The Cold War is over but international terrorism remains a threat across the globe and especially to the United States and its allies. When looking at the future of international terrorism, several key questions need to be answered. They are: Why won’t the terrorist threat go away? Is terrorism truly a serious threat or just Western paranoia to maintain military and police budgets? Where should terrorist actions be expected and for what reasons? What will be the impact of terrorism on individual nation states and overall global stability? And finally, will peaceful resolution and responses to terrorism be possible or will anti-terrorism efforts merely begin another version of arms escalation, punitive actions, and repressive governmental endeavors? This chapter will explore the global role of terrorism in the twenty-first century, including anti-terrorism responses and the possible consequences to nation states when they respond to terrorist acts.

TERRORISM: PRESENT AND FUTURE

Terrorism is defined in many ways and in its global context no one definition has gained universal acceptance. However, for the purposes of this chapter, the definitions will be those contained in Title 22 of the United States Code, Section 2656(d). The US government has employed these definitions since 1983 and they are as follows:¹

The term “terrorism” means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant (noncombatant is interpreted to include civilians and military personnel unarmed at the time of the incident) targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.
- The term “international terrorism” means terrorism involving citizens or the territory of more than one country.
- The term “terrorist groups” means any group practicing, or that has significant subgroups that practice, international terrorism.\(^2\)

What do these definitions tell us? First, international terrorism has not changed significantly in the past ten years despite radical changes in world politics. In fact, changes in the recent political balance of global power have generated increased terrorist activity. In 1982, Grant Wardlow, in *Political Terrorism*, stated, “Groups with little or no direct political power have demonstrated repeatedly in recent years that by employing certain tactics, central to which is the use of directed terror, they can achieve effects on a target community which are out of all proportion to their numerical or political power.”\(^3\) With reference to the Middle East, Mr. Wardlow’s words are more true today than they were then. Despite the peace process and as a direct result of it, Middle Eastern terrorism in 1995 is being used to create unrest and widespread panic among the people of Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and apprehension for the people in the rest of the world. The world was psychologically ready to mark the end of the Cold War as the beginning of global peace.

The world community today is being subjected to the terrorism of the inclusive Middle East; to African terrorism in Angola, Ghana, Nigeria, Rwanda, and Somalia; to Asian terrorism in Afghanistan, India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Japan, the Philippines, and South Korea. What many had hoped would be the end of European terrorism is now marked by terrorist activities in Eastern Europe, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the lands of the former Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Finally, Central and South American terrorism is waged in Chile, Columbia, Ecuador, Peru, and Nicaragua. Thus, the decline of animosity among traditional enemies, or the decline of traditional/conventional war as described by VanCreveld in his book, *The Transformation of War*, does not mean the end of organized violence or a decline in terrorist activity.\(^4\)
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Historically, terrorist causes have been classified into two main types with numerous variations and some overlap between them. One broad type is called “nationalist-separatist” terrorism. This category is represented by members of “nations, national minorities, and ethnic or racial groups fighting for freedom from what they regard as foreign rule.” Examples include the Irish Republican Army of Northern Ireland, the Spanish Basque ETA, the Palestine Liberation Organization HAMAS, several anti-Turkish Armenian groups, and the Puerto Rican FALN in the United States.

The second type of terrorism is the traditional group. This group bases its actions on political ideology, and is the most complicated. It represents organizations of both the political left and the right, and newly formed environmental groups with mixed ideological followers. Traditionally, these groups comprised Trotskyites, Maoists, Castroites, Che Guevara, Ho Chi Minh followers, West Germany’s Baader-Meinhof Gang and its new United Germany offspring, and the Red Army Faction. Also included are Italy’s Red Brigades, Argentina’s ERP, the Japanese Red Army, and the Turkish People’s Liberation Army. These examples of leftist terrorist groups have typically advocated some form of socialism to end “evil and oppression.” But the reality of their actions has typically been contempt for authority and often a strong leaning toward anarchism.

The terrorist threat to democratic nation states is also represented by the “right” side of the political spectrum. Right-wing extremists, like the leftists, typically aspire for the violent overthrow of democratic governments in favor of ultra-nationalistic states. Jonathan Harris lists the following examples: The German Military Sports Group Hoffman; Italy’s Black Order, Armed Revolutionary Nuclei; National Advanced Guard; Croatian Revolutionary Brotherhood; Spain’s Youth Force; Warriors of Christ the King, America’s Ku Klux Klan; and the American Nazi Party.

Within the political ideology type there exists a sub-category of terrorist whose ideology is religion-based and usually fundamentalist in nature. The oldest such group is the Muslim
Brotherhood in the Middle East. Some new anti-abortion groups in North America responsible for bombings and assassinations, also fit into this category.

State support for terrorism such as that by Cuba, Iran, Libya, North Korea, Syria, South Yemen, and Iraq continues for many of these groups despite United Nations protests or sanctions and/or their political ideology.\(^8\) Terrorism is still a safe strategic weapon for countries, with little chance of punishment or reprisal for their sponsorship. Additionally, the distinction between domestic and international terrorism is becoming a gray area as most terrorist organizations in pursuit of political change have expanded their operations beyond the borders of their own countries.\(^9\) By operating beyond their borders, terrorists add to the psychological fear equation by threatening to victimize citizens and interests of target countries anywhere in the world.

Terrorist organizations also resort to major criminal activity in addition to terrorist actions. Drug and arms trafficking is becoming a common method for raising money for terrorist activities.\(^10\) The recent alliances between drug traffickers in Peru and Columbia and terrorist organizations for mutual benefit, with added political impact with their own populations and governments, is an example of this new trend.

**HOW SERIOUS IS THE PROBLEM?**

The number of terrorist incidents around the world continues to increase each year despite the best efforts of security forces. The United States, long considered invincible against terrorist attacks, has suffered more terrorist acts in the past two years than during the height of terrorist activity in 1983, and despite the massive counter-terrorism effort of the late eighties. The takeover of the Iranian Mission at the United Nations in New York in 1992 and the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993 changed the face of terrorism for most Americans and the world.\(^11\) Not only was America no longer invincible, but small, loosely organized groups with radical agendas and insulated sponsorships, could act with basic immunity. The Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 only served to reinforce the severity of the problem.
While Americans could take some comfort that the rate of attacks against the United States interests and personnel fell in 1993, the salient point remains that one quarter of all attacks worldwide that year were directed at the United States.\textsuperscript{12} It is expected that Americans will continue to be targets because of their international presence and the worldwide media coverage experienced when Americans are targeted.

These modern terrorists have changed their tactics as the world has changed. While revolutionary terrorism has prevailed for several decades, the current rise in ethnic and religious groups willing to use terrorist tactics to achieve their ends will cause major problems to global security and to individual nation states. The modern nation state, with its sophisticated infrastructure and its advanced technology systems, will find itself the most vulnerable to disruption and terrorist action.

Regardless of terrorist motivation, support, or organizational structure, terrorist behavior should be understood for what it represents. Terrorist acts should be looked upon as “war.”\textsuperscript{13} It is a war built on a strategy of intimidation and fear. Fear is a key to the strategy because it accomplishes the required dissemination of the terrorist’s communication. In its simplest form, the terrorist provides a “fear producing event” which is followed by media distribution of that event to the greatest extent possible. Manipulation of populations and media resources is crucial to the overall impact of the message. The reaction of the Japanese population to the 1995 subway chemical attack by a cult, with plans for additional nerve gas attacks, is a perfect example of the “war of fear” at work.\textsuperscript{14}

**FUTURE AREAS OF CONCERN**

Terrorism in the future will be focused in four specific areas. Each area may impact others but, for the purposes of this paper, each should be considered self-contained and a primary focus for future terrorist acts. Additionally, most experts agree that no one “typical” terrorist threat will destroy a nation’s sovereignty or destabilize the world. However, the extent or scope of individual terrorist acts is unlimited, and as shown in Japan, the self-imposed boundaries of terrorist groups can change overnight. The heretofore avoidance of chemical, biological, and
nuclear terrorist acts has been broken. A violent act of mass destruction could, depending on the event, cause world reactions such as national boycotts, suspension of civil rights within a country, or international discrimination of a racial or ethnic group in a manner not previously considered by “the experts.”

The first area of future terrorism is the economic sphere. As world nations become more interdependent in trade blocks, and multi-national corporate organizations increase the gap between prosperous versus non-prosperous nation-states, the opportunities for economic terrorism will expand. Groups using terrorist tactics can influence economics for both financial or political gain. The Chilean Grape Incident of 1989 is an excellent example:

In March 1989, at the waterfront in Philadelphia, inspectors of the US Food and Drug Administration, acting on an anonymous tip, examined crates of grapes arriving from Chile and discovered two cyanide-laced grapes. The evidence was the Chilean fruit had been poisoned. No citizen anywhere reported eating the tainted grapes. However, the world reacted. Chilean fruit was temporarily banned, triggering severe economic and political turmoils.

The Chilean grape incident is an example of traditional revolutionary terrorism, state-sponsored terrorism, or political terrorism. Yet the underlying motivation appears to have been economic. Trading between competing economies and nation states can include everything from protectionism, to dominating markets, to economic ruin. The rise of an insurgent Indian group within Mexico, just prior to the NAFTA agreement between Mexico and the United States, may be viewed as an issue of economic force and control. Some of the group’s actions were called terrorist in nature. However, the group described itself as an economic insurgent movement.

The second area of future terrorism emanates from religious fundamentalism. The threat is worldwide, concentrated in the Muslim states, but by no means inclusive to those states. Much of the Muslim terrorist movement is supported and motivated by Iran. Along with Sudan and Syria, Iran considers terrorism to be a primary instrument of state policy. In addition, Iran’s organizing struggle between its secular and religious factions has limited its interaction with
other nation states and contributed to its isolation.\textsuperscript{17} The ascendancy of the religious extremists has expanded Iran’s economic problems. Thus, it may appear logical for the leading mullahs to declare a Jihad against the West, (particularly the United States, the “Great Satan,” as a means to shift away from internal problems, to support Islam in a growing secular world, and to restore the Islamic revolutionary spirit both at home and abroad.\textsuperscript{18}

Iran has led the world for the past four years as the most active state sponsor of terrorism. They have been implicated in terrorist attacks in Italy, Turkey, and Pakistan. Their intelligence services support terrorist acts, either directly or through extremist groups. Iranian intelligence agents are under arrest in Germany and France for their links to murders of Iranian dissidents. Iran is the preeminent sponsor of extremist Islamic and Palestinian groups. They provide funds, weapons, and training to Hizballah, the PIJ, the PLP-GC and HAMAS.\textsuperscript{19}

The premise of Iran leading a worldwide terrorist campaign against the West and the United States fulfills two major requirements for the leaders of Tehran. First, it provides both a moral and symbolic attack against those forces (US) that represent evil to Islam. Second, it provides the clear message of fear to both the Iranian people and neighboring nations that no individual or nation is above the wrath of Iran.

The Iranian leadership may feel confident in this behavior based on earlier terrorist action. Bodansky in his work, \textit{TERROR} illustrates the point:

Tehran has reason to be confident....two major terrorist strikes against the United States: the mid-air explosion of Pan Am flight 103 over Locherbie, Scotland on December 21,1988, and, in San Diego, California, on March 10, 1989, the fire-bombing of a van driven by Sharon Lee Rodgers, wife of the captain of the USS Vincennes, who had mistakenly shot down the Iranian Airbus commercial flight in July 1988.”\textsuperscript{20}

Additionally, Iran is the main source of support for the fundamentalist regime in Sudan, and for the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) which has been responsible for hundreds of terrorist acts in
Turkey.\textsuperscript{21} The Iranian fundamentalists are currently the most active in terrorist activity around the world.

Religious ideologies have long been associated with terrorism and the support of violence for religious purposes. The doctrines of Christian (Catholic and Protestant), Muslim (Shi’\textsuperscript{a} and Sunni), Jewish, Hindu and Sikh religions have all been used to justify terrorism.\textsuperscript{22} Religious fundamentalism and dogma have provided individuals the support to carry out their fanatical or terrorist activities. However, it should be clearly understood that the vast majority of those who support fundamentalist movements do not become terrorists or even support violent activity.

The intensity of a fundamentalist terrorist differs little from a political, ethnic, or national terrorist. The added concept of having “God on your side” and promise of life after death adds a divine variable to the terrorist equation. These groups have recently been called “Superterrorists” because of their access to nuclear, chemical, biological, and conventional weapons, and computer technology.\textsuperscript{23} The true global threat from these terrorists is their willingness to use their new weapons. Since these terrorist targets represent “the unholy or unclean,” the traditional terrorist objective of political control is substituted with destruction of “evil.” As a result, the terrorists’ use of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons is considered ideal.\textsuperscript{24}

The terrorism of these fundamentalist groups is ideologically and religiously driven. It is critical for the leadership of these groups to present in a constant and conclusive way, the “rightness” of their views to their followers. The leaders of these organizations will take unilateral and arbitrary actions. However, these same leaders will attempt to legitimize their actions, their support, and the reactions of the world to them by addressing their own populations. The bombing of the World Trade Center should then be viewed as having a primary target audience made up of Islamic fundamentalists worldwide versus only Americans.

When non-traditional religious groups or cults are added to fundamentalist terrorist groups, the behaviors become even more confusing and unpredictable. An example of this is the
Japanese subway cult attack which should be considered a peek into the future instead of a non-repeatable event.

The third area of future terrorism will be “Technology Terror.” The information and computer highway of our future also includes a fast lane for terrorists. Modern technology has made it possible for smaller, more radical groups to access sophisticated means of destruction without significant support systems or funding. As computer systems become more powerful and cheaper, terrorists will develop greater ability to impact resources, intelligence, and terror operations with little or no risk, depending on advances “yet to be made” by the anti-terrorist forces.

Using information warfare tools, terrorists will have access to the vast amounts of financial resources that travel the information highways. By using and attacking these financial conduits, terrorists can not only transfer funding from outside sponsors, but can illegally tap these vulnerable conduits to obtain the required informational resources to sustain their activities. They can cripple the financial markets by either direct attacks or by instilling a credibility gap in the electronic financial world.25

As noted in the book, Information Warfare, “Money is the network that comprises hundreds of thousands of computers of every type, wired together in places as lofty as the Federal Reserve...and as mundane as the thousands of gas pumps around the world outfitted to take credit and debit cards.”26

In addition to being a possible funding conduit, information warfare techniques can also provide the terrorist with an invaluable source of intelligence; from sharing information on bomb making with other organizations, to targeting individual travelers through the airline reservation system, to stealing military secrets through the ever expanding Internet presence by military organizations. Information warfare provides an invaluable aid to the intelligence-gathering ability of the modern, high-tech terrorist. The information highway not only allows access to this vast wealth of information but allows access to this information from places safely within the borders of their safe havens.
The use of the information highway can also provide the terrorist the ability to coordinate remote multiple-cell activity with very little possibility of discovery, and provide the terrorist a method for attracting worldwide attention to their acts of violence almost as the events are unfolding. This can make the command, control, and intelligence techniques used on the military battlefield available to terrorist groups worldwide.

Besides the support functions of managing resources, gathering intelligence, and disseminating information, the most obvious use of information warfare techniques is to create terror or chaos and wreak havoc against a target. When considering the use of information warfare techniques by terrorists, the first consideration is given to the most vulnerable target to information warfare attacks. By its very nature, information warfare attacks are most effective where the information highway has made the greatest inroads into people’s everyday lives, business and governmental functions, and defense. Thus, the modern westernized societies are much more vulnerable to information warfare than are Third World nations. This vulnerability also corresponds to the nations most targeted by terrorists.

The types of terror that can be created by astute information warfare terrorists range from targeting key individuals to influencing decisions favorable to terrorist causes, to attacks that cause massive destruction and loss of life. A few examples follow for illustrative purposes.

On the personal level, terrorists could use the information highway to gather incriminating information on key decision makers from cyberspace. Whether it is past bad check writing activity, subscribing to pornographic magazines, belonging to non-politically correct groups, or having a medical condition that has remained a secret, people in powerful positions of influence often have material in their past that might make them vulnerable to coercion. However, if their past is not tainted, the terrorist could begin sowing the seeds of corruption along the electronic highway by altering credit history databases, banking records, mailing lists, medical records, etc. in enough detail to compromise the individuals despite their innocence.

In the book, *Information Warfare*, Winn Schwartau recounts one incident about an individual being bombarded with hate mail and police inquiries because of a request for pedophilia
information being sent by using their identification when in fact he sent no such request. Thus, information warfare tools in the hands of the terrorist has the potential to either influence or discredit influential individuals.

On the corporate level, terrorists could use information warfare techniques to cripple corporations physically or economically. Using techniques such as Trojan Horses, viruses, or spoofing, corporate information systems could be rendered inoperative by terrorist attacks. These attacks could bring systems such as corporate research and development, financial data management, personnel information, and shipping and receiving to a grinding halt. The cost to corporations could be millions of dollars. Even without physically crippling these systems, enough doubt could be instilled in the operators of the systems to render the systems worthless. Examples include, faulty bookkeeping software, inventory control systems that generate random numbers, and shipping and invoicing systems that become so unreliable that they can no longer be trusted. With these unreliable systems, vast quantities of manpower have to be expended to ensure accuracy in the data that has become the life blood of the corporation.

Other examples of terrorism against corporations include: industrial espionage, modifying tests results in order to give inaccurate data, and release of data that would discredit the corporation or individuals within the corporation. Thus, besides being able to hold individuals hostage, terrorists could also hold corporations hostage through the use of their own information systems.

On a more global level, nations become vulnerable to terrorist attacks through the use of information warfare techniques. National infrastructure such as banks, switched telephone systems, power grids, and air traffic control stations are but a few examples of targets that could cause massive disruption of life in a developed state if attacked. Nuclear power plants with bad controller chips, jamming of aircraft transponders, and theft of national security information from military networks are other examples that could cause massive destruction and loss of life.

In addition to computers, terrorist groups have moved into the technology and missile age with hardware and human intelligence. For example, in 1973 it was rare for terrorists to use
missile attacks. Today these missile attacks are common place. However, the future wave of technical terrorism will include more than missiles. These new technical terrorists will be intelligent, creative, and will have learned from past terrorist activities worldwide.

In their book, *Final Warning* 1989, Kupperman and Kamen discuss a scenario where a Middle East terrorist group obtained nerve agents for a terrorist strike. In 1995, a quasi-religious cult carried out a similar attack in Japan in a Tokyo subway; 16 people were killed and over 5,000 were injured. The police investigation revealed a terrorist plot of international mass destruction (for as yet undetermined religious reasons) by members of the Aum Shinri Kyo, or Supreme Truth Organization. Included among the cult membership are 30 cult chemists who worked for the cult’s Science and Technology Ministry. According to police sources the 30 chemists are suspected of preparing the chemical, sarin, that was used in the subway attack. A terrorist organization with a Science and Technology Ministry may not be typical of past terrorist organizations; however, this high technology computer based organization is more mainstream than the world would expect.

The fourth area of future terrorism will be what Donald Hanle refers to as “apolitical terrorism,” or terrorism for nonpolitical ends. There is some controversy with the apolitical category as some experts feel all terrorist acts have a political or social foundation, and, as such, should fall under the political umbrella. However, recent terrorist events around the world clearly indicate that some areas of terrorist activity do fall under the apolitical category.

The apolitical terrorist should be considered the most dangerous type of terrorist. The availability of modern technology, nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, combined with someone with a criminal or unbalanced psychological mindset, makes for an ominous concern. An individual or small group of individuals with personal motives could carry out an event of mass destruction with relative ease and success. Additionally, such an individual or group will probably be available for hire on a national or global market. Modern technology, computers, and information resources all tend to facilitate the interaction and communication of both individuals and groups.
The recent 19 April 1995 bombing in Oklahoma City of the federal building which left 167 people dead could be considered apolitical under certain conditions. If the two accused bombers, Terry Nichols and Timothy McVeigh, do not represent a particular group, organization, or movement, but rather were acting out their own anti-social and anti-government views, the terrorist act would not be exclusively politically motivated. The act could then be described as the abnormal behavior of two individuals based on either “psychotic” thinking in the grave sense and or CRIMINAL behavior in the narrow sense. The psychotic thinking scenario is adequately describe by Hanle as, “...estranged and fragmented individuals...lose self identity and doomed by soulless bureaucracy...”

Another example of apolitical terrorism is the “Unibomber” in the United States. The Unibomber has attacked over a period of 17 years; his latest victim being a lobbyist for the timber industry. The victim was killed by a package bomb that went off in his Sacramento, California office. During the Unibomber’s 17 year reign of terror, three victims have been killed and twenty-three have been injured. The Victims represent varied backgrounds and a particular motive or orientation to the terrorist is unknown. Both the FBI and local law enforcement agencies believe the Unibomber is brazen, typically cool, uncontrolled, and psychologically unstable.

Unlike most political terrorist groups or state sponsored groups, the apolitical terrorist has little concern for political or economic repercussions.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

As terrorism enters the twenty-first century and impacts the global community, a limited number of options will be available to counter the new threats. One option which received some success after the World Trade Center bombing is the economic incentive or bounty. After the World Trade Center attack, the United States government offered a reward of several million dollars for the person or persons responsible for the attack. An informant in Pakistan provided the information that led to the arrest of Ramzi Yousef as the mastermind of the 1993 terrorist act.
Yousef was arrested in Islamabad, Pakistan and immediately extradited to the United States (New York) where he awaits trial. An unfortunate follow-up to the arrest is the speculation that the subsequent killing in Pakistan of two American embassy personnel was revenge for the Yousef extradition.

The reward program is complicated because Pakistan is in the middle of sectarian violence between Sunni and Shiite Muslim groups. These groups not only engage fundamentalist terrorist activity, but overlap with the country’s powerful drug Mafia and the Militant Muslim groups. This ongoing terrorist activity complicates the bounty program but does not negate it. Thus, the United States government, in an attempt repeat the success of its original “reward program,” offered two million dollars in bounty for the killers of the two United States government workers.

A second option for Global Nation States against terrorism is “national resolve.” It should be acknowledged that a foolproof system against terrorism in democratic societies does not exist. In the words of terrorism expert Stephen Sloan, “...there can never be a totally effective program to deter or prevent a determined adversary from seeking softer targets of opportunity in what he perceives to be a justified war against all.” Simple procedures such as better intelligence and improved physical security of critical sites will, in most cases, deter a particular terrorist group. However, the overall result may be additional casualties, such as the revenge killings in Pakistan. A terrorist group deprived of a particular target will typically seek a more accessible alternative target.

The key point for the public of any nation attempting to combat terrorism, now as in the future, is that terrorist activity will take place and causalities will occur. As was evident after the Oklahoma City bombing, additional funding and legislation will result in the hardening of targets and drive some terrorist organizations underground. The realization for global society is that technology attacks, conventional or unconventional attacks, including hostage taking, will continue. The terrorist requirement for media coverage will typically exceed a democratic society’s inclination to control the media or the public’s demand for news.
Thus, the future of our global society is more terrorism rather than less terrorism. Much of that terrorism will be religious and ethnic based. Economics, technology, and the whims of both criminal and psychotics will have ongoing and, at times, spectacular events. Additionally, terrorism has reached America both domestically and internationally. A result of terrorism in America will be more public and political efforts to counter terrorism by the West. Sadly, terrorism in the Third World and in developing countries will continue almost unabated.
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