Hoffman, 2006). What is important to remember is that each of these historical terrorist groups was at least partly successful, and this success undoubtedly influenced the development of modern terrorist organizations.

One interesting view on the beginning of the most recent period of terrorism has been proposed by terrorism scholar Jonathan White (2005), who argues that, beginning right after World War II, terrorism has passed through three transitions or phases. The first phase, lasting from around 1948 to 1960, centered on anticolonial revolts by groups and even small countries. The rebels no longer wished to be ruled by those with overwhelming economic and military resources, and they used asymmetrical warfare to defeat those in power. **Asymmetrical warfare** is a method of warfare used by one side in a conflict or war when it

believes that it lacks the military power of the other and so must use strategy or tactics that differ from conventional, or symmetrical, warfare. Over the years, asymmetrical warfare has been used interchangeably with terms such as *guerilla warfare*, *terrorism*, *counterterrorism*, and more recently *insurgency* and *counterinsurgency*. Asymmetrical warfare was shown to be successful by two national revolutionary groups during the 1940s: the Japanese and the Jewish Zionists. The Japanese used their brand of asymmetrical warfare to defeat European colonial powers in key battles early in World War II. Two Jewish terrorist groups, the Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang, were both successful in the 1940s at convincing the British to withdraw from Palestine. Both of these revolutionary groups showed the world that terrorism or asymmetrical warfare can be effective.

After 1960 ideological terrorism came into vogue. Those espousing this form of terrorism had as their goal the overthrow or disruption of economic and social symbols of Western democracies. During this time, terrorist groups began to go global because they felt their cause was more than just national. Anti-Vietnam groups in the United States and abroad, as well as nationalist groups in Ireland, Spain, Latin America, and the Middle East, were representative of this group. But the strength and growth of democracy, including the transition of the former Soviet Union, led to the demise of these efforts by the late 1980s. What resulted, however, was a variant form of ideological terrorism that we continue to deal with today—religious terrorism (White, 2005, p. 70).

Religious terrorism is the third and most current phase of terrorism as proposed by White (2005). He explains that religious terrorism has “transmogrified” over the last 30 years from a regional problem located primarily in the Palestine region to a range of methods responsible for international death and destruction. The group largely responsible for this transformation is Al-Qaida. Following the success of the *mujihadeen* fighters in Afghanistan, and with the financial support of wealthy Muslims such as Osama bin

Laden, Al-Qaida was formed to take asymmetrical warfare across borders.

As we enter the post-9/11 era there are many experts who feel we are entering a new era of terrorism formed by what is called “**new terrorism**.” *New terrorism* is defined as terrorist activity conducted by individuals or groups who may or may not be formally connected to a loose, cell-based organizational structure, with religious motivations using asymmetrical tactics to achieve ideological goals often linked to promoting Islamic ideology (Hoffman, 2006; Emerson, 2011). Al-Qaida, which will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter, is an example of this kind of loosely indirectly linked network. In fact, most of the groups or individuals involved in terrorism have no direct link or connections with Al-Qaida group, but because of their shared sense of purpose, particularly against the West, they are able to carry out attacks in solidarity with the Al-Qaida network. Looking more closely, we find that there are a number of ways in which the new terrorism of today is different from pre-9/11 style terrorism. Russell Howard and Margaret Nencheck note at least eight identified differences:

1. The new terrorists are more difficult to detect.
2. The new terrorists are more violent.
3. The new terrorists are more transnational and less concerned with local politics.
4. The new terrorists are better financed than their predecessors.
5. The new terrorists are better trained.
6. The new terrorists’ hierarchical structures are less likely to be infiltrated.
7. The new terrorists have more access to weapons of mass destruction.
8. The new terrorists are less likely to be “defeated.” (Howard and Nencheck, 2001)

In the United States, the individuals or groups that are involved in this *new terrorism* referred to as “homegrown, jihadist-insi-

to take a symmetrical approach to terrorism. They are American citizens, legal permanent residents, or radicalized longer-term visitors who carry out or plan violent terrorist activity on United States soil. From May 2009 through October 2011, there were 32 arrests made regarding this type of terrorist incident in the United States. This number is a considerable increase from the 21 incidents of this type from 9/11 through 2009 (Soper, 2011). Two successful terrorist attacks by homegrown jihadists took place in 2009: a shooting in Fort Hood, Texas, by a U.S. Army soldier named Nidal Hasan, and another shooting at a U.S. Army-Navy Career Center in Little Rock, Arkansas, by Abdulhakim Muhammed.

Terrorism in the United States

Prior to 9/11

Although the face of terrorism in the United States has changed in recent years, it is important to keep in mind that terrorism in the United States did not begin with the events of 9/11. In fact, it has been argued that the United States has a long history of terrorism-related activities since its formation. It would not be surprising if the British viewed the actions of the mid-1770s and the violent means used by the colonists to overthrow their government as terrorism. Likewise, who could fault Native Americans in the nineteenth century for feeling justified when they witnessed large portions of their population displaced or slaughtered by miners, missionaries, and later the U.S. military? The term terrorism could also be used to describe the violent actions that arose from both sides during the labor movement that began with the mythical Molly Pitcher in Eastern Pennsylvania during the late eighteenth century and later led to the Haymarket riot in Chicago in 1886. Into the twentieth century, we witness acts of terrorizing by groups such as the Ku Klux Klan that were opposed to the newly won rights of slaves and by anarchists, who in 1919 attempted to use bombs to assassinate key American officials such as John D. Rockefeller and J. P. Morgan. In fact, a bomb attack on Morgan's Wall Street bank in New York City in 1920 was the

most destructive terrorist attack on U.S. soil until the bombs exploded at the World Trade Center in 1993 and in Oklahoma City in 1995 (Law, 2009).

During the 1960s, during the time of the Vietnam War, many radical leftist organizations are said to have carried out terrorist acts because of their opposition to the government and the war. More recently, ecoterrorist groups such as the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) and animal welfare groups such as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) have carried out hundreds of less violent but highly destructive acts in support of their cause. Although some have called for these acts to be classified as criminal offenses, the federal government and the FBI have investigated these groups and have counted any arrests as terrorists crimes solved or prevented. On the other side of the political spectrum are rightist domestic groups that due to their violent past could also be considered terrorist groups. Among these are the Aryan Nation, the National Alliance, Public Enemy Number 1, and the Oklahoma Constitutional Militia (Freilich et al., 2009).

Of course, the events of 9/11 have brought a reality to terrorism that was previously unimaginable to the American people. That event, the political response with air strikes on bin Laden's camps in October 2001, and the subsequent invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan signalled a global "war on terrorism" that has surely reformulated the way future generations view terrorism and has maybe led to many of the changes in new terrorism that we described earlier.

DEFINING TERRORISM

Over the years, literally hundreds of definitions have been proposed and much has been written on the subject of defining terrorism. Some have argued that each single definition is best (Laqueur, 1999), while others advocate having a consensus definition that uses the key elements of a number of definitions by numerous scholars (Schmid & Longman, 2005). Consider that on September 28, 2001, only a few miles away from the

still-smoldering ruins of the World Trade Center, delegates from the United Nations Security Council adopted a U.S.-sponsored resolution obliging UN member states to deny funds, support, and safe haven to terrorists groups and to exchange intelligence to fight them. Only one week later, however, after five days of debate, further draft resolutions of the UN General Assembly were shelved because of disagreement among the 189 members. The biggest area of disagreement was over the question of who is a terrorist. We can agree about the severity of terrorism, but we cannot agree on what terrorism is.

Why is it so difficult to reach a consensus on the definition? The central problem involves the larger ideological argument about whether the acts committed are “criminal” or are in the interest of promoting the “greater good.” It has been often stated that one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter. Terrorists themselves may not view their activities as illegal or immoral, and they may not believe themselves to be criminals. In fact, they may look upon themselves as martyrs. At the same time, those in power may label any individual or political movement acting against them as terrorist related.

Defining terrorism is further clouded by a change in status for those who are involved with terrorism. In the 1980s, President Reagan called the African National Congress a terrorist group, but the group subsequently was applauded for the sacrifices it made in the fight to eliminate apartheid in South Africa under the direction of Nelson Mandela. Menachem Begin, former Israeli prime minister, was well known as a leader of the previously mentioned terrorist group called Irgun Zvai Leumi. He later shared a Nobel Peace Prize with Anwar Sadat. In that same part of the world, Yasir Arafat, long excoriated as a terrorist, became the leader of the moderate element of the Palestine Liberation Organization that supported and signed the Oslo Peace Accords in 1993.

Finally, terrorism is difficult to define because the meaning of the term, like that of crime, can change and even expand over time because it is a socially derived term (Hoffman, 1999; White,

2005). During the French Revolution, *terror* had a positive connotation because it was associated with democracy. In the nineteenth century Russians were proud to call themselves *terrorists* because it meant they were connected to the overthrow and assassination of the czar and his followers. After World War II, *terrorism* came to be used in a more pejorative way to describe behavior by groups or individuals to support a cause or to mobilize governments or occupying forces (Barnes, 2001; File, 2001). Since the events of 2001, there has been a movement to expand the use and definition of the terms *terrorism* and *terrorist*, at least in the United States. Consider these examples:

- In 2002, Americans were made acutely aware of a new form of terrorism when John Muhammad and his accomplice, Lee B. Malvo, went on a rampage of sniper shootings mostly around the Washington, D.C., area.
- In 2004, U.S. Secretary of Education I. Michael Paige referred to the National Education Association, the national teachers’ union, as a “terrorist organization” because of the “obstructionist scare tactics” that it used in its fight over the nation’s education laws (Paige, 2004a).
- In 2006, a Bronx construction worker was charged under New York State’s antiterrorism laws for his involvement in violent street gangs in New York City.

In the future, will criminal behavior by groups, street gangs, or even labor unions be considered terrorism because they “terrorize” groups or neighborhoods? How about military forces invading and striking fear into the hearts of the enemy? If we simply view any act that creates terror as terrorism, then the potential actions to be included are limitless. These examples illustrate how difficult terrorism is to define and how difficult it is to decide who is a terrorist. Defining terrorism is an elusive process and is highly sensitive to a number of factors.

Despite the challenges to the adoption of an internationally agreed-upon definition of terrorism, it is important to subscribe to at least one

Without a definition it is impossible to write laws that can prevent such acts or allow law enforcement officials to catch and prosecute those responsible for terrorism. In the United States, terrorism has been defined by numerous criminal justice agencies such as the U.S. State Department, the Department of Defense, the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and the DEA (Law, 2009). But for our purposes of understanding terrorism today, we will use the following definition related to terrorism, which was adopted in 2005 by the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) and is contained in Title 22 U.S. Federal Code Section 2656f (d)(2):

Terrorism: the premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents.

Although some may consider this definition too broad and others may find it not encompassing enough, it does provide us with a starting point from which to begin to understand and study terrorism around the world today.

From this point we can proceed to a better understanding about the different types of terrorism, including two general types: domestic and international.

Domestic terrorism involves persons or groups committing a terrorist act or acts in their own country, having some domestic agenda as the motivation. One famous example in the United States would be the 1995 bombing of the Federal Building in Oklahoma City by Timothy McVeigh and his associates, who attacked in large part as an act of retribution against the federal government. McVeigh also chose April 19 as a symbolic date for the attack because it was the anniversary of the Battle of the Alamo and of the Waco, Texas, fire at the Branch Davidian cult site (Martin, 2003). An example of domestic terrorism in a country other than the United States would be the July 2011 sequential terrorist attacks in Norway. Both attacks were committed by 32-year-old Norwegian gunman and right-wing extremist Anders Behring Breivik, who set off a car bomb adjacent to a government building in Oslo that killed eight people and later in

the day opened fire at a summer camp, killing 69 people and injuring 110.

International terrorism involves citizens or territory of more than one country and has an impact that goes beyond a domestic agenda. International terrorism may involve an act of violence or destruction within the United States, such as the events of 9/11. A recent example of an act considered international terrorism on U.S. soil was the 2009 Christmas Day attempted bombing of a Detroit-bound passenger airplane by a 23-year-old Nigerian named Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab.

Alternately, international terrorism may occur in a location far away from the country that it intends to harm. Two serious examples occurred in Nairobi, Kenya, where 291 persons were killed in 1998 when bombs devastated the U.S. embassy, and in Aden, Yemen, in 2000 when a small boat laden with explosives blew up alongside the USS *Cole*, killing 17 U.S. sailors. The numbers of reported incidents of domestic and international terrorism will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

THE GOALS OF TERRORISM

What is it that terrorists are trying to achieve? Again, it is not easy to explain the goals of terrorism. In some cases, there are multiple purposes; in others, the goals are not clearly understood even by those involved. In any case, it is important to have some grasp of why people choose to become involved in terrorist activity throughout the globe.

One goal of terrorists is to force a government to respond to their violence in a harsh manner, in the hope that such repression will lead to discontent among the people and ultimately to revolution. In this case, terrorism may be used to destabilize colonial governments and occupation forces. Such terrorism is directed at a specific goal that is easy to articulate and understand, such as overthrow of the current political regime or change in a specific policy. This kind of terrorism, often referred to as **revolutionary terrorism**, may result from the

absence of democratic opportunities and ways to petition those in power in a legitimate fashion. Revolutionary terrorism in its purposes is similar to the anticolonial and ideological terrorism activities that were described earlier in this chapter. The longest-lasting examples of this kind of terrorism have involved the twentieth-century efforts of various groups in Palestine to unseat the Israelis in the Middle East, and the Irish Republican Army's attempt to free Northern Ireland from British rule—a movement that remained active until the late 1990s. A more recent example of revolutionary terrorist activity occurred in March 2010, when suicide bombers with Muslim and Chechnyan ties killed 38 people in Moscow.

Terrorism is also practiced by governments against their own citizens when they wish to protect their own political or economic interests. For example, they may use their power to harass, arrest, torture, or kill alleged enemies of the state. Governments may also implement covert actions against other countries for political, economic, or military reasons. These activities by governments against their own citizens or other countries are called **state-sponsored terrorism**. Examples of this form of terrorism during the twentieth century include Stalin's brutal repression in the former Soviet Union, the wholesale killing of Cambodians by the Khmer Rouge, state-sanctioned killing and torture of citizens in several South and Central American countries, and the more recent genocidal activities in Rwanda and Yugoslavia. These are just a few chilling reminders that governments are frequently guilty of violence designed to terrorize their own citizens.

Another frequently stated goal of terrorist groups is to promote a certain religious system or protect a set of beliefs within a religion. Religion is at the very core of these groups' political, social, and revolutionary agendas. This kind of terrorism, called **religious terrorism**, was mentioned earlier as the most common and powerful form of terrorism in our current era (White, 2005). Examples of this kind of terrorism may include violent Christian anti-abortionists in the United States; Hindu extremists in India; and the use of **jihad**, or holy war, by

Islamic fundamentalists who wish to protect religion from "creeping secularism and imperialism posed by Western countries the United States" (Martin, 2003).

The growth and popularity of religious terrorism have certainly been fueled by the transreach of **Al-Qaida**. The relative success of Al-Qaida as a religious terrorist organization is thought to be due to early realization by its leaders that they must convince its members that they are in a battle with evil, that the use of violence to win that battle is totally justified, and that to become a martyr for that cause is the highest of sacrifice and will lead to an eternal reward. Leaders of Al-Qaida, most notably Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, decentralized power of the organization, gave it transnational financial support, and sent the religious message to fight evil not just nationally or regionally but around the world. The CIA has stated that Al-Qaida operates in 68 countries worldwide (Schmallegger, 2009, p. 649). After the killing of bin Laden in May 2011, al-Zawahiri became the leader of Al-Qaida, and he remains at large with a \$25 million bounty. For a more detailed description of Al-Qaida, see the box on the next page.

Whatever the many goals of terrorism, probably the most important goal of any terrorist activity is to generate publicity on a wide scale: "Terrorism is not simply what they do, but the effect they create by their actions" (Jenkins, 1978, p. 119). Terrorists want their actions to be publicized to get their message before a wide audience. Because of the horrifying nature of terrorist acts, the media usually oblige and provide extensive coverage. This heightens the fear that we live in an insecure world and might be the victim of random violence at any time. Extensive publicity also enables terrorists to focus attention on their reasons for their actions, which is very important if they wish to initiate any change, gain sympathy from those in power, and even generate sympathy for their plight. And, given the importance of technology and world communication, it is not uncommon for videotaped segments of terrorist activity to be instantaneously

Al-Qaida: The "Base" of Transnational Terrorism

Al-Qaida, literally meaning "the base," is made up of Sunni Islamic extremists who were originally formed as a group of Arab nationals to fight the Russians during the war in Afghanistan. Since 1989, the group has quickly developed into probably the most feared international terrorist organization in the world thanks to the financial support and leadership of Osama bin Laden. The primary goal of bin Laden and his supporters was to liberate Palestine, with secondary goals of removing the Saudi ruling family from power and driving Western military forces and their corrupt, Western-oriented governments from predominantly Muslim countries.

We now know that bin Laden built up his Al-Qaida terrorist network into a worldwide force much like a large corporation. In addition to the money inherited from his father, bin Laden and Al-Qaida received contributions from a variety of sources in the Middle East, including wealthy businessmen who make protection payments to prevent terrorist attacks. Islamic charities throughout the world contributed large sums when their legitimate organizations were infiltrated by Al-Qaida members. Fake business firms were created to hide the flow of money that eventually landed in many Middle Eastern banks. The banks then transferred money to Al-Qaida operatives throughout the world. It is believed that Al-Qaida was responsible for providing financial support to those who carried out the 9/11 attacks.

Because of the international span of the Al-Qaida network, law enforcement officials have found it difficult to find, investigate, and apprehend the terrorists. The situation is exacerbated by the diffuse structure of

Al-Qaida. After being trained in camps throughout the globe, terrorists return home or relocate in different countries to establish cells—small groups of like-minded terrorists—and operate as "sleepers" who blend into society while planning terror strikes. The cells are allowed to act without any close connections to Al-Qaida; this makes them especially dangerous and hard to detect. Bin Laden and Al-Qaida are believed to have supported and trained thousands of terrorist fighters in Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chechnya, Somalia, Sudan, Yemen, the Philippines, Egypt, Libya, Pakistan, and Eritrea. Literally hundreds, maybe thousands, of international terrorist incidents have been at least tangentially linked to Al-Qaida operatives over the past 20 years. The group has been designated as a terrorist organization by the United Nations and by at least 15 countries. Al-Qaida has become a "symbol of Islamic resistance to Western powers and Western culture with an influence that has stretched far beyond its core membership in Afghanistan and Iraq" (Fichtelberg, 2008, p. 167).

In December 2011 Ambassador Daniel Benjamin, coordinator of the U.S. Office of the Bureau of Counterterrorism, stated that the death of bin Laden was a significant event given that he had been the commander, strategist, and emotional leader of Al-Qaida for 22 years. Also in 2011, at least four other key Al-Qaida leaders were killed, including the person moved to second-in-command after bin Laden's death, Atiya Abdul Rahman, a highly capable operational commander who was killed in Pakistan. As a result of the recent loss of key leadership it is thought that the international power of Al-Qaida has been diminished.

the world (White, 2009). Live telecasts of diving into the sides of the World Trade Center and the subsequent collapse of the Twin Towers will surely leave unforgettable images in the memories of millions of Americans for years. Even more unsettling is terrorism that appears to have no clear or immediate goal or that gains momentum through acts that will not further a goal in any evident way. General dissatisfaction with the status of society seems to inspire most of the serious acts of terrorism by Nazi skinheads in recent years.

Terrorism in France over the years has been a major problem, but it does not have a clear goal other than to vent frustration and create insecurities within the population. A more recent example of this apparently mindless terrorist activity was when American citizen Thomas Janis was murdered by Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) terrorists in February 2003 in Colombia. Mr. Janis was the pilot of a plane that crashed in the jungle. He and a Colombian service member were wounded in the crash; the terrorists shot them when they were discovered. Three U.S. citizen

passengers on the plane—Keith Stansell, Marc D. Gonsalves, and Thomas R. Howes—were kidnapped and remained hostages of FARC until they were rescued in 2008. Such incidents are particularly difficult to understand because they run counter even to the general goal of advertising a cause, the goal that is usually so important in terrorist action.

THE PREVALENCE OF TERRORISM

Although one would think that with the dramatic increase in both the amount of terrorism-related literature and public interest in the matter that information about terrorism activity would be readily available and easy to comprehend. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In fact, it can be argued that in some ways access to such data has actually diminished over the past five or so years. Just as with other kinds of general crime information, the accuracy and availability of terrorism data suffers from at least three problems. First, the definition of what terrorism is and what constitutes a terrorist act have not been universally agreed upon. This creates differences in reporting across law enforcement agencies and jurisdictions. Second, the ability to collect valid crime data varies greatly from agency to agency. Some countries—and the criminal justice organizations within those countries—have far more resources than others when it comes to crime data collection methods, access to and expertise in statistical packages, data storage systems, and so forth. Finally, and not least important, politics can often affect the free and accurate flow of terrorism-related information. Understandably, elected government officials are reluctant to have the success or failure of their decisions based on the rise or fall of crime statistics. Americans need only to study the recent story of the U.S. State Department and terrorism data to understand this point.

In 1982, the U.S. government began publishing an annual report called *Patterns of Global*

Terrorism. The report provided helpful trans terrorism information by year, by region, and individual terrorist groups. But in 2004 the numbers cited in the report more than tripled around 200 incidents to over 650 incidents (2005). This was at the same time that the Administration was claiming that worldwide terrorism was dropping over the previous two years. A sea of criticism surfaced, and the results were as follows: (1) the name of the report was changed to *Country Reports on Terrorism*, (2) statistics and chronology of terrorist attacks were dropped, and (3) a new agency called the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) was formed to collect and report terrorism activity (LaFree et al., 2005). Since 2005 the NCTC has utilized the Worldwide Incidents Tracking System (WITS) as the source for its database on terror attacks and to produce the *Country Reports on Terrorism* and the *NCTC Report on Terrorism*. The U.S. government and the NCTC have refrained from returning to reporting patterns of terrorism because it does not provide that a simple comparison of the total number of attacks from year to year provides a true measure, although they do provide the number of incidents in Iraq and Afghanistan separately (NCTC, 2009; U.S. Dept. of State, 2012). Interestingly, neither the *Country Reports on Terrorism* nor the *NCTC Report on Terrorism* mentions the number of attacks that reflect totals for international terrorism on U.S. soil for 2010 or 2011.

Another valuable resource for terrorism data is the Global Terrorism Database (GTD). The GTD includes data on domestic and international terrorist incidents from 1970 through 2010 and now includes more than 98,000 cases. The results of the GTD are published annually by the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (NCJRT), a research agency within the University of Maryland. Other data about terrorist incidents can be obtained through the RAND Corporation's Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism (MIPT), and the International Terrorism: Identification of Terrorist Events (ITERATE) database at the University of Maryland.

helpful trans- by region, and But in 2004 the more than tripled 650 incidents (G time that the that worldwide previous two and the results were report was changed, (2) statistical attacks were dropped the National Counter was formed to (LaFree et al., 2004) utilized the World (WITS) as the source and to publish and the NCTC ment and the NCTC to reporting it does not the total number provides a mean provide the number Afghanistan since State, 2012). *Reports on Terrorism* mentions an onal terrorist for terrorism the Global Terrorism ID includes incidents from includes more the GTD are distributed for the State Terrorism (ST the Univers terrorist incidents AND Corporation vention of Terrorism Terrorism: Att TE) database at

The available data offer three insights. First, relatively few terrorist incidents occur in the United States. In 1982, terrorist acts in the United States reached a high of 51; in 1994, the number dropped to zero—no terrorist acts were committed. More recent figures indicate that since 1995 no more than one act of terrorism occurred in any one year in the United States, and in several years (1996, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2007, 2009, 2010) there were zero successful attacks/incidents (U.S. Dept. of State, 2004; NCTC Terrorism Reports, 2005–2011). Keeping these figures in mind, it is easy to see that the number of individuals killed by international or domestic terrorism in the United States in any year (excluding natural disasters, accidents, or other causes of death). A larger concern for law enforcement and government officials in the United States is the number of attempted terrorist acts, especially by homegrown terrorists, that have occurred in recent years. Since September 11, 2001, at least 50 incidents of premeditated terrorist activity on U.S. soil have been recorded (McNeill, 2010; Bjelopera, 2011). These premeditated acts include the previously mentioned attempt at bombing a Detroit-bound airline on Christmas Day in 2009 and the May 1, 2010, attempted Times Square car-bombing incident.

Second, as we mentioned earlier, the number of domestic terrorist incidents in the United States greatly outnumbers international incidents. Studies indicate that domestic attacks outnumber international attacks in the United States 7 to 1 (LaFree et al., 2004). We know that of the recorded terrorist acts that were attempted between 2001 and 2011, all of them were by U.S. citizens, legal permanent residents, or radicalized longer-term visitors who gained citizenship.

Finally, we are well aware that by any measure the number of international terrorism incidents that occurred outside the United States has risen dramatically over the last decade. Between 2003 and 2004, the U.S. State Department recorded an increase of worldwide terrorist incidents from 208 to 222. Remember, in 2004 the U.S. government cannot even claim to have the *Patterns of Global Terrorism* reports, but the NCTC/WITS recording system fared no better.

In 2005, the number skyrocketed to 7,193, and that number does not include any incidents that can be counted as terrorist activity in Iraq or Afghanistan. However, it should be mentioned again that the numbers listed here are surely not exact and should be interpreted within the limits of understanding any crime data. In some cases, they may severely underestimate the number of terrorism incidents and in other cases they are sure to exaggerate. Take, for example, the case of Israel, which claims that between 2000 and 2004 there were 22,406 “terror attacks” on Israeli targets alone (Israeli Defense Force, 2004).

The good news is that there has been some decrease in the number of worldwide terrorist incidents from the peak of nearly 14,500 in 2007. Although over 10,000 terrorist attacks occurred in 2011, affecting nearly 45,000 victims in 70 countries and resulting in over 12,500 deaths, the total number of worldwide attacks in 2011 dropped by almost 12 percent from 2010 and nearly 29 percent from 2007. And these numbers do include terrorist activity in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, which account for almost two-thirds of the attacks worldwide (NCTC, 2011).

FOREIGN TERRORIST GROUPS

Literally hundreds of terrorist groups have surfaced over the course of the past century. Some 50 groups have been designated as terrorist organizations by the U.S. State Department and the Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism as of September 2012. See <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/123085.htm> for a list of the designated terrorist groups. Three legal conditions must be present to receive the designation of being a terrorist group. First, the group must be a foreign organization. Second, the group must engage in terrorist activities as defined by Title 22 of the U.S. Federal Code, or must retain the capability or intent to engage in terrorism. Third, the organization’s terrorist activity or terrorism must threaten the security of U.S. nationals or the national security (national defense, foreign relations,

TABLE 10.1 Key Terrorist Groups around the Globe

South America	Africa	Europe	Asia	Middle East
<i>Colombia:</i> Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), National Liberation Army (ELN), United Self-Defense Forces (AUC)	<i>Algeria, Somalia, and Kenya:</i> Al-Qaida operatives	<i>Spain:</i> Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA), Al-Qaida operatives <i>Northern Ireland:</i> Real IRA <i>France:</i> ETA, Corsican Separatists, Al-Qaida operatives <i>Turkey:</i> Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) <i>Russia:</i> Chechen separatists	<i>Uzbekistan:</i> Al-Qaida operatives <i>Pakistan:</i> Jashkar E-Jhangvi, Jaish-E-Mohammad, Lashikar E-Taiba <i>Sri Lanka:</i> Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam <i>Philippines:</i> Abu Sayyaf, Al-Qaida operatives including Jermaah Islamiyah, Moro Islamic Liberation Front, New People's Army	<i>Israel, West Bank, Gaza Strip:</i> Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, al-Aqsa Brigades (AAI) <i>Lebanon:</i> Hezbollah, Al-Qaida operatives including Asbat al-Ansar (AAI) <i>Iraq:</i> Tawhid Jihad and Al-Iraq (AQI)

SOURCES: U.S. Department of State (2011), *Country Reports on Terrorism*, available at <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/index.htm>. Laqueur, W. (2004) of Terror." *National Geographic*. November 2004. pp. 72-74.

or economic interests) of the United States (U.S. Dept. of State, 2012b).

There are very few areas of the world today that have not been greatly affected by terrorism. However, it is clear that some areas are more affected than others. In Table 10.1, we list different regions of the world and some of the more active terrorist groups that have been actively operating over the last five years. For more details about the level of terrorist activity within specific countries, including our model countries but not the United States, see the *Country Reports on Terrorism Report* for 2011 provided by the U.S. State Department at <http://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/crt/index.htm>.

RESPONSES TO INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

Organized responses to international terrorism are not simple matters of crime detection, apprehension, and punishment. The complexity of dealing

with crime and criminals across borders, the range of motivations for terrorist activity, and the large number of terrorists and terrorist groups create many problems for criminal justice and government officials. So, what can be done to stem the tide of international terrorism? Foreign policy, intelligence, international cooperation strategies, and police operations, legislation, and diplomacy all play a prominent role.

Foreign Policy

In some cases, the best way to deal with the struggles between two parties that are both innocent and contributing to terrorism is through foreign policy. Foreign policy in its most basic terms is the use of political and economic power, negotiation, and compromise rather than force to solve conflicts between nations or groups. Unfortunately, these efforts often have little impact and sometimes have actually exacerbated the bad feelings between the parties involved. In the last century has seen two serious at-

Middle East

Israel, West Bank,
Gaza Strip; Hamas

Palestine Islamic
Jihad, al-Aqsa Martyrs
Brigades (AAMB)

Lebanon: Hezbollah
Al-Qaida operations
including Asbat al-Ansar (AAA)

Iraq: Tawhid Wal
Jihad and Al-Qaida
Iraq (AQI)

employing foreign policy to mitigate terrorism and improve relations between combatants, with varying success.

The first has been the over 60-year conflict in the Middle East between the Israelis and the Arabs. Since 1948 the two groups have engaged in a number of armed conflicts, with the Israelis gaining the upper hand because of their economic, military, and technological strength. In response to the Israeli stranglehold on the region, Muslims have developed a number of terrorist groups beginning with the paramilitary organization, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), and continuing with Hezbollah and Hamas. Unfortunately, numerous foreign policy efforts by various parties in the Middle East and the United States have been unsuccessful in solving this long-standing conflict.

Another more successful example of foreign policy is the resolution of the situation in Northern Ireland. The "troubles" between England and Ireland are centuries old, with the central issue in the twentieth century being the partition of Ireland into a northern area, which was largely Protestant, and the remainder, which remained Catholic. This partition led to a protracted conflict between the British government and the Irish Republican Army (IRA), and later a plethora of splinter groups including the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) of Northern Ireland, the Continuity Irish Republican Army (CIRA), the Irish National Liberation Army (INLA), and, more recently, the Real IRA (RIRA).

The violence continued into the early 1990s, with the IRA, PIRA, and RIRA perpetuating violence as the primary means of trying to dislodge British troops from Ulster and unite this area with the Republic of Ireland through the use of violence. Through bombings in England and attacks on British soldiers in England and Northern Ireland, they hoped to wear down British resistance and achieve their goal.

However, a breakthrough in the violence happened in September 1994 through February 1996, when a ceasefire was observed by the IRA and declared by Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland. In April 1998 feuding Catholic and

Protestant parties signed the Belfast Agreement or the **Good Friday Accord**, which was a historic agreement outlining a power-sharing arrangement to share multiparty administration of Northern Ireland. In 2007, after some important conditions of the agreement were finally met by both parties, a power sharing to govern Northern Ireland was finally realized.

Another foreign policy option utilized by the United States is to designate countries as state sponsors of terrorism. The purpose of this designation is to promote international cooperation in condemning state-sponsored terrorism and to bring maximum pressure against those involved. A range of bilateral and multilateral sanctions is needed to discourage states from supporting terrorism. More specifically, countries are placed on this list if they assist terrorists by providing sanctuary, arms, training, logistical or financial support, or diplomatic immunity to groups or individuals. As of July 2012, four countries have been designated by the United States as state sponsors of terrorism: Cuba, Iran, Sudan, and Syria.

Dealing with terrorism within the confines of foreign policy may remain the first option, but other responses may be more viable.

International Cooperation Strategies

In the aftermath of terrorist bombings in Madrid in 2004 and London in 2005, the Council of Europe swiftly agreed to condemn the attacks, strengthen the European commitment to fighting terrorism, and propose new counterterrorism measures (DeFlem, 2006). A similar situation occurred after September 11, 2001, when numerous multinational organizations, including the United Nations, the European Union, the Organization of American States, and the Organization of African Unity, issued declarations of support and pledged assistance to the United States. These are only two examples of what most countries around the world now realize—that international cooperation is essential in the fight against terrorism.

Often, due to the efforts of the United Nations, treaties provide the general framework

Policy

to deal with problems that are both domestic and international. Terrorism is a global phenomenon in its most serious form, and economic and political factors often have been involved. The parties involved in serious attacks

for this cooperation. Fourteen multilateral UN treaties, called conventions, related to combating terrorism have been formed since 1963 (United Nations, 2012). Not all states have ratified each of these legal instruments, and others have not implemented them. One of the most important came in 1999, when a UN working group finalized an international convention aimed at cutting off all legal and illegal sources of funding for terrorism. The convention came into force with the ratification of the legislative bodies of 22 countries.

In addition to these treaties, other instruments may be relevant to particular circumstances, such as bilateral extradition treaties and UN Security Council and General Assembly resolutions related to a variety of international terrorism issues. Between 1972 and March 2010, there have been 63 such terrorism-related resolutions, and 11 since September 11, 2001. In addition to the multilateral UN-based treaties, a number of regional instruments have been formed by countries in Asia, Africa, South America, the Middle East, and Europe, although only in the latter region do such efforts seem to work effectively (Taulbee, 2009).

But none of the international collaborations mentioned here may prove to be more important than the one created by the United Nations General Assembly when in 2006 they adopted the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. In September 2008, all 192 member states of the United Nations confirmed their commitment to the strategy, and its adoption marks the first time that all member states have agreed to a common strategic and operational approach to fight terrorism. The strategy, with the force of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF), hopes to accomplish the following four “pillars”: (1) address the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism, (2) develop ways to prevent and combat terrorism, (3) work to provide assistance to the international community to counter terrorism, and (4) defend human rights while combating terrorism (UN, 2009).

Probably the best example of the effectiveness of international cooperation is the situation of the European Union and terrorism. Over the years,

extensive information sharing and cooperation have greatly aided criminal justice officials in the global fight against terrorism. There are many examples of this cooperation, but consider the case of the midair bombing of Pan Am Flight 103 in Lockerbie, Scotland, in 1988. The flight originated in Frankfurt, stopped in London, and ended over Scotland while on its way to the United States. An international investigation ensued, involving many countries in the Middle East who were believed to be involved. Then followed the extradition of the perpetrators to the Netherlands, where they were tried by a panel of Scottish judges and later transferred to a prison in Scotland to serve life sentences. Prior to the formation of the European Union, surely during the days of the Cold War, such cooperation between criminal justice officials would have been virtually impossible.

Military and Police Detection and Apprehension Strategies

Following terrorist attacks, an outraged public expects the government to take strong steps to prevent further incidents. Detection and apprehension strategies are at the heart of an effective response to terrorism because in general the use of military forces to deal with internal terrorist acts is not viable in democratic governments. Internal security incidents are another matter, since police departments do not have jurisdiction to operate across borders or to engage in the kind of intelligence operations that are crucial to preventing terrorist acts or tracking down terrorists. The large scale of international terrorist operations in today's world, with its ease of transport and communications, poses a particularly difficult problem of response. Still, in recent years, military agencies, civilian police forces, and intelligence agencies have developed an increasingly sophisticated apparatus of response to terrorism. Many countries have passed laws authorizing extraordinary antiterrorist measures by government authorities. The kinds of laws and measures are a function of the level of terrorist threat and the history of terrorism in the particular country.

and cooperation between police officials in the United States. There are numerous cases to consider the response to the hijacking of Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. The flight originated in London, and exploded on reentry to the United States. The ensuing investigation, including the extradition of suspects to the United States, where they were tried and later sentenced to life imprisonment in the European Union. In the aftermath of the Gulf War, such cooperation between officials would have been essential.

Detection and Response Strategies

Encouraged public cooperation and strong measures for detection and apprehension are part of antiterrorism efforts. The use of military force in response to acts of terrorism is unacceptable. International agreements require police departments to operate in coordination with intelligence agencies in preventing terrorism. The large number of terrorist incidents in today's world poses a significant challenge for police forces. Many countries have developed an integrated response to terrorism, including laws allowing for the use of military force by government forces against terrorist threat and in a particular country.

For example, because it is the constant target of terrorist attacks near its borders and even within its territories, Israel represents an extreme case of having a planned response to terrorism. Israeli authorities have a firm policy of refusing to negotiate or give in to terrorist demands. This policy is often honored only in the breach, especially when Israeli soldiers have been captured, but it remains a pillar of Israeli response. Military incursions against known or suspected terrorist bases are a common Israeli response to terrorist incidents. Antiterrorism squads, which themselves practice a form of terrorist assassination, have formed part of the Israeli response, as in the assassination of a PLO vice chairman in Egypt in 1991, and the killing of Hamas leaders over the course of the last five years. Israel has even practiced counter-kidnapping, as in the abduction of Muslim clergyman Sheik Obeid. Israel has also probably developed the most security-conscious airline system in the world today. Having lived with terror for decades, over 20 years ago Israel developed an impenetrable flight security system; the country has not experienced a single hijacking since 1968.

Many countries plagued by terrorist acts employ special units in both their police and their military to deal with terrorism. They may pass special laws that allow for martial law, curfews, and derogation of certain criminal procedure guarantees such as habeas corpus. This kind of legislation poses serious questions about abuse of civil rights, especially when governments use the military to quell domestic matters; military force is supposed to be used as a last resort or in severe emergencies.

In international cases, by contrast, the military and military intelligence units are more likely to be deeply involved. This was the choice made by the United States when after September 11, 2001, the United States, in coalition with a number of other nations and an Afghan organization called the Northern Alliance, utilized air and cruise missile attacks on established terrorist bases in Afghanistan in October 2001. Special Operations forces were also sent in to reduce the capabilities of terrorists in function. At the same time, humanitarian aid programs were sent for Afghans who left for

Pakistan and those who remained. Local government structures and economic alternatives to the opium trade were proposed to peaceful Afghans. By the end of 2003, there was no evidence of an active Afghan terrorist network, although it appears that in recent years there has been a resurgence of terrorist activity in that country in the form of smaller, loosely connected Al-Qaida networks.

In addition to the military units such as the Delta Force and the SEAL Team Six, the United States also has at its disposal two primarily civilian units: the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team (HRT) and the CIA's Special Activities Staff (SAS). The HRT team is an elite counterterrorism unit that handles terrorist or hostage situations inside the borders of the United States. The SAS is an elite group whose members are drawn from the ranks of the best of the military, the Delta Force, the SEAL Team Six, and the CIA itself. As we mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, a SEAL Team Six unit was responsible for killing Osama bin Laden in May 2011. The SAS carries out a number of delicate operations as directed by the president of the United States. Because of the secrecy of its missions, the SAS is probably the least known of the units operating on behalf of the United States.

Legislation

Over the past 10 years, most countries around the world have enacted new laws to combat terrorism, punish terrorists, and respond to terrorist attacks. This is especially true of individual states and the federal government in America. Understandably, New York passed what has been called the toughest and most comprehensive package of antiterrorism laws in the nation, establishing six laws for persons who commit terrorist acts, make terrorist threats, solicit or provide material support for terrorist acts, or hinder the prosecution of terrorists. On the federal level, two significant laws were passed following September 11, 2001. The first was the **Patriot Act**, and the second, the Homeland Security Act.

The U.S. Patriot Act was passed six weeks after September 11, 2001, with the goal of broadening

law enforcement agencies' authority to conduct surveillance on U.S. citizens and residents. Supporters of the Act claim that it has been an effective tool in the fight against terrorism. However, many have been highly critical of the Patriot Act. Civil libertarians have been very critical of the Patriot Act, believing that the balance between liberty and power has tipped too far in the direction of the government. In February 2005 and 2006, the Patriot Act was reauthorized and now includes some new measures, but according to critics it still falls short in the area of protecting civil liberties. On May 26, 2011, President Obama used an autopen to sign a four-year extension of three key provisions in the Act while he was in France.

The National Strategy for Homeland Security Act and the Homeland Security Act were passed in late 2002 with the purpose of establishing the **Department of Homeland Security (DHS)**. The DHS is a federal agency that combines and reorganizes dozens of federal agencies, with just under 230,000 employees and a budget of over \$59 billion for FY 2013, making it the second-largest U.S. cabinet department after the Department of Defense. The mission of the Department of Homeland Security is to "ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive" (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2012).

Adjudication

- During the September 6, 2012, hearing for his involvement in the November 2009 Fort Hood shooting, Nidal Hasan twice offered to plead guilty, but U.S. Army rules prohibit the judge from accepting a guilty plea in a death penalty case.
- The trial of a man accused of trying to blow up a commercial airliner above Detroit with a bomb sewed into his underwear ended just a day after it had begun on October 11, 2011, when Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab said he would plead guilty to all of the federal counts against him.
- In December 2008, a German court in Dusseldorf convicted Youssef Muhammad Hajdib of multiple counts of attempted terrorism for his failed attempt to bomb two trains (Kulish, 2008).
- During 2007, a number of young British Muslims of Pakistani descent were convicted of conspiring to plant bombs in public places in the United Kingdom (Long & Cullen, 2008).

These are just some examples of the method used to respond to terrorism—the implementation of formal adjudication. When people are killed by terrorists, emotions run high and a certain spirit of mob vengeance can take over. Even governments dedicated to the rule of law find it difficult dealing objectively and lawfully with suspected terrorists. Within this hostile environment they must form some method to maintain judicial elements of their justice system while also being "tough" on terrorism and terrorism suspects. The United States, for example, has chosen to use special courts for terrorism suspects such as those captured by U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Guantanamo.

Unfortunately, terrorist excesses can be used as an excuse for suspension of rights or even development of a repressive paramilitary regime. Human rights organizations have found that justice abuses in the name of terrorism prevent the world from becoming too common throughout the world. For example, in Australia the government has used the rhetoric of counterterrorism to justify its policies on refugee and asylum issues and has extended powers of detention for its immigration agency. Chinese officials have stepped up a campaign against Uighur separatists in Xinjiang province by invoking the war on terror to distinguish between peaceful activists and those with genuine connections to international terrorist organizations. Russia has continued to justify its actions in Chechnya as a tight counterterrorism operation, despite the fact that it has produced vast civilian casualties, extrajudicial executions and forced disappearances. The measures adopted by the U.S. go

German court in
 Josef Muhammad
 of attempted
 bomb two trains

of young British
 were convicted
 in public places
 & Cullen, 2008

examples of another
 terrorism—the
 When inner
 emotions run
 vengeance can develop
 to the rule of law
 and lawfully with
 hostile environment
 to maintain the
 system while appearing
 and terrorists

has chosen to develop
 aspects such as
 Afghanistan and Iraq
 processes can become

or even the
 military regime. However,
 that justice
 terrorism prevention
 throughout the world
 government has used
 to justify its hard
 issues and has

reason for its security
 have stepped up
 separatists in Xinjiang
 war on terror, blaming
 peaceful activists
 to international
 has continued to

as a tightly focused
 despite the fact that
 casualties, including
 forced disappearances
 the U.S. government

After the September 11, 2001, attacks have also
 defended some because they appear to violate fun-
 damental provisions of international human rights
 and humanitarian law.

Terrorist leaders may believe that such devel-
 opments will lead to further support for their own
 revolutionary causes, but this is seldom the case. In
 extreme cases, a country may slide into dictatorship
 and lose whatever traditions of democracy it once
 may have had. And there is no guarantee that adju-
 dication will result in the desired impact. In an
 independent study of federal terrorism prosecutions
 in the United States since September 11, 2001, it
 was determined that of the 64,000 referred for
 criminal charges, fewer than one-third were for-
 mally charged, only 879 were convicted, and only
 received a correctional sentence of more than
 3 years. In fact, the median sentence given for
 those convicted was 14 days (Associated Press,
 2003). Another study of prosecutions showed that
 from 2001 to 2006, of the 417 people charged with
 terrorism-related matter, the majority faced
 immigration or other related charges and only
 three were convicted of actual terrorism (Criminal
 Justice News, 2006).

As we have seen, international terrorism is not
 simply a problem of crime and punishment. The
 growth of religious terrorist groups such as Al-
 Qaeda has complicated this equation. However,
 we must not lose sight of the fact that terrorist
 actions are crimes. In dealing with individual terror-
 ism, then, we need to view them as criminals who
 have committed acts of murder, assault, arson, rob-
 bery, and the like rather than as pawns in an inter-
 national power struggle. Otherwise, the system of
 crime and punishment in any country, as well as the
 rule of law, may be seriously diminished.

THE FUTURE OF TERRORISM

In our increasingly technological world, a relatively
 small number of terrorists potentially can wreak
 havoc out of all proportion to their numbers.

A number of possibilities loom as means of com-
 mitting domestic and international terrorism for the
 twenty-first century. Of greatest concern for most
 are the potential uses of **weapons of mass
 destruction (WMDs)**. WMDs are nuclear, chem-
 ical, or biological weapons that by their nature can
 cause mass casualties and extensive property dam-
 age. The possibility that a terrorist or terrorist group
 may obtain a nuclear device increases all the time, as
 knowledge about their manufacture becomes more
 available. This would be a far cry from the bomb-
 carrying anarchist terrorists of the early twentieth
 century. The poisoning of water and food supplies
 through chemical alterations, and the use of biolog-
 ical agents or agents of biological origin, may be
 used to attack large population centers. **Agents of
 biological origin (ABOs)** generally fall into one
 of four categories: bacteria, viruses, plagues, or tox-
 ins (White, 2009). One example of the use of
 ABOs was the sarin nerve gas attack in the Tokyo
 subway system in March 1995; another was the
 anthrax-laced letter sent to Senator Patrick Leahy
 at his office in 2001. Other new and more sophis-
 ticated technological methods can also be converted
 into weapons by terrorists who have a high degree
 of scientific knowledge. Electromagnetic pulse
 technologies can disable electronic components
 such as microchips or computers with a burst of
 energy from a generator. New kinds of plastic
 can easily be converted into weapons that are unde-
 tectable by metal detectors. And some chemicals
 based on liquid metal embrittlement technology
 weaken metals when applied and could conceivably
 be applied to vehicles and aircraft (Marron, 2003).
 With advances in the technology related to com-
 munications, terrorists will also find a easier to
 work across boundaries, and it is more likely that
 their message can be heard around the globe within
 minutes of, if not during, terrorist activity.

However, the terrorist threat that probably
 looms largest in the twenty-first century is cyber-
 terrorism. Potential acts of computer terrorism
 range from viruses that infect individual computers
 and spread to unexpected users, to computer attacks
 infiltrating defense systems, cutting water and

power supplies, and disrupting transportation systems. In Estonia in 2007 and in Georgia in 2008, large scale denial-of-service attacks left the countries vulnerable to a number of massive access problems. Large international gatherings such as Olympic games or World Cup soccer tournaments produce opportunities for this form of terrorism. The possibilities for terrorist mischief in this area seem as endless as the uses of computers themselves.

In addition to the methods themselves, we can project about who will be those most likely to commit terrorism in the future and where hotbeds of terrorism will most likely develop. One serious challenge for law enforcement officials will be the many small pockets or cells of terrorists that have spread around the globe. These groups, such as those of Al-Qaida, are loosely organized, are not tied to any larger terrorist organization, and may have their own agendas that are difficult to predict and interpret. Another challenge is the growth and collaboration of criminal enterprises such as the Russian Mafia, Triads, and Mexican and

Colombian drug gangs. For example, we know that the terrorists behind the Madrid train bombings in 2004 and other deadly bombings in Bombay, India, were also linked to drug trafficking organizations. These groups have begun using political and religious extremism with their proximity for transnational crime, and the result has been highly profitable and extremely dangerous (Martin, 2003; Kaplan, 2005). With the globalization of the economy, the ease of travel, improved communications, terrorism will continue to grow beyond the historically hot regions of the past such as Northern Ireland and the Middle East. Regions of the world with growing populations, ethnic clashes, government instability, and large-scale economic problems are ripe areas for terrorism. These include the Balkans in Europe, Northern Africa, and parts of Central America and South Asia. Whatever the type of group, or location, it is likely that terrorism will continue to be a worldwide problem for generations to come.

SUMMARY

The threat of terrorism and the impact of terrorist activity have changed the way people view the world and the way they act on a daily basis. Terrorism is not a new phenomenon, and the general goals have changed little over the past century, but the form and frequency of terrorist activity certainly have been transformed. There appears to have been a concurrent increase in the number of terrorist groups that have surfaced, although they vary considerably in their size and effectiveness. Among the options for dealing with the problem are foreign policy, international cooperation, legislation, and adjudication. Although the quantity and quality of counterterrorism measures seem to have had some

impact on the incidence of terrorism and the apprehension of terrorists, the problem still exists because of the new and improved methods of spreading terror. Understandably, the United States has been at the forefront of terrorism prevention, detection, and apprehension. Laws have been enacted, agencies formed, and policies developed that have changed the course of daily life for Americans and affected a considerable portion of the globe. Although impossible to predict with any precision, we can project who will be responsible for future terrorism and what methods will be used to continue to combat this worldwide scourge.