

Lecture 9
27 October 2009
Copyright: Ronald B. Mitchell, 2009

- I. Intro
- II. Small group discussion: What is terrorism? Is "One Man's Terrorist another Women's Freedom Fighter." Is it not terrorism if you agree with their Goals and Objectives? Is what defines terrorism the means, goals, who does it, who is affected or what else? When are terrorist acts justified? Which of the following do you see as terrorist?
 - A. 9/11 Attacks
 - B. Oklahoma City Bombing
 - C. Irish Republican Army
 - D. Hamas
 - E. Chechen Rebels
 - F. John Brown -- Harper's Ferry
 - G. Ku Klux Klan
 - H. Radical Leftist Anti-war activists
 - I. Right wing Anti-government Militias
 - J. White Supremacists
 - K. Abortion Clinic Bombers & Snipers
 - L. ELF: Environment Liberation Front and eco-saboteurs
 - M. Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- III. Definition: "violent acts intended to influence a wider audience, to send a message" (Stohl, 3). "Violence to instill fear - to terrorize" (Jenkins in Art and Jervis, 200).
 - A. US government definition: the use or threatened use of "premeditated, politically motivated violence against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience" (Frieden/Lake/Schultz, 381).
 - B. "November, 2004, a UN panel defined terrorism as: 'Any action intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians, non-combatants when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act.'" [<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terrorism>].
 - C. **Actors doing act:** non-state actors (but what about state-supported terrorist organizations, as in Taliban support of Al Qaeda?)
 - D. **Means:** violence or force, or threat of them
 - E. **Goals:** political, religious, nationalistic, or ideological
 - F. **Process:** fear, intimidation, coercion of others beyond those actually harmed ("audience")
 - G. **Strategies** terrorists use: Frieden, Lake, & Schultz. 2009. *World Politics*. New York: Norton, 392ff:
 - 1. Coercion: make target state meet its demands through *threats* (once carried out, target has no reason to do what is asked).
 - 2. Provocation: get target to respond aggressively and thereby build support for terrorist cause
 - 3. Spoiling: prevent accommodation and cooperation by target state and home government of terrorist group by showing home government cannot control terrorists
 - 4. Outbidding: expression of competition between competing terrorist groups for hearts and minds of home population, to demonstrate leadership and commitment relative to competition
 - H. **Targets:** innocent people or property, civilians, noncombatants. With exception of "civilians, non-combatants" phrase, isn't UN panel just a definition of warfare?
 - I. **Audience not equal to target:** government, whole population, segment of population. "Political terrorism is theater. It is profound and often tragic drama for which the world is the stage" (Stohl, 1).
 - J. What is the value of distinguishing terrorism from military attacks? Are there differences and if so, what are they?
- IV. Are terrorists rational Frieden, Lake, & Schultz. 2009. *World Politics*. New York: Norton. 284ff
 - A. Rationality addresses means of actors, not goals
 - B. Terrorists appear quite rational in their efforts to achieve their goals
 - 1. Pick targets appropriate to achieving their goals
 - 2. Use randomness where it furthers their goals
 - 3. Choose means that allow them to make up for lack of power relative to targets
 - C. To extent they are successful, this is an example of the "paradox of unrealized power"

- V. Types of terrorism (see Magstadt and Schotten, 1999)
 - A. **State terrorism:** use of terrorist tactics by a government against own citizens, e.g., Iraqi use of chemical weapons on Kurds; desaparecidos in Chile, Guatemala, Argentina; Pol Pot in Cambodia
 - B. **International terrorism:** use of terrorist tactics by one government against citizens of another country
 - 1. Firebombing of Dresden, bombing of London
 - 2. Why are these distinctions important?
 - 3. Noam Chomsky in his book "Pirates and Emperors Old and New: International Terror in the Real World" argues that the term "terrorism" is used for ideological purposes, especially by the US and Israel, and defined so that it can be seen as "only committed by others." Chomsky argues that we need a definition sufficiently wide that any act of violence that targets civilian populations so that all "terrorists, and those who support them, must, and will be held to account" (whether or not those are countries or non-state actors) [http://www.equalized.org/scribbles/reviews/pirates_and_emperors_old_and_new.php]
 - 4. US bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki: Schelling argues these bombs "were weapons of terror and shock" (Schelling, 1966, 16-17). Audience was citizens of Tokyo. "The bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki represented violence against the country itself and not mainly an attack on Japan's military strength. The effect of the bombs, and their purpose, ... [was] the pain and the shock and the promise of more" (Schelling, 1966, 16-17).
 - C. **Transnational terrorism:** use of terrorist tactics by non-government actors in one country against citizens of another country
 - 1. Bombing of U.S.M.C. Barracks in Lebanon 1983, 223 killed.
 - 2. TWA flight 847 hijacking and Achille Lauro in 1985
 - 3. Berlin nightclub bombing (1986) Six U.S. Servicemen & dates
 - 4. Pan Am Flight #103 American Airline flight blown up in 1988 over Lockerbie Scotland.
 - 5. World Trade Center bombing of 1993
 - 6. Khobar Towers in Dahrhan, Saudia Arabia, 1996. 19 U.S. Airmen dead
 - 7. Kenya and Tanzania Embassy bombings (1998) 156 Killed mostly Africans
 - 8. Bombing of USS Cole in Yeman October 2000, 17 U.S. Sailors killed
 - 9. World Trade Center and Pentagon 9-11-01
 - D. **Domestic terrorism:** use of terrorist tactics by non-government actors in one country against citizens of own country
 - E. **Nationalist-separatist terrorism:** use of terrorist tactics by non-government actors in one country against citizens and government of own country to establish own homeland
 - F. Where do civil wars fit in this set of categories?
- VI. Motivations and sources of terrorism
 - A. Nationalist aspirations
 - B. Religious beliefs: most terrorists not religious, most fundamentalists not terrorists
 - C. Resentment and resistance to oppression
 - D. Political discontent
 - E. Fear and alienation - response to perceived threat of "the other"
 - F. Poverty
 - G. Disenfranchisement and disempowerment
- VII. Small group discussion: What should we do about it?
 - 1. What actions should the US take to avert terrorism? How much should the US spend? How much are you willing to pay in additional taxes? How much are you willing to put up with in delays at airports? What about profiling? How much are you willing to give up in freedom and liberty, and identification checks?
 - 2. Should we negotiate with terrorists who are holding people hostage or making threats? What if the hostages are members of your family?
 - 3. Would you authorized "commandoes" to attack and kill those who the commandoes claim are terrorists who are about to act? Do you agree or disagree with Posen's claim that "Terrorists must be treated like criminals, not enemies: Police should apprehend them; courts should try them. Military action should occur seldom if at all, and it should always be precise." (Posen, 53).
 - 4. What should we do in response to a perceived threat? If the US "needs friends" as Posen (p. 51) suggests, how much should we look the other way with countries who can help us with respect to terrorism but are involved in torture or human rights abuses or even nuclear weapons development

(as with Pakistan). That is, what do we do when we must trade off protecting ourselves from terrorism against other things we value?

VIII. What should we do?

- A. Strategies
 - 1. Deter
 - 2. Defend
 - 3. Criminalize
 - 4. Preempt
 - 5. Negotiate and compromise
 - 6. Remove conditions that promote it:
 - a) Pew Global Attitudes Project found that “respondents in every country surveyed in 2006 ... identified the United States as a greater threat to world peace than either Iran or North Korea” Frieden, Lake, & Schultz. 2009. *World Politics*. New York: Norton, 395.
 - b) If "failed states are a national security problem" (Walt, 62), then how much effort should we expend to respond to failed states and help them out? Remove deeper causes of terrorism, like poverty and other sources? That is, if "the United States is less popular than it thinks" (Walt, 59), what should it do to reduce such antipathy?
- B. Does it seem like the US is ready to do what it takes? "It is increasingly clear that this policy entails significantly greater costs than Americans have thought. In addition to the lives already lost and the need to devote greater resources to homeland defense, the international campaign against global terrorism is forcing the United States to shoulder a breathtaking array of international burdens" (Walt, 75).

IX. Fit with previous theories

- A. Realism - doesn't expect non-state actors to play important roles but does expect violence as useful and fungible
- B. Institutionalism - Walt argues that institutions have an important role to play in allowing the US to operate effectively in its fight against terrorism. Nonstate actors play a far more important role in institutionalist thought.
- C. Feminist theories - What might feminists have to say about the views of people who have been marginalized and how the oppression and antipathy that is bred by such marginalization is the source and a breeding ground for violence?

X. Sources: these lecture notes build on:

- A. Kenneth Quinnell at <http://cfcc.quinnell.us/tcc/pos2001/lecture/middleeast.htm>
- B. Magstadt, Thomas, M., and Peter M. Schotten. *Understanding Politics: Ideas, Institutions and Issues*, Fifth Edition. 1999. St. Martin's/Worth.
- C. Roskin, Micael G., Robert L. Cord, James A. Medeiros, & Walter S. Jones. *Political Science: An Introduction*, Seventh Edition. 2000. Prentice Hall.
- D. Frieden, Lake, & Schultz. 2009. *World Politics*. New York: Norton.