THE NEW TERRORISM:
CHANGING FACE OF WAR AND CONFLICT

Mahdi Mohammad Nia[*]

Abstract

After the cold war, the world's security perspective underwent a major change from the seeming stability of the bi-polar power balance to a situation in which sub-national groups and organizations particularly terrorist groups became able to acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Since the mid 1990s terrorism has transformed into an inherently new structure with new characteristics and now presents markedly different challenges than traditional state-to-state security threats. The concept of "new terrorism" is being used to justify a "new" counter-terrorism war initiated by the United States in 2001. The aim of this paper is to develop an understanding of the changing nature of war, new terrorism and the US - post 9/11 counterterrorism strategy.

Keywords: international security, old terrorism, new terrorism, motivation, territoriality and individualization.

Introduction

*T*he concept of threat is considered as one of the ambiguous concepts of world politics which has been changing with the changing international environment. With the end of the Cold War, the world's security perspective underwent a major change from the seeming stability of the bi-polar power balance to a situation in which not only any state, but even sub-national groups and organizations may be able to acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMDs).

The traditional meaning of international security, which dominated both the academic and the political worlds until the end of the Cold War, remained focused on the use of force between states, specially in the context of great powers' military operations. In this perspective, states as the main actors of world politics are both the cause

[*] PhD. scholar, Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, University of Pune, India.

of the threat to security and what is threatened. But since the 1980s, this picture has become increasingly questionable with regard to who should be secured, the nature of international threats, and the kind of reactions that were subsequently authorized to manage the contemporary threats.[1]

International security which has long been challenged by wars and conflict between states is presently jeopardized by an unknown, complex, and unconventional force so called "new terrorism". Terrorism is certainly not a new phenomenon. The terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon in September 2001 brought it to prominent attention in the United States and many other countries.[2] In this regard, the September 11 attacks have not only altered how one defines security but also disclosed the true nature of new terrorism as the current threat to world peace. It can be said that this event undoubtedly marked a turning point in the nature of terrorist activities. Terrorist groups operate in secrecy, often blending in with civilians, and typically attack using means other than large formations of conventionally armed soldiers. Therefore, it is more difficult to detect in advance their readiness for a terrorist attack. New terrorists, unlike guerrilla armies or traditional insurgencies, do not control territory and they have no population to defend. This is making terrorist invasion more difficult to deter by the threat of counterattack.[3]

Nowadays, "A terrorist operation carried out in the United States can be orchestrated from the Middle East or Southeast Asia. Such an incident could even involve the use of weapons of mass destruction, such as a suitcase containing a nuclear device or Anthrax spores".[4] The growing risk of linkages between terrorism and weapons of mass destruction has become an acute international security concern.

---

[1] C. Elisabeth St. Jean, "The Changing Nature of International Security: the Need for an Integrated Definition," *Paterson Review*, vol. 8, (2007): 22.

[2] Jack Patterson, Eliza Kretzmann, and Tom Smith, "Global Security and Insecurity: Responses to Terrorism and Other Threats," in Michael T. Snarr, D. Neil Snarr (eds.), *Introducing Global Issues* (London & Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2005), 72.

[3] Allen S. Weiner, "The Use of Force and Contemporary Security Threats: Old Medicine for New Ills?," *Stanford Law Review,* vol. 59, no. 2, (2006): 44.

[4] Martin A. Kalis, "A New Approach to International Terrorism," *International Affairs* 10, no. 2, (Summer/Autumn 2001): 81.

Contemporary terrorism, with possibility of using chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons, poses serious challenges to the global security.[5]

Of course, the contemporary terrorists threatened not only the security of the United States, but also of many countries, especially the US allies in South Asia (Pakistan and India). In the case of Pakistan, according to Pakistan Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS), only in 2009, 87 suicide attacks occurred in this country (32 per cent higher than the previous year) killing 1,299 persons and injuring 3,633.[6] In the case of Pakistan, the global security concerns arise from the country's instability and the much hyped perception that its nuclear weapons might fall in the hands of terror organizations like the al-Qaeda and Taliban.

War and Conflict in a Changing World

The nature of conflicts has continuously evolved and changed. The traditional formulation of international security apparently faced the problems raised by the narrow definitions of threats. The major problem refers to concentrating on the state as the unit of analysis and the main referent in the context of security. This has changed after the end of the Cold War and particularly since 9/11. There has been a significant shift from state to non-state actors especially the "new generation" of terrorist groups. Traditional methods have proved to be insufficient to fight these new threats. This transformation has created a new kind of threat which is called "asymmetrical threat". This concept "implies the superiority of the attackers against its target despite the terrorists' relative weakness."[7]

In reality, since the terrorist attacks in September 2001, many countries have begun to look at international security in a much broader context than was the case during the bi-polar Cold War conflict. The events of 9/11 served as a wake-up call to the world that international terrorism poses grave dangers to civilian and military populations alike.

---

[5] See Frank J. Cilluffo , Sharon L. Cardash, and Gordon Nathaniel Lederman, "Combating Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Terrorism: A Comprehensive Strategy: A Report of the Csis Homeland Defense Project," (Washington DC: Center for Strategic & International Studies, 2001).

[6] "Pakistan Security Reports 2009," *Pakistan Institute for Peace Studies (PIPS)*, http://san-pips.com/download.php?f=29.pdf (accessed January 12, 2010).

[7] Chagri Erhan, "Combating threat of the globalization era," *Journal of Strategy and Analysis*, Issue 5, (June 2003), http://www.stradigma.com/english/june2003/articles_01.html (accessed January 13, 2010).

These attacks were distinct in several ways. First, the deaths associated with the 9/11 terrorist attacks were unprecedented: the human casualties were equal to the number of deaths from international terrorism since the 1980s to the end of 2000. Second, 9/11 showed that everyday objects (jetliners) could be turned into deadly weapons with catastrophic consequences. Third, the event showed that the goals of today's terrorists were to seek maximum destruction and induce widespread panic as against   the predominantly left-wing terrorist campaigns of the 1970s and 1980s that sought to win over constituencies. Finally, 9/11 mobilized a huge reallocation of resources to US homeland security. Since 2002, the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) budget has increased by over 69 per cent to $36.2 billion for the fiscal year 2004 and $40.2 billion for 2005. A little over 60 per cent of DHS's budget was spent on counterterrorism programmes on the US soil.[8] These expenditures are small compared to the so-called preemptive actions taken in fighting the "war on terror," including the US wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. According to a new report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the US Congress has provided the Department of Defense (DOD) with about $808 billion in supplemental and annual appropriations since 2001, primarily for military campaigns in support of the Global War on Terrorism.[9] Still other proactive spending involves improving intelligence, tracking terrorist assets, and fostering cooperative linkages with other states.[10]

Generally, in the contemporary era, the nature of war and conflict has undergone some major transformations:

1. Crises in the 1990s and 2000s have intensified a trend that started during the Cold War—the shift from war between states to war within states. Many wars and conflicts during and after the Cold War were often between warring parties and non-state actors within national borders. Some scholars believe that the violence and civil conflict in countries like

---

[8] For more information see "Office of Management and Budget," http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2008/defense.html (accessed January 8, 2009).

[9] See "Global War on Terrorism: Reported Obligations for the Department of Defense," *US Government Accountability Office*, (December 15, 2008), http://gao.gov/products/GAO-09-233R (accessed February 2, 2009).

[10] Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, *The Political Economy of Terrorism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1-2.

Iraq, Afghanistan, Sudan, Sri Lanka, Liberia, and Rwanda have features which are qualitatively different from previous conflicts.[11] In reality, contrary to conventional wars, the "war on terror" is an asymmetric war in which instead of asking "where is the enemy?" the first question asked is, "who is the enemy?". The enemy in an asymmetric war does not wear a uniform and is part of a civilian population, and thus it is not always obvious who it is. Moreover, the adversary can be "both" an ordinary civilian during the day and a terrorist at night.[12]

2. Non-state organizations, such as guerrilla groups, terrorist networks, and paramilitaries (unofficial armies especially in Iraq) are increasingly organized along ethnic or religious lines. These actors have reach beyond their national borders. Nowadays, terrorist groups often attack outside the boundaries of their own country, whereas most terrorist attacks in the past occurred within countries or sometimes in neighbouring countries.

3. The primary victims and majority of casualties are now civilians, while military deaths are on the decline. In Iraq for example, it is estimated that more than 30,000 civilians have died, well below the 5,000 U.S. soldiers killed there.[13] According to NCTC (*National Counter Terrorism Center*) there was an uneven upward trend from 1982 to 2003 in the numbers killed and injured in international terrorist attacks each year. The 2004 casualty toll (includes those wounded) was nearly 9,000, double that of 2003.[14] At the beginning of the twentieth century, "the ratio of military to civilian

---

[11] Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, "From Cold Wars to New Wars," in Clive Jones and Kennedy-Pipe (eds.), *International Security in a Global Age* (London: Frank Cass, 2000), 20-21.

[12] See Giora eiland, "The Changing Nature of War: Six New Challenges," *Strategic Assessment* 10, no. 1, (June 2007).

[13] Some find this data very misleading. They argue that the numbers of death to date are greater than this data shows. *The Canadian*, March 25, 2004, http://www.agoracosmopolitan.com/home/Frontpage/2008/03/21/02286.ht ml (accessed February 2, 2009).

[14] Human Security Report 2005, "International Terrorism," www.humansecurityreport.info/press/Terrorism-Factsheet.pdf (accessed January 12, 2010).

victims was about nine to one, while during the Second World War, the ratio was about even. By the end of the century, the ratio had been completely turned upside down as nine civilian deaths occurred for every one military death."[15] Today, victims of war cover all sections of the population regardless of gender or age. Nowadays, the ongoing human suffering comes from the imposed conflicts in Angola, Afghanistan, the Caucasus, Colombia, Sudan, the Great Lakes region of Africa, Palestine, West Africa, Rwanda and Srebrenica.

The New Terrorism: Contemporary Challenge to Global Security

What is Terrorism?

Essentially, terrorism is a vaguely defined term. The political and ideological nature of terrorism renders it difficult to define. Moreover, "terrorism" is a pejorative term; most terrorist groups do not like to call themselves such."[16] While terrorism has existed in one form or another for centuries (if not millennia), no international and comprehensive definition has been accepted.

In fact, the term terrorism carries ideological baggage. The cliché that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" is critically significant. In fact, the nature of "conflict" is one of the significant contextual elements when examining terrorism. The nature of conflict is definitely a distinguishing factor in classifying an act as terrorism, freedom fighting, insurgency, or guerilla war. The boundary between them is muddled. Moreover, in examining terrorism, the role of the media should not be ignored. The media exploits the term terrorism in order to sell the story by sensationalizing it. In fact the media can sensationalize any number of activities as a terrorism act.[17]

---

[15] Jack Patterson, Eliza Kretzmann, and Tom Smith, (2005), 72.

[16] Thomas Copeland, "Is the 'New Terrorism' Really New? An Analysis of the New Paradigm for Terrorism," *The Journal of Conflict Studies,* Vol. xxi, no. 2, (Winter 2001): 24.

[17] See James A. Johnson, Gerald R. Ledlow, Mark A. Cwiek, "Community Preparedness And Response To Terrorism," Vol. II, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 2005): 67.

Scholars and political organizations have formulated various definitions of terrorism. The difficulty encountered when trying to define terrorism is connected directly to the source of the definition. In other words, the group or organization defining terrorism will normally determine its meaning. Schmidt and Youngman, the authors of Political Terrorism, identified 109 different definitions. Many efforts to define terrorism as an international legally binding instrument were unsuccessful. Jonathan White proposes that terrorism must be examined through the contextual elements of history, conflict, political power, repression, media, crime, religion, and specific forms of terrorism.[18] Bruce Hoffman offers the following definition of terror: "Violence—or, equally important, the threat of violence—used and directed in pursuit of, or in service of, a political aim."[19] Walter Enders and Todd Sandler define terrorism as "The premeditated use or threat to use violence by individuals or sub-national groups in order to obtain a political or social objective through the intimidation of a large audience beyond that of the immediate victims."[20] According to Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, "terrorism may be defined as the use of violent or intimidating methods to coerce a government or community—a phenomenon noticeable throughout modern history."[21] The United Nations defined terrorism (not officially accepted) as follows: "The act of destroying or injuring civilian lives or the act of destroying or damaging civilian or government property without the expressly chartered permission of a specific government, this by individuals or groups acting independently... in the attempt to effect some political goal."[22] The UN definition also considers all war crimes as acts of terrorism. However, attacks on military installations, bases, and personnel are not considered acts of terrorism. The UN definition of terrorism does not include state-sponsored terrorism. At the present, there is no commonly accepted definition of terrorism within the US government.

The FBI defines terrorism as "the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a

---

[18] Jonathan R. White, *Terrorism 2002 Update* (Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2003), 5-7.

[19] Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 2-3.

[20] Walter Enders, Todd Sandler, *The Political Economy of Terrorism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 3.

[21] Caroline Kennedy-Pipe, (2000), 22.

[22] Quoted in Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, (2005), 3.

government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives."[23]

Surprisingly, even two departments of the US government—the leader in the global war on terrorism—do not have a single comprehensive definition of what constitutes terrorism. The US State Department, for example, defines terrorism as "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets, i.e., in addition to civilians, military personnel who at the time of the incident are unarmed or not on duty, by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience." This definition characterizes the victims as "noncombatant" and further states "the term 'noncombatant' is interpreted to include, in addition to civilians, military personnel who at the time of the incident are unarmed and/or not on duty."[24] The US Department of Defence characterizes terrorism as "the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological."[25] The DOD definition of terrorism is distinguished from the definition of the Department of State in three main elements. First, the threat, *not the use* of violence, is now included. Second, the noncombatant distinction is ignored, so that the roadside bombing of a US military convoy in Iraq would be terrorism. Third, religious and ideological incentives are explicitly identified. Nevertheless, both definitions share five minimalist elements: violence, political motivation, perpetrator, victim, and audience.[26]

---

[23] Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit, National Security Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, "Terrorism in the United States 1999: 30 Years of Terrorism," *A Special Retrospective Edition* (Washington DC: United States Department of Justice, 1999),
http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terror99.pdf (accessed December 28, 2008).

[24] Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, "Patterns of Global Terrorism 2002," *US Department of State Publication* 11038, (Washington DC: State Department, April 2003): 13,
http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/20177.pdf (accessed January 13, 2009).

[25] Department of Defense, *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms* (Washington DC: United States Department of Defense, June 2003), 531,
http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf (accessed January 13, 2009).

[26] Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, (2006), 5.

A very different definition was coined at the fifth Islamic summit that was convened under the aegis of the United Nations in order to discuss the subject of international terrorism, which is as follows:

"Terrorism is an act carried out to achieve an inhuman and corrupt *(mufsid)* objective, and involving threat to security of any kind, and violation of rights acknowledged by religion and mankind."[27]   In this definition there is no reference to the nation-states, something that in the West would be essential to any understanding of terrorism. The following elements were excluded from this definition:

a. "Acts of national resistance exercised against occupying forces, colonizers and usurpers;
b. Resistance of peoples against cliques imposed on them by the force of arms;
c. Rejection of dictatorships and other forms of despotism and efforts to undermine their institution;
d. Resistance against racial discrimination and attacks on the latter's strongholds;
e. Retaliation against any aggression if there is no other alternative".[28]

Thus, these discussions clearly show the ideological nature of defining terrorism which makes it difficult to arrive at a comprehensive formulation.

Basic Characteristics of Terrorism

Actually many definitions of terrorism hinge on five determinant factors:

a. *Violence*—without violence or threat of violence, terrorists cannot compel a political decision maker to respond to their demands. Violence is used to achieve goals.
b. *Perpetrator*—the perpetrator aspect is controversial. If a state or government uses violence and terror tactics against its own citizens (in dictatorial states such as Stalinist Russia), is this counted as a terrorist act? In such cases, the literature usually speaks of *state terror*, though not necessarily

---

[27] Ayatullah Shaykh Muhammad Ali Taskhiri, "Towards a Definition of Terrorism," *Al-Tawhid* V, no. 1, (1987): 6.
[28] Ibid.

terrorism. In cases where states support sub-national terrorist groups by providing safe havens, funding, weapons, intelligence, training, or other means, we can speak of *state-sponsored terrorism*. Libya's purported sponsoring of the downing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, on 21 December 1988 is one such example.

c. *Motive*—the type of motivation determines the type of terrorism. In the absence of a political/social motive, a violent act is typically labeled a crime rather than a terrorist act. Contrary to rational-choice theorists who assume that human beings are motivated only by self-utility, some scholars argue that terrorism is ultimately an altruistic act in the eyes of its perpetrators. For example, suicide terrorists are willing to sacrifice themselves for a better future for their loved ones and posterity.[29] According to Bruce Hoffman, "the terrorist is fundamentally an altruist: he is serving a "good" cause designed to achieve a greater good for a wider constituency—whether real or imagined—that the terrorist and his organization represent."[30] The clear example is Pakistan which has fallen victim to terrorist activities especially suicide attacks since September 11, 2001 when Pakistan chose to be a frontline state in the US-led global "war on terrorism". Just within two years (2007-2008) there were 115 suicide attacks in Pakistan in which 1611 people were killed and over 3500 persons injured.[31] Most of these suicide bombers have hit the North-West Frontier Province and tribal areas. In 2009 Pakistan topped the list of countries in number of suicide bombing deaths so that it left Afghanistan and Iraq behind.[32]

---

[29] See Mark Waugh, "Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management* 2, no. 4, (December 2005).

[30] Hoffman, Bruce, (2006), 37.

[31] "Pakistan Assessment 2009," *Stap.org*, http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/pakistan/index.htm, (accessed January 12, 2010).

[32] "Pakistan Tops Iraq, Afghanistan in Suicide Bombing Deaths," *Pak Tribune* September 15, 2008, http://www.paktribune.com/news/index.shtml?205698 (accessed January 12, 2010).

d. *Victims*—the victim identity is the most controversial. There is some confusion as to what is meant by the term "victims." Actually, all mentioned definitions consider terrorist assault against civilians as terrorism. However, the main question is this: Is an assault against a passive military target or a UN peacekeeper a terrorist act? The Israelis recognize an attack against a passive military target as a terrorist act, whereas other states may not when the military person is part of an occupying force. The data set "International Terrorism: Attributes of Terrorist Events" (ITERATE: a project to quantify data on transnational terrorism) considers terrorist actions against peacekeepers, but not against an occupying military force, as a terrorist act.[33] Another discussion regarding the nature of victim refers to the issue of "property". Thus, contrary to FBI definition, most definitions of terrorism fail to consider attacks directed against property as acts of terrorism. Based on FBI definition, for example "the bombing of a governmental computer database center containing vital national security information or the destruction of a pipeline providing much-needed natural gas to a particular region of the United States can also be considered acts of terrorism depending upon the motive".[34] Whereas, according *to the*se definitions, damage to property caused by *"non-violent action"* - such as electronic interference to disrupt computer systems or wireless communication - because of the lack of violence is not considered as a terrorist act.

e. *Audience*— Terrorism relies on the psychological effect more than the physical, and needs an audience. Audience refers to the population that the terrorist act intends to intimidate. For instance, a terrorist bomb in a commuter train is meant to cause widespread social anxiety, because such bombs can occur in any train or public place. Examples include suicide

---

[33] See Mickolus, Edward F., Todd Sandler, Jean M. Murdock & Peter Flemming, "International Terrorism: Attributes of Terrorist Events 1968-2005," (ITERATE 5, 2006): 11-28, http://library.duke.edu/data/collections/iterate.html (accessed February 5, 2009).

[34] Martin A. Kalis, (2001), 83.

bombings in Iraq and Pakistan and shootings and explosions in Indian railway stations (especially the recent attacks in Mumbai of 26 November 2008). Thus, the audience broadens beyond the immediate victims of the assault. Regarding the 9/11 attacks, al-Qaeda's audience was, on at least some level, everyone everywhere, not just the immediate victims associated with the four hijackings or the US government. Therefore, terrorists are willing to extend their audience beyond their immediate victims by making their actions appear to be random, so that those far from the event feel insecurity and anxiety. In fact, by intimidating a target population, terrorists intend that the victims will apply pressure on policymakers to concede to their demands.[35]

The Major Distinctions between Old and New Terrorism

Explaining the shift from "old" to "new" terrorism is fundamental to understanding the changing nature of global security. The new and old terrorism exhibit characteristics that contrast with each other.

Who are the "old" terrorists? Who are the "new" terrorists? The new terrorism should be properly defined and its applicability to current circumstances evaluated. The September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001 have completely transformed the perception of terrorism throughout the world and required the redefinition of a long list of concerns regarding international and national security.[36] Of course, some scholars make a distinction between *transnational* and *international* terrorism: "A transnational terrorist organization is based in one country but operates at times outside its territory. An international terrorist organization not only operates outside a particular territory but is also based in several countries and is comprised of members of different nationalities;" hence "al-Qaeda is truly international."[37] In the post-Cold War era, particularly after 9/11, the notion of a "strategic revolution" has been associated with terrorism. Al-Qaeda was deemed an example of new terrorism, perhaps

---

[35] Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, (2006), 5.

[36] Gheorghe Fulga, *Combating International Terrorism & Cross-Border Organized Crime. Strengthening the FIS' International Partnerships* (Camberley, UK: The Conflict Studies Research Centre, 2005), 3.

[37] Stéphane Leman-Langlois and Jean-Paul Brodeur, "Terrorism Old and New: Counterterrorism in Canada," *Police Practice and Research* 6, no. 2, (May 2005): 131.

even a "catastrophic terrorism," and one at odds with the old lessons of seemingly well-known phenomena.[38] Bruce Hoffmann, a senior analyst with RAND (a nonprofit global policy think tank), developed the most plausible explanation regarding the emergence of the new terrorism in the mid-1990s.[39] He argued that terrorism now included new adversaries, new motivations, and new methods, all of which challenged many of the most essential assumptions about terrorism and how it operated. Hofmann argued that while terrorist attacks were declining, casualties were increasing. The new religious terrorism was overturning the old dictum that terrorists wanted only a few people dead, but many people watching.[40] The basic distinctions between old (traditional or nationalist) terrorism and new (transnational) terrorism are as follows:

Territoriality

Terrorism is international and transnational when an event in one state involves perpetrators, victims, organizations, governments, or people of another country. If an event begins in one state but ends in another, then it is a transnational terrorist incident, as is the case of a hijacking of a plane in state A that is made to fly to state B. An attack against a multilateral organization is a transnational event owing to its multi-country effects, like 9/11, or even in the case of the suicide car bombing of the UN headquarters in Baghdad on 19 August 2003. The destruction of the WTO towers was a transnational event, because victims were from ninety different states, the mission had been organized abroad, the terrorists were foreigners, and the implications of the incident (for example, financial repercussions) were global.

---

[38] Wyn Ress and Richard Aldrich, "Contending Cultures of Counterterrorism: Transatlantic Divergence or Convergence," *International Affairs* 81, no. 5, (October 2005): 911.

[39] See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RAND and www.rand.org (accessed February 5, 2009).

[40] See Bruce Hoffmann, (2006). Some scholars believe that "new terrorism is nothing more than old terrorism recycled and packaged by the media to represent a new super-sized threat to global stability. They believe that the characteristics of terrorism through the 1980s and into the 1990s are very similar to the terrorism of the twenty-first century that is now being called 'new terrorism' by terrorism experts and the media alike". Jay T. Stull, Maj., *New Terrorism Old Terrorism Recycled* (USAF Air University: Air Command and Staff College, April 2006), 27.

Old or traditional terrorism is homegrown and has consequences for the host nation, its institutions, population, property, and policies. In a domestic event, the perpetrators, victims, and audience are all from the same country. With the old domestic terrorism, states were self-reliant if they possessed sufficient resources. Therefore, antiterrorist strategies did not involve other states, as neither the terrorist acts nor the government's reactions affected foreign interests.[41] With the new terrorism, states have to cooperate with other countries' intelligence agencies and security forces in order to address the root causes of terrorism. Nowadays, the main challenge regarding the counterterrorism activities refers to the difficulty of international intelligence cooperation particularly when states and organizations deal with secret materials as there are barriers to sharing information and other resources.[42] In this regard, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) launched its global technical cooperation programme on "strengthening the legal regime against terrorism" in October 2002. The programme supplies the framework for UNODC's specialized assistance to countries for ratifying and implementing the global conventions and protocols associated with the prevention and suppression of international terrorism and for setting effective mechanisms for global cooperation.[43]

Traditional terrorist groups tended to have a particular geographical focus for their political goals. Notable examples were the Stern Gang in British Palestine (a Zionist extremist organization founded by Avraham Stern in 1940 in order to gain political independence); the Shining Path in Peru (the most formidable guerrilla force founded 1960s); the ETA in Spain (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna, a Basque separatist paramilitary organization); the Red Army Faction in Germany (an extreme left–wing revolutionary movement); and the Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka (an ethnic-based militia striving for Tamil autonomy). The perpetrators of traditional terrorism are individuals or groups with strong nationalist ideas and goals. Sometimes they want to establish an independent state, or abolish an entire political system and replace it

---

[41] Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, (2006), 6-7.

[42] See Thomas C. Bruneau, "Introduction: Challenges to Effectiveness in Intelligence due to the Need for Transparency and Accountability in Democracy," *Strategic Insights* VI, no. 3, (May 2007).

[43] See "Eleventh United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Bangkok, Thailand 18 - 25 April 2005," http://www.unis.unvienna.org/pdf/05-82102_E_3_pr_SFS.pdf (accessed February 6, 2009).

with another. Of course, the transnational terrorism is not an unprecedented phenomenon. In this regard, the anarchist terrorists[44] of the late 19ᵗʰ early 20th century had also transnational goals; nevertheless, they are distinguished from the new terrorists by two key features: Firstly, they were using terror to "bring down" a government; whereas new terrorists are using terrorism as a tool in persuading governments to "change" behaviour. For new terrorists, the overthrow of a government is not considered as an "immediate" goal. Secondly, anarchists were "deliberately" selecting their victims and often attacking the leaders of the corporations and heads of State (although they began to target civilians in opera houses, stations, town halls). Whereas, victims of new terrorism are generally chosen "randomly". In fact, the victims are used to manipulate the main target (audiences). Nowadays, many terrorist groups lack delimited borders and do not operate in particular states. They are increasingly moving toward becoming a borderless phenomenon and trying to create and develop international networks. Nevertheless, the role of nationalist terrorists in some states should not be ignored. Nationalist terrorists try to achieve self-determination in some form, which may range from obtaining greater autonomy to establishing a completely independent, national state (separatism). The Yishuv, Hagnah and Jabotinsky are also good examples of national terrorist groups which are defined by ethnicity (racial or cultural background), language and religion.

Motivation

The "new" terrorists have no clear and concrete political goals and simply seek to destroy societies and much of mankind. The goals of the "new" terrorists are unlimited, while, the "old" terrorists have been pragmatic in their goals. Their demands were negotiable and could be

---

[44] Between 1890 and 1908 anarchists were responsible for killing the French president, Spanish prime minister, Italian king and Russian head of state. Anarchists were also active in the US between 1890 and 1910 setting off bombs on Wall Street. The two most famous acts by anarchists were the assassinations of President McKinley (1901) and Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria (1914) which triggered World War I. They developed the concept of "propaganda by the deed" - the idea that a mass uprising could be triggered by action.

met.[45] The old terrorists had unambiguous "political" objectives and tasks. They were often promising to stop terrorist attacks in exchange for concrete political agreements. Traditional terrorists were mainly motivated by left wing ideologies such as Marxism and Maoism, and also nationalism and separatism.

According to Bruce Hoffmann, the "new terrorism" and the "new generation" of terrorists are characterized by scattered structures and goals that are religious rather than political, go far beyond the creation of a theocracy, and include a strong embrace of mystical beliefs.[46] For example, according to Indian and Pakistani officials, many terrorist attacks within the two countries derived from extreme religious groups such as al-Qaeda and Lashkar-e-Taiba. Terrorism has only recently become religious. When the contemporary international terrorism first emerged, none of the terrorist groups and organizations could be classified as religious.[47] However, not all new terrorists are motivated by religious intentions. For instance, the category of "new" terrorists often includes not only contemporary jihadi groups, but also Aum Shinrikyo, the Japanese cult responsible for the sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subways in 1995, and, most curiously, Timothy McVeigh, responsible for the bombing of the Oklahoma City Federal Building in 1995."[48] Traditional terrorism had political roots, however; religion played a part in some traditional forms of terrorism, for instance, the confrontation between Catholics and Protestants in Ulster has religious roots. Of course, for Islam's more enthusiastic and/or dogmatic adherents, the separation of politics and religion is completely unacceptable, since the

---

[45] Martha Crenshaw, "Old and New Terrorism-Lessons Learned," (paper presented at the Second IRRI Conference on International Terrorism, February 13, 2006): 1, http://www.egmontinstitute.be/speechnotes/06/060213-jihad.terr/crenshaw. htm, (accessed October 13, 2010).

[46] Hoffman, Bruce, (2006), 22. Religiously motivated attacks are increasing in frequency. As Audrey Kurth Cronin argues, "in 1968 none of the identified international terrorist organizations could be classified as "religious"; in 1980, in the aftermath of the Iranian Revolution, there were 2 (out of 64), and that number had expanded to 25 (out of 58) by 1995." Audrey Kurth Cronin, "R Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism," *International Security* 27, no. 3, (Winter 2002/03): 42.

[47] Matthew J. Morgan, "The Origins of the New Terrorism," *Parameters* 34, (Spring 2004): 32.

[48] Martha Crenshaw, (2006), 1.

only truly ethical politics follows the revealed truths of religion.[49] As Duyvesteyn believes, the so-called "new terrorism" presents both political and religious motivations which overlap together.[50] Wilkinson calls it "religio-political" terrorism.[51] We can see these "religio-political" terrorists in Pakistan. Their goals are political and they seek to force the Pakistani government to change its policies about the war on terrorism. However, these terrorist groups in Pakistan are using the name of religion to recruit perpetrators.

Nevertheless, the new terrorism is not limited to radical Islamic groups. The current trend of Western states to focus on the link between Islam and terrorism is misleading because violent religion is not supported by the text of the Quran, the holy book of Islam.[52] Non-Islamic terrorist groups such as right-wing Christian extremists also exhibit many features of the new transnational terrorism.

Considering the possibility of "catastrophic" terrorist attack, Nadine Gurr and Benjamin Cole describe nuclear-biological-chemical (NBC) terrorism as the "third wave of vulnerability" experienced by the United States beginning in 1995 (the first two waves were the Soviet test of the atomic bomb in 1949, and the aggravating nuclear arms race that followed).[53] David Rapoport made a similar assessment by saying that religiously motivated terrorism is the "fourth wave" in the evolution of terrorism.[54] Interestingly, warnings about non-traditional terrorism were raised frequently before 2001.[55] For example, Ashton Carter, John Deutch, and Philip Zelikow declared in 1998 that a new threat of

---

[49] Stéphane Leman-Langlois, Jean-Paul Brodeur, (2005), 13.

[50] Duyvesteyn, I, "How New is the New Terrorism?," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, no. 27, (2004): 446.

[51] Wilkinson, P, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response* (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 20.

[52] Jack Patterson, Eliza Kretzmann, and Tom Smith, (2005), 74.

[53] Nadine Gurr and Benjamin Cole, *The New Face of Terrorism: Threats from Weapons of Mass Destruction* (New York: I. B. Tauris, 2002).

[54] David C. Rapoport, "The Fourth Wave: September 11 and the History of Terrorism," *Current History* 100, no. 650, (December 2001): 419-24.

[55] See Richard A. Falkenrath, Robert D. Newman, and Bradley A. Thayer, *America's Achilles' Heel: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Terrorism and Covert Attack* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998); Philip B. Heymann, *Terrorism and America: A Commonsense Strategy for a Democratic Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998).

"catastrophic" terrorism had appeared.[56] Some analysts believe that terror has evolved from being a means to an end, to becoming the end in itself, and that many radical terrorist groups seek destruction and chaos as ends in itself.[57] R. James Woolsey, the former CIA Director, has been quoted in the National Commission on Terrorism: "Today's terrorists don't want a seat at the table; they want to destroy the table and everyone sitting at it."[58]

Organisation

The "new terrorism" is organizationally distinct from the "old terrorism." The new terrorist groups have become more diffuse. The structures of the "new terrorism" are far more difficult to grasp. In fact, they are often explained as networks rather than as organizations. The formal hierarchies have been replaced with personal and networked relationships, "because, if one or even several of its constituent entities are destroyed, the others carry on. A network, unlike a hierarchy, cannot be destroyed by decapitation."[59] The difficulty in tracing terrorist attacks such as al-Qaeda's bombings in Madrid, London, Afghanistan and Pakistan, illustrates how terrorist group structures have become more diffuse and decentralized. By contrast, old terrorist groups such as Jewish terrorist group Irgun and the EOKA, and the Basque group ETA enjoyed hierarchical organizational structure with clear lines of command and control. Hence, "none of the cells could carry out a bombing without the leadership's knowledge and approval."[60]

Thus, the new terrorism is decentralized and trying to become more networked, inspiration-driven, and usually the groups are amateurs and nonprofessional. Whereas, the old terrorism is centralized, top-down skilled organizations. Because of the non-hierarchical leadership, security services of nation-states are having difficulty penetrating these cells and

---

[56] Ashton Carter, John Deutch, and Philip Zelikow, "Catastrophic Terrorism," *Foreign Affairs* 77, no.6, (November/December 1998): 80-94.

[57] Matthew J. Morgan, (2004), 30.

[58] National Commission on Terrorism, "Countering the Changing Threat of International Terrorism: Report of the National Commission on Terrorism," (Washington: GPO, 2000), 2.

[59] David Tucker, "What's New About the New Terrorism and How Dangerous Is It?," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 13, (Autumn 2001): 1, http://www.crusader.net/texts/bt/bt04.html (accessed January 10, 2010).

[60] Alexander Spencer, "Questioning the Concept of 'New Terrorism'," *Peace Conflict & Development*, Issue 8, (January 2006): 12.

networks; whereas, old terrorism often had identifiable operational leaders such as Baader-Meinhof for Red Army Faction or Abimael Guzman for the Shining Path. Thus, contrary to common perception, it seems that terrorist cells nowadays   operate with much greater independence from the headquarters, like March 2003 Madrid bombing in Spain which was perpetrated by relatively independent al-Qaeda cells operating in some European countries. Some scholars assert "that the amateur terrorist is a manifestation of a new network structure that is facilitated by the emergence of new advanced telecommunications technology." Each group within this network is relatively autonomous, yet it is linked by sophisticated communication and shares a common goal.[61] The information revolution, by lowering the cost of communication, allows organizations to push functions outside a controlling hierarchical structure. They thereby are more flexible than old terrorists.

The different entities of new terrorists " making up terrorist networks might also be large, more formal, even hierarchical organizations that work together without any common hierarchy or central commanding authority between them".[62]

Of course it is not true to say that there is no structure to today's terrorism. But the point is that old terrorism is "more" centralized than new terrorism. Some scholars criticize the hierarchical organizational structure and decentralization of respectively old and new terrorism. For example, the West German terrorists of the '70s and '80s were composed of different groups often with varying political aims or European anarchist terrorists of the late 19th century were already not a centralized organization and were operating in dispersed, loosely organized international networks. "They formed a transnational conspiracy that acted on inspiration and shared ideology, not on the basis of direct orders given from the top of an organization." According to them "the original al-Qaeda operation was a top-down structure. It came into being because Bin Laden kept a list of mujahidin who had

---

[61] Peter R. Neumann, "Old and New Terrorism," *Social Europe Journal* 4, no. 3, (2009), http://www.social-europe.eu/2009/08/old-and-new-terrorism/ (accessed January 10, 2010).

[62] David Tucker, (2010), 2.

fought in Afghanistan. Certainly, the operations of Zarkawi in Iraq are organised in terms of cells. There is central direction".

Individualisation

In the contemporary terrorist attacks, victims are chosen for their symbolic rather than their strategic value; whereas the victims of old terrorism were not chosen at random. For example, in 1975 the terrorist known as Carlos the Jackal (né Ilich Ramírez Sánchez), who attacked an OPEC conference held in Vienna, took some 70 hostages, and killed three. In this case, the victims were targeted for their symbolic value and the terrorist had an elaborate escape plan that worked. Although, some kinds of traditional terrorism have slipped into violence for the sake of violence, this kind of terrorism usually targets individuals who are symbols of what it is opposed to, such as heads of state, diplomats, bankers, and so forth. On the contrary, the new terrorism seeks "bit by bit" genocide and depersonalization of its targets. Suicide bombings in Iraq since 2003, which have killed thousands of people, mostly Iraqi innocent civilians, and the various explosions and shootings in Pakistan and India, exemplify indiscriminate killing by the new terrorists. The agents of new terrorism do not discriminate between individual members of their target groups. "Not only are civilian men, women, and children indiscriminately killed if they are perceived to belong to an enemy state, nation, or ethnic or otherwise identified group ("apostates," Jews, US citizens, Westerners), but recent incidents have shown that the boundaries of nationality are also becoming irrelevant and that even the remotest connection with the "enemy," such as working for the UN or the Red Cross in Iraq, qualifies one as a potential target."[63]

Patterson, Kretzmann, and Smith, characterize the new terrorism with five points. First, the new terrorism makes use of high technology (military, intelligence, communication) to assault targets anywhere in the world seen to conflict with its trans-boundary aims. This is an invariable consequence of globalization. Second, new ideological commitments are the source of catastrophic fanatical streaks in the new terrorism. "This shift in ideology sees terror at least in part as an end in itself rather than just a tactic to achieve a political end." Third, contemporary terrorists have a new range of targets. The new "targets are often chosen to maximize destruction and for the amount of press and global attention as

---

[63] Stéphane Leman-Langlois and Jean-Paul Brodeur, (2005), 133-134.

Mahdi Mohammad Nia

illustrated by attacks of September 11 and activities of Al Qaeda."
Fourth, globalization and the information technology revolution have
allowed terrorists to overcome large distances with relative anonymity.
Moreover, the possibility of access to biological, chemical and nuclear
weapons has also increased. Fifth, terrorist groups tend to adopt a less
hierarchical and more networked form. There are fewer chains of
command and fewer instructions given from a centralized leader. Because
of the non-hierarchical nature of command, the security services of
nation-states cannot penetrate these cells and networks easily.
Traditional terrorism often had identifiable operational leaders such as
Andreas Baader and Ulrike Meinhof (Red Army Faction) or Abimael
Guzman (Shining Path). Contrary to common perceptions, terrorist cells
operate nowadays with much greater independence from their
headquarters. The March 2004 Madrid train bombings were perpetrated
by relatively independent al Qaeda cells operating in various European
countries.[64]

     According to Russell Howard, "new terrorism" is clearly different
from "old terrorism" in six very distinguishable ways.[65] First, new
terrorism is more violent. Terrorists previously wanted attention, not
mass casualties. Now terrorists want both. In fact, the most critical
element of the new threat is the nature of violence, which is extreme,
and does not discriminate between military and civilian. Second, old
terrorism was mainly directed at effecting change in local politics, but
new terrorism is "transnational," perpetrated by non-state actors
operating internationally to destroy the West and all Islamic secular state
systems. Third, new terrorism is much better financed than earlier
terrorism, using not only legitimate but also illegitimate income sources
to finance its operations. The contemporary terrorist threat relies either
on self-financing or individual supporters and in both cases is supported
by the convenience of the modern international financial system and
technology to transfer funds.[66] Fourth, new terrorism's forces are better
trained in the black arts of war than previous "old" terrorists. For
example, al-Qaeda uses various camps and training centers in many

---

[64] See Jack Patterson, Eliza Kretzmann, and Tom Smith, (2005), 73-75.

[65] See Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics* 13,
     no. 4, (July 1981).

[66] Al-Qaeda as a wealthy and multi-national organization has investment and
     concealed accounts throughout the world. See Brian Murphy, "The shape of
     terrorism," *Fayetteville Observer*, August 21, 2002, 95.

countries, and especially in Afghanistan. Fifth, because of the level of fraternization involved, the new terrorist threat, especially the religious extremist one, is more difficult to penetrate than prior terrorist networks. The uses of networked, cellular command structures by al-Qaeda pose serious security challenges to the US and its allies. Sixth, the potential availability of weapons of mass destruction to current terrorists creates cataclysmic threats. Old terrorism up to the 1980s was characterized by the use of small arms, plastic explosives, rocket-propelled grenades, and anti-aircraft missiles.

Countering the New Terrorism: Implications for the US Strategy

After the September 11 attacks, the United States developed a preemptive national strategy for combating new terrorism, which outlined the policy framework for coordinated actions to prevent terrorist attacks against itself, its citizens, its interests, and its friends throughout the world.[67] According to the administration, the 9/11 attacks demonstrated the decreased efficacy of nuclear deterrence.

The following three assumptions can develop an understanding of the link between new threats and the US preemptive strategy:

1. First and foremost is that there is a growing link between transnational terrorism and WMD proliferation, making the potential of a 9/11-like attack using nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons quite likely.

---

[67] In truth, preemption as the US post 9/11 strategy began with a small group of foreign policy specialists serving in the first Bush Administration. They drafted a Defense Planning Guidance which asserted that since the United States was the sole superpower in the post-Cold War world, it should implement a strategy of preemption. When President Clinton took over the presidency, these advisors (such as Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz) collaborated on the "Project for the New American Century" and published "Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces, and Resources for a New Century," whose provisions were outlined in the Bush's preemptive doctrine after many of the authors became policy advisors and cabinet members of the Bush administration. See Adam Lichtenheld, "The Practicality of Pre-emption in United States Foreign Policy", *Journal of Politics*, no.1, (Spring 2006): 13-14; and Hammond, John, "The Bush Doctrine, Preventive War, and International Law," *The Philosophical Forum* 36, no.1, (Spring 2005).

2. Second, there is a growing pessimism about deterrence and its applicability to non-state threats; the argument being that "deterring terrorists" is an oxymoron, and that, in the case of terrorists and WMD, possession guarantees use. Most analysts contend that terrorist groups, which lack populations to protect or territory to safeguard and whose operatives may be willing to die for their objectives, cannot be deterred. At least, such groups are very difficult to deter given contemporary international standards and political norms, such as the unacceptability of reprisals against innocent civilians.[68]

3. The third assumption is that if deterrence fails, defences will never be perfect. Despite some defensive tools and measures, such as ballistic missile defence, cruise missile and other air defences, civil defence, detection, vaccines, port/border checks, and so forth, these measures would not be 100 per cent effective against WMD challenges.[69]

The apparent success of nuclear deterrence before 9/11 was conditioned by two major factors:

First, "it was directed against the "use" of nuclear weapons by states possessing such weapons. Nuclear deterrence did not seek to prevent states from "acquiring" nuclear weapons—it sought instead to prevent their use by holding hostage the enemy state's targetable territory, leadership, industry, military forces, and cities. Nuclear deterrence, moreover, did not have to concern itself with threats posed by non-state actors armed with weapons of mass destruction."[70]

---

[68] Former Vice President Dick Cheney argued that "In the days of the Cold War, we were able to manage the threat with summit meetings; arms control treaties, and strategies of deterrence and containment. But there is no way to deter enemies who have no country to defend. And containment is not possible when dictators obtain weapons of mass destruction and have missiles to deliver them, or provide them in secret to a shadowy terror network." http://www.whitehouse.gov/vicepresident/newsspeeches/speeches/vp2002071 9.html (accessed January 12, 2009).

[69] M. Elaine Bunn, "Preemptive Action: When, How, and to What Effect?," *Strategic Forum*, no. 200, (July 2003): 2-3, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SF200/SF200.pdf (accessed January 7, 2009).

[70] Jeffrey Record, "Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counter proliferation," *Policy Analysis*, no. 519, (July 8, 2004): 6,

Deterrence in this case means to induce at least one of the enemies not to take a hostile action contrary to the interests of the other by convincing the enemy that doing so would not be worth the effort. Deterrence is an effort to manipulate the enemy's motivation, to challenge the status quo. Preemption is based on "imminent threat,"[71] and like deterrence seeks to manipulate the motives of the opponent in order to affect his behaviour; however unlike deterrence (which seeks to convince the adversary not to take action) preemption is an attempt to persuade the opponent to "change" his hostile behaviour.[72] Deterrence is successful when the adversary's expected utility of inaction exceeds his expected utility of action. Preemption is successful when the adversary's expected utility of changing his action exceeds his expected utility of continuing his present course. Preemption occurs in the wake of failed deterrence. Unlike deterrence, preemptive strategy requires the enemy to make concessions or bear the consequences. "Deterrence occurs when a "defender" tries to manipulate the expectations of a "challenger" such that the challenger is deterred from taking an action contrary to the interests of the defender."[73] Preemption occurs when a state manipulates the expectations of another state or terrorist groups to change their actions. Conventional wisdom holds that deterrence requires less coercive effort than preemption, whereas preemption adheres to military options.

Jeffrey Record believes that substituting preemptive action for deterrence ignores the fact that traditional nuclear deterrence was directed at states already armed with nuclear weapons and aimed at deterring their "*use*" in time of crisis or war, whereas preemption or preventive war is enlisted as a means to prevent the "*acquisition*" of

---

http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa519.pdf, (accessed January 8, 2009).

[71] As Robert R. Tomes explains, the "imminent threat" is difficult to define. He believes that "Preemption, to be an effective component of national security strategy, requires exquisite intelligence. It requires deep insights into adversary capabilities and interests, accurate indicators and warning, prescient decision making capabilities, and superior battlefield intelligence, that make it very hard to determine 'imminent threat'". Robert R. Tomes, *US Defense Strategy from Vietnam to Operation Iraqi Freedom: Military Innovation and the New American Way of War 1973-2003* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 141.

[72] Poli Slantchev, "Deterrence and Compellence", http://www.polisci.ucsd.edu/~bslantch/courses/ir/lectures/notes-10.pdf (accessed January 10, 2009).

[73] Ibid., 8.

nuclear weapons.[74] Preemption is a unilateral US initiative aimed at certain states or terrorist groups. In comparison, deterrence is bilateral or multilateral.

The U.S. administration believes that terrorists and certain so-called "rogue" states cannot be deterred or contained. Strategies based on containment and deterrence are therefore inappropriate to ensure security in the twenty-first century threat environment. The need to prevent the proliferation of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons was highlighted in the *National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (issued in September 2002), which encouraged the administration to adopt a preemptive strategy.[75] George W. Bush outlined this new war doctrine in his June 1, 2002, graduation speech at West Point:

For much of the last century, America's defense relied on the Cold War doctrines of deterrence and containment ... new threats also require new thinking. Deterrence—the promise of massive retaliation against nations—means nothing against shadowy terrorist networks with no nation or citizens to defend. Containment is not possible when unbalanced dictators with weapons of mass destruction can deliver those weapons on missiles or secretly provide them to terrorist allies... the war on terror will not be won on the defensive. We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge. In the world we have entered, the only path to safety is the path of action. And this nation will act.[76]

According to the National Security Strategy (NSS), "The United States will, if necessary, act preemptively"[77] to prevent rogue states or

---

[74] Jeffrey Record, (2004), 3.

[75] Jennifer K. Elsea, "Weapons of Mass Destruction, Counterproliferation: Legal Issues for Ships and Aircraft", *CRS Report for Congress*, Order Code RL32097, October 1, 2003,
http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/crs/RL32097.pdf (accessed December 28, 2008).

[76] "Bush's West Point Address, in mid-2002, The National Security Strategy (NSS) of the United States of America," (Washington DC: The White House, September 2002): 2,
http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Commencement_Address_at_West_Point
accessed December 29, 2008). Bush argued that "We must deter and defend against the threat before it is unleashed" (NSS: 14). According to him, "America will act against such emerging threats before they are fully formed" (NSS: 2).

[77] Bush, NSS: 15.

terrorist groups from threatening or using WMD against the United States or its allies. The National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction calls for "capabilities to detect and destroy adversaries' WMD assets before these weapons are used." [78] Thus, these three factors shape the current U.S. strategy:

a) The inability to deter a potential attacker.
b) The immediacy of today's threats.
c) The magnitude of potential harm.

The United States identifies three main threat elements for US security: first, terrorist organizations with global reach; second, weak states that harbour and assist such terrorist organizations; and third, rogue states. Al-Qaeda and Afghanistan during the Taliban regime cover the first two elements. According to the US administration, rogue states are defined as states that brutalize their own people, disregard international law, threaten their neighbours, seek to acquire WMD for purposes of aggression, sponsor terrorism around the world, reject human rights, and hate the US and everything it stands for.[79]

From the perspective of the US administration, "the war on terrorism is really a counter-proliferation war—the use of force to prevent the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, by state and non-state entities hostile to the United States. It was not just an act of terrorism that prompted a sea-change in US security policy; it was also what George Bush called the "crossroads of radicalism and technology."[80] Accordingly, the administration recognized the threat of extremist groups or states and their unprecedented destructive ability: "When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology... occurs, even weak states and small groups can attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations. Our enemies have declared this very intention, and have been caught seeking these terrible weapons. They want the capability to blackmail us, or to harm us, or to harm our friends."[81] The former secretary of defence Donald Rumsfeld stated,

---

[78] The White House, "National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction," (December 2002): 3.
[79] The NSS: 14.
[80] The NSS: 1.
[81] George W. Bush, *We Will Prevail: President George W. Bush on War, Terrorism, and Freedom* (New York: Continuum Press, 2003), 159.

"What's new is the nexus between terrorist networks, terrorist states and weapons of mass destruction that, when combined with missile technology, can make mighty adversaries of small or impoverished states, or even relatively small groups of individuals."[82] US current strategy is focused on what I call the "*Threat Triangle*" of terrorist groups or weak states, weapons of mass destruction (chemical/ biological/radioactive/nuclear weapons and technologies of ballistic missiles), and radical religious fanaticism (sometimes with fundamentalist, revolutionary, millenarian, messianic, or even nihilistic components).

Conclusion

The "new terrorism" has become increasingly more irrational in its thought, more fanatical in its ideological manifestations, more international in its reach, and more mass-casualty-causing in its tactics.[83] The categorical fanaticism that is apparent in terrorist groups across a spectrum of belief systems is an important part of the new terrorism.

In the past, terrorist groups were more likely to be dominated by pragmatic considerations of political and social change, public opinion, and other such elements. Today, a phenomenon that was a rarity— terrorists bent upon death and destruction for its own sake—has become commonplace. The new terrorism involves different actors, motivations, goals, tactics and actions, organizations compared to the old terrorism. Besides, the statelessness of new terrorists removes crucial pressures that once held the extreme terrorists in check or prevented them from reaching top positions in their organizations.[84] The new transformations in the nature of war and threats and advent of new form of terrorism led the United States to adopt new strategy based on preemptive military action. This strategy is based on the argument that due to strategic transformations in the nature of threats, the strategy of deterrence is inadequate to contain terrorism. But, increase in terrorist attacks since 9/11 shows that this strategy has not been sufficient enough to prevent terrorism. Actually, the preemptive military action can do little to

---

[82] Donald Rumsfeld argued: "We must act to prevent a greater evil, even if that act means war," *The Independent*, September 8, 2002.

[83] Zafar Nawaz Jaspal, "WMD Terrorism and Pakistan: Counterterrorism," *Defence Against Terrorism* 1, no. 2, (Fall 2008): 103.

[84] Matthew J. Morgan, 2004. Also see: Alexander Spencer, "Questioning the concept of New Terrorism," *Peace Conflict & Development* 8, (January 2006).

prevent terrorist attacks by "shadowy networks" of terrorists.[85] Therefore, to prevent terrorism, one should focus on the "root cause" of terrorism which lies in the lack of education, poverty, ignorance, non-tolerance and especially the role of ideology. I believe that the best way forward in combating terrorism lies in democratization and the growth of democratic processes and economic development which can undercut much of the support of radical religious terrorists and militants.∎

[85] Adam Lichtenheld, "The Practicality of Pre-emption in United States Foreign Policy," *Journal of Politics*, no. 1, (Spring 2006), http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/users/psa/Journal/Journal.docJ, (accessed January 12, 2009). Of course, some scholars suggest that the issue being raised by the US administration is not preemption but instead is preventive military action. See M. Elaine Bunn, (2003), 3. Also see Mohammad Nia, Mahdi, "The Debate Over Preventive and Preemptive Action," *Odidia*, http://www.odidia.com/index.php?page=bla, (accessed January 13, 2009).