



# **The New Terrorism**

## ***The Nature of the War on Terrorism***

MICHAEL W. KOMETER, Major, USAF  
School of Advanced Airpower Studies

THESIS PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF  
THE SCHOOL OF ADVANCED AIRPOWER STUDIES,  
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA, FOR COMPLETION OF  
GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2001-2.

Air University Press  
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama 36112-6615

July 2004

# Report Documentation Page

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>JUL 2004</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-07-2004 to 00-07-2004</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>The New Terrorism. The Nature of the War on Terrorism</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Air University Press, Maxwell AFB, AL, 36112-6615</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>85</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

This School of Advanced Air and Space Studies thesis and others in this series are available electronically at the Air University Research Web site <http://research.maxwell.af.mil> and the AU Press Web site <http://aupress.maxwell.af.mil>.

### **Disclaimer**

Opinions, conclusions, and recommendations expressed or implied within are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of Air University, the United States Air Force, the Department of Defense, or any other US government agency. Cleared for public release: distribution unlimited.

## **Contents**

<i>Chapter</i>		<i>Page</i>
	DISCLAIMER . . . . .	<i>ii</i>
	ABSTRACT . . . . .	<i>v</i>
	ABOUT THE AUTHOR . . . . .	<i>vii</i>
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	<i>ix</i>
1	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
2	NATURE OF TERRORISM . . . . .	5
3	HOW TO ANALYZE TERRORIST STRATEGIES . . . . .	19
4	“OLD” TERRORISM . . . . .	27
5	“NEW” TERRORISM . . . . .	49
6	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	71

### **Table**

1	Comparison of Analytical Frameworks . . . . .	21
---	---	----

## ***Abstract***

This study defines the nature of the war on terrorism by assessing the changing nature of terrorism itself and develops an analytical framework within which to assess the strategies of terrorist groups. It compares the strategies of old terrorist groups—Red Army Faction, Palestinian Liberation Organization, and Irish Republican Army—to the new terrorism, the militant Islamic movement. This study concludes that there is a “new terrorism” that is not merely terrorism but a global insurgency. The strategy of this new movement requires an aggressive war on terrorism as a counterstrategy but not necessarily the war that the United States is trying to fight. This study develops guidelines for military strategy against the insurgents by using the same analytical framework to assess the insurgents’ strategy.

## ***About the Author***

Maj Michael W. Kometer, a senior navigator with approximately 1,000 flying hours, was born and raised in Kohler, Wisconsin. He was commissioned upon graduation from the US Air Force Academy with a bachelor's degree in Engineering Sciences in June 1988. He completed undergraduate navigator training in May 1989 as an electronic warfare officer (EWO) and assigned to the 16th Special Operations Squadron (16 SOS) at Hurlburt Field, Florida, where he served as an EWO on the AC-130H Spectre gunship. His tour of duty with 16 SOS included operations during conflicts in Panama, Saudi Arabia, and Somalia. While flying with the 16 SOS, he was assigned to Headquarters Special Missions Operational Test and Evaluation Center to perform operational flight-testing of AC-130s, MC-130s, HC-130s, and MH-53s. In 1994 Major Kometer was selected to attend Georgia Institute of Technology for a master's degree tailored to test and evaluation. In 1996 he graduated in the top 10 in the School of Engineering and was assigned to a classified location as a special projects test director and, subsequently, served as flight commander and operations officer for the unit. Major Kometer is a distinguished graduate of the Air Command and Staff College and a graduate of the School of Advanced Airpower Studies (now School of Advanced Air and Space Studies), both based at Maxwell AFB, Alabama.

## ***Acknowledgments***

I thank Lt Col Pete Hays for his guidance early on, his shaping the main ideas, and his willingness to work with me from long distance in the latter stages. I also thank Lt Col Forrest Morgan for the inspiration to tackle this subject after the unfortunate attack that occurred on 9/11. Maj Vicki Rast, Dr. Stephen Sloan, and Dr. Bard O'Neill encouraged the formation of the research ideas and shared their expertise on terrorism and insurgency. I thank my wife, Cheryl, for her patience, love, and support. Although she often found herself in lonely conversations with a man lost in another world, she never lost her faith that it would eventually end, and I would be successful. Finally, without my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, nothing would be possible.

## Chapter 1

### **Introduction**

*Those who slaughtered more than 3,000 persons on 9/11 and who, by their own admission, want nothing more than to do it again, constitute a clear and present danger to all people of good will everywhere in the world, not just the United States. Such acts are a pure example of naked aggression against innocent human life, a world-threatening evil that clearly requires the use of force to remove it.*

— “What We’re Fighting For”

Five months after the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center (WTC) and the Pentagon, this carefully worded epigraph by 60 intellectuals summed up a position that most Americans could support. The letter that contained the statement acknowledged America’s shortcomings yet rejected the notion that these shortcomings somehow gave justification to the terrorists that committed the attacks. It deftly pointed out the moral differences among the beliefs of terrorists, Americans, and mainstream Islamics. It represented a well-thought-out justification for the declaration of war on terrorism that the US government issued on 9/11.

Those who issued the original declaration of war were not given the luxury of the same five months to develop their rationale for the stand they took. At 0848 American Airlines Flight 11, carrying 92 people from Boston to Los Angeles, crashed into the north tower of the WTC. Eighteen minutes later, United Airlines Flight 175, with 65 passengers on the same route, tore through the south tower. Then at about 0940, American Airlines Flight 77, with 64 aboard from Dulles to Los Angeles, destroyed four of five rings in a section of the Pentagon. Meanwhile, United Airlines Flight 93, carrying 45 passengers from Newark to San Francisco, had crashed in Shanksville, Pennsylvania, where it had been heading in the direction of Washington. In the next hour, both towers of the WTC collapsed, burying thousands of victims with them.<sup>1</sup>

The immediate reaction of officials everywhere was volatile. Gen Henry Shelton, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, promised, “I will tell you up front, I have no intention of discussing today what comes next, but make no mistake about it, your armed forces are ready.”<sup>2</sup> Other officials declared a state of “total war.”<sup>3</sup> The media instantly began to make comparisons that put the attacks into the same category as the conflicts in both world wars: “Just as Japan on 7 December 1941 destroyed America’s long-standing belief in its ocean-guarded invulnerability, now 11 September 2001 joins that date to live in infamy.”<sup>4</sup> Overseas, foreign diplomats also stoked the fire by declaring a new age of terrorism. Prime Minister Tony Blair promised Britain would stand “shoulder to shoulder” with America in fighting these



mass terrorists, whom he called a “new evil in our world.”<sup>5</sup> Prime Minister Ariel Sharon of Israel declared, “This is a turning point in the international war on terrorism. This is a war between good and evil. The fight of the free world against the forces of darkness.”<sup>6</sup> As US government officials were trying to deal with the disaster and its aftermath, the rest of the world was narrowing their policy options for them by declaring a state of war and even declaring the nature of that war. By the time the war cabinet met that night, there really were no policy options.

Regardless of the initial inclinations of President George W. Bush’s staff, the foregone conclusion was that the United States would be at war. While the events were unfolding, President Bush was aboard Air Force One for security. When the plane landed at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana, Bush said only that “the United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts.”<sup>7</sup> But by that evening, the tone had changed slightly: “America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism.” This statement, in peaceful times, could be taken to mean an ongoing struggle similar to that waged against drugs or crime—“war on drugs” or “war on crime”—but not that night.<sup>8</sup> When told that the suspect, Osama bin Laden, was a global threat whose reach included about 60 countries, President Bush replied, “Let’s pick them off one at a time.”<sup>9</sup> Three days later, during a speech at the national funeral, Bush firmly planted the notion of a war with a foreseeable end: “This conflict was begun on the timing and terms of others,” he said. “It will end in a way, and at an hour, of our choosing.”<sup>10</sup> In the furor of the world’s shock at the devastation of 9/11, this could only mean total war against terrorism—whatever that means.

The meaning of the statement *war on terrorism* is the subject of this study. A declaration of a war on terrorism (versus a war against a single terrorist group or an ongoing struggle against terrorism) is unprecedented, and as such it is a concept that cannot be grasped by referring to existing paradigms. Traditionally wars are declared on political entities, and terrorism is not that. Supposedly, one of the factors in declaring this type of war for the first time in history is the notion that there is a “new terrorism.” This notion implies that there was an “old terrorism,” and that the nature of terrorism has changed so that today’s terrorists must or should be defeated through total war rather than classic counterterrorist measures. If that is the case, then lessons learned in the past may not be applicable to today’s war.

If it is the case, the fact still remains that the United States is at war with terrorism, and as Carl von Clausewitz tells us, understanding the nature of the war is the first step in developing strategy.<sup>11</sup> This study lends clarity to the war on terrorism and determines if there is a new terrorism by defining and comparing the nature of old terrorism with new terrorism. It considers whether the nature of terrorism (new or not) has implications for the American strategy in the war on terrorism and whether it can incorporate any of the old lessons.

### Notes

1. Michael Grunwald, "Terrorists Hijack 4 Airliners, Destroy World Trade Center, Hit Pentagon; Hundreds Dead," *Washington Post*, 12 September 2001, A1.
2. Rowan Scarborough, "Military Officers Seek Swift, Deadly Response," *Washington Times*, 12 September 2001, A1.
3. Ibid. The remarks are from Sen. Richard Shelby (R-Ala.).
4. John Fialka and Jackie Calmes, "Attacks on Symbols of U.S. Power Mark a Second Day of Infamy," *Wall Street Journal*, 12 September 2001, A1.
5. George Jones, "We Will Help Hunt Down Evil Culprits," *London Daily Telegraph*, 12 September 2001.
6. "Israel Calls for War against Terrorism," *Washington Times*, 12 September 2001.
7. George W. Bush, remarks by the president upon arrival at Barksdale AFB, La., 11 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 5 December 2001, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-1.html>.
8. Michael Howard, "What's in a Name? How to Fight Terrorism," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2002, 8.
9. Dan Balz and Bob Woodward, "America's Chaotic Road to War: Bush's Global Strategy Began to Take Shape in First Frantic Hours After Attack," *Washington Post*, 27 January 2002, A1.
10. Dan Balz and Bob Woodward, "A Day to Speak of Anger and Grief: After Bush's Pivotal Speech and New York Visit, Time to Decide Strategy," *Washington Post*, 30 January 2002, A1.
11. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), 88.

## Chapter 2

### **Nature of Terrorism**

*The first, the supreme, the most far-reaching act of judgment that the statesman and commander have to make is to establish by [the nature of their motives and of the situations which give rise to them] the kind of war on which they are embarking; neither mistaking it for, nor trying to turn it into, something that is alien to its nature.*

—Carl von Clausewitz  
*On War*

Clausewitz's admonition determining the nature of a war points to the very issue that makes our declaration of a war on terrorism problematic. What is the nature of this war? Even before 9/11, terrorism experts were advocating a more proactive policy toward terrorism, while at the same time admitting that "the nature of the conflict is still to be defined."<sup>1</sup> There are precedents for using military force to combat terrorist groups. Certainly Great Britain and France have had experience with this, and there have been a number of South American countries that have had to resort to the armed forces to combat terrorism. But in each of these instances, the enemy was a particular group. The fact that the United States declared war on terrorism implies that there is a definable nature to a conflict against terrorism. It also implies that this nature has changed—that we are dealing with a new terrorism—since, in the past, experts have warned against escalation in counterterrorism.

This chapter challenges these two implications. It also briefly traces the history of terrorism to show that the changing nature of terrorism has added to the inability to define it, discusses the evolving view of a new terrorism and the characteristics that define it, and examines the problems that scholars have had in categorizing and defining terrorism as a phenomenon. This chapter presents a more practical way to analyze the nature of the war on terrorism: to limit the scope to the enemy in this war, thereby limiting the potential that the war will grow beyond control.

There is a real danger in misreading and overreacting to terrorism, a danger that is "not in terrorist acts per se, but in triggering off a wider and more dangerous armed conflict."<sup>2</sup> One danger in this wider conflict is, of course, that there may be more destruction and loss of human life due to the escalation than there ever would have been due to the terrorists themselves. However, there is an additional danger that the overwhelming use of force can actually be damaging to the society in general, possibly even aiding the terrorists' cause. This can best be understood by examining an actual example.

The Tupamaros were a Uruguayan insurgent group whose movement to overturn the Uruguayan government lasted almost a decade and, though it ended in the group's destruction, had devastating effects on Uruguayan government and society. In 1961 Raul Sendic unionized the sugarcane and sugar-beet cutters and marched on the capital, Montevideo, to demand land expropriation and redistribution. Imprisoned in the resulting riots, Sendic started the Tupamaro National Liberation Movement.<sup>3</sup> The Tupamaros perceived the problems with the Uruguayan economy as stemming from the basic system of capitalism on which the economy was based. They claimed this system was doing nothing but making the rich richer and the poor poorer, while at the same time making Uruguay more indebted to imperialist nations such as the United States. The government was unwilling to solve these problems because the individuals running it were profiting from the existing system.<sup>4</sup> The Tupamaros wanted a Uruguay that was independent of the industrial nations, fiercely nationalistic, and operated by a socialistic government—not necessarily a strict copy of other Marxist-Leninist countries but tailored to Uruguay's particular conditions.<sup>5</sup> Their strategy was to use violence—the very thing their government held most critical to the survival of its power monopoly—to seize power from the government. The Tupamaros planned to break down and demoralize the government forces through the selective use of violence in the city, to create a mass uprising of the people to take power, and to implement their ideological objectives.<sup>6</sup> They sought to create a “power duality” where the Tupamaros would be immune to the government's power, and the people would see them as another, parallel source of power.<sup>7</sup>

Their operations were chosen to create this condition. They tried to avoid indiscriminate killing and were “genuine idealists; some of the best of the young generation belonged to them.”<sup>8</sup> They coerced their enemies to finance their cause by stealing from sources that they recognized as supporters of the elite and explained, “The bourgeoisie's property is our natural fountain of resources and we have the right to expropriate it without compensation. [Our] revolution puts to use the surplus of the privileged.”<sup>9</sup> The Tupamaros kidnapped officials they accused of corruption or wrongdoings (i.e., torturing prisoners) to blackmail the government and demonstrate their power. To further intimidate, they bombed and killed other corrupt officials. In one case, the Tupamaros broke into an illegal loan company, took records, and forwarded them to a judge who convicted the company.<sup>10</sup> This context in mind, it is clear the government's reaction was critically flawed.

The government's policy in this struggle eventually led to the collapse of all democratic institutions in Uruguay. In the beginning, combating the Tupamaros was the job of the national police. President Jorge Pacheco Areco ruled with an iron hand and imposed wage freezes and press censorship in an effort to control the situation. In 1968 he gave himself emergency powers so he could quell demonstrations and silence opposition. When the policemen proved unable to handle their job, the president militarized them.

When the bankers struck in 1969, he militarized them.<sup>11</sup> In 1970, during one month alone, he ordered extensive searches of more than 20,000 homes, many without warrants.<sup>12</sup> In 1971, after the Tupamaros rescued more than 100 of their prisoners (and subsequently imposed a unilateral cease-fire for the elections), Pacheco ordered the armed forces to take charge of the entire operation. The army requested congress to declare a state of internal war and started a powerful, ruthless campaign that wiped the Tupamaros out. However, in the process the army also came face-to-face with corruption in the Uruguayan government (with the help of some prodding from the imprisoned Tupamaros). In 1973 the military seized power from President Pedro Bordaberry, and any pretense of democracy in the country was gone.<sup>13</sup> By many classic measures, the Tupamaros had lost the war—they were completely destroyed. The government had misjudged the nature of the war. It had fought a brutal war of attrition, as if the security of the state was at risk instead of the freedom of the people and the legitimacy of the government. To keep this from happening to our country, the United States needs to do a better job of determining the nature of the war it is fighting.

One reason this is so difficult is that the term *terrorism* has been used to refer to many technically different phenomena throughout history. In fact, when trying to determine if there is a “new breed” of terrorist, one might question whether that is important because terrorism has changed so many times. Its origin is often traced (although not by the name terrorism) back as early as the Zealots of the first-century time period.<sup>14</sup> Later, the Assassins were a Persia-based group that spread throughout the Middle East in the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries. Although the group was driven by political aims on the strategic level—they were fighting the Crusaders—these killers seem to have been motivated by a millenarian vision, the notion that murder was a sacramental act of duty and the possibility of martyrdom.<sup>15</sup> But when the term *terror* was first used, it referred to the efforts of the new government in France to suppress its enemies immediately following the revolution in the 1790s.<sup>16</sup> In the mid-to-late nineteenth century, groups that are now labeled anarchists began using violence to try to overthrow governments they viewed as corrupt, especially in Russia. This represented a 180-degree shift in the nature of terrorism.<sup>17</sup> Some Marxists attempted to spread revolution through the use of terror following the Soviet revolution at the end of World War I. Following World War II, ethnic groups began to notice that campaigns of terrorism were sometimes effective at convincing colonial powers to abandon their colonies to self-rule.<sup>18</sup> However, most writers agree that the 1960s really spawned the modern age of terrorism, and it is this modern age that is examined in this study. The youth of the sixties were reared by the conservative generation for whom World War II had been the formative years. Nurtured by the teachings of liberal- or Marxist-minded university professors, these modern (as opposed to “new”) terrorists rebelled against what they perceived as oppressive economic

strategies and the abuse of the third world in the Cold War struggle.<sup>19</sup> They introduced a new form of conflict that included the targeting of innocent civilians in hijackings, skyjackings, bombings, and kidnappings that grabbed headlines and made governments look powerless. In this study, the terms *old terrorism* and *new terrorism* refer to the period between 1960 and the present. Yet even in this limited time period, defining the nature of a war on terrorism is a difficult task.

One of the reasons the nature of a war on terrorism is elusive is that *terrorism* is a pejorative term that is used whenever it is convenient. It is a vaguely defined term. In general categories, we would have to begin with the fact that terrorism involves violence—the use of violence and the threat of more—by a certain group to instill terror in a certain population. It can be considered a form of warfare, such as conventional and guerrilla warfare.<sup>20</sup> In more abstract terms, it can be considered a form of communication—a type of theater.<sup>21</sup> Terrorists perform shocking acts to communicate a message to some target audience. These categorizations have something to do with a means to achieving an end. But it is only used to describe one's enemies. Those who practice what others call terrorism claim their methods are necessary to accomplish a worthy cause.

This is a distortion—the use of terrorist methods is recognizable and wrong. However, to combat terrorists it is useful to realize this is not a black-and-white issue in the minds of the entire world. Terrorists have a morality of their own.<sup>22</sup> They believe they are fighting for a purpose worth the destruction they are causing. The nineteenth-century German anarchist Karl Heinzen proclaimed killing was justified by its very necessity—terrorists have no other way to achieve their aims. His point was that once governments had made killing acceptable, the only question in its justifiability was whether it would achieve its aims.<sup>23</sup> This is not to say that terrorists are the moral equivalent of law-abiding citizens. In war between states, the just-war tradition facilitates judging the justness of a war, and similar judgments can be made regarding terrorists' wars. Governments have sovereignty within their territory granted by the consent of the people. To merit violent action, an enemy must have vastly overstepped the accepted boundaries of its authority to determine rights in the common good of its citizens.<sup>24</sup> Some judgment along this line would validate whether the terrorist cause is a moral one—whether the war is just (*jus ad bellum*) or if the means are just (*jus in bello*). Michael Walzer agrees that some past terrorists might be considered honorable in that they committed only “just” assassinations. He declares that after states introduced terror to war during the bombings of World War II, terrorists switched from assassinating responsible officials to targeting innocent civilians.<sup>25</sup> This action moved them into the category of violators of *jus in bello*, regardless of the justness of their cause. And no matter how just the cause, there is considerable doubt about whether the terrorism can really bring about lasting social change, even if the terrorists get their way.

Resolution of the issue that a given terrorist group points to as the cause of its actions is not necessarily a cure for terrorism. It may seem that to develop a security strategy, the United States first needs to envision a desired societal end state and work towards that end state, instead of working for its own state interests. If the world could be rid of all the conditions that cause gaps between the haves and the have-nots, then there would be no reason to resort to terrorism. This goal is infeasible though admirable, and even if it were feasible, many writers disagree. Walter Laqueur proposes that if everyone who claimed the right to autonomous rule could be given their own state, this would only increase the amount of conflict over borders and diaspora. He claims terrorism is least survivable in states with effective dictatorial regimes.<sup>26</sup> Appeasement is not the answer.

The cause is not always the driving factor. Kachig Tololyan presents a convincing argument that political and psychological analysis of terrorism is meaningless without the corresponding analysis of the cultural milieu that gives them meaning. In his example of the Armenian culture, terrorism was the result not of ethnic repression but “the manifestation of a desire to give one’s individual life an iconic centrality in the eyes of the community, which professes to value certain forms of behavior articulated in narratives.”<sup>27</sup> It was not that the Armenians were repressed at present, but they were carrying on the fight because of stories and legends of their forefathers. Martha Crenshaw agrees that, although some groups—which she terms *instrumental*—use terrorist acts to achieve defined goals; others, termed *organizational*, use terrorism as a means to ensure survival of the group. For these groups, terrorism is simply a means to attract support and maintain viability. The groups offer incentives that require violent activity regardless of the cost, and the ideological purpose is only one of the incentives.<sup>28</sup> The fact that the cause is not the driving force does not mean it can be ignored.

The cause or ideological purpose of a terrorist group may become an important battleground. In a terrorist group’s struggle to be seen as a legitimate authority with legitimate power, the group must remain true to the cause. The strategy to defeat them must not add fuel to what may be the causal fire, or it will only make matters worse. The mind-set of those who live in states is often much different than that of those who consider themselves outside of states. While states are concerned with positions and interests, others may be driven by worldviews, and the two are bound to collide.<sup>29</sup> The cause may indeed be an important pillar in the terrorists’ strategy—terrorists and their audiences obviously believe they are in the right to intimidate by fighting against some kind of evil. Whether or not the cause is the driving factor, sensitivity to this cause is an important factor in maintaining the legitimacy to fight against terrorism—at least in the past.

Writers since the late 1980s have been heralding the arrival of a change in the nature of terrorism that could nullify some of these principles. Amir Taheri claimed the exportation of the fundamentalist Islamic revolution from

Iran in 1979 had started the “new kind of terrorism.”<sup>30</sup> According to Taheri, while all terrorist movements in the past have been driven by political goals, these Islamic terrorists would be insulted if described as political. Their ultimate aim is the conversion of all mankind, by choice or by force, to the teachings of Muhammed.<sup>31</sup> RAND Corporation analysts have come to broader conclusions. Brian Michael Jenkins, who in 1975 made the oft-quoted statement “terrorists want a lot of people watching and a lot of people listening, but not a lot of people dead,”<sup>32</sup> now advises a proactive strategy that includes military response and counters to possible spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).<sup>33</sup> In a 1999 study, RAND experts proposed that the new terrorism is marked by different motives, actors, sponsors, greater lethality, and a flatter, less hierarchical structure.<sup>34</sup> Another RAND expert, Bruce Hoffman, points out that the ambition, coordination, security, and dedication necessary for 19 suicide bombers to pull off four suicide hijackings simultaneously and under total secrecy are unmatched in history.<sup>35</sup> The fact that the hijackings killed more than 3,000 people adds to this factor.<sup>36</sup> He also points out that the planning for the 9/11 attack probably overlapped the execution of the November 1999 attack on the USS *Cole* in Aden harbor that points to the existence of a multitrack organizational capability.<sup>37</sup> Laqueur, who formerly resisted categorizations, admitted that a new category of terrorist now exists—one with an apocalyptic vision, nationalist or racial elements, and access to WMD.<sup>38</sup> Unlike Taheri most recent writers point to more than just the Iranian revolution as the facilitator of this new kind of terrorist. Christopher C. Harmon pointed out that the end of the Cold War may have terminated support from some former government sponsors of terror, but it also produced regional and domestic tensions that can now spawn terrorism.<sup>39</sup> Beau Grosscup proposed that the end of the Soviet Union’s hold on these regions enabled these tensions to finally find violent expression.<sup>40</sup> But he pointed out that it was the Gulf War in 1990–91 that thrust the new, post–Cold War terrorist, the militant Islamic terrorist, into the limelight.<sup>41</sup> Despite the subtle differences, there is much support for the existence of a new terrorism. There are also signs that this is nothing more than a logical extension of past forms of terrorism.

Terrorism has gone through so many transformations throughout history that it seems almost pointless to declare that there is a new terrorism. Indeed, Hoffman compares modern militant Islamic terrorism to the eleventh- and twelfth-century Assassins, also a radical Islamic sect. The Assassins not only believed violence as a form of struggle to vanquish their Christian enemies but also a ritual duty that was meant to cleanse the perpetrator and hasten the arrival of the new millennium.<sup>42</sup> Heinzen wrote of the desirability of acquiring WMD: “We need instruments of destruction which are of little use to the great masses of the barbarians when they are fighting a few lone individuals but which give a few lone individuals the terrifying power to threaten the safety of whole masses of barbarians.”<sup>43</sup> It is possible that some past terrorists would have been just as fanatical and lethal as current terrorists had they possessed the



means. This is an important issue. To develop the proper strategy for an unprecedented war on terrorism, a strategist must know whether any of the lessons from past counterterrorism campaigns are applicable. This study determines whether there is a new terrorism by analyzing old and new terrorism in a consistent manner and begins with a good definition.

Scholars have struggled with the issue of defining terrorism for decades, and they do not seem to have made much headway. In 1974 Jenkins defined it as “the threat of violence, individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear.”<sup>44</sup> He pointed out that the real target of terrorism is the people watching, not the victims of the attack, so that the object is not mass murder.<sup>45</sup> Hoffman presents an admirable definition based on distinguishing terrorism from other forms of violence, such as guerrilla warfare, ordinary crime, and lunatic assassinations: “The deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.”<sup>46</sup> Laqueur resists giving a definition, saying instead that ideally all studies of it would have a clear definition, but the lack of such a tool does not mean terrorism cannot be identified or studied.<sup>47</sup> He prefers interpretations of terrorism, of which his favorite is “the use of covert violence by a group for political ends,” and admits it is usually directed against a government but can also be against an ethnic group, class, or party.<sup>48</sup> Of course, those concerned with policy or law need a definition. The US State Department has used a consistent definition of terrorism since 1983, which is the definition contained in Title 22 of the *US Code*, section 2656f(d): “premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.”<sup>49</sup> Here the term *noncombatant* is taken to include military personnel not on duty at the time of the attack. It should really include anyone not formally engaged in an armed conflict. These details cause disagreements over the definition of terrorism.

But while most publications and authors struggle admirably to come up with a definition, what is really necessary to prosecute a war on terrorism is a clear conception of the enemy in this particular case. Given the trouble these scholars have had with the subject, an all-inclusive definition may be self-defeating. What is important is not mastery of the entire spectrum of terrorism but to point out the portion of the spectrum with which we are currently dealing.

Since this study aims to inform American and allied decision makers in their development of strategy in the war on terrorism, it refines the nature of this particular war by studying statements by the Bush administration. On 20 September, after the dust had settled from the initial statements in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, President Bush expounded on his view of the nature and aims of the war:

Our war on terror begins with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped and defeated.

These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us, because we stand in their way.

We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the twentieth century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions—by abandoning every value except the will to power—they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way, to where it ends: in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies.

Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command—every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war—to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network.<sup>50</sup>

So the president had set out an extremely tough aim for the war—the defeat of every terrorist group of global reach. This action was a good morale boost for the public but was an extremely ambitious and ill-defined objective. A joint statement by the United States and the European Union the same day echoed that the aim was to “eliminate international terrorism—its leaders, its actors, its networks. Those responsible for aiding, supporting or harboring the perpetrators, organizers and sponsors of these acts will be held accountable.”<sup>51</sup> The campaign in Afghanistan lent some clarification in that the United States used military force to augment diplomatic efforts, to freeze financial assets, and legal efforts by shutting down a government that would not cooperate in America's efforts to capture terrorists.<sup>52</sup> In January President Bush gave further guidance: “Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.”<sup>53</sup> In the same speech, he named North Korea, Iran, and Iraq to a special category called the “axis of evil” that could potentially supply terrorists with WMD.<sup>54</sup>

From this trail of statements, a number of things become clear. First, the United States considers terrorism a threat to its national security and its way of life. Bush declared that the terrorists had started a war against the United States and all who believe in its ideals to bring about the collapse of these societies. Second, this threat is great enough to warrant sending its military to a foreign country, where the United States does not have any appreciable interests, to fight a war. Third, the aim of the war is to eliminate all terrorist groups of global reach. Bush implied terrorism is comparable to fascism, Nazism, and totalitarianism and would be rendered ineffective and undesirable just like these ideologies had been. Fourth, the strategy for accomplishing this is to use the combined instruments of America's power to solidify all states in a worldwide coalition that gradually eliminates any support to terrorists, while simultaneously capturing and bringing to justice

known terrorists. The war thus becomes one of a coalition of legitimate states defending the peace and security of their citizens against nonstate actors and their state allies who together threaten to disrupt that peace and security to impose some wide-reaching change. In pragmatic terms, this limits the scope of this study to those groups who have the ability to operate in the international arena and will therefore be acknowledged as a threat by enough of the coalition states to keep the coalition together.

This step is important in this study because of what it rules out, as much as anything. One common barrier to a global understanding of terrorism is the notion that “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” This is a false dichotomy because the term *freedom fighter* deals with the ends sought, while terrorism is a category of the means used.<sup>55</sup> In any case, the type of terrorism being studied is narrowed to the enemies of legitimate governments, and especially the coalition in the US war on terrorism. Admittedly, this ignores the possibility that some current terrorists may have a legitimate grievance against a current government that they believe may have used terrorism to gain or solidify its position of power, as in the case of the Palestinians. This study does not examine terror used by a state to compel its own citizens to adopt its policies. It may not consider some indigenous terrorist groups that affect only a limited area, and thus are somebody else’s problem. It does not examine conventional warfare between equivalent political entities, where the participants are well identified and remain within established norms. The terrorists, by contrast, are usually not equivalent as political entities, are anonymous, and go well outside accepted norms of warfare.<sup>56</sup> But so do guerrillas.

Drawing a distinction between guerrilla warfare and terrorism as a form of war is not necessary in this type of analysis. Both are forms of insurgency or rebellion against authority—the difference is in the methods the insurgents use in each case. Bard O’Neill notes that guerrillas target “the government’s armed forces, police, or their support units and, in some cases, key economic targets, rather than unarmed civilians.”<sup>57</sup> But even he admits there are many grey areas and groups that use a combination of guerrilla and terrorist means.<sup>58</sup> Laqueur puts a slightly different twist on the matter, insisting it is a straightforward matter to separate the guerrillas from the terrorists. He claims looking at the ultimate strategy should make the distinction. The guerrilla aims at “building up ever-growing military units and eventually an army, and establishing liberated zones in which an alternative government can be put up and propaganda openly conducted.”<sup>59</sup> Laqueur claims guerrillas have often used terrorist strategies, but the reverse is almost never true, because of the difficulties of creating safe havens in the urban setting.<sup>60</sup> Here Laqueur reflects the positions of Mao Tse-tung, who envisioned three phases of war: strategic defensive, stalemate, and strategic counteroffensive.<sup>61</sup> The purpose of guerrilla warfare, according to Mao, was to support regular warfare and to eventually become regular warfare.<sup>62</sup> Part of this process was to “arouse the masses to arm themselves, and wage guerrilla warfare in co-ordination with the masses.”<sup>63</sup> In other

words, the guerrillas conduct a campaign to gain the people's support and new recruits. The guerrillas did not kill the civilians, they recruited the civilians. They concentrated on winning small military victories to secure one area at a time until they had control over enough area and enough support from the people to transition to a strategy of offensive conventional warfare. In Mao's type of warfare, the military would know they were involved in a conflict, albeit with an enemy they could not normally locate. There would not be a question of whether or not to fight the guerrillas militarily, as there is with terrorists. Thus, the technical distinction between terrorist and guerrilla is not as important in this war as the determination that the group is an insurgent, nonstate actor recognized as a threat to the security of a legitimate state and its citizens. However, labeling a group a terrorist rather than a guerrilla force may have strong implications in the propaganda war.

Determining the nature of a war on terrorism is a difficult but important task. The government of Uruguay proved that misreading the threat and, therefore, the war can lead to disaster for the government and the society. But the nature of terrorism has changed so much through the centuries that it cannot easily be defined. It is violence, a form of war, a strategy, a form of communication, a means to an end. But that end is not always readily discernible; therefore, even solving all the world's problems would not necessarily rid the world of terrorism. Nor is the cause always the driving force in terrorist groups. There is always a cause, and that cause cannot be ignored because it will form an important battleground. Although the nature of terrorism has changed throughout history, modern terrorism has increasingly involved acts that can be considered immoral: seemingly indiscriminate attacks against innocents for purposes that do not warrant this force. The fundamentalist revolution and the end of the Cold War have created a world where radicals have an increasingly permissive environment for their extreme methods. The extreme nature of terrorism in the 1990s, culminating with the 9/11 attacks on the United States has caused many to warn of the arrival of a new terrorism. The United States has responded by declaring a war on this new terrorism. But what does that mean? How can a state declare war on a form of warfare?

The state must transform the war into a war against some political entity or entities. This war is a war of unequals in more ways than one. For the states involved, it has become a war to rid the world of a major threat to their security. The strategy is to simultaneously hunt down and punish terrorists while dividing the states of the world into two camps, with one eventually eliminating the other and thus cutting off all support for terrorism. This strategy narrows the scope of terrorism to those groups that will simultaneously be acknowledged as threats to the security of (or at least not favored by) the entire coalition and leaves out some forms of terrorism, such as a state's repression of its citizens or indigenous terrorism where it only affects one state. On the other hand, it eliminates some of the need to distinguish between some other categories, such as those who may have a legitimate cause and those who may technically be clas-

sified as guerrillas. But more importantly, it transforms the struggle into one of state powers defending their interests. This is a convenient way to enable the states to use their instruments of power against the terrorists, but is it wise? Has terrorism become a new phenomenon that warrants a war against it? Or is the US government totally misreading the nature of this war and condemning the effort to failure or even a disaster similar to but on a larger scale than the Uruguayan tragedy?

### Notes

1. Take, for example, Stephen Sloan, *Beating International Terrorism: An Action Strategy for Preemption and Punishment* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 2000). On page 60, he declares: "It is time to declare war on terrorism." On page 79, however, he warns that our policies at the time (during the Clinton administration) came nowhere close to this level of aggressiveness; and so, if we did, we would have to define the nature of the conflict.
2. Walter Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1987), 321.
3. Arturo C. Porzecanski, *Uruguay's Tupamaros* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 3.
4. *Ibid.*, 4–5.
5. *Ibid.*, 7–8.
6. *Ibid.*, 14.
7. *Ibid.*, 17.
8. Laqueur, 138.
9. From the document "Rules of the Organization," in *Los Tupamaros*, O. Costa (Mexico City: Era, 1971), 92; and Porzecanski, 40.
10. Porzecanski, 44–46.
11. *Ibid.*, 57.
12. *Ibid.*, 56.
13. *Ibid.*, 74.
14. *Ibid.*, 12.
15. Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 89.
16. Laqueur, 11.
17. *Ibid.*, 11.
18. Hoffman, 65.
19. For a much more in-depth explanation of this emergence, see Beau Grosscup, *The Newest Explosions of Terrorism: Latest Sites of Terrorism in the 1990s and Beyond* (Far Hills, N.J.: New Horizon Press, 1998). Grosscup proposes it was the neoconservatives—disillusioned liberals-turned-conservatives during the 1960s—that developed this view of the emergence of terrorism in the 1960s and thereby helped to develop our terrorist stereotypes. Grosscup suggests this may be detrimental to understanding terrorism. Nevertheless, it is provided here as the most-often cited reason for the emergence of the modern terrorism (including old and new terrorism) examined in this study. For example, see Laqueur, 206 or Hoffman, 80.
20. Bard O'Neill, *Insurgency and Terrorism* (New York: Brassey's, 1990), 24.
21. Brian Michael Jenkins, "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict," in *International Terrorism and World Security*, ed. David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf (London: Croom Helm, 1975), 16.
22. Dr. Lewis Ware, professor of International Studies, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala., interviewed by author, 7 November 2001.
23. Karl Heinzen, "Murder," in *The Terrorism Reader: A Historical Anthology*, ed. Walter Laqueur (New York: Meridian, 1978), 56–57.
24. Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 54–55.

25. Ibid., 203.
26. Laqueur, 6.
27. Kachig Tololyan, "Cultural Narrative and the Motivation of the Terrorist," in *Inside Terrorist Organizations*, ed. David C. Rappaport (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 227.
28. Martha Crenshaw, "Theories of Terrorism: Instrumental and Organizational Approaches," in *Inside Terrorist Organizations*, 24.
29. Maj Vicki Rast, PhD, former course director at Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala., interviewed by author, 10 October 2001. This refers to a model for conflict that Rast taught at the school. While rational or realist organizations such as states may fight to protect positions and interests, the more culturally driven an organization is, the more it will be motivated to defend values. Moving further away from states in mind-set, small groups or individuals are often driven by worldviews or even needs. When two groups operating on different parts of this spectrum collide, there will often be no way to communicate or compromise, and conflict is inevitable.
30. Amir Taheri, *Holy Terror* (Bethesda, Md.: Adler & Adler, 1987), 9.
31. Ibid., 10.
32. Jenkins, 15.
33. Ian O. Lesser et al., *Countering the New Terrorism*, foreword by Brian Michael Jenkins (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, 1999), xi-xii.
34. Ibid., 1.
35. Bruce Hoffman, "Re-thinking Terrorism in Light of a War on Terrorism," Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, House of Representatives, 26 September 2001, 2.
36. "A Nation Challenged; Dead and Missing," *New York Times*, 8 January 2002. As of 4 January, official estimates were that the 9/11 attackers had killed 3,119 persons, including 2,895 in New York, 184 in Washington, and 40 in Pennsylvania. This does not include the 19 hijackers.
37. "A Nation Challenged; Dead and Missing," 3.
38. Walter Laqueur, "The New Face of Terrorism," *Washington Quarterly* 21, no. 4 (1998):176.
39. Christopher C. Harmon, *Terrorism Today* (Portland, Ore.: Frank Cass, 2000), 3.
40. Grosscup, 386.
41. Ibid., 387-88.
42. Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, 89.
43. Heinzen, 62
44. Ibid., 14.
45. Ibid., 15.
46. Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, 43.
47. Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism*, 142.
48. Ibid., 72.
49. US Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999*, April 2000, i.
50. George W. Bush, address to a joint session of Congress and the American people, 20 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 5 December 2001, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010920-8.html>.
51. Richard Boucher, US-EU ministerial press statement on combating terrorism, 20 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 5 December 2001, available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2001/4975.htm>.
52. George W. Bush, presidential address to the nation on the eve of the Afghanistan war, 7 October 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 5 December 2001, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011007-8.html>.
53. George W. Bush, State of the Union Address, 29 January 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, 20 February 2002, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>

54. Ibid.
55. O'Neill, 7.
56. Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism*, 3.
57. O'Neill, 26.
58. Ibid.
59. Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism*, 5.
60. Ibid.
61. Mao Tse-tung, *Six Essays on Military Affairs* (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1972), 237.
62. Ibid., 302.
63. Ibid., 303.

## Chapter 3

# How to Analyze Terrorist Strategies

*Thus, what is of supreme importance in war is to attack the enemy's strategy . . . Therefore I say: Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in peril.*

—Sun Tzu  
*The Art of War*

The way to answer the questions at the end of the previous chapter, according to Sun Tzu, is to analyze and counter the strategy of the enemy in this war. Strategies are nebulous things to analyze, so to do this objectively, this study needs a systematic method of analyzing and using terrorist groups' strategies. This chapter explores the most common method of comparing terrorist groups: the typology. It explains why this method is not deep enough for analyzing and comparing strategies. Instead, it develops what it calls an analytical framework, which consists of factors cited by scholars as those, most important to consider when analyzing terrorist groups. It explains how this framework can (and will) be used to develop an assessment of a terrorist group's strategy.

One way of attacking the problem is by grouping the terrorist organizations within a terrorist typology, which is merely a classification system that attempts to delineate the different types of terrorism. For instance, some classify groups entirely by ideological motivation, which generally yields anarchism, communism, fascism, nationalism/separatism, religion, and pro-state classes.<sup>1</sup> Others include catchall categories for groups that do not quite fit, such as Latin American or new world.<sup>2</sup> The classes or types within the typology are usually driven by its analytical purpose. To adequately represent the spectrum of terrorist groups, one would have to develop a multidimensional typology that differentiates with respect to all variables significant to the analysis. The claim, for instance, that there is a new terrorism suggests a typology with the classes "new" and "old." But this is not entirely useful, because undoubtedly there would be differences among the old groups and among the new groups. A comparison strictly based on this two-class typology would stand little chance of finding a difference. To be effective, the typology would need subclasses, and the subclasses should be the same for "old" and "new." The weakness of this approach is that it implies the nature of terrorism is stable. It is entirely possible, if there is a new terrorism, that none of the new groups would fit within the subclasses of old terrorism. To compare, however, an analyst would be tempted to fit the groups within these categories anyway, and this would blur reality.<sup>3</sup> If the purpose of the classification is to determine the nature of the terrorist threat to states and to tell whether



this threat has changed, this type of classification exercise is not nearly deep enough.

The factors that produce these classes and subclasses are a good point of departure. If ideology is important enough to have inspired entire typologies, then it is a factor that should be considered in the analysis. Similarly, other factors that may be used to differentiate groups should be considered as well. This study develops an analytical framework consisting of the factors that are important in determining the nature of the terrorist threat. The difference between this analytical framework and a typology is that the study makes no attempt to put names to the different factor variations. It will not call one group a left-wing group and another a right-wing group, as a typology would. Rather, it will perform a more difficult subjective assessment.

Developing this analytical framework is difficult due to the diversity of terrorist groups. Like snowflakes, no two are identical; to ignore a nuance may be to incorrectly understand the threat a group imposes. Understandably, few experts have developed comprehensive analytical frameworks. O'Neill proposes the way to determine the nature of the insurgent group by identifying its goals, the means, or form of war, it uses. For a terrorist group, the means would be terrorism, as opposed to guerrilla or conventional war. The next step is to identify the strategy being used. These strategies would differ with respect to six factors: environment, popular support, organization, unity, external support, and government response.<sup>4</sup> A RAND Corporation study identified 10 categories of terrorist-group attributes that could be used to analyze terrorist groups and to answer broad analytical questions: organization; leadership; demography; ideology, doctrine, and goals; psychology, mind-set, and decision making; funding and logistics; operations and modus operandi; communications; external relations; and environment and government response.<sup>5</sup> Chapter 1 showed that most writers who claim there is a new terrorism point to factors that have something to do with the lethality of the terrorist acts, the functional organization of the group, the ideological motivation for the group, and the support the group receives, in terms of both material and moral support.<sup>6</sup> Some also include strategy in the list. At first glance, it may seem that these analytical frameworks have little in common.

However, they can all be stripped to a common core of factors. For the moment, remove strategy from consideration. Strategy relates means to ends, so it will be addressed later as the overarching link among all other factors. The group's desired ends are often difficult to discern, given that the group may not have explicitly stated them and may have stated false ends just to cloud the issue.<sup>7</sup> As our exploration of the nature of terrorism revealed, often the ends are only one of many methods a group will use to motivate its members and target audience. Therefore, any stated ends can be considered in the same category as ideological motivation during the analysis. The rest of the factors in each of the above frameworks relate to a group's means. When placed side by side, the factors

can be massaged into four categories that form a simple, four-factor analytical framework (table 1).

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of Analytical Frameworks**

<i>O'Neill</i>	<i>RAND</i>	<i>Analytical Framework</i>
Environment	Operations and Modus Operandi; Environment	Operations
Goals	Ideology, Doctrine, and Goals	Motivation
Organization, Unity	Leadership; Organization; Psychology, Mind-set, and Decision-making; Communications	Organization
Popular Support, External Support	Popular Support; Funding and Logistics; External Relations	Support

The operations factor refers to the type of acts the group carries out. The analyst must look at the types of tactics the group uses, the frequency of its attacks, and the number and type of targets it attacks. A group that attacks mostly materiel targets has a different strategy than one that attacks mostly people. A group that assassinates public officials with whom it disagrees has a different strategy than one that drives a planeload of people it does not know into a building of more people it does not know. O'Neill proposes that this has much to do with the type of environment in which the group is operating.<sup>8</sup> For instance, the Tupamaros showed that an urban campaign is possible within the proper societal context. The choice of the urban campaign revealed that the Tupamaros (1) wanted close proximity to the more politically active city-dwellers, (2) wanted to be near the more lucrative political targets, and (3) knew that the city was a better environment from which to resist any military intervention.<sup>9</sup> These are bits of information that can aid in piecing together the group's strategy. The increasing lethality of modern terrorist acts and the fact that these acts are committed on seemingly innocent bystanders are probably the most oft-cited factors in the determination that today's terrorism is new.

Motivation is another factor that is considered to have undergone a revolutionary change. In the context of this framework, motivation refers to the driving force that inspires the collective group (not the psychological motivation of the individuals). Whereas older groups usually had a political objective in mind (as well as a matching political ideology), many experts say today's groups are interested in causing total world chaos so as to usher in a new world order.<sup>10</sup> That this will have an impact on the terrorists' strategy is evident from Taheri's summary of the Islamic ideology used by many modern terrorist groups: "Considering itself as an expres-

sion of Islamic revival which must, by definition, lead to the conquest of the entire globe by the True Faith, . . . it is clearly conceived and conducted as a form of Holy War which can only end when total victory has been achieved.”<sup>11</sup> This motivation is an important factor in understanding the group’s strategy, because it is the message that the group must transmit to its target audience to gain and maintain its legitimacy and, therefore, sustain moral and materiel support, which is the third factor in the analytical framework.

There are basically two types of support the groups need: materiel and moral. In the past, especially during the Cold War, external relations with states were common sources of funding and weapons. That should have been a hint to these states that such ties were a potential starting point for counterterrorism: “It is a curious anomaly of covert warfare that governments understand the importance of financing groups they support, but fail to appreciate how vital cash is to the terrorist forces they oppose.”<sup>12</sup> Obtaining this materiel support forms a major portion of the terrorists’ strategy. But just as important is obtaining the moral support of followers. “Terrorism is aimed at the people watching, not at the actual victims.”<sup>13</sup> The tough question here is, “Which people watching are the terrorists aiming to influence?” For example, when the airliners slammed into the WTC on 9/11, citizens of the United States were angry. That evening President Bush proclaimed in a speech that:

The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet, unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed; our country is strong.

A great people has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.<sup>14</sup>

Whether the terrorists correctly predicted the American public’s reaction to the attacks on the WTC is a matter for hypothesis. But more important is the fact that Americans were probably not the target audience for the attacks. It is quite possible the attacks were meant to show others in the world that the terrorists were carrying out their sacred duty to fight against the evil West, no matter what the cost. In that case the strong response can play into the terrorists’ strategy. To correctly understand the terrorist group’s strategy, the analysis must correctly identify the target audience. Usually, the audience is one that, if properly influenced, will increase the group’s materiel and moral support.

Once all the means are in place, the terrorists must organize to put them into action. In organizing, the group needs to satisfy several somewhat conflicting needs. There is a need to maintain covertness but also a need to maintain contact with the target audience to proselytize. There is a need for cooperation among members but also a need for anonymity in case one member gets arrested. Not only is there a need for functional specialization

but also a need for duplication of some efforts. And there is a need for control from the top and a need for freedom at the operations level. The Basque *Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA)* solves these needs by organizing along three different lines: a basic cell structure, where a handful of individuals who do not know each others' names are responsible to a single individual; a division into legals, illegals, and supporters to maintain some covertness and some overtness; and a committee structure which assures the various functions such as finance, politics, and military operations are accomplished.<sup>15</sup> As new terrorism evolves, organizations are increasingly becoming flatter, less hierarchical, and capable of forming a matrix with other organizations. This strategy indicates a difference in that this type of organization would be capable of operations on a much larger, global scale with the possibility of multiple operations immediately. Advanced technology communication would allow all the operations of a large network of terrorists to be effectively controlled by a single command section.

Identification of these terrorist means and ends does not constitute assessment of the group's strategy. A strategy is a much more esoteric, subjective thing that one might describe as: "a product of the mind and will that adapts and distributes available means to attain desired ends in an atmosphere of uncertainty."<sup>16</sup> It is rarely written in one place while it is being executed. Even the top members may not be able to clearly communicate how the available means will translate to the desired ends. It is not an easy task to discern the group's strategy. But doing so is critical to determining the appropriate counterstrategy. The problem in Uruguay was that the government did not understand the Tupamaros's strategy and ended up playing right into it. Identifying the four factors in the analytical framework is the first part of identifying a terrorist group's strategy. The next part is identifying the mechanism that turns these factors into a strategy.

In this context, a mechanism is an intellectual explanation for the translation of force, applied on a given target set, into political change.<sup>17</sup> It is the theoretical reason for the success or failure of a given method to produce a desired outcome. Since this is the esoteric part of strategy, this is the part that must be surmised. Sometimes in retrospect, terrorists may hint at a mechanism in their writings. Carlos Marighella was a Brazilian legislator—turned terrorist in the late 1960s—who wrote a practical manual on how to conduct an urban terrorist campaign. Many groups have adopted his methods. His basic mechanism was that spontaneous and random violence, combined with a propaganda campaign, would convince the government and its people that the government had lost control. Such action would cause the government to crack down with some type of martial law that would take away the people's freedoms and would show how repressive the government can be. At this point, the "urban guerrillas," as Marighella called them, would be the underdogs—victims of the same repression that the people were experiencing—but willing to fight in spite of it. The people would turn away from the government and join the guerrillas.<sup>18</sup> Presumably, Marighella then aimed at in-

creasing the terrorist forces through recruitment of the people until the government forces could be overthrown, although this is not clear from his manual. Another possibility would be that he expected the pressure of public opinion to force the government to give in to his demands.

A similar mechanism had worked for another group 20 years earlier—the Israeli group, Irgun, led by Menachim Begin.<sup>19</sup> The Irgun had used violence, although mostly in the form of attacks on British government forces, to induce the British to impose military discipline on the Palestinian region. Simultaneously, the violence and counterviolence gained international recognition for the Irgun's cause. Finally, outcry from the British public and other countries, including the United States, forced the British to acquiesce to the formation of an Israeli state in Palestine.<sup>20</sup> Lacking strategic foresight, the British played right into the Irgun's strategy. Since then, the Irgun strategy has been ineffective, even though many groups have followed Marighella's writings and used his method to spread terror in different parts of the world.<sup>21</sup> This points out the need to identify a terrorist group's overall strategy, including its mechanism, when determining the counterstrategy.

Identifying a mechanism in a terrorist group's strategy is not as simple as putting oneself in another's shoes. The tendency when assessing a mechanism is to treat the enemy as a single, rational individual, when that is not the case at all. Not that terrorists are not rational, but no organization of human beings can be depended upon to act like a single, rational human being in all of its actions. The tendency is to think that an organization's actions are the results of choices made by its leaders. An organization is a black box that covers many smaller organizations that may be performing according to their own rules and procedures or that they may be serving goals that are only partially compatible with the organization's overall goals.<sup>22</sup> This agrees with Crenshaw's observation that many terrorist organizations espouse ideological goals only as a way to appear legitimate. These organizations commit terrorist acts because that is what they do—violence attracts more recruits, who are trained to commit more violence, in a self-perpetuating cycle. Many of these organizations could be considered criminal in nature, and there may be no higher mechanism than tactical *modus operandi*. This is why the analyst must identify the organization's operations, ideological motivation, support, and organizational structure and infer from them the nature of the group's strategy. Any incongruence among these factors could signal an incomplete or irrational strategy.

The task of defining the nature of the terrorist threat to determine whether there is a new terrorism is a complex one. It involves much more than simply developing a typology that classifies terrorist groups by one or several characteristics of the group. This study follows the advice of Sun Tzu and assesses the strategy upon which the terrorist groups are staking their hopes of success. The first step in this two-step method is the development of a consistent analytical framework that completely de-

scribes the means at the disposal of a terrorist group. This study uses framework that is a hybrid of those used by several terrorist experts and consists of four primary factors: operations/lethality, motivation, support, and organization. The second, and more difficult, step is determining the mechanism by which these four factors could translate into success for the terrorist group. The two steps, taken together, form an assessment of the terrorist group's strategy—a strategy that the group may or may not even be able to articulate among themselves. This strategic assessment forms the analytical foundation of the natural threat posed by terrorist groups and the appropriate strategy to defeat them.

The remaining chapters analyze a small sample of old and new terrorist groups and use this process to determine whether the nature of the new terrorist threat holds implications for our strategy in a war on terrorism. The delineation between old and new is that the new groups are those who have been influenced by both the Islamic fundamentalist revolution and the end of the Cold War—groups that have begun their terrorist activities in the 1990s and have ideologies that deal with worldwide struggle and conversion.

#### Notes

1. Christopher C. Harmon, *Terrorism Today* (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 4–34; and Crozier's typology as presented in Jonathan R. White, *Terrorism: An Introduction*, 2d ed. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1998), 12.

2. Walter Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1987), 203. Laqueur lists separatist-nationalist, Latin American, urban terrorism by the new left, and extreme right or semifascist. Ian O. Lesser et al., *Countering the New Terrorism*, foreword by Brian Michael Jenkins (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, 1999), 68–71. The authors classified terrorists by the paradigm the terrorists used to come up with their overall strategy, leading to three classes: coercive-diplomacy, war, and new world.

3. White, 11.

4. Bard O'Neill, *Insurgency and Terrorism* (New York: Brassey's, 1990), 27; and e-mail from the author, 11 December 2001.

5. Brian Michael Jenkins et al., *A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Terrorist Groups* (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, 1985), 3.

6. Stephen Sloan, professor of Political Science, University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma City National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, e-mail to the author, 14 November 2001. Sloan said to examine both old and new terrorism in terms of the things that make terrorism run, which he enumerated as motivation, tactics, strategy, organizational doctrine, and support.

7. O'Neill, 35.

8. O'Neill, e-mail to the author with a handout he uses to link grand strategy to the analytical framework in the book, 11 December 2001.

9. Arturo C. Porzecanski, *Uruguay's Tupamaros* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 15–16.

10. Lesser et al. probably puts this in a nutshell the best, 71.

11. Amir Taheri, *Holy Terror* (Bethesda, Md.: Adler & Adler, 1987), 14.

12. James Adams, *The Financing of Terror* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 14.

13. Brian Michael Jenkins, "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict," in *International Terrorism and World Security*, ed. David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf (London: Croom Helm, 1975), 16.
14. George W. Bush, presidential address to the American public, 11 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/20010911-16.html>.
15. Harmon, 99.
16. This definition by a classmate, Michael Hays, at the School of Advanced Airpower Studies (now the School of Advanced Air and Space Studies), Maxwell AFB, Alabama, was used in his unpublished paper on the nature of war. Hays derived it from several sources, the most prominent being: Sir Basil H. Liddell Hart, *Strategy*, 2d ed. (London: Faber & Faber, 1967), 321; and Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1976), 104.
17. Robert A. Pape, *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), 56.
18. Carlos Marighella, "Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla," in *Urban Guerrilla Warfare*, ed. Robert Moss (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1972), 40.
19. Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 52.
20. *Ibid.*, 52-56.
21. White, 55.
22. Graham T. Allison, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Boston: Harper Collins, 1971), 5-6. Allison explains that the way we usually think about decisions is a rational actor model, which he calls Model I. This thinking is useful but must usually be supplemented or even supplanted by two alternative conceptual models, the Organizational Process Model (Model II), and the Governmental (Bureaucratic) Politics Model (Model III).

## Chapter 4

### **“Old” Terrorism**

*. . . the basic dynamics of the underground. The revealed truth generates the energy necessary for a classical armed struggle that must be hidden by a congenial ecosystem—the underground—that offers security at the price of competence. All such constructs are special and each is different.*

—J. Bowyer Bell  
*The IRA 1968–2000: Analysis  
of a Secret Army*

J. Bowyer Bell encapsulated the idea of analyzing terrorist strategy in one statement. The revealed truth is the group’s motivation in terms of ideology and goals. This allows the group to continue its operations—the armed struggle, in its ecosystem, which is the underground organization and its materiel and moral support. Communication of the motivation is the energy to maintain this support. This chapter analyzes three of the old terrorist groups: the Red Army Faction (RAF), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), and the Irish Republican Army (IRA).

#### **Red Army Faction**

The RAF of West Germany was a good example of what most terrorist experts would label ideological or left-wing terrorism. They were born of the antieverything movements that predominated in the West in the 1960s—when students with a social conscience were protesting the Vietnam War and there was a perceived repression of the Third World by the United States in the name of anticommunism. As Hoffman puts it, “Perhaps the unprecedented economic prosperity of these years allowed the luxury of introspection and self-criticism that, in more radical political circles, generated a revulsion against the socioeconomic inequities endemic to the modern, industrialized capitalist state.”<sup>1</sup> The RAF evolved into one of the more dangerous European groups of the modern era and committed spectacular acts of terrorism against high-visibility targets, emerged from the ashes twice when their entire leadership was imprisoned, and attempted to organize a Europeanwide anti-imperialism front by combining with Action Directe of France in 1984 and the Red Brigades (PCC Faction) of Italy in 1988.<sup>2</sup> But the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 started the process of politically marginalizing the group by taking away their ideological relevance, and the group declared a truce in 1992. As such, they make an excellent group to examine to learn the nature of the old terrorism.



The RAF evolved from a group formed by two German college students. On 3 April 1968 two Free University of Berlin students, Andreas Baader and his girlfriend, Gudrun Ensslin, set fire to two department stores with incendiary bombs. Their subsequent radical actions gradually drew the attention of the politically engaged, disaffected Berlin youth, including Ulrike Meinhof, a journalist-turned-political activist who became one of the group's core members.<sup>3</sup> Andreas and Ulrike became the founders of the Baader-Meinhof Group (BMG). In 1970, Baader, Ensslin, Meinhof, and six others fled Germany to a terrorist training camp in Jordan to be trained by Palestinians. Although they were dismissed after two months, they had learned enough to begin their terrorist group, now called the RAF.<sup>4</sup>

### **Organization**

The best place to begin studying the RAF is within their organizational structure because it provides a foundation for understanding other facets of the group. The structure that evolved over the years was an organization of four levels: commando, resistance, sympathizer, and prison. The commando level included the hard-core, clandestine members who performed the most tactically difficult and risky acts. The resistance-level members were those who lived legal, open lives but carried out low-level, less risky and demanding terrorist acts in support of the commando level. It was from this level that the RAF recruited new commando members. Sympathizers supported the RAF with demonstrations and propaganda but were unwilling to become militant. The prison level comprised former commandos who had been arrested and put in prison where they continued the struggle.<sup>5</sup> The structure was basically an adaptation created by necessity when the original BMG members were arrested in June 1972.

The group would have fallen apart had the leaders not worked through their attorneys to maintain direction from prison. They established a communication system and developed former supporters into the next generation of the RAF with the primary objective of getting the leaders out of prison.<sup>6</sup> Some of the other supporters started carrying out smaller attacks in response to the actions of the prisoners or commandos with the intent to cause materiel damage instead of casualties, and the RAF members began to see these resistance members as an integral part of the strategy.<sup>7</sup> However, the commando level always maintained a distance from the resistance level for security purposes.<sup>8</sup> In 1991 the German police estimated that there were 12–20 commandos, and the total strength of the group was approximately 200–300 members.<sup>9</sup> This organizational structure had a major impact on the types of operations the group undertook.

### **Operations**

The RAF in its infancy was a small organization that answered only to its own whims. Until 1972 most of the group's operations were thefts and bank robberies. On 11 May 1972 the original RAF members began their

first and only campaign with a bomb attack on the US Fifth Army Corps officers' mess in Frankfurt that killed one and injured 13.<sup>10</sup> In rapid succession between then and 24 May, the group pipe bombed the Augsburg police headquarters, car bombed the Bavarian criminal investigation department in Munich, planted a bomb in a German High Court judge's car, set off three bombs in the Springer Publishing firm in Hamburg, and car bombed the European headquarters of the US Army in Heidelberg. These attacks killed four and injured 59.<sup>11</sup> The entire leadership of the group was arrested and imprisoned, and the campaign was disrupted. The next generation would be entirely different.

As the RAF organizational structure evolved, different—but related—RAF operations were accomplished at each of its four levels. After its resurrection by the imprisoned leadership, the commando level began an operational campaign to obtain the release of the prisoners. The most sophisticated of these was the kidnapping of Dr. Hans-Martin Schleyer. As president of the Employers' Association of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Federation of German Industry, board member of Daimler-Benz, and personal friend of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, Schleyer was a conspicuous capitalist target. The RAF nabbed Schleyer from an armed motorcade on 5 September 1977. In coordination with their communiqué demanding the release of the RAF prisoners, on 13 October a Palestinian terrorist group member named "Martyr Halimeh" hijacked a Lufthansa airliner with 91 passengers. He flew the plane to Mogadishu, Somalia, and also demanded compliance with the RAF's demands.<sup>12</sup> The German government refused to cave in and executed a counterterrorist operation that freed all the passengers and captured or killed all the hijackers. When the RAF leaders in prison learned this elaborate scheme had failed, they committed suicide. But the RAF commandos, insisting the prisoners had been murdered, killed Schleyer.<sup>13</sup> This marked the end of the last major campaign of the RAF's career.

From 1978 until 1991, the RAF struggled for its existence. Able to muster only one or two attacks per year, the group relied on a parallel operations strategy to generate excitement among public supporters. All four levels activated simultaneously, and this resulted in (1) an assassination and communiqué by the commando level, (2) a hunger strike to the death by the prisoners, (3) low-level bombings by the resistance, and (4) protests and arson by the sympathizers.<sup>14</sup> For example, in December 1984, about 30 RAF members in prison began a hunger strike that lasted until February 1985. During this period, there were about 60 terrorist strikes, one of which was the assassination of Ernst Zimmerman, chairman of a major industrial corporation.<sup>15</sup> The other strikes were made in Germany, France, and Greece, which signaled another trend in RAF operations. On 15 January 1985 the RAF and a French group, Action Directe, announced in a joint five-page statement that they were setting up a united political-military front in Western Europe to oppose NATO employment and operations in Western Europe.<sup>16</sup> Although the RAF tried a similar arrangement later with the Italian

Red Brigades, neither arrangement amounted to much. For the RAF, the 1980s were a struggle for viability.

The overall record of the RAF is not terribly frightening as a threat to security. In the years 1972 to 1991, there were 24 commando-level attacks. Of these, 11 were directed at facilities and 13 at people. About 45 percent of the attacks were successful, but even many of the unsuccessful ones were audacious. The RAF did not shy away from attacking heavily defended targets, such as attempting six assassinations of heavily guarded individuals.<sup>17</sup> In the entire period, a total of 23 people were killed and 100 injured by the commando-level attacks, including those in 1972.<sup>18</sup>

### **Support**

The RAF used various methods of materiel support necessary to maintain their two-decade war. The early group's actions resembled those of Mari-gHELLa and the Tupamaros in that they tried to expropriate everything they needed from their enemies. They robbed banks to finance their activities and stole cars—BMW's were their trademark—to pull off the robberies.<sup>19</sup> For their training, they attended Palestinian training camps in 1970. The PLO group al-Fatah also sold the RAF weapons.<sup>20</sup> They obtained valuable support from East Germany. In 1980 the RAF met with the East Germans to discuss strategy and gain intelligence. In 1981 the East Germans trained three RAF members to operate rocket-propelled grenades.<sup>21</sup> Arrests in East Germany in 1990 uncovered that the RAF was receiving money, weapons, intelligence, and safe haven from their eastern brothers.<sup>22</sup> Yet this materiel support could not guarantee the RAF's vitality.

Maintaining the support of the public, or at least enough to continue recruitment, was the toughest part of the RAF's struggle. German intelligence officials estimated the number of sympathizers had been more than 1,000 in the 1970s, but by the mid-1980s the number had dropped to about 150.<sup>23</sup> From this pool, it is difficult to maintain a steady stream of recruits. Struggle for support is indicative of the group's lack of ideological strength and resilience.

### **Motivation**

The biggest weakness of the RAF was a profoundly unprofound ideology. The group seemed to be antieverything: "There are thousands of unresolved problems that are crying out for a solution and that will lead all mankind into a catastrophe unless they are tackled soon and solved. All these problems sprang up as a result of the capitalist principle, according to which the only thing that counts is profit and power, and where people and nature play only a subordinate role."<sup>24</sup> In the early years, this meant fighting the United States because of its involvement in Vietnam. After Vietnam the RAF had to look for another cause and latched onto the Palestinian struggle.<sup>25</sup> But throughout the majority of its existence, the RAF was focused on the liberation and civil rights of its imprisoned members

and continued a line of propaganda that the prisoners were being tortured and isolated.<sup>26</sup> In 1992 German Justice Minister Klaus Kinkel put it more bluntly: “Without the prisoners, there would be no RAF.”<sup>27</sup> Added to this, several of the group members, notably Baader, showed by their lifestyle that they were motivated as much by the sex and drugs that were loose and free in the group as by the save-the-world ideals.<sup>28</sup> This haphazard mixture of aims severely diluted any Marxist-Leninist ideology the group may have used to reach its supporters.

Even this Marxist-Leninist ideology was doomed. The fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 took away the RAF’s cross-border sanctuary, terminated support from all communist sources, and started the process of politically marginalizing the RAF.<sup>29</sup> In the group’s own words, “The collapse of the socialist states . . . has had a disastrous effect on the millions of people throughout the world, and now all those who are fighting for liberation all around the globe have to rely solely on themselves.”<sup>30</sup> But the “millions of people” were not willing to join the RAF in a struggle without the support of the socialist states. Two communiqués in 1992 set the stage for the dismantling of the RAF, and by 1998 they were completely disbanded.

The true RAF strategy was much different than the one that any group member may have recited during its existence. The organizational structure developed around the prisoners, with even the commandos usually following their lead. Their tendency was to try to get themselves out of jail or at least obtain access to each other in jail so they could communicate. These goals took priority over and diluted any higher calling. It is true that the group accomplished some impressive feats that, in quantity, could have caused NATO and the imperialist nations enough headaches to change policy. (This is the only possible mechanism for success.) But the RAF did not accomplish these in quantity. The main purpose of the operations was to maintain moral support from the public and materiel support from the socialist nations. The central theme of the RAF strategy was that of group maintenance—in Crenshaw’s terms, they were an *organizational*-type group. The label criminal may have even fit them better than terrorist, and the West German government’s response to them reflected this. The Germans simply refused to negotiate with the RAF, most notably in the case of the combination Schleyer kidnapping-Lufthansa hijacking.<sup>31</sup> The government kept the RAF in check by arresting and prosecuting its leaders—in June 1972 and November 1982 they arrested all the leaders. Although the group came back from these setbacks, they were never able to pose a serious threat to national security. When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, there was no higher cause to drive them and no support to sustain them, so they expired.

## **Palestine Liberation Organization**

Analyzing the PLO as a terrorist organization requires some explanation because many would object that the PLO is not and has never been

a terrorist organization. Having evolved into the Palestinian Authority, which today is the governing body of a territory, it could now be considered a government. The PLO has always been an umbrella for many factions and groups, most of which have been terrorist in nature. But while the PLO was more than just these terrorist groups, it would have been nothing without them. The terrorist groups took control of the PLO, put it in the world public opinion limelight, and brought in enough recruits and support to sustain its struggle toward their vision of a Palestinian-controlled state in the territory controlled by Israel. The PLO provided the framework and organizational structure within which these groups could claim a unified front toward a common goal, even if they had different methods for achieving that goal. In this respect, the PLO was no different than the IRA, which also had a central structure but had no real control over individual actions of its constituent groups. The PLO should be viewed as an organization with a strategy that, from the beginning in 1964, included the use of terrorism through its constituent groups to achieve its ends.

The British had promised the Palestinians they would become their own state after World War I. Instead, the Middle East was carved up and divided among the imperial powers and the Arab tribes. After World War II, the Jews who had flocked to the area managed to gain control of the state of Israel from the British through United Nations mediation (and after a terrorist campaign of their own).<sup>32</sup> The Arabs attacked the Israelis but were defeated, and 500,000 Palestinians were forced to leave their homes and live in refugee camps in nearby areas, especially Lebanon.<sup>33</sup> In these camps, the Palestinians built new lives and never gave up hope of eventually regaining their homes. They sent their children to get educated in Western universities, they used their education to set up successful businesses, and they prospered when merchant families in the unstable, oil-rich countries (Libya, Iraq, Iran, South Yemen, and Syria all underwent revolutions, but were rich from oil exports) hid their money in Lebanon.<sup>34</sup> Then in 1964, Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser organized a Pan-Arabic convention that formed the PLO.<sup>35</sup> But the formation of an organization could not assure the unity of the Palestinians.

### **Organization**

The PLO was an umbrella organization for many other groups and was organized into three departments at the highest level: the Palestine National Council, the Executive Committee, and the Palestine National Fund (PNF).<sup>36</sup> The Executive Committee was a group of 15 men, of whom Yasser Arafat was appointed chairman in January 1969, riding a wave of popularity due to his survival of a battle with the Israelis at Karamah.<sup>37</sup> The PNF was eventually given total control of all the PLO's finances, although many of the groups' funds were directly from external sponsors who did not want their influence watered down by a common funding pot. The PLO attempted to develop unity through the Palestinian National Congress, of which there

were 18 sessions between 1968 and 1990.<sup>38</sup> But the amount of influence the PLO had over these groups was debatable, since each of them had its own internal organization, ideology, and support.

The two main groups in the 1960s were Fatah and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). Yasser Arafat, who had started his career with the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, led the Fatah. When President Nasser destroyed the Brotherhood, Arafat moved elsewhere and formed Fatah. At the time of the PLO's formation, Fatah was already planning to begin military operations against the Israelis and thus gained the momentum which eventually made them the most powerful group within the PLO.<sup>39</sup> George Habash formed the PFLP as a counterweight to Fatah. There were other factions, and many more would come later. The history of the PLO is one of continuous splits among splinter groups.<sup>40</sup> The organization of the individual groups is not as important to the overall strategy of the PLO as the fact that the PLO was under the constant tension of having to try and integrate its own actions with those of the groups and who sometimes played along and sometimes did not. But their fate was ultimately tied to the fate of the PLO because of their common goal and the fact that the PLO was the organization that the rest of the world recognized as the authority over the smaller groups.

### **Motivation**

The driving force behind the PLO and the only thing nominally holding the different factions moderately together was—as its name implies—the desire to liberate the Palestinians. In 1964 the resolution that initiated the PLO stated, “Palestinian people must play a part in liberating its country, and in achieving self-determination.”<sup>41</sup> Fatah under Arafat recognized the armed struggle as a transcendent cause requiring the organization to abandon all ideological and social divisions. The groups had ideological leanings. In 1974 Arafat admitted that Fatah realized the Palestinian struggle as one piece in the worldwide struggle against colonialism and imperialism.<sup>42</sup> The PFLP was even farther to the left. In Marxist-Leninist style, the PFLP believed it would be a revolutionary party that could ignite a revolution (the liberation of Palestine from Israel) that would unite the entire Arab world.<sup>43</sup> But it was the memories (and, among the youth, the tales) of the injustice and devastation of the exodus in the late 1940s—the hunger for their own land—that inspired the Palestinian people. This is what basically motivated the PLO—most of the time.

The Arab states had other goals and that complicated the PLO's organizational dynamics. They also had money and other forms of support that individual factions within the PLO needed. But in return for this support, these sponsors often spurred the groups to undertake operations against other Arab states or even other groups within the PLO. This often gave the illusion that the groups were simply fighting to maintain support from the Arab states. For example, the Lebanese civil war in 1975–76 experienced Pales-

tinians fighting with the left-wing Lebanese against Syrians. In its aftermath, Anwar Sadat of Egypt made overtures to Israel and the United States to start a peace process. Iraq, dreaming of a pan-Arabic state under Iraqi control, hired Abu Nidal, a PLO terrorist group, to make strikes against moderate PLO members and against Syria, its political enemy. Thus, Fatah found itself fighting Iraq, other Palestinians, and Syria simultaneously.<sup>44</sup> In 1982 during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, Fatah was expelled from Beirut by the Israelis, their refugee camps by the Christian Falange group, and the Tripoli area by the Syrians and the Lebanese Shiites, who were sponsored by Iran.<sup>45</sup> The Palestinians and the Arab states had in common the desire to remove Israel from the lands occupied in the 1967 Six-day War. But the political dealings of the states got the PLO involved in operations that exacerbated the internecine nature of its groups. Nevertheless, the PLO found out along the way that they did not need the materiel support of the Arab states as much as they thought and found other ways to support themselves.

### **Support**

Since the beginning, state support to the PLO has been unreliable. In 1971 only \$40,000 of \$10 million promised by Arab states was delivered to the PLO. This spurred the PLO to demonstrate, through spectacular feats of terrorism, that it still held credibility in the war against Israel. In 1975 the PLO made a tour of the Gulf States to coerce them into paying. Only Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and the United Arab Emirates could be counted on.<sup>46</sup> The individual groups under the PLO umbrella received donations directly from the Arab states, who could then take advantage of the differing ideological leanings of the groups for their own purposes. Syria financed Saiqa and the PFLP General Command (PFLP-GC) to the amount of \$50 to \$100 million. At different times, Abu Nidal was hired by Syria, Iraq, and Libya to do their bidding, which included assassinations of PLO representatives in the late 1970s and an attempt on Arafat's life in 1974. Libya had made its debut into terrorism by stuffing \$1 million into the PFLP's coffer in 1971. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the PLO never received less than \$100 million per year from the Arab states, and it usually received closer to \$250 million. The problem was that their operating budget alone was more than \$500 million by 1987. This is why the PLO had to turn to self-financing.<sup>47</sup>

Most of the efforts of the PLO and its groups in this endeavor were criminal. In the middle of the Lebanese civil war, 20 January 1976, the PLO teamed up with one of its enemies in the war, the Christian Militia, and the Mafia to pull off the largest bank robbery of all time. They robbed the British Bank of the Middle East for what was estimated at \$100 million.<sup>48</sup> In 1972 the PFLP hijacked a Lufthansa plane and flew it to South Yemen where they were subsequently paid \$5 million as ransom for the crew and the plane. The PFLP also ran a very profitable document forging business.<sup>49</sup> In Lebanon—where the Palestinians essentially dictated the rules—robberies,

looting, and pass-through taxes were commonplace.<sup>50</sup> The PLO only made an effort to appear legal when it needed to—for political purposes. However, it still needed to obtain the moral support of its target audiences.

The PLO was as adept at communicating to these target audiences as it was at ignoring the opinions of its nontarget audiences. In 1970 the PLO established Samed, or the Palestine Martyrs Work Society, under Arafat's Fatah. The organization's objectives were to develop skilled Palestinian workers, get them in jobs, and develop a thriving, self-sufficient economy that would allow Palestinians to continue the revolution. Samed was basically the economic arm of the PLO. It started by manufacturing basic necessities and expanded to become both a major institution with industrial, cinematography and informational, agricultural, and general commercial branches.<sup>51</sup> The PLO had a captive, motivated audience in the refugees. But it did not take their loyalty lightly. Besides Samed, the PLO also worked on instilling unity and loyalty to the cause in generations of Palestinians through a social welfare system that included free schooling, free medical care, and generous compensation to the families of anyone killed or injured in the fight against Israel.<sup>52</sup> The PLO had no intention of losing the support of this target audience. Yet there was another target audience—the international community. For this type of communication, the PLO spoke with its terrorist operations.

### **Operations**

The most famous and effective communications with the international community were those acts of international terrorism that vaulted the PLO into the limelight in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The PFLP, under Habash, believed terrorism was a necessary part of the armed struggle and, consequently, the PFLP took the lead in committing 15 acts of international terrorism between 1968 and 1970. At this time, the Fatah acknowledged these acts as reprehensible and only later adopted such methods as desperation measures.<sup>53</sup> The first PFLP incident was the hijacking of an Israeli El Al flight from Rome to Tel Aviv on 22 July 1968. The PFLP held the plane, its crew, and its passengers hostage and demanded the release of Palestinian prisoners held by Israel. To its satisfaction, the PFLP found this was an extremely successful way not only to obtain this immediate goal but also to awaken the world to the Palestinian cause.<sup>54</sup> The last of the 15 acts was to have different consequences. In early September 1970, the PFLP hijacked four planes, blew one of them up in Cairo, and blew the other three up at Dawson Field in Jordan in front of the television cameras that were filming the hostage negotiations.<sup>55</sup> Because of this act, the Jordanian Hashemite regime began a massacre of the Palestinians in Jordan and forced the PLO to relocate to Lebanon and spurred the Fatah to adopt more extreme measures out of anger and frustration. The Fatah secretly developed an organization called Black September to commemorate the month the massacre oc-



curred.<sup>56</sup> The most infamous act of this organization was the Munich Olympics kidnapping and murder of Israeli athletes. On 5 September 1972 eight terrorists killed two Israelis and kidnapped nine from their dormitory. They offered to exchange the hostages for 236 Palestinian prisoners in Israel and some RAF prisoners in Germany, and the hostages were taken to an air base to board an aircraft to Cairo. A rescue attempt by the West German police sparked a firefight, and the terrorists killed all nine hostages before the police could kill or capture the terrorists.<sup>57</sup>

This terrible incident showed that even acts that fail to achieve the ostensible objectives could succeed strategically. Although the rest of the world perceived the terrorists as despicable, they also recognized them as a force with a serious cause. Palestinians acknowledged them as heroic defenders of this cause who were able to take incredible risks in its name. Most importantly, less than 18 months later, Arafat was invited to address the UN General Assembly, and the PLO was accorded special observer status.<sup>58</sup> The PLO successfully used international terrorist operations to reach both its target audiences—the Palestinians and the world public. But these operations are only a small part of the spectrum of the PLO's military activities.

The majority of the PLO's military operations were more "conventional" guerrilla or terrorist operations or outright conventional warfare. Fatah began its operations against Israel in 1964 with border attacks that drew criticism from Arab governments. Because of this criticism, Fatah turned to sabotage attacks in an attempt to get the Israelis to go on the offensive. Fatah's attacks probably contributed to the military developments that triggered the 1967 war.<sup>59</sup> After the Six-day War, Fatah tried to secure strongholds along the Israeli border by attacking the Israeli settlements there but failed because the Israeli forces were too strong.<sup>60</sup> However, when Arafat and Fatah (with substantial help from Jordan) successfully defended one of their bases at Karamah from a ferocious Israeli cross-border attack in March 1968, Arafat and the PLO became heroes to the Arab world.<sup>61</sup> Since then, the majority of the operations directed against Israel have been either hit-and-run attacks from across the border against Israeli transport or settlements, bombs, or shelling of Israeli settlements.<sup>62</sup> The groups then turned to the international terrorism mentioned above.

After the Yom Kippur War, the PLO groups, including PFLP, decided the hijackings had outlived their usefulness.<sup>63</sup> As an acknowledged member of the world community, the PLO had to appear more moderate. In addition, conflict in Lebanon would keep them busy for over a decade. In 1975 the Lebanese civil war kicked off, and in the period 1976–80, almost all of the attacks by the various PLO terrorist groups were against each other or against the traitor Egyptians. Sadat's 1977 trip to Israel and 1979 Camp David Accords added fuel to the fire, and the use of terrorism as statecraft was in full swing. The only real international terrorist acts during 1976–80 were those by Abu Nidal against Egyptian and PLO targets and a couple retaliations by Fatah.<sup>64</sup> By the late 1970s, the PLO had built

up its military infrastructure, and by 1980 Fatah numbered more than 20,000 men.<sup>65</sup> When the Israelis invaded Lebanon in 1982, to put an end to the terrorist strikes they had been receiving from across the border, Arafat's Fatah was overcome by the weight of a large conventional attack. The PLO would never revisit its ways of the 1970s.

The reality of the international environment forced the PLO to take a more political path. The Soviet Union had not helped the PLO at all, despite the PLO's left-leaning ideologies. Arafat began to see that the United States might be the key to any solution. To gain the good graces of the West, the PLO had to appear more moderate. Throughout the mid-1980s, Arafat walked a tightrope between trying to appear moderate to the West and appeasing the extreme factions inside his PLO. While he was officially denouncing terrorism, Fatah committed some terrorist acts, including financing the Palestine Liberation Front in the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* in 1985.<sup>66</sup> But Arafat was on a path to political resolution with Israel. Even when the Palestinians in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip started an uprising called the Intifada in 1987, Arafat tried to play the peacekeeper. Rather than encouraging the popular revolt that he had wished for two decades earlier, he tried in vain to maintain the peace.<sup>67</sup> But the Intifada accomplished much for the cause, as the West witnessed rock-throwing Palestinians fighting well-armed Israelis. World public opinion, the moderate stance of the PLO, and the active part of the United States led to the Oslo Agreement of 1993.

The Oslo Agreement was not the end of the conflict. But it established a Palestinian state, with the former PLO, now the Palestinian Authority, as government. The PLO had come a long way toward achieving its goals. However, the goals changed—the original aim was to remove the Israeli state and get the 1967 land back. The Oslo Agreement did not do this. This shift in aims is indicative of the overall strategy of the PLO, if such a thing could be formulated.

The PLO was a politically motivated organization that used a number of coercive methods to gain its political aims. It was able to accommodate diverse groups under an umbrella organization. It developed a self-sufficient financial arm to provide for the welfare of its people. It used both legitimate and illegitimate methods to obtain the resources to take care of its people and defend itself. It did not rely on terrorism but was able to use terrorism to its advantage to gain worldwide recognition and support, while mounting more conventional military campaigns at the same time. The PLO was willing to compromise in the end to obtain an end state that was slightly short of its original aims, but one that was sufficient to put the PLO in power as a legitimate authority. All these are the signs that the ultimate strategy of the PLO (whether they knew it or not at any given time) was to obtain this legitimacy and power to govern its constituents using coercive methods where necessary. The PLO's mechanism to accomplish this was raising its enemy's assessment of the costs involved in resisting its demands. Cross-border attacks would impose high blood and treasure costs on Israel, international

terrorism would vault the PLO into the international limelight, and a moderate stance would convince the world (including the Israeli public) the PLO could be trusted. The result would be materiel, human, and political costs that Israel simply could not handle. It is not clear how this mechanism could have led to Israeli abandonment of its land, but the mechanism was sufficient to obtain a reasonable compromise.

The Israeli counterstrategies were most certainly not devised with compromise in mind. To the Israelis, the PLO constituted a national security threat. Mindful of their inability to absorb losses of territory and people, the Israelis have always had a distinctly offensive military doctrine, and the counterinsurgency campaign against the PLO was no exception. The Israelis have used a combination of regime targeting, selected air strikes, widespread artillery bombardments, limited land incursions, and full-scale combined operations.<sup>68</sup> The Israeli security forces get much of the credit for the failure of the guerrilla campaigns of 1967. The Battle of Karamah in 1968 was an Israeli mechanized assault designed to wipe out one of Fatah's main bases in Jordan. It was swift and ferocious, but the Jordanians came to Fatah's rescue.<sup>69</sup> In 1978 Israel invaded again, Lebanon this time, an attack which was eventually halted by UN Security Council Resolution 425, which called on Israel to completely withdraw and allow UN forces to stabilize the region.<sup>70</sup> The resolution did nothing for Israel's security. In 1981 Israel started shelling southern Lebanon in retaliation for the shelling of Israeli settlements. Then in 1982, Israel began Operation Peace for Galilee, an invasion of Lebanon with the declared intent to destroy the political and military infrastructure of the PLO. The invasion, led by Sharon, covered the planned 45 kilometers so quickly that the Israelis decided to press on to Beirut. However, they were unable to wipe out the PLO forces (although Arafat's Fatah fled the country), and in the process ignited resentment among the Shiites. Surgical air strikes were unable to protect the Israeli troops from terrorist harassment, and the Israelis had to pull back closer to the Israel border.<sup>71</sup>

The Israeli dilemma is difficult and promises rewards for neither hard line nor soft. The troops dealt with the PLO from a position of insecurity throughout the entire struggle. Since the PLO's stated objective precluded the presence of an Israeli state, this was quite understandable. But they were facing an enemy that learned to use world public opinion very effectively, a skill the Israelis neglected. They never attempted a "hearts and minds" campaign and, consequently, missed opportunities to put the PLO on the defensive and also to make allies out of the Shiites in Lebanon.<sup>72</sup> Instead, they have made bitter enemies. But they did enter into the peace process, signed the Oslo Agreement, and withdrew from disputed territory—possibly too little, too late. The PLO has become the Palestinian Authority, and Arafat won elections in 1996, but there is still no peace. The Islamic Hamas commands enough support, and the Palestinian Authority and Israel—enough distrust—that the Palestinian people are divided as to which way is the road to satisfaction.<sup>73</sup>

## **Irish Republican Army**

The foregoing cases provide good examples of the application of this study's analysis framework and process, but they do not completely define the nature of the old terrorism. While such a complete definition may be out of reach in this study, no discussion of modern terrorism is complete without some mention of the IRA. In many taxonomies, the IRA's struggle would be categorized with the PLO's because both are struggles for an ethnic nation. There are similarities, but a quick analysis of the IRA reveals many differences as well.

Although the Irish conflict has cultural roots that extend back centuries, the struggle was rejuvenated in the late 1960s. This modern-day period began in 1969 when the Catholic civil rights campaign in Northern Ireland sparked violence. Since the formation of an Irish free state with British protection in Northern Ireland in 1921, the northern government had systematically reduced civil rights for Catholics living in the north. In the 1960s, these Catholics started a major civil rights movement to improve housing and education. In January 1969 participants in a four-day civil rights march from Belfast to Derry were gassed and beaten. Then in August, at the annual Protestant Apprentice Boys celebration, violence erupted and sent Belfast and Londonderry up in flames.<sup>74</sup> The British sent in the army to make peace. However, the army, under Gen Frank Kitson, tried to implement some of the measures that were successful in its Malayan emergency of 1948–60. This resulted in a security policy that was “repressive enough to continue the alienation of working-class Catholics but not repressive enough to actually defeat the Provisional IRA.”<sup>75</sup> The army implemented internment, torture of prisoners, and house-to-house searches to try and control the situation.<sup>76</sup> Then on 30 January 1972—“Bloody Sunday”—the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association marched on Derry. Part of the crowd advanced on a British barricade, and violence broke out. The British paratroopers eventually opened fire, killing 13 and wounding 14 others.<sup>77</sup> The events of 1969 through 1972 were enough to completely rejuvenate the IRA, inactive since 1962, and the war was on.

### **Motivation**

The Irish conflict is a good example of Tololyan's culturally based struggle. The IRA has been described as “a dream working.”<sup>78</sup> The ideology of the movement is not analytical or political or even well-encapsulated, it is merely shared—“the perception assured by the dream.”<sup>79</sup> There is a political ideology espoused by Sinn Féin, but that is definitely not the ideology that has driven the movement. The IRA's training manual, “The Green Book,” takes one small paragraph to mention that the objects of the movement are to establish a sovereign, Socialist Irish Republic, with civil rights for all and the Irish language as its official language.<sup>80</sup> The IRA's motivation defies intellectualism and appeals instead to the masses

who share the dream. The dream is a unified Ireland, and it requires sacrifice and struggle, not for vengeance against the evil Protestants, but for unity with misguided Irish.<sup>81</sup> It is perpetuated through rituals, especially funerals that transform the dead into martyrs, rather than through indoctrination.<sup>82</sup> Thus, the Irish acknowledged their problems stemming from the invasion of outsiders, passed down to them for generations in stories, and necessitating a constant struggle.

## **Operations**

The struggle was violent. From 1969 through 1998, there were 3,289 killed (2,332 civilians) and 42,216 injured (27,238 civilians) as a result of the fighting.<sup>83</sup> Although the IRA tries to avoid and then apologizes for casualties to innocents, these happen frequently. The IRA's tactics could have been designed by Mao or Sun Tzu: strike hard and disengage, mass again where the enemy least expects it, then strike again, always keeping him off guard.<sup>84</sup> For example, on 27 August 1979 the IRA accomplished a spectacular double feat of terror. At Warrenpoint in Ireland, they set off a bomb that blew up a British military patrol truck, and then a second one where the soldiers took cover and the rescue helicopter was landing. This killed 18 soldiers. On the same day, they assassinated Lord Louis Mountbatten, on holiday in his boat off Mullaghmore.<sup>85</sup> Whether assassination or guerrilla warfare, it was always certain that the gun was the primary means of continuing the struggle—until 1981.

In 1980–81, the IRA learned that communicating their cause could gain political headway. On their own initiative, 10 prisoners died from hunger strikes when the British refused to negotiate or concede to their demands. This brought attention to their cause from the Irish and from the world that the IRA command had not counted on and opened up a new battleground.<sup>86</sup> Sinn Féin got one of the hunger strikers, Bobby Sands, to run for Parliament. Sands was elected, and when he died, a Sinn Féin representative took his place.<sup>87</sup> Since then the IRA and Sinn Féin have collaborated, although not without conflict, in a policy Gerry Adams laid out in 1977 as “the bullet and the ballot.”<sup>88</sup> The road was tough with internal dissension but it got them closer to peace and to their goal. The main problem with any policy in the IRA is the ability to enforce it throughout the organization.

## **Organization**

The IRA organization has evolved, but the basic essentials have been again shaped by the struggle and Irish culture. In the early 1970s, the IRA was organized as a conventional army, with brigades that were given geographic responsibility in Ulster. These brigades were too large and easy for the British to penetrate. In 1977 the IRA adopted a cell structure, with limited contact among cells for security.<sup>89</sup> These cells provided the desired security but also made it harder to coordinate operations. The local commanders were the ones who decided when and where to act.

This decision led to blunders, but it allowed the movement to keep unity, where tactical micromanagement would only have invited schism.<sup>90</sup> The British estimated in 1984 there were about 300 hard-core members, plus several thousand sympathizers.<sup>91</sup>

There was a hierarchy to the organization: the Army Convention, Army Executive, Army Council, Chief of Staff Northern Command, and Chief of Staff Southern Command. But these positions did not carry with them the ability to control the cells. They mainly concentrated on marshaling the resources to continue the struggle.<sup>92</sup>

## **Support**

Throughout the years, marshaling the resources became a big business. Certainly the most highly publicized way the IRA obtained materiel resources was through the Irish Northern Aid (Noraid) that was established by Michael Flannery in 1969.<sup>93</sup> Although Noraid contributed more than 50 percent of the IRA budget in the early 1970s and managed to set up major fund-raisers such as an annual fund-raiser dinner in New York, their support has waned over the years. This is because the British recognized that the United States was a major battleground in the moral support campaign. The British tried to counter the strong Irish lobby by playing on America's guilt for helping to finance and arm the perpetrators of atrocities.<sup>94</sup> For example, after the murder of Lord Mountbatten and the 18 British troops, the *Economist* spewed, "The killers were partly financed by citizens of the United States, and most informed Britons thought that the Carter administration's decision four weeks ago to delay arms sales to Ulster's police (so as to please some Irish American voters) would encourage the IRA into another murderous heave. This last effect was not merely forecastable, it was forecast."<sup>95</sup>

After this murder, the United States finally yielded to British pressure. The FBI set up a special squad just to interrupt the flow of cash and arms to the IRA. This resulted in a series of court cases in the 1980s that essentially took Noraid down.<sup>96</sup> But the IRA was already evolving to a more self-sufficient method of support. They started by forging tax-exempt certificates for building contractors in the early 1970s and eventually worked their way into the security business, the taxi business, and the nightclub business. The security business was a particularly devious one—the terrorists would approach a potential customer and offer security protection for a monthly payment. If the client refused, he was guaranteed to be involved in security incidents that convinced him he needed the protection.<sup>97</sup> The IRA has basically been able to get its hands into any part of the market it wants, so it has not missed the Noraid money. Seemingly, it has not missed the moral support that Noraid represented in the United States. The key to the IRA was always "the intensity of the faith and only incidentally the assets and even capacity of the underground."<sup>98</sup>

The IRA did not maintain the intensity of this faith forever. In the 1990s, the IRA switched from a primacy of the bullet to the primacy of the ballot. On Good Friday, 1998, the IRA signed an accord that settled for less than an independent, unified republic. Instead, they got political checks and balances on the Northern Irish Republic that they hope will eventually lead to a unified Irish Republic.<sup>99</sup> Obviously, everyone was not satisfied—in October 2001 IRA members were arrested while working with terrorists in Columbia. The resulting outrage by the United States caused Sinn Féin to demand and receive a start to the disarmament process within the IRA.<sup>100</sup> Whether this was really the end of the IRA is another story. It is difficult to believe “the dream” that was kept alive for so long by violence could find resolution in a manner so devoid of drama.

The reason this is so hard to believe is that the IRA’s entire strategy to this point was one of maintaining a struggle. The IRA knew the dream of an independent, united Ireland was beyond its grasp. Even if it could force the British to leave, it would have to fight its Protestant brothers in Northern Ireland. Yet this dream still propelled its members. It propelled them to the point that they made themselves totally independent of outside support. Their operations were not spectacular—just a few killed here and there. Their organization kept its members to a life of isolation but exercised very little control over them. The key was always to maintain consensus, maintain the faith, and maintain the struggle. The only mechanism for success was to simply outlast the enemy, imparting costs that the enemy could not handle. The IRA had the opposite problem that the RAF had—instead of too little focus, the IRA had too much. Ireland became a quagmire where an unstoppable force met an immovable object, which resulted in eternal tension. Exhausted by this process, the IRA switched to the political solution. But the process also confounded the British counterstrategy.

The British search for an effective counterstrategy produced more lessons in what not to do than in what to do. In 1976 the British stopped trying to treat Ireland as a repeat of Malaya and turned to a policy of internal security where the Army played a supporting role to law enforcement.<sup>101</sup> They ended internment and turned increasingly to the judicial process to prosecute the terrorists. However, the British Special Air Service still used harsh tactics that, at times, included killing rather than arresting the IRA. Although they were effective at containing the IRA, it is probable that these tactics undermined the legitimacy of the British efforts and increased support for the IRA.<sup>102</sup> The British also failed to recognize the fact that the Protestant paramilitaries were also terrorist groups. By responding only to the IRA and giving the Protestants latitude, the British allowed the Protestants to terrorize the Catholics, further legitimizing the IRA as the only protection the Catholics had. The other problem with British policy was a lack of cooperation between the politicians, the police, the army, and the Dublin government. Each saw its role in a different light and missed the effectiveness that could have been gained by cooperating to pass effective legislation,

enforce the legislation, aim effective intelligence toward that enforcement, and patrol the north-south border.<sup>103</sup>

There were fundamental differences among the old terrorist groups. The RAF's ideology centered around global revolution, where that of the IRA and the PLO were focused on territorial and nationalistic objectives. However, the RAF's organization was extremely limited by its focus on the imprisoned leaders. The RAF did not have the resources and leadership to link up with other groups who had similar goals. The IRA's organization was also isolated but very decentralized. Where the lower levels of the RAF took their cues from the prisoners, the lower levels of the IRA were fairly autonomous, which left its leadership to worry about forming a coherent strategy based on tactics that were out of that leadership's control. PLO leadership also had very little control over its constituent groups. The PLO played a key strategic role in managing both the materiel and moral support for the Palestinian cause. It arranged for funding from the Arab states and organized independent financial operations (legal and illegal). Similarly, the IRA took donations from Noraid but eventually had to learn to support itself after the British won the propaganda war with the Americans. Both the PLO and the IRA benefited from solid moral support among their target audiences because of the historical roots of the struggles. The RAF, on the other hand, struggled for moral support. They obtained materiel support and sanctuary from East Germany and relied on the existence of the Soviet Union to prove their ideological relevance. When the Soviet Union dissolved, the group lost its ideological resilience. All the RAF's operations, consisting of parallel hunger strikes, bombings, kidnappings, and demonstrations, had to be aimed at developing moral support. The IRA and the PLO used operations to develop support as well—especially the PLO's dramatic hijackings. However, these two groups were also involved in a more guerilla-type war—targeting the enemy to wear him down and gain military advantage. The PLO, at one time, had an army of almost 20,000 soldiers in Lebanon. It is difficult to say that old terrorism had any observable nature at all.

The strategies of all these groups did, however, have something in common. Although each professed to be after an absolute victory, they were about outlasting the enemy to achieve political change. In the RAF's case, the strategy was more to ensure the survival of the terrorist group than to achieve any particular policy change, despite the group's stated aims. The PLO proved to be a political body willing to use terrorism to coerce and communicate and to compromise if necessary. The IRA was a stubborn, tunnel-vision group bent on carrying on a two-century-old conflict that had always been about violent struggle. But in the end, even they were worn down by the potential for political gain.

In the background loomed the sponsorship of states, but in the world of the terrorist, the state became more of a nuisance than an aid. Unwilling to accept strings attached to the support they got from states, terrorist organizations developed their own resources. This, of course, came too late to stop



the debacle of Lebanon, where in the late 1970s and early 1980s it was difficult to determine if the terrorists were more of a threat to each other or the legitimate states. It also did not stop Libya from provoking violent confrontation with the United States in 1986. By 1987 state sponsorship amounted to about 2 percent of the PLO's budget, and 3 percent of the IRA's budget.<sup>104</sup> The state support simply did not fit with their overall strategies. The states and the terrorist groups had in mind some sort of coercion to change the policies of another political body. Each hoped its enemy would see the costs of the current policies as too high and give in to the terrorist group's agenda. The nature of old terrorism was that of coercion—threats to the policies of governments more than the security of its people.

While all this was taking place, the beginnings of the new terrorism were already taking root. Samuel P. Huntington noted that while western cultures, styles, and habits were becoming increasingly popular among the masses of people in nonwestern countries, the elite of these nonwestern countries were becoming increasingly vocal about rejecting western values.<sup>105</sup> This created conflict along the borders of what Huntington called the "fault lines between civilizations."<sup>106</sup> Although not all civilizations have reacted violently, some have. "Islam has bloody borders."<sup>107</sup>

#### Notes

1. Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 80.
2. Dennis A. Pluchinsky, "An Organizational and Operational Analysis of Germany's Red Army Faction Terrorist Group," in *European Terrorism Today and Tomorrow*, ed. Yonah Alexander and Dennis A. Pluchinsky (New York: Brassey's, 1992), 44.
3. Jonathan R. White, *Terrorism: An Introduction*, 2d ed. (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1998), 190.
4. Hoffman, 82.
5. Pluchinsky, 52–53.
6. *Ibid.*, 46.
7. *Ibid.*, 47.
8. *Ibid.*, 48.
9. Frederick Kempe, "Deadly Survivors: The Cold War Is Over, But Leftist Terrorists in Germany Fight On—'Red Army Faction' Keeps Refining Its Operations and Eluding Authorities," *Wall Street Journal*, 27 December 1991, A1.
10. Hoffman, 81.
11. Pluchinsky, 58–59.
12. *Ibid.*, 62.
13. *Ibid.*, 46–47.
14. *Ibid.*, 54.
15. Roger Thurow and Peter Gumbel, "Blunt and Brutal, The Chill of Terrorism Again Descends upon Western Europe," *Wall Street Journal*, 4 February 1985, A1.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Pluchinsky, 55.
18. *Ibid.*, 57–78.
19. White, 190–91.
20. Hoffman, 83.
21. Kempe, A1.
22. Pluchinsky, 81.

23. Thurow and Gumbel, A1.
24. Dennis A. Pluchinsky, "Germany's Red Army: An Obituary," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 16 (1993):147.
25. Hoffman, 82.
26. Pluchinsky, "Germany's Red Army,"142.
27. *Der Spiegel*, 20 April 1992, 19, as quoted in Pluchinsky, "Germany's Red Army," 143.
28. Hoffman, 80.
29. *Ibid.*, 84.
30. From the text of the Red Army Faction's (RAF) 2 June 1992 communiqué, in Pluchinsky, "Germany's Red Army," 148.
31. Pluchinsky in *European Terrorism Today and Tomorrow*, 63.
32. White, 107-8.
33. James Adams, *The Financing of Terror* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 54.
34. *Ibid.*, 84.
35. Ely Karmon, "Fatah and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine," 25 November 2000, n.p., on-line, Internet, 20 February 2002, available from <http://www.ict.org.il>.
36. Adams, 109.
37. Karmon.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*
40. Walter Laqueur, *The Age of Terrorism* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1987), 215.
41. Karmon.
42. *Ibid.*
43. From a basic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) doctrine document called "The Military Thinking of the Front," quoted in Karmon.
44. Karmon.
45. Laqueur, 218-19.
46. Adams, 56-57 and 97 (for the PFLP and Libya).
47. *Ibid.*, 59.
48. *Ibid.*, 93-94.
49. *Ibid.*, 98.
50. *Ibid.*, 99.
51. *Ibid.*, 87-88.
52. *Ibid.*, 89.
53. Karmon.
54. Hoffman, 67-68.
55. Karmon.
56. *Ibid.*
57. Hoffman, 71-72.
58. *Ibid.*, 73-75.
59. Karmon.
60. White, 125, actually says Fatah attacked schoolchildren, apartment complexes, farms, settlements, and other civilian targets, saying Arafat called this guerrilla war; the Israelis called it terrorism. Laqueur, 216, cites the Israeli forces and terrain as the reasons the campaign failed.
61. White, 125.
62. Laqueur, 216.
63. Karmon. In 1976 Waddi Haddad hijacked a Lufthansa plane in support of the RAF. This was hijacking in conjunction with the RAF kidnapping that was mentioned in the RAF section. However, Habash expelled Haddad from the PFLP.
64. Karmon.
65. Laqueur, 216.

66. Karmon reveals the actions of Arafat in the 1980s. A 1983 Palestine National Council allowed a political solution with Israel, and in 1985, Arafat and King Hussein of Jordan signed an agreement to try and form a Palestinian state to coexist with Israel. Karmon also tells that Fatah restarted terrorist attacks against Israel in 1983, although they were within the Fatah's existing policies on international terrorism. The *Achilles Lauro* hijacking, in October 1985, is better described in Adams, 23–24.
67. White, 131.
68. Clive Jones, "Israeli Counter-Insurgency Strategy and the War in South Lebanon," *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Winter 1997, 86.
69. White, 125.
70. Jones, 88.
71. Kenneth C. Schow Jr., *Falcons against the Jihad: Israeli Airpower and Coercive Diplomacy in Southern Lebanon* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 1995), 3–4 and 21–25.
72. Jones, 86–87.
73. Khalil Shikaki, "Peace Now or Hamas Later," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 1998, 42–43.
74. White, 173–74. He also gives a good historic background for the conflict, which includes the fact that in the 1500s and 1600s, Henry VIII and his daughter, Elizabeth, imposed the Protestant Reformation upon an unwilling Ireland. She created the Plantation of Ulster, which displaced Irish peasants from their homes. When they revolted, Oliver Cromwell put them down with a massacre. In the seventeenth century, the Catholic James II revolted against William of Orange, then King of England. The Apprentice boys held out against a long siege of Derry by James and in August 1689 were relieved by the English. Thus, every August, the Protestants celebrate this victory with a parade marked by taunting and the wearing of orange, 169.
75. John Newsinger, "From Counter-Insurgency to Internal Security: Northern Ireland 1969–1992," *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Spring 1995, 93.
76. *Ibid.*, 94.
77. The Irish Republican Army official history of the events of Bloody Sunday is the most precise account of this incident, its precedents, and aftermath. It describes the route of the march, exact times and locations, and even estimates the number of participants (3,000 to 5,000 people). It admits that what is in dispute is whether the British were fired upon at the scene of the shooting. Although there was a firefight elsewhere, at the scene where the 13 were killed, no bombs or bullets were found and no British troops were hurt, n.p., on-line, Internet, 20 February 2002, available from <http://sinnfein.ie/index.htm>.
78. J. Bowyer Bell, *The IRA 1968–2000: Analysis of a Secret Army* (Portland, Oreg.: Frank Cass, 2000), 146.
79. *Ibid.*, 62.
80. Martin Dillon, *The Dirty War: Covert Strategies and Tactics Used in Political Conflicts* (New York: Routledge, 1990), 447.
81. Bell, 57.
82. *Ibid.*, 60.
83. Sydney Elliot and W. D. Flackes, *Conflict in Northern Ireland: An Encyclopedia* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO, 1999), 681–82.
84. Christopher C. Harmon, *Terrorism Today* (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 222.
85. Bell, 228–29.
86. *Ibid.*, 210–11.
87. Adams, 164.
88. *Ibid.*, 163.
89. "IRA: Tough Nut to Crack," *Economist*, 1 September 1979, 19.
90. Bell, 161.
91. Adams, 131.
92. Bell, 142.

93. Adams, 135. Flannery was a member of the old Black and Tans who harassed the British back in 1919. When the Irish parliament accepted the British offer of dominion in 1922, he believed this to be appeasement and participated in a civil war that landed him in jail. He left for the United States in 1927 and came back in the limelight when the IRA approached him for funds in 1969. His personal check was returned, so he decided to start Noraid as a more subtle way to support the movement.

94. Adams, 136.

95. "After Mountbatten," *Economist*, 1 September 1979, 11.

96. Adams, 145. He goes through the cases on 145–53, but the essential bottomline is that the cases showed beyond doubt that Noraid was supplying cash and arms directly to the IRA, contrary to its position in the 1970s that all money went to humanitarian causes in Northern Ireland, 154.

97. *Ibid.*, 167–74. The Catholics let the Protestants dominate the security business in exchange for a cut of the profits, 172.

98. Bell, 317.

99. "Northern Ireland: From Process to Procession," *Economist*, 18 April 1998, 19.

100. Marc Champion, "In 'Unprecedented Move,' IRA Says Disarming Has Begun—Blair and Trimble Praise Act, Which Could Remove Old Roadblock to Peace," *Wall Street Journal*, 24 October 2001, A16.

101. Newsinger, 99.

102. *Ibid.*, 103.

103. Adams, 182–83.

104. *Ibid.*, 34.

105. Samuel P. Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993, 27.

106. *Ibid.*, 35.

107. *Ibid.*

## Chapter 5

### **“New” Terrorism**

*The Muslim World has found itself at a historical cross-roads. Its encounter with Western Civilization seems to have failed despite the unprecedented wealth accumulated by the elite. Attempts to consolidate modern regimes brought about widespread repression and impoverishment of the masses, creating popular tension for which the state system has no solutions and that further modernization can only exacerbate. . . . And so, starting in the late 1970s, Islamist thinkers could see no way out of the crisis of Islam except for an all-out confrontation with the West that would be incited once an excuse legitimizing the outbreak of violence was provided.*

—Yossef Bodansky  
*Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared  
War on America*

There is no doubt that the major distinguishing feature of today’s terrorism is the existence of militant Islamic groups throughout the world. In *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999*, the US State Department mentions, “The primary terrorist threats to the United States emanate from two regions, South Asia and the Middle East. Supported by state sponsors, terrorists live in and operate out of areas in these regions with impunity.”<sup>1</sup> The State Department lists the following groups as the primary threats from these two regions: the Hizb’Allah, HAMAS (an Arabic acronym for the Palestinian Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement), and Palestinian Islamic Jihad from the Middle East and “Usama Bin Ladin and a host of other terrorists loosely linked to Bin Ladin” in Afghanistan.<sup>2</sup> In the descriptive list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (FTO), 13 of the 41 groups have militant Islamic ideologies.<sup>3</sup> Although these groups share certain common characteristics, an in-depth look at any one of them would mask the true nature of the threat. The RAF tried to unite terrorist groups in Europe in a weak effort at global revolution. The IRA was only concerned with Ireland and thus cared little what the rest of the world did, except insofar as it affected their struggle. The PLO, on the other hand, had to attempt to unite all the Palestinian groups to have any chance at legitimately controlling Palestine. But none of these comes close to the scope of militant Islam. Even Bin Laden’s al-Qaeda group is just part of the system. As Yossef Bodansky put it, “Bin Laden has always been—and still is—part of a bigger system, a team player and a loyal comrade at arms. The terrorist operations in several parts of the world now attributed to Bin Laden were actually state-sponsored operations perpetrated by dedicated groups of Islamists.”<sup>4</sup> During the 1990s, militant Islamic groups crossed barriers that before had seemed impenetrable, such as Sunni-Shiite (the two biggest sects of Islam) and African-Arab-Asian barriers. As a result, a

new transnational actor has emerged that has both state and private support but is eclectic and unpredictable.

### **Militant Islam**

Violence is not new to the Islamic world. Three out of four of the caliphs who succeeded the prophet were assassinated because they were considered “weeds,” or enemies of the faith.<sup>5</sup> Systematic assassination as a method of shaping the Islamic world probably had its beginning with Hassan Sabbah in the middle ages. Sabbah was a revolutionary who planned to take power from the Turkish Seljuk Dynasty. In 1090 he established a base at the fortress of Alamut in Rudbar, took over power, spread his propaganda throughout the countryside, and recruited fedayeen—those prepared to sacrifice their lives for Allah. The fedayeen, who killed with poisoned daggers, became such heroes in Islam that their name has been carried into the twentieth century by the PLO and others.<sup>6</sup> Sabbah indoctrinated his killers by giving them glimpses of paradise in special gardens where they were intoxicated by natural beauty and hashish, which grew in the fertile valleys of the Elburz mountain range. It was this practice that the group got their nickname hashasheen (smokers of hashish), which was later translated assassin.<sup>7</sup> During the Crusades, Sabbah and his men turned their daggers against the Christians and infiltrated their camps on assassination missions that were often so obviously fatal that they could be considered suicide missions.<sup>8</sup> However, there are great differences between the terrorism of the assassins and today’s terrorism.

The Muslim world is headed in a completely different direction today than it was in Sabbah’s time. He fought to reform the faith but in the direction of progress.<sup>9</sup> During the amazingly rapid spread of Islam throughout the Byzantine and Persian empires, the Arab invaders—driven by their faith and the desire for conquest and booty—conquered mightily. But they did not impose conversion or any other constraints upon surrender. Instead, they opened themselves to the culture of the conquered lands by creating an atmosphere of relative freedom that really was tantamount to liberation from the harsh rule of the Byzantines and Persians.<sup>10</sup> Fereydoun Hoveyda called that action “a collective cultural suicide triggered mainly by the use of fundamentalism as an instrument of ‘legitimacy’ in the political race for power.”<sup>11</sup> Although the Arabs allowed the conquered peoples to continue with their lives, the Arabs assumed positions of power in the governments—positions the non-Arabs coveted. To gain power over the Arabs, who claimed the Koran had been revealed to them, the non-Arabs had to become more Muslim than their Muslim teachers that set in motion a competition for orthodoxy that condemned creativity and science.<sup>12</sup> Rulers, anxious to avoid being seen as “weeds” in the faith, allied themselves with the fundamentalist clerics and spread fundamentalism throughout the world of Islam.<sup>13</sup> It was against this wave

of fundamentalism that Sabbah fought. Militant backlashes have occurred in cycles throughout Islamic history since the twelfth century and whenever fundamentalists think modernization is threatening the faith.<sup>14</sup> Today's militant Islamists may be part of such a cycle.

The twentieth-century backlash was created by the fact that the Muslim world, so long in isolation because of fundamentalism, has been penetrated and subjugated by the West in the last two centuries. The collapse of the Turkish empire and subsequent redrawing of its borders by the imperialist powers after World War I culminated a process that probably started with Napoléon Bonaparte's arrival in Egypt in 1789.<sup>15</sup> After the Great War, when British and French carved up most of the Ottoman Empire, western influence began to grow throughout the Muslim world. The Suez Canal Company provided about 90 percent of Egypt's foreign earnings and spawned cities around the canal that were westernized and extremely prosperous.<sup>16</sup> In one of these cities, Ismaili, in March 1928, Hassan al-Banna and six of his followers started the Muslim Brotherhood.<sup>17</sup> Originally a peaceful teacher, Shaikh Hassan was influenced by King Fahd bin Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia and the fascists in Europe to choose a mantle of action rather than ideas.<sup>18</sup> His plan banked on an Axis victory in World War II, combined with a heavy propaganda campaign, to bring down the government of Egypt. As the Axis defeat became apparent, he turned to terrorism in hopes of seizing power through a coup d'état. His fedayeen attacked cinemas, restaurants, hotels, inappropriately dressed women, and especially political leaders.<sup>19</sup> This terrorism did indeed shake up the country enough for a military coup in 1952. However, the brothers did not receive a share of the power. Colonel Nasser, apparently a former brother, became fearful of their power, turned toward socialism, and ordered a major crackdown on the Muslim Brotherhood.<sup>20</sup> But the group did not die out—it provided fuel for the militant Islamic movement for decades.

This fuel was sometimes in the form of trainees, disciples, and enemies. For example, the Sunni-Shiite gulf was the reason Shaikh Hassan could not work with Sayyed Mohammed Navab-Safavi, who later took Islamic terrorism to Iran to try to overthrow the Pahlavi Dynasty. The group was eventually defeated, but not before they introduced a young mullah named Sayyed Ruhollah Khomeini to the power of militants connected with Islamic authority.<sup>21</sup> Khomeini also developed strong ties to Mussa Sadr, a Shia cleric, who Iran sent to Lebanon in 1967. Iran needed to shore up support for the Shiite population there or lose all power to the Sunnis and Maronite Christians.<sup>22</sup> Sadr organized the Shiites in Beirut, created a populist movement called Amal, and established ties with the PLO to train militants that would later aid Khomeini's revolution.<sup>23</sup>

Thus, when Khomeini took power in Iran in 1979, he was well prepared to do what was necessary to hold and expand that power. Most sources cite 1982 as the year the Party of Allah, or Hizb'Allah, was created. Yet a group by that name already existed at the time, albeit in another form. In 1973, when Ayatollah Mahmoud Ghaffari was tortured to death in prison in Qom,

he created the party with his last words.<sup>24</sup> In 1979 Khomeini revived the name when he ordered all Islamic groups to band together in defense of the newly established government. At first they were nothing more than gangs in the streets throwing rocks and cans, but then Khomeini established training camps where children were sent as a precursor to service either in the cities or at the Iran-Iraq front.<sup>25</sup> In 1982 the Israelis invaded Lebanon to put an end to PLO guerrilla and terrorist attacks. Initially, the Shiites welcomed the Israelis. But when it began to look as if the Israeli presence might become permanent, Khomeini sent 500 members of his Hizb'Allah force (which at the time numbered about 20,000) to fight with and organize the Shiites in Lebanon. They became the Lebanese Hizb'Allah that fought the Israelis and terrorized the West in South Lebanon for the next two decades.<sup>26</sup>

While the Shiites were busy exporting their revolution, the Sunnis were building momentum of their own. The 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan spurred Sunni Muslims from Saudi Arabia to issue a fatwa, or religious ruling, designating the war a holy war for which every Muslim was responsible. One of the Muslims who spread this word through his writings, Abdullah Azzam, set up an organization called *Makhtab al Khadimat*, the Office of Services, to finance the immigration of holy warriors from all over the Arab world. He took on Bin Laden, a wealthy business partner, who helped finance the organization and run military affairs.<sup>27</sup> In 1986 the two split up after a disagreement over the vision for the organization. Mr. Bin Laden wanted to train soldiers for a global jihad against the West, while Mr. Azzam wanted to focus on creating a Muslim state in Afghanistan and then expand.<sup>28</sup> Bin Laden organized a group called al-Qaeda (the base) in 1988 and set up a training camp for Persian Gulf area Arabs. But Afghanistan was not the only hot area for Sunni Muslims in the late 1980s.

The fight against Israel was also heating up. In 1987 Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip started a spontaneous uprising called the Intifada. During this uprising, a small nucleus of Muslim Brotherhood members banded together to form the group HAMAS. HAMAS aimed to emulate the Shia Hizb'Allah group in its struggle against Israel.<sup>29</sup> HAMAS's zeal and fundamentalist leanings attracted Iran's attention, and in 1991 they obtained support from Tehran. This made it easier to reject Yasser Arafat's pleas for HAMAS to join forces with the PLO. HAMAS wanted victory through armed struggle, not appeasement.<sup>30</sup> In December 1992 Israel assured the group would gain international attention when it deported 415 HAMAS members and sympathizers to Lebanon, where they were homeless for months. The international community noticed, and the UN passed a special resolution (UN Resolution 799) in hopes of resolving the situation.<sup>31</sup> HAMAS has since become feared for its extremist tactics, including suicide bombing missions in the West Bank and Gaza Strip areas.

Another hotbed for Sunni Muslims was the Sudan. In 1989 middle-rank military officers seized the government of Sudan in a coup. With no unifying ethnicity, culture, or language, the leaders turned to a popular Muslim leader, Hassan al-Turabi, to design the government.<sup>32</sup> Turabi had



established a Sudanese chapter of the Muslim Brotherhood in the 1960s, an organization that is now the National Islamic Front (NIF).<sup>33</sup> After the 1989 coup, he set about developing a state that would be unified by Islam, although a much more lenient, tolerant version than that of the fundamentalist Arab states.<sup>34</sup> Here was an emerging Sunni Islamic state to match the Iranian state in its authority, if not its fundamentalist zeal. In 1991, in the wake of the Persian Gulf War, Sudan held a conference of militant Sunni organizations from 55 countries to organize an assault against the West in revenge for the war on Iraq.<sup>35</sup> The big surprise was that Iran openly acknowledged the NIF as a legitimate Sunni Muslim organization and even supplied high-technology communication equipment to facilitate its operations in the future.<sup>36</sup>

The Sunnis were completing a major consolidation with this big step. The Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan in 1989 released thousands of trained Afghans who were militant Islamists with experience in the Afghan war. They went to Afghanistan in the late 1980s to get experience to use elsewhere. They had endured a final, unnecessary, bloody battle for Jalalabad that they viewed as a joint US-Pakistan setup, but they were now ready for action elsewhere.<sup>37</sup> Bin Laden returned to Saudi Arabia a hero. However, it was not long before he clashed with the Saudi government. When the Saudis invited the US military onto its soil in 1990 to defend against the Iraqis, Bin Laden argued strenuously against the move. He offered to donate construction equipment and recruit Saudi Afghans for the defense. He warned that inviting infidels onto the sacred ground would desecrate the holy places and cost the Saudis their Islamic legitimacy. This could have dire consequences for its position in the eyes of the militant Islamics.<sup>38</sup> But the Saudi government ignored Bin Laden and eventually forced him and his family into exile in Sudan after the war.<sup>39</sup> The Sunnis now had a Muslim state in the Sudan, two charismatic leaders in Turabi and Bin Laden, and unprecedented support from a Shia nation, Iran. A new, united militant Islamic movement was emerging.

## **Motivation**

Muslims consider their faith predestined to animate the entire planet.<sup>40</sup> The difference between militants and less extreme Muslims is that the militants believe force is a necessary part of that predestination. Jihad was the force that created the Muslim empire, and jihad is exactly what many fundamentalists are calling for today.<sup>41</sup> In Arabic, the word has several meanings, all of which are used in the Koran. It can mean effort, striving, or struggle, as in the obligation of a Muslim to live up to the stringent requirements of his religion.<sup>42</sup> But militants focus on its connotation of holy war. And even though jihad is not an article of faith in the Koran, militants consider it a personal duty, as though it were a sixth pillar of the faith.<sup>43</sup>

The concept of holy war comes from some fundamental principles on which all Muslims agree. Islam's traditional view of existence is that the world is divided into two camps—the city of faith and the city of war. The city of faith, or *Dar al-Iman*, refers to all areas where Islam reigns supreme and its rules are obeyed. The city of war, or *Dar al-Harb*, refers to the rest of the world.<sup>44</sup> Relations between the two places cannot be anything but hostile, because Islam has to strive to eventually bring the whole world in line with the right path. As long as the two cities are easily recognizable and separated, there could be a truce, and conflict would occur only at the boundaries. However, this is not the case. Muslim society has been invaded by Western values and materialism, so even Muslims must be divided into the two cities.<sup>45</sup> But the West is not the only culprit.

Islam itself has always been divided. There are many sects, but the two largest, the Sunnis and the Shiites, comprise the vast majority of all Muslims. Although these sects agree on most of the fundamental tenets of Islam, their differences are grave and ingrained by historical conflicts. From the dawn of Islam, its leadership was subject to violent struggle. Three of the four successors of the prophet Muhammed were assassinated, including Ali ibn Abi Taleb, the fourth caliph and the son-in-law of Muhammed.<sup>46</sup> Ali's murder gave birth to the split between the Shiites, who believed Ali as the rightful, divinely inspired successor to Muhammed, and the Sunnis, who believe no man since Muhammed has ever been a divine messenger from Allah.<sup>47</sup> Shiites recognize 12 imams who were descendants of Muhammed and supposedly also endowed with his power of interpreting the Koran and thus revealing the truth. The twelfth imam disappeared as a child and, according to Shiites, went into occultation to reappear at any time.<sup>48</sup> This difference between the two sects, along with some other doctrinal disagreements, creates a schism that precludes the definition of a single city of faith, and thus there is constant conflict even within Islam itself.

This difference between the two sects also dictates their respective views about government. Sunnis view the nation-state as a fact of life on this earth, to be accepted and used for the good of Islam. To a Sunni, the first order of business is to establish a government that is obedient to sharia, or Islamic law, and then use that government to expand the boundaries of the Muslim world. The Shiites, on the other hand, view government as an un-Islamic entity.<sup>49</sup> To a Shiite, the imam is the only legitimate ruler on earth. All government is therefore the property of the missing twelfth imam, and all Muslim clergy should avoid involvement in government, instead supporting all Islamic causes equally. Shia clergy can tolerate rulers and advise them in keeping with the sharia, but cannot participate.<sup>50</sup> Because of this, Shia writings have advocated Islamic government without specifying the details of how such a government would be run. Some Sunni writings, on the other hand, have gone into detail on how sharia should be applied to the administration of a state. Mawlana Abul Ala Mawdudi, a Pakistani Sunni theologian, laid out the specifics of how the people would elect a ruler of an Islamic state. This ruler would be a "just despot," who would create a "monolithic in-

stitution that upholds one ideology, which is Islam, and uses all its enforcement agencies to ensure that Islamic principles are respected by everybody in all walks of life.”<sup>51</sup> Although the Shiites would shun this practice of laying out how a government should work, they would probably agree with the principles on which the Sunnis’ ideal government was based.

In practice, militant fundamentalists blur this line even further. Militants have little use for many of the doctrinal differences between the sects, preferring instead to stick to basics. Both Sunni and Shia fundamentalists insist that a spotless ruler run the government and that it strictly obey sharia.<sup>52</sup> Khomeini, a Shiite, obviously had a different view of the clergy’s involvement in government than the majority of Shiites. The success of his revolution (and his military thugs) probably shielded him from criticism.<sup>53</sup> Once in power, he went to great lengths to ensure the government was run in accordance with sharia. Khomeini thought that children were innocent and therefore better able to decide right from wrong. In view of this, he installed children as supervisors throughout his government, with the authority to blow the whistle on any untoward dealings they saw and even overrule important decisions.<sup>54</sup> In the Sudan, Turabi talks of a moderate application of the sharia, but his government’s record of punitive practice is a lot stricter than his propaganda.<sup>55</sup> In the end, both Sunni and Shia militants are all aiming at the same thing—spreading Islam’s power by whatever means necessary with the final aim of an entire world subject to the laws of Islam.

The statements of the Islamic terrorist groups bear witness to this. In a 1988 statement, the Hizb’Allah in Lebanon delineated their objectives: (1) to eliminate the Americans, the French, and all other imperialists from Lebanon, (2) to punish the Phalangists for all crimes against the Lebanese, and (3) to permit the Lebanese to choose their own government. However, the Hizb’Allah called on the Lebanese to choose Islam, which “alone, is capable of guaranteeing justice and liberty for all. Only an Islamic regime can stop any further tentative attempts of imperialistic infiltration into our country.”<sup>56</sup> The charter of HAMAS is more forthright. Although it also promises liberty for all people, it explains that “safety and security are possible only in the shadow of Islam, and recent and ancient history is the best witness to that effect.”<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, it warns that peaceful solutions are no longer possible: “Once the enemies usurp some of the Muslim lands, Jihad becomes an individual obligation for every Muslim.”<sup>58</sup> Even though the charter admits the PLO is made up of its Palestinian fathers, brothers, and sons, it declares that until the PLO accepts Islam as its sole theology, HAMAS will not cooperate.<sup>59</sup> But these two groups are focused mainly on the struggle with Israel.

Osama bin Laden’s vision is much more global, integrating all Islamic issues in a common struggle. In 1998 Bin Laden issued his third fatwa, an edict that religious authorities issue to guide followers on a particular issue and obliges them to take whatever actions it specifies. Bin Laden’s 1998 fatwa claimed that the US occupation of Saudi Arabia, blockade of Iraq, and

support of Israel in the Arab-Israeli struggle constituted a declaration of war on Allah. Because of this, he proclaimed that it was every individual Muslim's duty "to kill Americans and plunder their money wherever and whenever they find it. We also call on Muslim ulema, leaders, youths, and soldiers to launch the raid on Satan's US troops and the devil's supporters allying with them and to displace those who are behind them so that they may learn a lesson."<sup>60</sup> Bin Laden's 1996 and 1998 fatwa became the stated motivation for the 1996 bombings in Saudi Arabia (Riyadh and al Khobar Towers in Dhahran) and the 1998 bombing of the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, respectively.<sup>61</sup> This highlights several important points about the looseness of the organizations involved and that Bin Laden's vision is a motivating force. Militant Islamists respond to his words with dedication given only to the highest authorities. He communicates a message that touches the hearts of a broad range of radical organizations, and they answer his calls. However, lest the analysis indicate all operations are undertaken with the apocalyptic vision as their inspiration. Remember there are states and organizations involved, and these actors have interests.

The states and organizations involved often act because they are in a struggle for legitimacy and power. When the United States entered Somalia in November 1992, Sudan and Iran held a conference in Khartoum to analyze the situation. A committee of intelligence officials from both countries proposed that humanitarian aid was a pretext to allow the Americans to strengthen their presence in the Gulf region. The Americans would gain control of the oil grid in Sudan, Somalia, Eritrea, and Yemen; install a pro-American government in Somalia; and enter the Sudan to wear down the Sudanese the way they were attempting to wear down the Iraqis. The committee assessed that the direct cause of this aggression was the failure of the Islamists to solve the Islamic and Arabic problems. They decided on a long-run, joint Sudan-Iran effort to train and supply guerrilla fighters in Mogadishu and an immediate, indirect strike elsewhere—in Yemen.<sup>62</sup> In the case of the 1998 bombings, the groups received Iranian and Sudanese support because it was in both nations' strategic interests: Sudan, because of its regional location and Iran, because of its desire to remain the most influential Islamic state in the region.<sup>63</sup> At the same time, there was a surge of militant Islamic fever sweeping the Arab world. Even Egypt was publicly warning that it appeared the United States was pressuring Iraq to gain an opportunity to strike Iraq militarily. With anti-American rage at a high pitch, the militant organizations would have lost legitimacy had they not acted when they did.<sup>64</sup>

What emerges from this is a picture of militant Islam that is not a structured organization but certainly a movement that acts in a semi-coordinated way. Its followers are motivated by an ideology that crosses some historical-doctrine divides, but the leaders involved are also subject to organizational pressures based on identity and bureaucratic interests.

## Organization

Because of the 9/11 attacks on the WTC, Bin Laden's group is thought of as the umbrella organization for all Islamic terrorism today. Most sources say the al-Qaeda was created in the late 1980s and has financed the training of more than 5,000 personnel from more than 50 countries worldwide.<sup>65</sup> It is described as a loose network that holds together organizations such as Egyptian Islamic jihad, Algeria's Armed Islamic Group, HAMAS, Hizb'Allah, and various groups in Pakistan, Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, and the Philippines.<sup>66</sup> Al-Qaeda was probably just a financial vehicle, starting as a network of charitable organizations that received donations and funneled them to militant Islamists.<sup>67</sup> Militant Islamists trained by Bin Laden return to outposts in countries around the world to perform in small cells that have at best indirect ties to al-Qaeda, including possible financing arrangements. Many are veterans of the Soviet-Afghan war, and some are members of other rogue terrorist organizations.<sup>68</sup> Bin Laden set up the financial networks and established propaganda organizations in London that could provide information on and explanations for militant Islamist operations without taking the blame.<sup>69</sup> Now that the network is established, removal of any of its leaders would probably not debilitate the operations of its pieces.<sup>70</sup> But Bin Laden gives the movement its overall direction. Along the way, he worked closely with the head of the Egyptian Islamic jihad, Ayman al-Zawahri. The two became the key personnel to organize, support, and direct operations in such places as Somalia and Bosnia. In June 1998, the two cochaired a conference of 100 plus Islamists from organizations around the world and came up with a strategic plan of action for all who would be members of a worldwide front. The front was named the World Islamic Front for jihad against Jews and Crusaders, and one of its first public documents, coauthored by Bin Laden and al-Zawahri, was the February 1998 fatwa.<sup>71</sup> So Bin Laden's organization is an ideological umbrella called the World Islamic Front, which includes loose alliances to many militant Islamic organizations and a complex support network called al-Qaeda, which trains and supports small cells throughout the world. But, as extensive as Bin Laden's influence is, there is more to the movement than just him.

The militant Islamic movement is, to a large extent, state-sponsored so the organizational picture includes influential ties to Iran, Sudan, and Pakistan. Many militants in countries other than Iran and Sudan view their own governments as corrupt because they are not strictly obedient to the sharia. They look to Iran and Sudan for guidance since these two were successful in developing governments based on Islam. Iran's dominance over the movement was unquestioned during the 1980s, when it was the sole bastion of Islamic government. But Iran is cautious about its use of terrorism, even more so since Khomeini's death in 1989. It often acts through clandestine agents who issue no proclamations or by supporting other groups like Hizb'-Allah or HAMAS, who take all the credit for the operations. Iran is interested in maintaining its legitimacy as a state but also retaining the ability to pres-

sure and shock the world.<sup>72</sup> It extends its influence and pressure through its embassies and through the deployment of its Revolutionary Guards, or Pasdaran, who train militants abroad. It employs the Iranian Ministry of Intelligence and Internal Security to terrorize counterrevolutionaries at home and abroad and supplies aid to schools and mosques abroad through charity funds that can be used to funnel funds to militants.<sup>73</sup> After the coup in Sudan, Iran supplied support to them like parents taking children under their wings. But in the mid-1990s, as Iran's terrorist operations started to draw unwanted attention to Tehran, Iran started to realize the potential of the Sunni militant movement. It organized Hizb'Allah International under a committee of three leaders: Imad Mughaniyah of Lebanese Hizb'Allah's Special Operations Command, Ahmad Salah of the Egyptian Islamic Jihad (al-Zawahri's group), and Osama bin Laden.<sup>74</sup> In this way, Iran tried to deflect attention and show deference to the idea of a unified movement, while still harnessing the authority it felt it rightly deserved.

At the same time, the Sudan was attempting to shore up its own influence over the Sunni movement. Turabi established the first real Sunni Islamist organization, the Popular International Organization with a representative from each of the 50 countries where Islamic struggles were taking place. But in a conference in Tehran in 1991, Turabi saw how far behind the Shiites his organization was, despite its zeal.<sup>75</sup> Iran built up the Sudan with weapons, know-how, and money, but the real progress happened when Turabi got Bin Laden to work for him. Sudan was struggling after the Bank of Credit and Commerce International (BCCI) in London, its biggest financial cover, was closed. In exchange for land and business contacts in the Sudan, Bin Laden organized a support network that financed militant groups and acted as covers for them.<sup>76</sup> The end result was called the Islamist International and its military wing, the Armed Islamic Movement (AIM), which is now a Khartoum-headquartered umbrella for Sunni militant groups. Bin Laden has departed Sudan, but AIM still spearheads militant Islamic groups, most of whom are former Afghans.<sup>77</sup> Bin Laden's 1996 departure from the Sudan, necessitated because of pressure from Saudi Arabia, ushered Pakistan into the spotlight.<sup>78</sup>

Pakistan had considerable influence in the world of militant Islam because of its support of activities in Afghanistan. Following the Soviet withdrawal, the Pakistanis, through their Inter-Service Intelligence (ISI), built up the Taliban with weapons and training to fill the power vacuum and avoid a collapse of Afghanistan. With the ISI's help, the Taliban defeated warlords and rogue tribes to secure Pakistan's access to the major road system from the Indian Ocean to Central Asia.<sup>79</sup> The Taliban and ISI maintained training camps where Afghans could freely move about and train for operations in their home countries. When Bin Laden arrived in the spring of 1996, the Taliban eagerly welcomed him. Pakistan, on the other hand, was more wary of its standing in the world community. The ISI had the Taliban put him on loose house arrest until Saudi Arabia

denied that it wanted Bin Laden extradited. He was elevated to the position of emir, in charge of Afghanistan's terrorism-supporting activities.<sup>80</sup>

The struggle for influence in the militant Islamic movement does not end with Bin Laden and the states—it also includes some of the larger, established terrorist groups. For example, HAMAS has evolved into an organization with interests of its own. It has a seemingly hierarchical structure, built around cells, villages, and subdistricts. But it is also well-represented in the Palestinian social arena through departments of education and community services.<sup>81</sup> HAMAS has also gotten entrenched in the political realities of its struggle. It now realizes that to attain its two divergent goals—that of a complete Islamic state in Palestine with no concessions to Israel and that of a community that lives in peace and harmony—it may have to give in some face-saving way.<sup>82</sup> Groups such as HAMAS and Hizb'Allah need and accept the support of state sponsors and Bin Laden, but it is difficult to imagine them being controlled by this support. Rather, it is more probable that sponsors could use the groups as a rheostat—the introduction of more resources would spark additional activity, but on terms chosen by the groups and possibly in line with existing fatwa from legitimate Islamic leaders.

The organizational structure that emerges from this analysis of the militant Islamic movement is admittedly amorphous but no less a reality. Yet the semiautonomous pieces are bound together more tightly than any terrorist organizations in the past. The RAF failed miserably to unite Communist insurgent organizations in Europe. The PLO had the same troubles uniting its factions for the struggle against Israel—and they were all focused on the same, very limited regional objective. The Islamic movement is no *Brady Bunch* either—Islam still has internal struggles.<sup>83</sup> But the militant Islamic movement has succeeded in building a loose, global hub and spoke type network. Iran, Sudan, Pakistan, and Bin Laden vie for control of the “hub of Islam.”<sup>84</sup> The outlying spokes can act autonomously but in concert because of their shared vision as elucidated by the fatwas of its leaders. Furthermore, when it is necessary, the spokes have the benefit of support from the hub.

## **Support**

Financing a terrorist organization is a tough job, but it is easier when you are rich. Bin Laden inherited a sum estimated at \$300 million from his father, the late construction magnate Muhammad bin Laden. His enemies, including the Saudis and the Americans, have attacked this nest egg, yet he still has a considerable portfolio of investments in everything from construction to banks to agriculture.<sup>85</sup> It was this money that originally allowed him to contribute to the development of the Mujahideen Services Bureau, which imported thousands of Arabs to Afghanistan and trained them in Pakistan and Afghanistan to fight the Soviets. He also imported heavy construction equipment to build roads, tunnels, storage depots, and hospitals in Afghanistan's mountainous terrain.<sup>86</sup> But these

tasks were relatively easy compared to his later feats. In Afghanistan there was a single fight to support.

Bin Laden's biggest contribution to materially supporting the militant Islamic movement is his establishment of the financing network that hides and invests the money and funnels it to the militants. His first effort at this began soon after his move to the Sudan. Officials of the Bank of England closed down the BCCI, which Arab states and terrorist organizations used to launder money and finance weapons deals. Officials of the BCCI kept sparse, if any, records, and embezzled money as payment for their services.<sup>87</sup> Turabi and the Muslim Brotherhood were using this bank heavily to build up their own banking system, on the way to becoming an independent sponsor of Islamist groups. The closing of the bank left them stranded, so they called on their new visitor, Osama Bin Laden. He set up emergency collateral using his money and that of some wealthy supporters, then went to work setting up a financial network to move money through legitimate businesses already owned by wealthy members of a group he called the Brotherhood Group.<sup>88</sup> He upgraded this structure in the late 1990s to a more global network that is even harder to trace—a "highly complex, tangled, and multilayered organizational network that spreads throughout the world and in which bin Laden's name does not appear at all."<sup>89</sup> His payment for the work there was in the form of business opportunities in the Sudan, including construction of an airport and highway and ownership of a bank, an import-export firm, and several farms.<sup>90</sup>

Of course, money must be funneled into this network to sustain it. One of the ways this happens is through one of the pillars of Islam: alms giving. Wealthy donors give money to Islamic organizations, many of which are part of Bin Laden's network or give directly to terrorist organizations. Islamic states, including Saudi Arabia, Iran, Sudan, and Pakistan, also give to these Islamic organizations, either knowingly or unknowingly supporting Bin Laden. Another way money finds its way into Bin Laden's coffers is from drug trafficking. Afghanistan has a large opium crop that al-Qaeda militants help export for use in manufacturing heroine and morphine. Not only does this make the network rich but also adds to the degradation of the West by feeding their addictions—a double bonus.<sup>91</sup>

Money is only one of the important resources the militant Islamic movement needs. US officials estimate training camps that Bin Laden established in Afghanistan alone have been responsible for training more than 20,000 militants from all over the world. Based on the materials found in caves, the training camps were highly professional and capable of handling soldiers with extremely diverse language and cultural differences.<sup>92</sup> Apparently, Bin Laden has even developed contacts for training HAMAS and Hizb'Allah in some of these camps.<sup>93</sup> When the training camps in the Sudan, Pakistan, Lebanon, and Iran are included, it is clear that the movement can train a large quantity of militants in a very professional way. Another important role supporters played was arranging the logistics for operations. In 1993 when Sudan and Iran decided to strike at Yemen as a statement against the Ameri-



can buildup in Somalia, Bin Laden's job was to round up Yemenite Afghans to conduct the operation, recruit Sheikh Tariq al-Fakli to leave his London exile and take charge of the operation, and transfer the money to banks in Yemen.<sup>94</sup> Meanwhile, Iran and Sudan were training and arming forces for the eventual clash in Mogadishu. Bin Laden also moved 3,000 of his Yemenite Afghans there with heavy weapons in time for the Mogadishu operation.<sup>95</sup> He smuggled guerrilla warfare experts and heavy equipment into Mogadishu by plane and boat and established a headquarters from which the experts could direct the fighting.<sup>96</sup>

This type of cooperative support has continued through the present. Recently, Iran has found indirect ways to help Bin Laden. During the war on the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, Iran opened its borders to escaping Afghans, which allowed them to emigrate to other countries in the Middle East and Africa.<sup>97</sup> Although there is no doubt that hostility exists between the different militant Islamic factions and states, all involved benefit from the increased moral support that the appearance of solidarity brings.

This is because there are two target audiences from which moral support is needed. The first is the world of donors who support the Islamic organizations that funnel money to the militants. The second is the pool of possible militants who may be convinced to support the militant agendas if they perceive the agendas are genuinely inspired. In neither case does the target audience include Westerners. As Edgar O'Ballance put it, "Such fundamentalism can only operate in Islamic countries where a moderate Muslim population is available for conversion, and it does not seek—nor would it have any chance of success if it did, as universal Islam has little appeal to Westerners—a proselytising mission amongst non-Muslims."<sup>98</sup> As Bin Laden put it, "The Western regimes and the government of the United States of America bear the blame for what might happen. If their people do not wish to be harmed inside their very own countries, they should seek to elect governments that are truly representative of them and that can protect their interests."<sup>99</sup> Thus, those who propose the main purpose of their terrorist operations is to instill terror in the hearts of the potential victims are off the mark. The victims are not part of the real target audience.

To appeal to donors who provide cash support, the Islamists have full-time propaganda operations. The objective with this target audience is to appear ideologically (in this case, religiously) legitimate. To this end, Bin Laden made several trips to London, where he purchased property and set up organizations to act as fronts for the various Islamist groups. The most authoritative of these was the Liberation Party, run by Sheikh Omar Bakri. Throughout the 1990s these organizations, which had plausible deniability of any involvement in operations, could provide accurate data and explanations that would satisfy the Muslim intellectuals.<sup>100</sup> At the same time, the charitable organizations spend large sums of money distributing food, medical services, education, work, religious services, and housing.<sup>101</sup> This com-

bination of acceptable intellectual justification and charitable service helps to keep the Islamists legitimate even to moderate Muslims.

To appeal to the pool of potential militants, the Islamists need to show strength and sacrifice—the tougher the message, the better. The attraction for this target audience seems to be the notion that the cause is an inspired one, since so many are willing to die fighting the evil city of war for it. When the United States responded to the 1998 bombings with a cruise missile attack, Bin Laden's popularity soared. As the *New York Times* put it, "Attacking Mr. Bin Laden with missiles gave him the status of a state—a nation unto himself, as an intelligence official said—in a war with America."<sup>102</sup> Victory over the Americans in Somalia gave the Islamists a huge propaganda tool, which Bin Laden flaunted in a 1998 interview: "They had thought that the Americans were like the Russians, so they trained and prepared. They were stunned when they discovered how low was the morale of the American soldier . . . our boys were shocked by the low morale of the American soldier and they realized that the American soldier was just a paper tiger."<sup>103</sup> As long as there is dramatic action against the evil West, especially the United States and Israel, this target audience gives support whether it sees the actors as victims or as heroes. The key is dramatic action, which is most effectively achieved through terrorist operations.

## **Operations**

This analysis considers mostly operations against the United States and Israel. However, many operations against governments that are sympathetic to the West, such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia, have been part of the same strategy. Bin Laden's energy has been directed mostly at Saudi Arabia from the moment it invited Americans onto its sacred soil until Bin Laden helped the Islamists triumph over the United States in Somalia. It is a Muslim's duty to identify those who deviate from the sharia and to punish them or pressure them to reform. Of course, this is also a way for militants to maintain legitimacy in the eyes of the faithful. Either way, it is a fact of life with militant Islam.

During the 1980s, the Sunnis were busy fighting the Afghan war while the Shiites were fighting the battles of Lebanon. Hizb'Allah carried out numerous hijackings, kidnappings, and assassinations aimed at Israeli and Western targets throughout the 1980s, but perhaps the most disturbing development was that of the suicide bomber. Hussein Mousawi, a breakaway Amal commander, and Imad Moughniyeh, the Hizb'Allah operations director, led the development of this devastatingly effective terrorist tactic. On 18 April 1983, Moughniyeh's men (who called their group Jihad al-Islami, but were effectively working with Hizb'Allah) drove a van with about 440 pounds of explosives into the American embassy in Beirut, killing 63 and injuring 120.<sup>104</sup> On 23 October 1983, Hizb'Allah suicide bombers simultaneously truck-bombed French and American

bases in Beirut, which caused 300 deaths (including 241 US Marines) and many more injuries.<sup>105</sup> Here was something new. When the IRA killed 18 British soldiers and Lord Mountbatten in a single day, that was the Irish group's biggest strike, and they aimed it at parties they held responsible for their plight. The PLO directed their hijackings at innocent people, but tried not to kill them—instead using them to gain political advantage. But here were people who cared so little for life that they would kill themselves along with all the innocent people they could. Today, the militant Islamic movement has kept this as one of its trademarks.

But the movement has proved to be capable of more than terrorism. During Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan in 2002, the United States uncovered documents that showed that the training camps prepared militant Islamists in diverse skill sets via a multilevel training program: "Implicit in the split levels of training was the Islamic groups' understanding of the need for different sets of skills to fight on several, simultaneous fronts: along trench lines against the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan; against armor or helicopter assaults from conventional foes in Chechnya; as bands of foot-mobile insurgents in Kashmir, Central Asia or the Philippines; and as classic terrorists quietly embedded in cities in the Middle East, Africa, the former Soviet Union and the West."<sup>106</sup> This training had its roots in the 1980s, when the Afghans had been trained to fight the Soviets in many different ways. As the Americans arrived on Somali soil in 1993, Iran and Sudan thought it was the perfect opportunity to put these skills into practice again. While training and supplying the Somalis, they ordered an indirect strike on en route American troops in Yemen. This strike was merely an attempt to make a statement quickly—although the strike was a tactical failure, it was sufficient to express the Islamists' rage at the American presence.<sup>107</sup> Meanwhile, the Islamists were building up forces in Mogadishu. Al-Zawahri led the operation to ambush the US rangers on 3 October 1993 that led to the withdrawal of the American troops. First, he got Mohammed Farrah Aideed, the local warlord the troops were pursuing, to leak a tip that hung two of his aids out for the Americans to pick up. Then, using Afghans trained by Iranians and Iraqis, he set up an ambush that downed three American helicopters and trapped soldiers in Mogadishu for the night under intense fire.<sup>108</sup> Although the helicopters were most likely downed by Aideed's men, they used weapons modifications and techniques taught by the Islamists.<sup>109</sup> The resulting withdrawal was a major victory for the Islamists, who would later set up similar operations to oppose the UN forces in Bosnia after the Dayton Accords and the Russians in Chechnya.<sup>110</sup> The militant Islamists, far from being strictly terrorists, would use whatever techniques or methods suited their purpose at the time.

Terrorist operations were, however, usually the chosen *modus operandi*. On 13 November 1995, Saudi Afghans bombed the Military Cooperation Building in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, a military training center operated by the United States for the Saudis. The operation was professionally planned. A special van had been cleaned of all identification. A sophisticated timing

device controlled the bomb with remote control backup. The timing was perfect—at 1140 hours Americans were eating lunch in the snack bar. To top it off, a second, antipersonnel bomb exploded in the parking lot, which killed some of those who came to help.<sup>111</sup> On 25 June 1996, an even more complicated job was accomplished at the Khobar Towers complex, a facility that was used to house American airmen in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. A combination of Saudi Afghans, Iranian intelligence officials, Hizb'Allah terrorists, and Syrian experts performed preparations for months to plan the job and smuggle the explosives, incendiaries, and electronics into the country. They constructed a sophisticated, shaped-charge, fuel-oil incendiary bomb on site in a stolen tanker truck, which they parked outside a security fence, well within the powerful bomb's range of the barracks. The bomb took off an entire side of a four-story building, killing 19 and wounding 515.<sup>112</sup> Two years later, on 7 August 1998, militant Islamists blew up American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, on the eighth anniversary of the American deployment to Saudi Arabia to fight Iraq. The simultaneous explosions were both vehicle bombs, and the operation involved smuggling in experts and parts and assembling the bombs on site. Yet each team had knowledge only of its own operation.<sup>113</sup> This time, about 300 people were killed and 5,100 injured.<sup>114</sup> Two years later, 12 October 2000, Yemeni Islamists performed a suicide mission in an explosive-laden refueling boat that blew a gaping hole in the USS *Cole* that killed 17 and injured 39. Yemeni officials had less than two week's notice that the *Cole* would make the stop, pointing to a highly proficient, flexible, and possibly indigenous capability.<sup>115</sup> These are just the headliner missions.

There are plenty of other examples. The bombing of the WTC, numerous attacks in Egypt, the Philippines, and Saudi Arabia, and numerous failed attacks can be traced to militant Islamists who are tied together in one way or another—usually through Bin Laden.<sup>116</sup> Palestinian groups started conducting suicide operations in 1994, and now groups such as HAMAS say the suicide bombers are their most effective weapon against the overwhelming Israeli military forces.<sup>117</sup>

Taken in the context of these operations, the attacks of 9/11 were typical, though extreme, in their characteristics. The operatives had been living in the United States for up to seven years, mostly using their names. The pilots trained at American flight schools. One attended an Air Force professional military school. Each probably knew only a limited amount of information on the overall operation.<sup>118</sup> Thus, some of the operatives were probably living in the United States, in isolation, watching the operations in Kenya and Tanzania and the bombing of the USS *Cole* and awaiting their chance. The planners meticulously laid out the details to get the operatives through security and aboard the right flights at the right times so the geographically separated attacks would occur almost simultaneously. The new part was the substitution of the fuel-filled aircraft for sophisticated bombs—a deviously creative combination of hijacking and suicide bombing.

When taken together, this analysis shows a disturbing picture of the nature of the new terrorism. The Iranian revolution set the stage for this phenomenon. Khomeini's message—that the only good government was the sharia, and it was every Muslim's duty to spread this revolution, by force if necessary—was the basic fuel for the fire. But it was not until the Sudan became an Islamic state, the Afghans returned from the war with the Soviets, and Saudi Arabia asked for US help in defending against Iraq that the movement truly gained momentum. Finding itself the lone superpower in the world, the United States had to take action in the unstable Middle East and Africa for its own security. The resultant meddling played right into the Islamists' portrayal of the United States as the "Great Satan" bent on destroying Islam. Despite the traditional Sunni-Shiite gulf, the militant Islamic movement developed into a pseudo-united organization. The organization has a hub consisting of Iran and Sudan and Bin Laden's World Front for jihad against Jews and Crusaders. It also has spokes, which are the militant groups that now have access to resources from the hub (through the al-Qaeda network and training camps in numerous countries) and to some extent take direction via their fatwas. And the organization is global—but not universal. The target audience does not include those who are in the city of war, as the message is not conducive to converting them—only conquering them. The message is conveyed by the operations of the militant Islamic movement, which do not aim at coercion but victory. Where possible, the militants confront the West's military. Where necessary, they simply kill its infidel citizens.

All four factors in the analysis, therefore, add up to a strategy of violent worldwide insurgency by confrontation.<sup>119</sup> The mechanism for success is that violence on the militant Islamists' terms will lead to strength in their movement and weakness in the West. This happens in two ways. First, terrorist attacks and attacks on the American military (such as the USS *Cole* and the rangers in Somalia) show the militants' ability to weaken the paper tiger (i.e., the West). Second, these attacks provoke violent reactions from the West that the militants can characterize as attacks on Islam. In these two ways, the movement's strength will increase until Islam finally confronts the West from a position of military strength and overpower it. Then the whole world will be ruled by sharia. The mechanism is flawed in that the Muslim world is slipping farther behind the West in social, economic, and military strength. But the elegance is that all the Islamists have to do for now is survive.<sup>120</sup>

Counterstrategies in the past have aided the Islamists' cause. To appeal to their target audiences, the Islamists need to maintain their Islamic legitimacy, and they need to appear strong. The latter can be accomplished by surviving an attack by a powerful enemy, but defeating this enemy in military confrontation is even better.<sup>121</sup> Neither the Soviet Union nor the United States knew the enemy they were facing in Afghanistan or Somalia, respectively. But the fact that the militant Islamists were able to defeat both of these superpowers significantly bolstered the movement. The

United States responded to the 1998 embassy bombings by launching cruise missiles at the Ahawar Kili terrorist camp in Khost, Afghanistan, and a pharmaceutical plant in Khartoum, Sudan. The Clinton administration had intelligence indicating there would be a meeting of top Bin Laden officials at the Afghanistan camp, and they suspected the Sudan plant of developing chemical weapons.<sup>122</sup> Though Bin Laden did nothing but survive the attacks, he still gained hero status because of them.<sup>123</sup> The Israelis have tried both appeasement and destruction. In June 2000 the Israeli army pulled out of the Lebanese territory it had occupied since the 1982 invasion. Although this could be seen as admitting defeat by the Hizb'Allah, it allowed the Israelis to withdraw to a "morally defensible position, from which they'd be better able to fight if the need arose."<sup>124</sup> Again, the Hizb'Allah are harassing the Israelis across the border.<sup>125</sup> The all-out military offensive the Israelis launched, in the West Bank at the end of March, appears to have increased the number of volunteers for martyrdom among young militant Islamists.<sup>126</sup>

The conundrum is that this makes it appear there is no way to defeat the terrorists but to destroy them—all of them. In short, win a total war against terrorism. But how can victory ever be claimed in that type of war, whose aim is the total destruction of clandestine units throughout the world? If victory is claimed and there is another terrorist act, the victor's reputation is destroyed. If victory is never claimed, it is damaged just the same.<sup>127</sup> Is this really the only way?

#### Notes

1. US Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism 1999*, April 2000, iv.
2. *Ibid.*, v.
3. *Ibid.*, 67–98.
4. Yossef Bodansky, *Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War on America* (New York: Random House, 1999), x. The prophet is Muhammed, to whom Muslims believe God revealed the Koran.
5. Amir Taheri, *Holy Terror* (Bethesda, Md.: Adler & Adler, 1987), 35.
6. *Ibid.*, 38.
7. *Ibid.*, 41–42.
8. *Ibid.*, 41.
9. Fereydoun Hoveyda, *The Broken Crescent: The "Threat" of Militant Islamic Fundamentalism* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1998), 41.
10. *Ibid.*, 45–46.
11. *Ibid.*, 48.
12. *Ibid.*, 47. Hoveyda cites the fundamentalist Ash'ari and his disciple, Ghazali, of the Seljuk dynasty as instrumental in "closing the Muslim world." He says Ash'ari's thesis was that man should not try to grasp the laws of nature because these were merely momentary manifestations of God's will, which God could change in an instant. Man should aim at eternal life, not life on earth, so science and philosophy are just a waste of time.
13. Hoveyda, 48.
14. Dr. Lewis Ware, professor of International Studies, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala., interviewed by author, 7 November 2001.
15. Bodansky, xii.

16. Taheri, 46.
17. Ibid., 44.
18. Ibid., 50–51.
19. Ibid., 52.
20. Ibid., 53–54.
21. Sayyed Muhammed Nawab-Safavi, later known as Ostad Nawab, tried briefly to work with Shaikh Hassan in 1938 but differed significantly in his beliefs. Sayyed Muhammed believed only a small, pure group of Shiites could reform (read convert *back* to fundamentalism) Islam, while Shaikh Hassan found the Shiites too arrogant to work with. In any event, Sayyed Muhammed, a victim of oppression by Reza Shah, was more interested in attacking Iran than Egypt anyway. Taheri, 61–65. While the “Fedayeen of Islam,” as his group was called, were active in Iran, they became a radical arm of Khomeini, whose death sentences the group carried out, 64–65. This is the same Khomeini who would lead the revolution in 1979.
22. Taheri, 73–74.
23. Hoveyda, 79.
24. Taheri, 86.
25. Ibid., 88–92.
26. Edgar O’Ballance, *Islamic Fundamentalist Terrorism, 1979–95: The Iranian Connection* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 58.
27. Stephen Engelberg, “One Man and a Global Web of Violence,” *New York Times*, 14 January 2001, A16.
28. Ibid.
29. O’Ballance, 166.
30. Ibid., 167–69.
31. Ibid., 171–72.
32. Milton Viorst, “Sudan’s Islamic Experiment,” *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 1995, 46.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid.
35. Bodansky, 36.
36. Ibid., 36–37.
37. Ibid., 25–27. Bodansky claims between 16,000 and 20,000 militant Islamists from around the world went to the Pakistani training camps in the late 1980s. He described the battle of Jalalabad, which occurred after the Soviet withdrawal, as a massive suicidal-frontal assault that the Pakistanis engineered to leave a power vacuum for the establishment of the Taliban.
38. Bodansky, 29.
39. Ibid., 30–32.
40. Hoveyda, 56.
41. Ibid.
42. Ibid., 154.
43. Ibid.; and Taheri 292. The five pillars of the faith are shahada (the two testifications “There Is No God but Allah, and Muhammed Is His Prophet”), prayers, alms, fast, and pilgrimage.
44. Taheri, 20.
45. Ibid., 21.
46. Ibid., 35.
47. Bodansky, 409–10.
48. Hoveyda, 38.
49. Bodansky, 34.
50. Hoveyda, 75.
51. Ibid., 68.
52. Taheri, 264.
53. Hoveyda, 76.

54. Taheri, 94.
55. Viorst, 54.
56. Sheikh Muhammad Hussein Fadlallah, "Nass al-Risala al-Maftuha allati wajahaha Hizballah ila-l-Mustad'afin fi Lubnan wa-l-Alam," trans. Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya in "The Hizballah Program," 25 March 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, available from [http://www.ict.org.il/inter\\_ter/frame.htm](http://www.ict.org.il/inter_ter/frame.htm).
57. "The Charter of the Islamic Resistance Movement (HAMAS)," in *The Palestinian Hamas: Vision, Violence, and Coexistence*, ed. Shaul Mishal and Avraham Sela (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 195.
58. *Ibid.*, 184.
59. *Ibid.*, 193.
60. Osama bin Laden, "Jihad against Jews and Crusaders: World Islamic Front Statement," trans. the Federation of American Scientists, 23 February 1998, n.p., on-line, Internet, 25 March 2002, available from <http://www.fas.org/irp/world/para/docs/980223-fatwa.htm>.
61. Bodansky, 266–68. The Saudi Arabia bombings were claimed in the name of the Liberation Army of the Islamic Sanctuaries—"a kind of military wing" of Bin Laden's International Front. Bin Laden admitted only to having "instigated" these attacks in an interview with ABC's John Miller, 25 March 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, available from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/interview.html>). The embassy bombings in 1998 were claimed by the Islamic Army for the Liberation of Holy Places, who cited only inspiration, not direct support, from Bin Laden. Bodansky thinks this may have been done to shield Bin Laden.
62. Bodansky, 68–70.
63. *Ibid.*, 207–8.
64. *Ibid.*, 230.
65. Daniel Pearl et al., "Moving Target: Bin Laden's Network, Far-Flung and Fanatic, Challenges Retaliation—Any Strategy Must Account For the Number of Cells, Likelihood of Backlash—'My Ideas Go on Forever,'" *Wall Street Journal*, 14 September 2001, A1.
66. *Ibid.*
67. Bodansky, 315.
68. Pearl et al.
69. Bodansky, 101–2.
70. Steven Emerson and Daniel Pipes, "Terrorism on Trial," *Wall Street Journal*, 31 May 2001, A16.
71. Bodansky, 252–53.
72. Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 117.
73. *Ibid.*, 118–19.
74. Bodansky, 157–58.
75. *Ibid.*, 36–37.
76. *Ibid.*, 40–42.
77. *Ibid.*, 34–35 and 407.
78. *Ibid.*, 186. Bodansky explains that Bin Laden was actually arguing with Turabi and General Bashir for some time. Bin Laden was upset about Sudan's use of the Afghans in the Sudanese Civil War instead of other, more worthwhile Islamic causes. This, combined with Saudi Arabia's pressure due to the bombings in Riyadh and Dhahran, forced Bashir and Turabi to arrange for Bin Laden to leave.
79. *Ibid.*, 97–99.
80. *Ibid.*, 188–90.
81. Mishal and Sela, 173.
82. *Ibid.*, 147–72. The writers explain that HAMAS has fluid internal structure because of the need to avoid violent internal clashes brought about by its extreme agenda. They have adopted a shifting strategy that, at times, accommodates political bargaining with re-



spect to the existence of an Israeli state but never outwardly abandons its ultimate aim. The writers think the best solution for HAMAS would be a settlement with Israel negotiated through a third party.

83. Barbara Crossette, "Afghans Ask U. N. to Mediate with Iranians," *New York Times*, 21 September 1998, A10. One example of this internecine behavior, Iran was seeking UN support and planning the use of force to retaliate for the killing of nine Iranian diplomats in Mazar-i-Sharif.

84. Bodansky, 333.

85. Vernon Loeb, "A Global, Pan-Islamic Network: Terrorism Entrepreneur Unifies Groups Financially, Politically," *Washington Post*, 23 August 1998, A24.

86. *Ibid.*, A24.

87. Bodansky, 40.

88. *Ibid.*, 42-43.

89. *Ibid.*, 314.

90. Yael Shahar, "Tracing Bin Laden's Money: Easier Said Than Done," 21 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 25 March 2002, available from <https://www.ict.org.il>.

91. Shahar.

92. C. J. Chivers and David Rohde, "Afghan Camps Turn Out Holy War Guerrillas and Terrorists," *New York Times*, 18 March 2002, A1.

93. Emerson and Pipes.

94. Bodansky, 71.

95. *Ibid.*, 73-74.

96. *Ibid.*, 84.

97. Rowan Scarborough, "US Says Iran Helps al-Qaeda Flee Afghanistan: Officials Cite Underground Terrorist Route to Lebanon," *New York Times*, 3 April 2002, A3.

98. O'Ballance, 213.

99. Osama bin Laden, interviewed by ABC's John Miller, May 1998, n.p., on-line, Internet, 25 March 2002, available from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/interview.html>.

100. Bodansky, 101.

101. *Ibid.*, 315-16.

102. Tim Weiner, "Missile Strikes against bin Laden Won Him Esteem in Muslim Lands, U. S. Officials Say," *New York Times*, 8 February 1999, A13.

103. Interview by Miller.

104. O'Ballance, 66.

105. *Ibid.*, 67.

106. Chivers and Rohde.

107. Bodansky, 72-73.

108. *Ibid.*, 85-86.

109. Paul Watson and Sidhartha Barua, "Somalian Link Seen to al-Qaeda," *Los Angeles Times*, 25 February 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, available from <http://www.latimes.com>.

110. Bodansky, 155-56 and 385-86.

111. *Ibid.*, 135-37.

112. *Ibid.*, 171-72.

113. "Details Emerge of Network Behind Nairobi Bombing," 19 August 1998, n.p., on-line, Internet, 25 March 2002, available from <http://www.ict.org.il>.

114. US Department of State, "Significant Terrorist Incidents, 1961-2001," 28 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 28 May 2002, available from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ho/pubs/fs/5902.htm>.

115. "US Warship Targeted by Suicide Attack in Yemen," 13 October 2000, n.p., on-line, Internet, 28 May 2002, available from <http://www.ict.org.il>.

116. Loeb, A24.

117. "Israeli Military Drive Seen Spurring Suicide Bombers," *Chicago Daily Herald*, 5 April 2002, A1.

118. "Conspiracy Shows Signs of Following Classic bin Laden Doctrine," 17 September 2001, n.p., on-line, Internet, 25 March 2002, available from <http://www.ict.org.il>.
119. This characterization was inspired by an E-mail from Lt Col Forrest Morgan, PhD, professor of Strategic Studies, School of Advanced Airpower Studies, Maxwell AFB, Ala., 27 September 2001.
120. "The al-Qaeda Doctrine," *Stratfor.com*, 11 March 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, 11 March 2002 through *The Early Bird*, available from <http://www.ebird.dtic.mil>.
121. Ibid.
122. James Risen, "US Says It Has Strong Evidence of Threat Justifying Retaliation," *New York Times*, 21 August 1998, A11.
123. Weiner, A13.
124. Daniel Klaidman et al., "Retreat, Regret, Relief: Israel's Lebanon Withdrawal Has Echoes of Vietnam," *Newsweek*, 5 June 2000, 6.
125. Richard Beeston, James Bone, Roland Watson, "UN Fears War Will Engulf the Arab World," *London Times*, 3 April 2002, A1.
126. "Israeli Military Drive Seen Spurring Suicide Bombers," A1.
127. "The al-Qaeda Doctrine."

## Chapter 6

### **Conclusions and Implications**

*War is always a matter of doing evil in the hope that good may come of it, and it is very difficult to show discrimination without failing in determination. Moreover, the cautious line is usually a mistake in battle, where it is too commonly followed, so that it rarely receives credit on the higher plane of war policy, where it is more often wise but usually unpopular. In the fever of war, public opinion craves for the most drastic measures, regardless of where they may lead.*

—Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart  
*Strategy*

It would seem that the United States embarked upon a war whose aim is the total destruction of all terrorist groups of global reach. But contemplating the end state of this type of war should give policymakers pause. Even if one could imagine a world where no terrorism existed, where all terrorist groups had been destroyed, and where terrorism as a strategy had been shown ineffective so no new groups would emerge, it is difficult to imagine having the operational ability to accomplish destruction in the first place. Such an operation, “would involve simultaneous strikes against al-Qaeda’s network in dozens of countries, as well as strikes against manufacturing and storage facilities for weapons of mass destruction in countries that might be willing to share them with al-Qaeda. The strikes could include attacks against the leaders of some of these countries.”<sup>1</sup>

### **Conclusions**

This war on terrorism is a war between a coalition of states and an opposing insurgency that poses a threat to the national security of that coalition. That is the most useful way to analyze terrorism in this context because terrorism is not a phenomenon that can easily be defined. It is a strategy, or a means to an end—an end that is not always readily discernible. Defeating terrorism is not a matter of solving social problems or even distinguishing between right and wrong, although injustice, right or wrong will form a major battlefield in the war. Defeating terrorism is a matter of national security. The fundamentalist revolution and the end of the Cold War have created a world where radicals have an increasingly permissive environment for their extreme methods. The extreme nature of terrorism in the 1990s, culminated with the attacks on the United States on 9/11, has caused many to warn of the arrival of a new terrorism. The United States has responded by declaring a war on this new terrorism.

Defining the problem as a national security threat to states narrows the scope of terrorism to those groups that will simultaneously be acknowl-

edged as threats to the security of the entire coalition. This leaves out some forms of terrorism, like a state's repression of its own citizens and indigenous terrorism that only affects a limited area. It also eliminates some of the need to distinguish between some other categories, such as those who may have a legitimate cause and those who may technically be classified as guerrillas. The war becomes one of states against a global insurgency. The appropriateness of this point of view depends on whether the nature of the threat warrants it.

Defining the nature of the threat requires detailed analysis of the strategy upon which the terrorist groups are staking their hopes of success. This study develops a framework that is a hybrid of those used by several terrorist experts, which consists of four primary factors: operations-lethality, motivation, support, and organization. The second and more difficult step was the subjective process of determining the mechanism by which these four factors could possibly translate into success for the terrorist group. The two steps, taken together, emphasize the terrorist group's strategy—a strategy that the group may or may not be able to articulate among themselves. This process, therefore, transforms an operational analysis into the strategic threat posed by a group. Only when this strategy has been assessed can the true nature of the threat be determined, and only then can appropriate counterstrategies be developed.

With this type of analysis, it is possible to compare the nature of old terrorism and new terrorism in a meaningful way. One of the big differences is the congruency—or lack thereof—of all four factors. The RAF had a vision of worldwide revolution, but its organization and support revealed that its strategy was built around ensuring the survival of the group. Whenever the group needed an adrenaline shot, it combined hunger strikes by the prisoners, bombing by the commandos, and demonstrations by the sympathizers to provide a spark. But the viability of the group's Leninist-Marxist revolutionary vision was dependent on the existence of a mother state that could provide the political base for the revolution. When the Soviet Union dissolved, the group faded away. The PLO proved to be a political body willing to use terrorism to coerce and communicate, capable of developing a large army and willing to compromise if necessary. The simplicity of its cause gave it a huge support base and made it resilient enough to withstand the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. But the diversity of the groups that belonged to the PLO forced Arafat to be a chameleon, striving for progress through compromise. This compromise led to the Oslo Agreement, but that appears to be far from the end. In the latter part of the 1990s, Arafat came under intense pressure from groups such as HAMAS, for whom compromise was unacceptable. At this writing, Arafat is a prisoner in his own headquarters building in Ramallah, an acknowledged terrorist but still an important player in the peace process.<sup>2</sup> The IRA was a stubborn, tunnel-visioned group bent on carrying on a two-century-old conflict that had always been about violent struggle. Its loose organization seemed to add to its effectiveness—the authority of the local commanders

ensured the primacy of the bullet over the ballot, and Sinn Féin was mainly afforded the role of postoperative apologist, rather than strategist. But the IRA's vision for a united Ireland seemed to be incongruent with its moral support base, which did not include part of that same Ireland. The IRA was also forced to compromise and reverse the primacy to the ballot. The tenuous peace from the Good Friday Accord continues today.

The mechanisms are difficult to categorize, due to the incongruence. Additionally, during this period, state sponsorship loomed in the background, but in the world of the terrorist, the state became more of a nuisance than an aid. Unwilling to accept the strings attached to the support they got from states, terrorist organizations developed their own resources. The state support simply did not fit with their overall strategies. The mechanisms of both the states and the terrorist groups were based on some sort of coercion to change the policies of another political body. Groups such as the IRA posed only internal security threats in their own countries. The RAF theoretically aimed at being a worldwide national security threat, but given the weakness in its organization and support, posed an internal security threat as well. The PLO arguably posed (and continues to pose) a national security threat to the existence of Israel, which could be destabilizing to the region. There are many insurgent groups in the world today whose strategies resemble this type of coercion. Many of these do not pose a security threat to the world's states and are, therefore, not the enemy in the war on terrorism.

The militant Islamic movement is not focused on coercion and poses a much broader security threat. It is focused on world domination by force. The Iranian Revolution, the Soviet-Afghanistan war, the emergence of the Sudanese Islamic state, and the Persian Gulf War all contributed to the rise of a global movement. The strategy of the movement is congruent in all four factors. Its motivation is an extreme form of fundamentalist Islam that promises the domination of the world by Islam—through force, if necessary. Its organization is global, uniting nations and sects that have never worked well together. The hub and spoke network provides support for the militant groups while allowing them autonomy and security, yet their devotion ensures they follow strategic direction in the form of fatwas. The materiel support for the movement comes through this al-Qaeda network from both private and state sponsors. The movement does not worry about moral support from anyone who disagrees with its methods because in theory they will be overcome in the end, unless they convert. It does, however, take pains to explain its actions to the Islamic elite to maintain legitimacy. The movement is capable of accomplishing operations over a spectrum of violent measures, including conventional warfare, guerrilla warfare, and terrorism. Its members are willing to die for the cause—intentionally, if necessary. It takes little imagination to envision a scenario where the group would use WMD. The biological attacks in the United States after 9/11 may have been such a scenario. All four factors are congruent and are appropriate for the same mechanism.

The mechanism is that of a global insurgency. Like Mao, the militant Islamists envision being able to concentrate force in a limited time and space to perform tactical actions on their terms. Unlike Mao, the militant Islamists do not care about the support of the people who are victimized because these people are not the target population (unless the attacks occur in a Muslim country). Each of these actions that is successful weakens the enemy to a small extent because it shows the government is not strong enough to protect its citizens. This also makes the Islamists appear as heroes in the eyes of their target population. Counterattacks by the government can also make the Islamists look like heroes, as long as they survive the attacks. In this way, the movement theoretically builds up strength by surviving, shoring up Muslim support, and striking until it can eventually fight from a position of strength.

The difference between old terrorism and new terrorism is the congruency of the operational factors in forming a strategy. There are differences between the old and the new in each of the four areas, but none of these by themselves warrant an unprecedented counterstrategy such as the current war. There are also similarities. Militant Islam's motivation is vaguely similar to that of the RAF because its aim is world revolution. Its organization is vaguely similar to that of the PLO in that it is a loose and sometimes internecine conglomeration of diverse groups. Its moral support requirements are also vaguely similar to those of the PLO since its target audience is not in the population where its operations occur. The real difference is that for the militant Islamic movement, the strategy is a coherent one, where all four operational areas—motivation, organization, support, and operations—are congruent because they point to the same mechanism: global insurgency that gradually builds strength for a final takeover of the world. This is the nature of the war on which we are embarked.

## **Implications**

Today's terrorism is significantly different than the terrorism of the last few decades that suggests a new counterstrategy. The enemy is not a single group whose aims are focused on a limited political objective. This is why limited strikes such as the cruise missile strikes on Afghanistan and Sudan failed. It is why military campaigns that were not backed up by the resolve to succeed (e.g., the campaign against Aideed in Somalia) did more damage than good. It is why Israel, which is focused only on its own survival, cannot possibly make progress alone regardless how forceful its actions. The threat from today's terrorism is different. But since there are limited similarities with old terrorism in the four operational areas, there may be lessons from past efforts against terrorism that can be incorporated into this war.

The RAF may have taught us a lesson about dealing with ideologies of worldwide revolution: This type of ideology alone is not enough to sustain a global revolution. Without an organization and support that are also

worldwide, the RAF needed to point to a powerful state (the Soviet Union) whose existence validated the ideology. When this state disappeared, the ideology was discredited. The Soviet Union was not conquered, it was beaten in the arena of ideologies. Had the United States conquered the Soviet Union militarily, there is no guarantee the same effect would have been achieved. On the contrary, this may have fueled the fire of such revolutionary groups as the RAF to continue indefinitely.

This lesson only applies to the current conflict if there is some way to discredit the militant Islamic ideology of world domination by showing that the ideology has failed in the states where it took hold. This failure should not be measured by the standard of living of the people in the states but by the adherence of the governments to sharia. The ideologies espoused by Khomeini and Turabi represent deviations from several accepted tenets of fundamental Islam. Khomeini's assertion that Islamic clergy should participate in the government was a departure from the beliefs of many Shiites. Turabi's moderate application of sharia could be considered offensive to many fundamentalist Muslims. Certainly, Islamic clerics would not condone many of the ruthless methods used by both men and by the Taliban in Afghanistan. Therefore, the information war must be a major front in this war.

The Israel-PLO struggle revealed several lessons about dealing with a loose organization of diverse-minded groups. The Israelis tried several different strategies, including diplomacy, invasion, surgical strikes, and regime targeting. The invasion of 1982 was extremely effective militarily, but when the Israelis continued after achieving their initial, limited goals, they created another enemy in the Hizb'Allah. Surgical strikes and regime targeting have been of limited use because there are no targets that are valuable enough to cause the collapse of the entire organization. Diplomacy has at times seemed successful, as in 1993 with the Oslo Accord. However, militant Islamic groups who will not accept compromise have attacked Arafat because of the political nature of his strategy.

This is how the conflict in the Middle East has become inextricably linked to the global conflict. Israel cannot defeat the security threat it faces on its own. If Arafat could be isolated and protected from groups like HAMAS, Israel would be able to deal with him diplomatically. These groups are part of the global insurgency in the militant Islamic movement and cannot tolerate the existence of the state of Israel in the midst of the Holy Land. This is a place where the frontiers of Islam meet the frontiers of the West. The only hope of solving the problem is to find a way to isolate and destroy the terrorist groups while still recognizing the legitimacy of the cause of the Palestinian people. Again, the information war is a major part of this effort.

The British struggle against the IRA can teach lessons about the coordinated use of different national instruments. The IRA as a movement bears little resemblance to the militant Islamic movement, except that it was forced to develop a covert support system with overt fronts to finance itself without

relying on outside help. The British counterstrategy treated the legal and military aspects of the fight as separate, compartmented operations, and as a result lost any hope of synergy between the two. The war on terrorism is even more complicated because there are multiple fronts—military, economic, legal, political, information—and also a coalition of multiple states involved. A lack of cooperation among states could lead to the loss of opportunities to arrest important suspects. More importantly, if the United States is perceived as fighting the war alone, it will lose a major battle on the legitimacy front. This would add credibility to the Islamists' claims that the United States is the Great Satan, which is out to get Muslims.

The important task is to develop a strategy in this war that incorporates only the lessons from the past that have been adjusted for the nature of this war. The nature of war is the world's states fighting against a global insurgency—the strategy should keep this in mind at all times. The main strategy must be developed to defeat the insurgency's strategy and not to prosecute war in a certain manner just because that is the way the states normally operate. The way to accomplish this is to develop strategy using the analysis framework by working backward from the insurgency's strategy mechanism to the four operational factors and by developing an effective counter that is congruent at every level.

The strategy of the militant Islamists is to gradually dominate the world by conversion and force and to build up support from militants through tactical successes and survival, while maintaining legitimacy in the eyes of fundamentalist Muslims. That is what the counterstrategy should be designed to defeat. The coalition's mechanism of defeat inspires the growth of the coalition until, in the end, the materiel and moral support for the militant Islamic movement are gone. Any small groups that exist are isolated from the hub of Islam, and—possibly because—the militant ideology is discredited as being un-Islamic.

The organization of the coalition will be ad hoc. Forums such as the United Nations can be used to shore up support in the court of world public opinion, but the majority of the effort will consist of behind the scenes diplomatic overtures to ensure solidarity of the coalition. Unfortunately, this may involve giving up the ability to call all the strategic shots. The important thing is to maintain the coalition's solidarity while disrupting the insurgency's already loose organizational solidarity. It is not necessary to stick to an arbitrary definition of terrorism to determine the enemy. Instead, the enemy is any organization that is seen as a threat to the security of the coalition. For example, it is possible to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Palestinian cause and the security of the state of Israel yet condemn the extreme methods used in pursuit of each. It is also necessary to identify those groups that are acting outside the bounds of legitimacy, such as HAMAS and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and combine efforts with the two legitimate authorities in the region, the Israeli government and the Palestinian Authority. Even though Oslo is as good as dead and Arafat is an acknowledged terrorist, keeping him on the side



of the coalition would do the most good for the coalition. One good example of this coalition-building is the Bush administration's successful courtship of the Pakistanis prior to Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan. This amounted to "asking Pakistan to help destroy what its intelligence service had helped create and maintain: the Taliban."<sup>3</sup> Yet Pakistan's Pervez Musharraf supported the United States fully in each of its seven ultimatums.<sup>4</sup> This was a strategic victory that took a notch out of the hub of the militant Islamic movement, and it shows the type of organization the coalition will have.

Besides coordinating strategic activities, the coalition governments will need to develop the capability to coordinate operational-level activities as well. For instance, there must be legal methods for any country to aid another in its pursuit of known, declared terrorists in the latter's territory. This will require that each state involved has an organization with a single authority that can cross bureaucratic lines to make resources available as a team in support of the war on terrorism. Each state's committee for the war on terrorism should have knowledge of the state's operations on each front to coordinate them among the coalition states.

The motivation of the coalition is the peace, security, and prosperity of the states involved. Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld outlined this in ordinary terms in a February interview: "The ultimate victory in this war is when everyone who wants to can do what everyone of us did today, and that is get up, let your children go to school, go out of the house and not in fear, stand here on a sidewalk and not worry about a truck bomb driving into us."<sup>5</sup> However, this statement portrays a war of total elimination of terrorism itself, which is a long-term—and probably infeasible, although admirable—goal for a continuous conflict, such as the war on drugs or the war on crime. When the Bush administration outlined its intentions to eliminate all terrorist groups of global reach, it shaped the war in a different light. As Michael Howard put it, "To declare that one is at war is immediately to create a war psychosis that may be totally counterproductive for the objective being sought. It arouses an immediate expectation, and demand, for spectacular military action against some easily identifiable adversary, preferably a hostile state—action leading to decisive results."<sup>6</sup> In the initial strategy discussions at Camp David, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz pushed hard for including Iraq in the initial phase of the war, while the opportunity to strike was hot.<sup>7</sup> The media also took up this cry in some places.<sup>8</sup> The problem with this is that it feeds right into the insurgency's motivation. Arab and Muslim public opinion of Americans turned venomous when the United States bombed Iraq for noncooperation in the UN weapons inspection in December 1998, and there is a high probability it would again.<sup>9</sup> The United States and the coalition need to avoid aiding the militant Islamists in polarizing the world into the city of faith and the city of war. Instead of making the enemy states un-Islamic, this would make them look more legitimately Islamic.

The strategy must take into consideration coalition materiel and moral support and insurgent materiel and moral support. The coalition obviously has a major advantage in the area of materiel support. The terrorists cannot match the resources of the coalition states, even with state support from the rogue states. Coalition resources will only be available as long as the governments dedicate the resources to the effort. For the United States, the declaration of war in the wake of the devastation of 9/11 provided all the impetus needed to gain support from Congress, which guaranteed the support of the American people. As the war drags on, this moral support may be harder to obtain. As conditions in the Middle East heated up at the end of March 2002, American analysts were already questioning Bush's ability to keep up what they called a good-versus-evil view of the war on terrorism.<sup>10</sup>

While the coalition is worrying about keeping its materiel and moral support going, it must attack the insurgency's support as well. Difficult as it is to attack the materiel support, there have already been successes—161 coalition countries have combined to block \$104.8 million of terrorist assets.<sup>11</sup> Another, more dramatic way to separate the militant groups from materiel support is to eliminate or deter the groups' state sponsorship. The war in Afghanistan was undoubtedly a big step, as it eliminated a major training ground and a major portion of the global network. The US-led force took pains to avoid making this war a moral support victory for the insurgency. Obtaining Pakistan's support and concentrating on humanitarian aid were a huge part of that plan. This revealed to the world the fact that the Taliban, who claimed to be a fundamentalist Islamic organization, were unworthy of the authority they took from the government of Afghanistan. For Muslims, to side with the Taliban was to admit corruption as a part of Islam. A big part of the moral support front depends on how well the coalition plans its operations.

The coalition operations need to be aimed at defeating the insurgency while denying it moral victories. Obviously, homeland defense is a big part of this, as long as it does not go so far as to erode the freedoms that are essential to our way of life. How to conduct offensive operations is not quite as obvious. The military can be a big part of these operations, as in Afghanistan, but the operations have to be guaranteed successes with limited objectives. If the operation fails, the insurgents claim a major victory. If the operation is tactically successful but falls short of its strategic goal and the insurgents survive, the insurgents also claim victory. But if the coalition forces are seemingly able to accomplish any mission they undertake, they retain the appearance of strength even if the insurgents survive. For example, in Afghanistan, had the objective been to transform the state of Afghanistan into a state that is hostile to terrorism, the objectives would have been met before Operation Anaconda began. The operation could have been avoided, and even though some enemy soldiers would have survived in caves, they would have been insignificant—and acknowledged as such. If, however, the objective is to round up and capture or kill all enemy soldiers, any enemy troops that escape represent a

significant moral victory for the insurgency. If there are other objectives that are important enough to warrant the operation, then state them. For example, perhaps the intelligence that was gained from the caves was worth the risk of putting soldiers down to go in after it. Perhaps the sheer act of intimidation that comes from being able to kill them wherever they go is the object. The important thing is to limit the objectives to those having strategic effects.

This may mean that the armed forces play a supporting role to other instruments of power. The US armed forces may be placed in the position where they must provide intelligence to civil law enforcement officials from other countries. American space assets, airborne reconnaissance assets, and special forces may be particularly well suited to these tasks. The Air Force may be used extensively to provide humanitarian assistance and supply of foreign and covert agents. Army and Marine ground forces may spend a lot of time doing peacekeeping while law enforcement officials perform the direct actions involved in apprehending the enemy in situations where it is appropriate for this kind of action. These are missions that can have strategic effects. As Maj Gen David Deptula, author of the air strategies in the wars in the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan, put it, "The biggest piece of this war could very well be the information piece."<sup>12</sup> It may be that there are few opportunities for the armed forces to be used in a destructive manner as they were in Afghanistan.

But in Afghanistan, the American forces fought on the side of an insurgency against an authority. In this scenario, even in a small war, a conventional force can be successful using regular tactics. This principle applied in Bosnia in 1995 and Kosovo in 1999 as well. It also applied in North Vietnam after the Easter Offensive of 1972, during Linebacker I and II. However, in Vietnam before 1968, the United States tried to use conventional force (especially an airpower strategy of conventional targeting) against an insurgent force and was not successful on the strategic level.<sup>13</sup> The Israelis have shown the same tendency by using conventional force against the PLO in Lebanon, which gave them tactical, even operational success but was a strategic failure. They drove the PLO out of Lebanon, but gained a new enemy in the Hizb'Allah, and merely forced the PLO to relocate.<sup>14</sup> When there is an opportunity to eliminate a dangerous resource that could potentially be used by the insurgency, such as WMD in the hands of a state that has ties to terrorists, conventional war-fighting operations may be appropriate. But this should only happen when the conditions have been set so that the actions will be decisive and legitimate in the eyes of the coalition.

As Pericles warned the Athenians 2,433 years ago, "I have many other reasons to hope for a favorable outcome, if you can consent not to combine schemes of fresh conquest with the conduct of the war, and will abstain from willfully involving yourselves in other dangers; indeed, I am more afraid of our own blunders than of the enemy's devices."<sup>15</sup> This war is a war of states protecting their security from a global insurgency that does not

have the strength to do major damage to them at this time. The insurgency's strategy relies on the hope that Allah will eventually honor their efforts by making them strong enough to overpower the evil city of war, and the entire world will be run according to his will. In the interim, they must work from a point of weakness. That very weakness is to their advantage since they do not need to accomplish much to gain support. Survival is sometimes enough. However, limited victories are even better. The strategy that will defeat them depends on gradually growing a coalition that cuts off materiel and moral support for militant groups that will then be isolated and illegitimate in the eyes of Islam. This will take cooperation among the states of the coalition and among these states's instruments of power. It will not lead to a classical, decisive victory that eliminates terrorism, but to a long struggle that marginalizes the insurgents and makes terrorism an undesirable strategy for all others. The coalition must maintain its own moral support in the form of public opinion, which assures materiel support for the war from the governments. It must also cut off materiel support to the insurgents without increasing the moral support to them. This may mean that decisive action by the armed forces is not the chosen venue of action most of the time. The armed forces may be more useful performing indirect operations that have strategic effects on the information front. All use of force (civil or military) should be decisive and limited in its objectives so that the objectives are achieved as effortlessly as possible. When it is necessary to use conventional war-fighting operations, the conditions should be set so that the actions are seen as legitimate in the eyes of the coalition. This is a war that can be lost more easily than it can be won. American leadership is essential, but leadership implies someone to lead, and in this war, those who are following may make all the difference.

#### Notes

1. "The al-Qaeda Doctrine," *Stratfor.com*, 11 March 2002, n.p., on-line, Internet, 11 March 2002 through the *Early Bird*, available from <http://www.ebird.dtic.mil>.
2. Tracy Wilkinson and Richard Boudreaux, "US Brokers a Surrender at West Bank," *Los Angeles Times*, 3 April 2002, A1.
3. Dan Balz, Bob Woodward, and Jeff Himmelman, "10 Days in September: Inside the War Cabinet—Afghan Campaign's Blueprint Emerges," *Washington Post*, 29 January 2002, A1.
4. Ibid.
5. Donald H. Rumsfeld, secretary of defense, interviewed by Toby Harnden, "Rumsfeld Spells Out What US Victory Would Mean," *London Sunday Telegraph*, 24 February 2002, A1.
6. Michael Howard, "What's in a Name? How to Fight Terrorism," *Foreign Affairs*, January-February 2002, 9.
7. Balz, Woodward, and Himmelman, A1.
8. William M. Arkin, "Should Iraq Be Next?" *Washington Post*, 3 December 2001. Arkin stated the point pragmatically: "If Kosovo and Afghanistan teach us anything, it is that decisive military action can be taken with relatively few civilian deaths—many fewer than are

caused by the embargo that is imposed because Saddam Hussein refuses to let in UN inspectors.”

9. Yossef Bodansky, *Bin Laden: The Man Who Declared War on America* (New York: Random House, 1999), 352–53.

10. Dan Balz and Dana Milbank, “Bush Doctrine Begins to Blur: Mideast Complicates Good-versus-Evil Approach,” *Washington Post*, 3 April 2002, A1.

11. Taken from the White House’s official Web site for America’s response to terrorism, n.p., on-line, Internet, 28 May 2002, available from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/response/financialresponse.html>.

12. Maj Gen David Deptula, interviewed by the author, 31 January 2002, School of Advanced Airpower Studies, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

13. Mark Clodfelter, *The Limits of Airpower: The American Bombing of North Vietnam* (New York: Free Press, 1989), 205–6.

14. Clive Jones, “Israeli Counter-Insurgency Strategy and the War in South Lebanon,” *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, Winter 1997, 82–83.

15. Thucydides, “The Peloponnesian War,” in *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*, ed. Robert B. Strassler (New York: Free Press, 1996), 83.

The New Terrorism  
The Nature of the War on Terrorism

*Air University Press Team*

*Chief Editor*  
Hattie D. Minter

*Copy Editor*  
Tammi Long

*Book Design and Cover Art*  
L. Susan Fair

*Composition and  
Prepress Production*  
Mary Ferguson

*Print Preparation*  
Joan Hickey

*Distribution*  
Diane Clark