Mapping Terrorism Research
State of the Art, Gaps and Future Direction

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

ROUTLEDGE

Edited by Magnus Ranstorp,

Swedish National Defence College, Sweden

Chapter 1

Introduction: Mapping Terrorism Research – Challenges and Priorities

Magnus Ranstorp

"One of the chief practical obstacles to the development of social inquiry is the existing division of social phenomena into a number of compartmentalised and supposedly independent non-interacting fields."[1]

Are we academic nationalists? We have been trained since graduate school to defend our turf against assaults from Deans, dilettantes, and adjacent disciplines. We organize our journals, scholarly organizations, and university departments within precisely demarcated boundaries. We gesture vaguely in the direction of interdisciplinary cooperation, rather in the way sovereign states put in polite appearances at the United Nations; reality, however, falls short of what we routinely promised. And we have been known, from time to time, to construct the intellectual equivalent of fortified trenches from which we fire artillery back and forth, dodging shrapnel even as we sink ever deeply into mutual incomprehension."[2]

On reflection my own involvement in the terrorism studies field spans almost twenty years when terrorism seemed more predictable, the motivations more understandable and the logic of violence more clear and restrained. Three separate, and all to a degree inseparable, personal events etched an inedible impression in my early academic career. Collectively they also serve to reveal the broader complex character of terrorism as a subject or field of inquiry. Firstly, attendance at a 1987 Wilton Park conference on the symbiosis between the media and terrorism (coming in the wake of the infamous TWA 847-affair) sharply exposed the complexities of the dilemmas posed by the role media played in exacerbating the effects of terrorism. In particular, it became evident that media coverage of terrorism greatly complicated and compressed the time for decision-makers to respond to often choreographed spectacles. The role of the media as the oxygen of terrorism would take on a new added meaning, urgency and complexity with globalisation and the instruments of cyberspace. From the 9/11 planes flying into the twin towers to beheadings in Iraq, terrorist events reverberate in seconds around the globe uniting extremists and shocking public audiences. These events are impressively choreographed and designed to greatly amplify the effect of the violence. The constantly mutating networks and cells that transformed al-Qaeda into a global 'salafist-jihadist' movement thrive in this globalisation affected media milieu. It allows it like a 'ghost' to be everywhere but physically nowhere and provides it with a self-generating momentum to replicate, replenish losses and shift direction globally at a moments notice.[3] It defies simplistic or one-dimensional solutions. Countering a constantly mutating ideology attached to the dark underside of globalisation will probably remain among the most illusive challenges in the next century. For the West, this task is complicated by the role of different cultural norms and the inner logic of tribalism governing behaviour and outlook.[4] In many ways, argues David Ronfeldt, al-Qaeda and its affiliates represent a global tribe waging segmental warfare.[5]

Secondly, participation in the West European-Soviet Dialogue on Countering Terrorism with senior counter-terrorism officials in meetings held in Moscow, St Andrews, and Paris in 1990 revealed urgency that the changing complexity of terrorism needed new partnerships and multilateral solutions. These unique meetings during the last days of the Cold War generated policy advice distributed to the penultimate leaderships in Moscow, London, Paris and Bonn and ominously warned of the growing 'Lebanonisation' of the Balkan conflict. Shortly after these meetings, the Balkans descended into a self-destructive spiral of ethnic and religious violence. This conflict fault line joined Afghanistan as a training ground for a generation of foreign jihadists which would later be interchangeable with those conflicts in Kashmir and Chechnya where Muslims were 'besieged'. Those of us interested in this dimension were early introduced to the ideological tracts of Abdallah Azzam (Bin-Laden's ideologue) whose content urged the Muslim youths everywhere to literally 'Join the Caravan' (of martyrs) and In Defence of Muslim Lands. These ideological tracts were detected within the Bosnian civil war among the foreign fighters. No one could fathom that this embryo would later develop into the multi-headed hydra that plague and dominate the contemporary international security agenda and discourse. It also powerfully demonstrated the enduring lesson to always expect the unexpected.[6]

A third event that changed my outlook occurred in the autumn of 1990 when a Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) sleeper unit infiltrated an international terrorism conference organised by us at the Royal Overseas League in the heart of London. Amidst tight security procedures by New Scotland Yard's Anti-Terrorism Branch, the PIRA sleeper operative managed to conceal, underneath the speaker's podium, 2lbs of Semtex plastic explosives that accidentally but fortuitously was discovered by a sound technician. For those of us present at this event and who narrowly averted tragedy (the meeting went ahead without the British Defence Minister and without drama the following day) it provided a stark reminder that the research arena itself concerned real people and real events and was not without a degree of personal risk. The exact level of risk was naturally commensurate for those of us who substituted the comforts of the ivory tower for field interviews with an assortment of guerrilla leaders and terrorists in hostile and complex conflict environments. The pioneering spirit of the academic-adventurer Gerard Chaliand,[7] who spent time with the Algerian FLN, Palestinian factions in Amman before Black September, the North Vietnamese Viet Cong and the Kurdish PKK, paved the way how to really push the envelope in our understanding of guerrilla and terrorist movements worldwide (and innovatively parting with culinary expertise gathered during the same process).[8] Of course the dilemma of working in this area was also that the researcher may eventually attract adverse attention from the terrorists themselves as I most recently discovered when receiving a personal letter from the infamous 1974 Alphabet bomber. The terrorism academic speciality provided an exotic research environment but also unique challenges in data collection as the clandestine and underground existence of the subject studied remained for many inaccessibly remote and dangerous.

Prior to 9/11, the size of the academic community interested and committed to building a sustained body of knowledge remained resiliently very small but academically diverse. It attracted a handful of political scientists, sociologists and military strategic

experts. Literally over night with 9/11 the field of terrorism studies catapulted from the relative periphery into the absolute vortex of academic interest and policy concern worldwide. Retrained academic cold warriors and war correspondents competed to translate anything on al-Qaeda into a commercial success often without regard for quality, sources or other sound academic praxis. Within the United States, journalists entered the academic world without formal qualifications and good academics left for government vacancies or were inserted into the intelligence architectures in new burgeoning bureaucracies trying to readjust to the post-al-Qaeda world. More traditionally-orientated academics struggled to readjust the explanatory power of international relations theory to the dominance and challenge of sub state actors.[9] Some like John Gray[10], Keohane[11], and Richmond[12] partially succeeded while many other theory specialists are still lost in the wilderness of a hostile, alien and new intellectual non-state centric environment.

Among the most remarkable features amidst the explosion of academic interest in terrorism and political violence is the relative absence of any reflective state-of-the-art reviews of what the field has achieved, identification of where major gaps and weaknesses in research are and what are recommended future areas of research. A noteworthy exception is David Leheny, who constructively recommended that symbolism, strategic signalling and social movement theory could offer a useful vehicle to more closely connect the sphere of international relations scholarship with terrorism studies.[13] This extremely valuable contribution underscored that these fields rarely connects and exist largely independently from each other. However, many critics of terrorism studies seem largely ignorant that the two specialised and refereed academic journals, *Terrorism & Political Violence* and *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*) exists and have made sustained research contributions for almost two decades.

The critical processes of taking stock of the field are an ambitious and challenging undertaking. It is necessary to build new avenues of knowledge and identify new directions in research which are basic and usually sound praxis within most academic disciplines. However, the terrorism studies field have largely failed in this respect from within the old and relatively new academic research communities. Remarkably few academic analyses are devoted to critiquing levels of where research and knowledge is at on the many different levels.

There are always a few exceptions to this norm. No comparable monographs or books are devoted to the merits of research or provide a cogent future pathway except for the pioneering efforts authored by Alex Schmidt[14], Peter Merkl[15] and Paul Wilkinson[16] in the mid- to late 1980's and more recently by Andrew Silke, specifically addressing research achievements and merits of various social science methodologies.[17] The lacunae in developing a basic inventory or more advanced critiques of research and identification of future avenues remain one of the most critically missing ingredients which itself undermine the broader credibility of the field. This process of challenging assumptions, critiquing arguments and reflecting on research occurs normally in many different social science disciplines. It is normal and sound social scientific practise to reflect on research achievements as a base for the next wave of research and its likely direction. Unquestionably few established scholars would deny that this is now an urgent necessity.

This paucity of critiques of terrorism studies literature is worryingly evident in the limited number of relevant articles focusing on methodology or other research methods. Less than a dozen serious scholarly articles are exclusively devoted to critiquing the terrorism studies field – not just in the last few years following 9/11 but cumulatively over the last thirty years. Of course the evolution of knowledge within the field is accumulated through progressive results based on past analyses. However few actually address directly methodological aspects. The problem with the research agenda, according to terrorism doyen Martha Crenshaw, is that the field is probably still plagued by the enduring challenges posed by a lack of definition (what terrorism constitutes); the inability to build a cohesive integrated and cumulative theory (built around larger data-sets and over longer time periods) and "the event-driven character of much research."[18] It is, therefore, an essential and valuable task to periodically take inventory of the aggregate achievements made alongside any weaknesses and identifying a set of priorities for future direction of research. In a nutshell, it is this task this edited book is about: to contribute to the larger and necessarily continuous mapping process of terrorism research in order to assess what contributions have been made from different social and behavioural disciplines and from different themes, research questions and methodologies. More importantly, this research collection brings together different strands of academic perspectives cross-fertilising veteran insights with the emerging new academic talents within so-called 'terrorism studies.' It is not meant to be considered a definitive guide to terrorism research but rather is designed to hopefully generate new questions across specific thematic areas. It is generally meant to stimulate interest in and provide guidance for those serious new and old academics interested in pushing the intellectual boundaries of the field and in questioning the methodologies and assumptions underpinning a field in order to generate new knowledge and research agendas.

Understanding the Research Landscape and the Research Challenge

Over the last thirty odd years, the field of terrorism studies were largely confined to a small nucleus of scholars that were largely ensconced in the ivory tower. A few of these academics had a sustained research engagement; some with periodic field experience from conflict zones; some with direct contact with underground movements and access to the clandestine inner sanctum of terrorists whom they interviewed in captivity or freedom. Other academic trailblazers had very real practical on-the-ground counter-terrorism or counter-insurgency experience to draw from, most notably an effort spearheaded by Maj.Gen. Richard Clutterbuck.[19] However diverse and atomized in scope, all these individual efforts inadvertently contributed to the process of building a collective body of knowledge of terrorism as a complex and interdisciplinary social and behavioural phenomenon. These parallel academic efforts occurred largely by a small core group of scholars defiantly swimming against the mainstream current (or prevailing wisdom) within their respective scholarly disciplines. Schmidt and Jongman identified in 1988 only 32 leading main terrorism researchers.[20]

This pioneering core research was complemented by a sea of one-time contributions reacting spasmodically to the evolution of terrorism, the specificity of problems or cases, changing actors and methods as well as its impact on statecraft and the international system.

Edna O.F. Reid reveal through a comprehensive bibliometric study that 1166 publications on terrorism were produced and identified for the period 1960-1990.[21] However, Reid showed also that the specific growth of terrorism as a research speciality had not evolved in a steady trajectory but instead had gone through four different periods of expansion and contraction. The real 'take-off' stage occurred between the period 1970-78 and was reflective of the contemporary waves of terrorism and its commensurate media coverage. It did, however, decline between the period 1986-1990 in terms of volume of publications, number of involved academics and in collaboration. This decline across the board could be explained by the lack of financial support for research, a reduction in volume of terrorism incidents or may be even a reflection of the general demotion of terrorism as a major foreign policy or international security concern. Reid's inventory did highlight that the terrorism research community remained a small and closed group as only 24 scholars were classified as High and Moderate Producers, having contributed during this collective period with at least ten to thirty four or more articles or books. This key productive pool of scholars played a critical role expanding interdisciplinary engagement and creating a close-knit network of academics.[22] These key scholars were instrumental in the establishment and growth of the speciality of the field and in the development of the contours of the specific conceptual and methodological boundaries.

The downside to this dominance was that it reflected the primary interests of a few key knowledge-producing academics. Reid has correctly identified a few specific problems with this so-called 'invisible colleges of terrorism researchers.' A scarcity of primary data on terrorism meant a large over-reliance on media coverage of terrorism and other forms of political violence as primary sources. This does not need to be necessarily a problematic issue dealing with largely incident-driven research. However, many have questioned the reliability of media coverage and in particularly the tendency to reproduce and collate from diverse sources at times in a duplicating and regenerative fashion making the identification of original sources very difficult. Conflicting reports about actual events themselves were difficult to resolve and extremely time-consuming to find and crosscheck (for those of us who actually remember carrying out research before the computer era with data bases and other knowledge management systems). This criticism does not extend to the entirety of the academic community, who used a mixture of types of sources including invaluable terrorist ideological tracts or manifestos and unique interviews with terrorist prisoners. Nor did this criticism reflect the frequent and often valuable role played by the media by providing insight into clandestine and underground groups, individuals and environments. It did, however, contribute to circular reporting and recycling of the same media material in different format and contexts. As such, the exact source of the information is critical to originate in order to determine its veracity and credibility. In today's world there is an ocean of signals and information about terrorism globally. It has, however, not changed the basic problem. As highlighted in Andrew Silke's exhaustive survey of research methodologies, most terrorism research in the pre-9/11 period relied exclusively on secondary sources, some with questionable credibility and precision.[23]

A related methodological problem, pointed out by Reid, Gordon as well as Schmidt and Jongman, was the strong tendency of researchers to create an often closed and circular research system as they relied on each other's work, government publications and media

reporting functioning in a constantly reinforcing feedback loop.[24] This relatively closed system, argued Reid, "indicates a static environment, the same hypotheses, definitions and theories continued to be analysed, assimilated, published, cited, and eventually retrieved."[25] A problematic issue illustrative of this criticism was the often publicly repeated assumptions or theories that had become conventional wisdom within the field without ever being based on any serious or tested quantitative or qualitative field research or survey results. Relatively meaningless generalisations and statements, as exemplified by Brian Jenkins 'terrorists like a lot of people watching rather than a lot of people dead', do underscore the strong communicative element in terrorist violence and may demonstrate a trend in its broadest sense. It is, however, difficult to extract any real scientific meaning. As highlighted by Martha Crenshaw, "the study of terrorism, which is widely recognized as theoretically impoverished, stands to gain in theoretical scope, precision, and cumulativeness of findings."[26]

Others have appreciated the necessity to understand terrorism in its specific context as "it erupts and flourishes in different places at different times due to an often idiosyncratic combination of factors."[27] As a rule, however, this context-specificity became an almost overlooked dimension as terrorism was too often described generically and with a 'one-size-fits-all formula.' It has also been pointed out that the small size of the academic community largely devoting itself to terrorism studies stymied the receptivity for challenging conventional wisdom or assumptions and that efforts to explore new ideas and hypothesis were largely absorbed within existing established paradigms. In addition, there is only a small fraction of this community that innovatively explores the merits and possibilities of moving beyond the existing literature into other social science disciplines to explore the merits of different approaches, concepts and paradigms in unlocking new and truly innovative dimensions. How is it possible to ignore cultural anthropology and sociology in understanding today's salafist-jihadist challenge?

A major difficulty for the terrorism studies field is that as a complex social and behavioural phenomenon "it is characterised by contradictory assumptions" underpinning different levels or units of analysis and across the various disciplines within social sciences. As Schorkopf aptly observed terrorism studies "cannot be considered a distinct academic discipline"[28] and is situated awkwardly between the often clashing ontology's and epistemologies used by different subjects and disciplines. Moreover, this complexity is further compounded by the fact that terrorism continues to be a deeply contested concept requiring a subjective evaluation. The decades of countless UN political debates without consensus and sharp disagreement even within the academic community have failed to yield a universally agreed definition of terrorism. Most illustrative of this difficulty has been Schmidt and Jongman's collation of 109 different definitions that isolated common specific characteristics. Bruce Hoffman and others have underscored terrorism as a specific methodology with identifiable characteristics directed primarily at inflicting or threatening to inflict violence against an innocent civilian population. While it led Walter Laquer to criticise the usefulness of trying to resolve the definitional dilemma, Alex Schmidt put it succinctly, "terrorism is the peacetime equivalent of a war crime."[29]

The absence of any universal agreement of the concept of terrorism has its obvious academic consequences in developing and applying appropriate research methods at different levels of analysis. A further contested issue is whether the terrorism studies field should solely concern terrorism from below (by sub-state actors) or above.[30] Some criticise the focus on terrorism from below rather than above. To some extent this has resulted in the failure to comprehensively understand a range of issues related to the relationship between terrorism from above and below. At the heart of this issue is the understanding of the efficacy of terrorism and the processes as well as consequences of counter-terrorism policies. It is also the case that the diverse categorisation of different types of terrorism as a methodology by diverse actors "poses obvious problems for theory-building."[31] Often the field was criticised for using findings derived from too small samples or that the inferences were made often erroneously and hastily drawn from too divergent examples across non-comparable cases in order to conveniently fit generalisations and broad theories. As cautioned by Crenshaw, researchers should be careful in "constructing general categories of terrorist actors that lump together dissimilar motivations, organisations, resources and contexts."[32]

Another area of contention is the rivalry between the preferred emphasis on either policy-driven research or more theory-driven intellectual contributions. It has been recognised that international relations theory have had difficulty in adjusting to, dealing with, and developing theories responding to the dominance of adversaries other than with a state-centric focus.[33] A major failure has been the development of a body of knowledge trying to explain the underlying root causes of terrorism. Again the diverse types and complex forms of terrorism have greatly complicated this task alongside the context-specificity of terrorism in being driven by the interrelationship between diverse causes at the individual, group, environmental or international levels. These different levels of causation are unevenly studied and their interrelationship poorly understood. There are some recent seminal studies providing insight and constructive pathways to our collective understanding of causes at different levels. Perhaps the best understood levels are at the individual and group levels where Martha Crenshaw, Jerrold Post and more recently John Horgan and Andrew Silke, among the most notable academics, have provided groundbreaking analytical frameworks in advancing our understanding of what causes engagement in terrorism on the individual psychological level. Although they unanimously acknowledge the futility in developing taxonomies or typologies of terrorist personalities or profiles, their research has opened up new vistas for exploring how and why terrorists join, how group dynamics work and what necessary factors influence disengagement from terrorism.[34] Similarly, Jerrold Post skilfully unpacked the multi-faceted and multi-level generic factors influencing the behaviour of terrorist groups while Gordon H. McCormick provides probably the most enduring analytical *tour d'horizon* of terrorist decision making with an impressive and ambitious inventory of literature and research on the subject.[35] Another notable contribution has been made by Bruce Hoffman and Gordon McCormick in advancing our understanding of the communicative aspects of terrorism as a complex form of strategic signalling.[36] Equally, Tore Bjorgo has made a noteworthy effort in unpacking the kaleidoscope of factors behind root causes at the systemic and international level from a series of case-studies, isolating a range of systemic pre-conditions (that do not produce terrorism themselves) and providing a list of over a dozen precipitant causes alongside triggering factors and others that motivate and sustain terrorism campaigns and individual involvement.[37] Collectively these factors provide a useful multi-

causal framework for further research and significantly enhance our understanding of the root causes debate. At another level, Brynjar Lia has usefully examined the impact of globalisation on terrorism and its likely future evolution.[38]

Identifying and understanding the causes of terrorism and political violence and its organic and dynamic process require developing context-specific and relational analysis within and between cases. An alternative useful level of analysis to make sense of how these *processes* work in practise and theory can be found through sociological theories, most notably Charles Tilly's resource mobilisation theory[39] and Donnatella Della Porta's social movement theory.[40] As underscored by Crenshaw, Della Porta provided "a more complex framework that links individual life histories to political and social environments."[41] In the post 9/11-context, Quintan Wiktorowitcz singularly stands out as having broken new ground by fusing a social movement theory approach to the context of adaptive and sophisticated radical Islamist movements.[42] This approach provides an extremely useful vehicle to explore constructivist issues such as "violence and contention, network and alliances, and culture and framing"[43] – the ingredients towards understanding the processes and radicalisation and recruitment strategies of violent salafist-jihadist networks and other broad-based Islamist activist movements. A major advantage of this approach is that it provides the continuum to explain the process of moving from non-violent radicalism into violence itself. Another seemingly important element is to understand the role and function of trust in networks as underscored by Charles Tilly and others.[44] This notion of trust in networks should be explored in combination with studies on small-group dynamics.[45]

In the wake of 9/11, terrorism research has intensely focused on the phenomenon of the inner logic and dynamics of why suicide bombings occur. Some veteran scholars, most notably Mark Juergensmeyer and Scott Appleby, have pioneered the identification of the critical role of religious themes in the justification of violence and the role of charismatic leadership across extremism within the three monotheistic faiths as well as for sects and cults. These analytical interpretations have shown that sacred violence is often perceived and pursued for self-defensive purposes in a cosmic war in order to create or restore "a true moral order."[46] Others have more controversially argued that suicide operations are largely pursued for strategic rather than religious reasons.[47] In addition, Quintan Wiktorowitcz has posited the rational actor models against the merits of arguments of those advancing belief-systems as the primary motoring forces for why suicide-bombings occur.[48] Another scholar pushing the intellectual envelope is David Cook in unpacking radical Islam and martyrology.[49] Whatever driving factor(s) identified around so-called martyrdom operations, a major weakness in the terrorism literature is the failure to incorporate Occidental or non-Western sources and interpretations. Collectively, Feijsal Devji,[50] Montasser al-Zayyat,[51] Fouad Hussein,[52] among other interesting native approaches have provided a useful start in this direction in offering an alternative discourse and interpretation for our understanding of the al-Qaeda phenomenon and beyond. Much more collaborative efforts are necessary to more genuinely challenge prevailing Western assumptions and perspectives. At the same time, the Anglo-Saxon dominance of the discourse and research on terrorism would greatly benefit taking into account parallel research efforts in other European languages and other academic centres.

There are also major challenges in the expectations of the predictive qualities of terrorism research, especially of networked asymmetric adversaries. As forcefully argued by Colin Gray, "we cannot predict specific asymmetric threats…and we tend to lock onto yesterday's event and project it forward as the menace of the era."[53] It is the case that today's complex global asymmetric milieu necessitates increasingly to expect the unexpected. Some scholars, most notably Bruce Hoffman, have admitted that "on 9/11, of course, bin Laden wiped the slate clean of the conventional wisdom on terrorists and terrorism."[54] However, a failure to predict 9/11 by the academic community does not negate all previous assumptions or research findings but naturally may alter the primary focus. It may stimulate the necessary knowledge growth from cognate disciplines for the terrorism studies field towards becoming a mature speciality. This work, however, should build on, or at least be cognisant of, the often fragmentary but select and seminal analytical foundations made in the past. While the 9/11 attacks brought about a profound urgency about the scale of potential future violence and the scale of the problem as a strategic threat, it has also ushered in a growing need and even pressure to produce timely and policy-relevant advice by the academic community on a range of different issues. This push for policy-relevant focus can adversely affect and divert attention away from the critical task of theory-building and theory-formation. The net effect is often misplaced priorities. In turn, this problem is compounded by the fact that most terrorism research has traditionally been funded by the government. As astutely observed by Gaetano Joe Ilardi, "the result has been a spiralling of the literature that in the end adds little to our overall understanding of terrorism."[55]

Terrorism research and public policy occupy an uncomfortable position as it has been the primary cause for the often event-driven nature of the research focus.[56] While terrorism research have generally been recognised as having failed in its predictive capacity of terrorist events, it has played a critical function in educating the broader public, politicians and the counter-terrorism communities about terrorism in its broader strategic context. Occupying a unique educational and independent platform, terrorism researchers have provided important policy advise to parliamentary committees, military and law enforcement communities and to diplomatic audiences worldwide, taking advantage of their impartiality to place immediate issues in a broader horizontal and more long-term perspective. This select academic community has also acted, when deemed necessary, as a critical advocate of normative principles as exemplified by the precarious debates and balance between civil liberties and security. The ability of terrorism researchers to be ensconced in the ivory tower, contemplating for long periods about terrorism in context rather than the immediacy of the threat itself, is a major natural advantage over the strictly operational intelligence domain. Conferences, workshops and other forums serve an invaluable role for acclimatising the practitioner to the strategic domains and in grounding the academic to the practical realities of opportunities and constraints from the field operator's perspective in fighting the terrorism phenomenon. This exposure or cross-fertilisation is absolutely critical in bridging the tactical and strategic domains and in achieving a better and healthy equilibrium between theory and practise. In these exercises it is critical that the terrorism researcher is cognisant of the necessity to remain independent and academically authoritative rather than becoming closely embedded with the intelligence community to the extent one's credibility is in danger or may become undermined. Any academic work purporting to be based in part on classified CIA-briefings of captured detainees who have not been given the opportunity to hear a case in a

court of law is not only unverifiable according to any scholarly criteria.[57] This masquerade of evidence must also be considered severely unethical according to most obvious professional or personal standards even if the academic can produce evidence to underpin assertions. The relative "silence" of the rest of the terrorism research community is simply scientifically and morally indefensible.

A major unresolved debate today within the research community is whether terrorism is dramatically "new" or just an evolution of past tactics and strategies fused with a technological revolution through globalisation.[58] This so-called "network of networks"[59] seemingly defies precision of vocabulary or sufficient explanations of its mutating qualities to a degree that academics and media pundits regularly compete with each other offering relatively meaningless adjectives or analogies. Perhaps winning the prize of banality are the descriptions by Rohan Gunaratna of both al-Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan and the Iraqi insurgency as a terrorist "Disneyland."[60] As pointed out correctly by Mohamedou, "the multiplicity of analogies betrays the organisations novelty and masks its teleology."[61] The more rigorous academics have advanced a divergent range of paradigms to explore the modalities of various networked designs: from social network models,[62] corporate management and organisational theory[63] to synthesis of complexity theory (focusing on the dynamics of networks)[64], "dune" typology[65] to the "cultural autonomy" paradigm[66] and "neomedievalism"[67] among a few. Xavier Raufer has also underscored the difficulty in exactly diagnosing the phenomenon of al-Qaeda.[68] This diverse range of analytical lenses is invaluable in providing new and innovative avenues towards our understanding of the nature of asymmetric adversaries. They are particularly valuable in providing a series of durable and contrasting analytical frameworks from different perspectives. Collectively they challenge our past conceptions and bring clarity towards the processes that underpin this complex adaptive system.

It is unclear whether the role of history can provide an instructive guide what to expect for the future. David Rapoport have shown through his 'four waves' theory, beginning with the anarchists, anti-colonialist, New Left and religious waves, each wave having a projected life cycle of 45 years,[69] that the al-Qaeda phenomenon may disappear and be replaced by something else around 2025. Some would argue the wave theory is probably an underestimation of the likely projected longevity and power of a global wave of terrorism lasting over several generations as it thrives on the underside of an increasingly complex coming anarchy.[70] It does, however, underscore the role and relevance of history in understanding contemporary or so-called "new" terrorism. Albert Bergesen and Yi Han argue for the value of more comparative historical approaches and suggest that "terrorism not only bunches but may cycle."[71] Extracting the lessons of the history of terrorism will be invariably a valuable exercise in unlocking new dimension within social scientific disciplines and new potential research avenues. Historical longitudinal studies across comparable contexts and cases are unfortunately only a rarity.[72] Andrew Silke catalogued the 490 articles published during the entire 1990's in the two major specialised terrorism journals and found that only 13 articles focused on "non-contemporary terrorism and only seven of these look at terrorism prior to 1960."[73] This paucity of research may not be reflective of groundbreaking and authoritative studies in other journals or in other languages but it clearly illustrates where the majority of the current research effort is prioritised and focused.

Although research focus on history's role and its connection to terrorism may be relatively poorly developed, other social scientific disciplines are, through individual academic efforts, developing research questions and agendas to explore new interdisciplinary pathways and innovative approaches from different and often divergent perspectives. Introspective research inventories are being developed by geographers, exploring spatial dimensions of complex networks and the role of political geography within the context of counterterrorism policies[74] while sociologists are debating understanding terrorism in terms of social construction[75] and political scientists debate the notion and concept of risks in society.[76] In all these social scientific explorations an emphasis is naturally placed on surveying the current state of knowledge, the literature and various methodological approaches before exploring their applicability to terrorism specifically. Another question will remain whether these are isolated pioneering efforts or whether this will receive any research traction, allowing others to follow, explore and perhaps sustain a longer term engagement with terrorism studies within each discipline. Among the well-researched areas of terrorism studies are the communicative aspects of the violence for political effect and as a sophisticated form of psychological warfare.[77] In a rapidly changing global era, this theme may prove to be a fruitful avenue to connect to the terrorism studies field from outside the speciality. Providing new or continuous research inventories will be essential to move the field forward. In essence, interdisciplinary focus and innovation will remain absolutely vital in efforts to develop a critical knowledge base in future terrorism research.

Thomas Mockaitis has astutely observed that a major dilemma for terrorism research is fragmentation of effort both in understanding the phenomena of terrorism itself and in devising a strategy against it.[78] This dilemma is perhaps most acutely felt in the strategically important area of WMD or CBRN research, devoted to understanding the convergence of when two extremes meet to produce either mass disruption or in a worst-case scenario "catastrophic societal destruction."[79] Some excellent past work has been done in this area.[80] However, as pointed out by Gary Ackerman, a recent survey of all WMD terrorism publications indicated that the field has "reached something of an 'interpretative impasse'" that is reminiscent of the problems associated with early terrorism studies research with a small closed community and the recycling of the same material and assumptions.[81] He further suggests that the research community move to make policy relevant threat assessments, to analyse collaboration within complex milieus between extremist elements and to advocate second-order analysis to predict the likely time scales of terrorist transition to WMD and by what mechanisms.[82] Equally Gavin Cameron poignantly reminds us terrorism research must be considered beyond technical issues and group dynamics in its wider social and political context and the WMD dimension may also include areas beyond strictly CBRN agents such as agriculture and cyber targets.[83] The issue of the potential convergence between terrorist groups and cyber terrorism presents similar methodological challenges to predicting when terrorists groups are likely to acquire and employ WMD.[84] It is widely recognised that this shift may not appear in a linear and progressive trajectory but may occur with dramatic and sudden quantum leaps, especially as there are few categorisations valid anymore in a world driven by globalisation and as the pattern of horizontal and vertical interaction is a constantly changing and shifting a constellation of actors and factors. These "wild cards" have focused attention towards applicability of complex adaptive systems and the role of complexity

theory in understanding, managing and predicting complex networks, asymmetric adversaries and against really large systemic surprises.[85]

Mastering the sheer complexity of multidimensional factors in constant flux inhibits accurate and consistent predictions of any future terrorism events. There are, however, mechanisms that can be employed that provide insight into the interplay between the individual, group and environmental levels. Already in 1985, Crenshaw used innovatively Albert O. Hirschman's *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty* as a framework to map out the multiplicity of different choices that confronts terrorist leaders and their followers.[86] A relatively under explored critical area of terrorism research is the understanding of the processes of innovation within groups and cells. Hoffman provides a fascinating glimpse of the technological synergy of innovation in the detonation mechanisms developed by PIRA in Northern Ireland and its effects on British military counter-measures.[87] However, few academic research works focus at length and in depth on the role and processes of how groups precisely innovate, absorb new ideas and integrate different types of technologies towards these ends.[88] This applies particularly towards mapping out processes and types of these innovations and trajectories and how these may differ from case-to-case and across divergent geographical and cultural contexts.

A truly innovative exercise towards understanding terrorist innovation was spearheaded in 1999 at a conference organised in Paris in a joint collaboration between the Center on Terrorism and Irregular Warfare of the Naval Postgraduate School and Centre de Recherche sur le Menaces Criminelles Contemporaines of the University of Paris (II). This conference examined variables influencing terrorist decision making in relation to the cyber terrorism and involved a unique collection of past and active terrorist members as well as hackers.[89] Other scholars, most notably Crenshaw, have drawn attention to this research area as a valuable line of inquiry, employing psychological theories towards the processes of innovation with a special emphasis on understanding the multiplicity of factors producing and influencing so-called "mental leaps" alongside other factors such as revenge, leadership, and personal knowledge and experiences.[90] However, this specialisation is urgently in need of further expansion in collaborative and parallel interdisciplinary efforts. A major reason for this weakness is the analytical level and the absence of available and necessary fine-grained information. Another reason is the absence of knowledgeable social scientists with hard science backgrounds and requisite military field experience.[91] One potential unexplored research area is the role of innovation in relation to old and new technologies, especially tracing the evolution and application of so-called IEDs or improvised explosive devices within a particular group capability and specific context.[92] Others have argued that the research priorities should focus on understanding violence with the greatest potential "to achieve catastrophic social destruction."[93]

Understanding the kaleidoscope of various forms of terrorism is a complex academic exercise and various aspects of the field are in many ways still embryonic in its development. It would be a gross mischaracterisation and an injustice to fail to recognise the enduring and invaluable academic foundation made by a handful of pioneering scholars over the last three decades pre-9/11. Without their assistance in the development of conceptual roadmaps and empirical case-studies of terrorist groups and their behaviour as well as methodologies, the

academic communities across disciplines and policymakers would largely still be in relative darkness in crafting a cohesive and measured response to the intellectual and practical challenges posed by 9/11. An impressive multitude of case-studies across different contexts on terrorist groups and movements exists in abundance, especially in helping us to understand the changing contours of the so-called "old terrorism." Much of this rich literature does not classify itself as belonging to the terrorism studies field per se. There are also major research achievements in the area of counterterrorism crafted from a rich history, tradition and experience from counter insurgency and in understanding guerrilla warfare.[94] Similarly, more normative aspects of terrorism within the confines of legal norms and the balance between security and civil liberties have collectively been extensively and thoroughly examined by key scholars within the terrorism studies field as well as outside in the political philosophy domain.[95] Among the foremost and widely recognised contributions is Paul Wilkinson's *Terrorism and the Liberal State,* which provides a *tour d'horizon* of the challenges of this normative balance act with an enduring contemporary relevance.[96]

In contrast to the efforts to understand terrorism as a complex social and human phenomenon, the critique of the counterterrorism research landscape is relatively limited or even muted. This can possibly be explain by either the range of qualitative studies conducted according to context-specificity (Northern Ireland, Basque region and other more enduring ethnic or nationalist/separatist conflicts), the historical lessons from confronting past terrorist campaigns or even perhaps by the relative paucity of research in understanding the totality or relationships between the complex facets of counterterrorism regionally or even globally. Few scholars have ventured to provide comparative studies of counterterrorism policies and practices.[97] Even fewer have focused in on addressing the 'effectiveness' of counterterrorism policies more generically away from specific contexts.[98] Although 9/11 have refocused the issue of pre-emption and even introduced the notion of preventative wars, some research focus interestingly on the notion of deterrence and its applicability within the context of counterterrorism.[99] Others have focused on the dichotomy between the criminal justice and the war models in countering terrorism.[100] A wealth of academic studies has provided useful autopsies on specific strands of counterterrorism, from the micro and macro levels. It is also in this arena that the non-specialist scholar usually may find comfort to connect to the terrorism studies field given its state-centric nature. Unresolved, however, is the larger questionable value in divorcing an analysis of counterterrorism from its specific context and its causative dynamic interaction which in turn changes the terrorists' behaviour and choice of tactics. The lack of academic focus on this cyclical environmental complexity is illustrative of the priority given by certain well-established terrorism scholars on future research efforts in understanding how and why terrorism ends; decision making in counter terrorism;[101] effective crisis management procedures;[102] and public reactions to terrorism.[103] More research is simply needed that captures the dynamics of the relationship between terrorism and counterterrorism. A few academic contributions have begun to examine political pathways out of violence that captures this two-way process.[104]

A similar set of prioritised research areas were identified by the expert panel group of the U.S.-based National Research Council of the National Academies, stressing the need for comparative research knowledge about the processes of terrorism and the communicative aspects.[105] This latter point emphasises the rapidly changing role of the media and technology

in today's global information age with corresponding indirect and direct effects on terrorism. As such, the role of information operation studies as a vehicle to understand the total spectrum of effects is only likely to increase in attractiveness for the future, especially as the U.S. may intensify its efforts in the so-called "war on ideas." This focus needs to integrate and prioritise a non-Western approach to provide cultural traction within targeted societies and against extremist mindsets. It is clear we only operate on the rudimentary and superficial level today in this complex sphere.

Unpacking the complexities of counterterrorism is an academically challenging task. It is complex not only given its context-dependency but also in efforts to calibrate the various instruments of counterterrorism in simultaneous horizontal and vertical harmony. In this multifaceted task, Alex Schmid has provided an extremely useful conceptual toolbox in unpacking the various elements of counterterrorism policies including: politics and governance; economic and social; psychological-communicational-educational; military; judicial and legal; police and prison system; intelligence and secret service and other instruments.[106] This toolbox can be a useful checklist and a pathway towards understanding the complexities in the necessity to constantly evaluating which instruments to apply, to what degree and in what direction according to the context. These instruments may be strategically directed but operate on the tactical level in constant flux.

Among the many strands within the counterterrorism toolbox is the intelligence sphere that can itself provide new interesting avenues to unlock new dimensions. Few academic studies successfully connect the terrorism and intelligence studies fields as it demands mastery of two relatively inaccessible information and analytical domains. Beyond the contested arena of bureaucratic politics and new institutional architectures, intelligence studies offer not only a useful but an ideal vehicle to develop new and innovative methodologies that account for, and can better deal with, today's increasing complexity and uncertainty in the world. A series of think pieces by the CIA's Sherman Kent Center exemplifies the value of challenging prevailing assumptions and preconceptions in methodologies while handling uncertainty and complex volume of contradictory pieces of information and analysis through collaborative exercises.[107] As such, the intelligence field may constitute a useful auxiliary social science field with a high degree of synergy with terrorism studies as it deals with processing analysis through different methodologies. Despite this potential in synthesising the two fields, few academic crossovers occur as the intelligence studies field is a small and marginal speciality with few established scholars and relatively esoteric specialised journals.[108] Both fields, however, underscore that history and case-studies are essential and that a wealth of primary source material exists in national archives, from policy documents and public testimonies as well as from a multiplicity of court records from terrorist trials worldwide. A recent extraordinary document is the *9/11 Commission Report* which provides a unique first-hand insight into the event itself, the operational art of the perpetrators and the difficulty of decision-making and organisational flaws within the US counterterrorism bureaucracy and even decision making at the highest political levels. [109] Based on exhaustive interviews and 2.5 million documents, the *9/11 Commission Report* is already confined to the annals of history and is surprisingly and relatively unused as a reference within the scholarly terrorism studies literature. The *9/11 Commission Report* footnotes themselves reveals a remarkable degree of useful information

about the operational art and behaviour of the asymmetric adversary. Similarly, the explosion of over 7,000 salafist-jihadist and other extremist websites provide a treasure trove for the Arabic-speaking researcher and instantaneous access to ideological tracts and documents similar to those analysed by the academic communities in the 1970s and 80s.[110] On the flipside a main difficulty remains to actually verify the reliability and more critically the authenticity of the ocean of documents available. This contemporary research milieu stands in stark contrast to the relative inaccessibility of the field during its earlier days and may alleviate against the dangers of a closed research community. However, as in the past, today the primary challenge remains to struggle to avoid the event-driven nature of research efforts and avoid the technically-driven and overly funded research on purely mechanistic processes of critical infrastructure protection at the expense of soft social science research.

Illustrative of the complex and interdisciplinary nature of research into 'terrorism' was the effort made by the United Nations Terrorism prevention Branch (TPB) in April 2000 when it designed a research *desiderata,* a matrix of 24 research headings with over 180 subtopics represented as key priority areas of research for the academic and governmental research communities. A year and a half later, the events of 9/11 seemingly eclipsed the urgency and relevance of the UNTPB list as the policymaking and scholarly communities rapidly sought to readjust their research priorities and policy postures. In the post-9/11 world, the terrorism studies field finds itself at the absolute vortex of national security concerns and intense interest by the international community. Past analytical perspicacity is essential as a conceptual foundation to move the field forward. However, the academic field also finds itself at a critical juncture in terms of its prioritised direction. The menu of choices to choose from may be complex and large but priority must certainly remain on fostering collaborative avenues and on innovative interdisciplinary focus to allow the terrorism studies field to consolidate durable knowledge growth.

Whatever path it takes, it remains an important task to critically take stock on past research achievements, gaps and possible direction for future research. It is what this book strives to achieve. A principal aim is to slow down the velocity of largely event-driven research around al-Qaeda, the war on terrorism and other unfolding extremist groups and terrorist events. As forcefully argued by John Steinbruner, "very few would continue to argue that either analytical comprehension or practical mastery are likely to emerge from a simple continuation of past efforts. It is evident that some productive innovation is needed; but far from evident, of course, is what innovation would be productive."[111]

A Roadmap for a Future Research Agenda?

This book is the cumulative result of an international conference held at the Swedish National Defence College in Stockholm on 21-23 March 2005. It was generously sponsored by the Swedish Emergency Management Board (SEMA) and greatly benefited from the wise academic counsel by Professor Bengt Sundelius and Johan Hjelm alongside the continuous critical quality guidance provided by both Professors Wilhelm Agrell and John Eriksson.[112] This conference brought together a vibrant and eclectic but thoughtful research community distinguished by one principal characteristic: they were representative of a small body of researchers who had critically and intelligently reflected in their past writings on the merits

of research within their specialised areas in the terrorism studies field. It would be a mistake to think that the contributions in this book provide all the answers to what exactly the research community has achieved and what is still missing and where efforts should be prioritised. Nevertheless, it provides a partial answer or at least fragments to a process of reflecting more broadly and deeply on the absence of a grand theory and multiple methodologies available and the diversity of contending interdisciplinary approaches in the elusive quest towards better understanding terrorism as a complex social and behavioural phenomenon. Far too few efforts are made questioning assumptions behind research and assertions and arguments. In some way one could liken the current research efforts after 9/11 to a football match where all the players are rushing after the ball without a strategy rather than marking different players or utilising different areas of the pitch. Some are of course doing it for funding reasons. Apart from Andrew Silke (and the ongoing efforts of Alex P. Schmid of the United Nations Terrorism Prevention Branch), no books have been published that adopts a research inventory approach since the late 1980's. And perhaps more worryingly there are only a handful of refereed academic articles that reflectively and critically focus on this subject over the last three decades. Of course many academic articles exist that progressively build on an evolving body of scientific knowledge. This book will hopefully stimulate more explicitly critical introspection and efforts towards interdisciplinary collaboration. For the next generation of academics and students it provides a useful vehicle through which to evaluate past and present work while hopefully give rise to new ideas or avenues for research efforts into the "known unknown."

This book is divided into different thematic parts beyond the larger conceptual (and perhaps artificial) division between terrorism and counterterrorism. In the first part, devoted to diverse efforts to understand terrorism as a complex social and behavioural phenomenon, Isabelle Duyvesten takes the lead, before three other contributions, with an incisive historical perspective about the continuity of terrorism research. Providing interesting reflections on the different meanings of the epochs of terrorism and its history, she concludes insightfully that it is critical to avoid thematic labelling and that understanding terrorism in context is absolutely crucial. Additionally she encourages more non-Western perspectives from the global South in relation to the evolution of terrorism alongside more interdisciplinary research and the necessity for a closer understanding of the dynamics between terrorism and counterterrorism. Finally she cautions the academic and policymaking community in expecting too much of academics in making, or being able to make, predictions about the future direction of terrorism.

A second valuable contribution is provided by Joshua Sinai, focusing on the strengths and weaknesses in the social and behavioural sciences on terrorism. With almost surgical precision and clarity, his analysis provides a balance sheet across the spectrum of ten thematic areas. In several areas Sinai emphasise the necessity to understand multifaceted casual factors and their relationship with the social, political and individual contexts. Interestingly he also stressed that research needs to be conducted on how ideas are translated into action and how these influence every day choices and decision making for terrorists and their followers. He concludes by underscoring the necessity to understand how and why terrorism ends and perhaps hints at further research on political pathways out of terrorism.

The third contributor, Andrew Silke, provides another calm and collected analytical reflection on the impact of 9/11 on research on terrorism. An updated survey, based on his previous review of methodology of journal articles (1990-1999),[113] reveal a number of interesting patterns within the terrorism studies field since 9/11: limited statistical or historical analysis; limited original field work or sources; overly focus on al-Qaeda and a dramatic increase in focus on WMD as well as suicide tactics. However, Silke notes some reasons for optimism in research terms as more work is being conducted collaboratively among researchers that are much greater in number and from different disciplines. He concludes by arguing that terrorism studies is far from becoming an own discipline and that may not be entirely a bad thing.

A fourth and final contribution in this section is authored by psychologist John Horgan who provides an incisive pathway towards understanding terrorist motivation from a socio-psychological perspective. In this comprehensive analysis, Horgan provides an applicable toolbox in unpacking the arguments and complex factors as to why individuals involve themselves with terrorism, remain involved and disengage from the group and violence. He emphasises the necessity to understand the psychology of terrorists as process-based and always occurring in context as he offers a valuable model for these processes. He concludes by arguing for a greater synergy of learning between government analysis and academic work and admits that the state of the art of psychological literature on terrorism is still embryonic and lacks the necessary primary data.

The next section of this book is devoted to exploring various understanding of terrorism post-9/11 that both explicitly and implicitly may contribute to new pathways in understanding the al-Qaeda phenomenon and beyond as well as in the challenges of responding to it. In a groundbreaking analysis, Jeffrey B. Cozzens moves us away from simplistic and uni-dimensional organogramme approach of al-Qaeda and instead examines the role of function, culture and grand strategy. This complex analysis unlocks new dimensions of different themes, from fourth generation warfare to culturalist factors, which is urgently needed to enrich our knowledge about the behaviour of future asymmetric adversaries following the ideology and narrative of al-Qaeda and beyond.

Michael Taarnby provides an auxiliary analysis in the next contribution that examines the contours of recruitment of Islamist terrorists in Europe. He provides a broad survey of recruitment patterns across Europe with a typology of different processes before raising the issue and role of potential non-violent gateway organisations. Taarnby concludes that the research on this strategically important issue is often fragmentary, quickly outdated and lack in analytical sophistication due to the simple fact that this issue has been neglected within research and is admittedly difficult to handle and confront.

In the final contribution of this section Karin von Hippel tackles the contentious issue of responding to root causes of terrorism. She provides a survey of the different arguments advanced within the public domain as to the causal and facilitating factors of terrorism. In particular, von Hippel underscores the problems of collapsed or weak states alongside regional conflicts. Additionally, she illustrates the multi-dimensional levels of causes that complicate the efforts of response to religious extremism.

The next section of this book deals with research contributions within the field of counterterrorism. Martin Rudner skilfully provides an interesting assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the various Western intelligence architectures and their analytical methodologies in dealing with contemporary terrorism threats. In addition he provides a conceptual toolbox in understanding the complex challenges for intelligence analysis as they adjust themselves to deal with terrorism through various institutional reforms. In conclusion he argues the essential need for recognition of the value of the intelligence analyst within the profession itself as an enduring career path.

Neal Pollard contributes with a forward looking analysis on the consequences of globalisation and advances in technology on terrorism and efforts to deal with it effectively. He succeeds not only in showing that asymmetric adversaries are more adroit at exploiting these information architectures but also points towards substantive legal and policy challenges that undermine cooperation. All these vistas require changes in our approach and open up not only policy problems and a host of legal dilemmas but also highlight the need for new research agendas to incorporate rapid technological changes that is increasingly creating new vulnerabilities.

Finally Ronald D. Crelinsten examines the global geopolitical context where terrorism and counterterrorism interacts before proceeding to argue for global governance as an approach to identify new potential avenues for research. This ambitious and thought-provoking analysis underscores the complexities involved in understanding the different types of knowledge necessary in an era of globalisation and increased asymmetry.

The final section of this book is devoted to the future landscape of terrorism research. Berto Jongman provides not only a personal reflection on the research challenge but also uniquely an annotated analysis of the expanded list of research topics developed by him and Alex P.Schmid at the UNTPB. This list of research topics or *desiderata* originally contained 24 research headings with 180 subtopics but has now expanded to over 444 different subtopics for prioritised research for the established scholar and prospective students. This annotated analytical commentary is a tribute to the longstanding contributions made by Alex P. Schmid to the field but is also a unique foundation and vehicle for further research in the future.

Nancy Hayden of Sandia National Laboratories introduces us to the complexity of analysing asymmetric threats and terrorism and asserts that the problem of al-Qaeda and the new networked structures represent so-called "wicked problems" which are resistant to simple one-dimensional solutions or even understanding. In some instances these problems have no solution. She maps out the implications of so-called "wicked problems" that require the terrorist analyst to be the master of a complex spectrum of analytical skills.

Finally Paul Wilkinson, regarded by many as one of the founding fathers of the discipline of terrorism studies, provides a broad reflection of achievement in research over the last three decades. He concludes with some reflections brought about by the so-called new terrorism for the international system generally and the balance between civil liberties

and security specifically. Judging by his impressive scholarship and record in highlighting what will be the future issues and challenges, there could hardly be a better guide to calmly navigate us through a minefield of issues. This enduring security and normative challenge requires us to counsel wisdom and experience. And undoubtedly sustained research knowledge of terrorism will continue be in critical demand.

Already in 1978 terrorism doyen Stephen Sloan made the case for "the urgent need for crucial programs based on scholarly research, operational expertise and incisive policymaking and execution is absolutely vital in view of the sobering degree of coordination and cooperation among terrorist groups who are now acting together in a global assault on the civil order."[114] Furthermore, as prophetically argued back in 1986, Walter Laquer identified that future historians would probably "draw the conclusion that those living in this 'age of terrorism' perhaps never quite understood the exact nature of the threat."[115] If only more people would have then counselled their wisdom about the future of terrorism and made the necessary intellectual and practical investments.

---

[1] John Dewey, *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (New York, NY.: Holt, 1938): p.509. For further analysis on the merits of interdisciplinary research, see: John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Critical Framework* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
[2] John Lewis Gaddis, "History, Theory and Common Ground", *International Security*, Vol.22, No.1 (1997): p.75.
[3] See: Abu Ubeid al-Qurashi, "Fourth Generation Wars", *Al-Ansar: For the Struggle Against the Crusader War,* February 2003.
[4] For example, see: Reed W. Wadley, "Treachery and Deceit: Parallels in Tribal and Terrorist Warfare", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol.26, No.5 (Sept-Oct 2003): pp.331-345.
[5] David Ronfeldt, "Al-Qaeda and Its Affiliates: A Global Tribe Waging Segmental Warfare", *First Monday*, Vol.10, No.3 (March 2005)
[6] For an early and excellent analysis on this, see: Charles F. Parker and Eric Stern, "Blindsided? September 11 and the Origins of Strategic Surprise", *Political Psychology,* Vol.23, Issue 3 (September 2002).
[7] Gerard Chaliand, *Guerilla Strategies* (University of California Press, 1982) and a host of other incisive historical books.
[8] The author is the proud owner of a personally signed copy of Gerard Chaliand, *Food Without Frontiers* (London: Longwood Publishers, 1982) which is based on recipes from guerrillas around the world and revolves around the cultural principle that food and cooking underpin the most intimate trust and friendship in many societies around the world. The lesson for the researcher is to not neglect this valuable tool in field interviews.
[9] David Leheny, "Terrorism, Social Movements, and International Security: How Al Qaeda Affects Southeast Asia", *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, Vol.6, No.1 (2005): pp.87-109.
[10] John Gray, *Al-Qaeda and What It Means To Be Modern*
[11] Robert O. Keohane, "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'", *International Organisation,* (Spring 2002): pp.29-43.
[12] Oliver Richmond, "Realizing Hegemony? Symbolic Terrorism and the Roots of Conflict", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.26 (2003): pp.289-309.
[13] David Lehny, "Symbols, Strategies, and Choices for International Relations Scholarship After September 11", *International Organisation,* (Spring 2002): pp.57-70.
[14] Alex Schmidt and Berto Jongmann, *Political Terrorism* (1988).
[15] Peter Merkl (ed.), *Political Violence and Terror: Motifs and Motivations* (University of California Press, 1986).

[16] Paul Wilkinson and Alasdair Stewart (eds.), *Contemporary Research in Terrorism* (University of Aberdeen Press, 1989).

[17] Andrew Silke, *Research on Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures* (London: Frank Cass, 2004).

[18] Martha Crenshaw, "The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century", *Political Psychology*, Vol.21, No.2 (2000):p.405.

[19] Richard Clutterbuck, *Kidnap and Ransom: The Response* (London: Faber & Faber, 1978).

[20] Alex Schmidt and Berto Jongman (1988), *op.cit.*

[21] Edna O.F. Reid, "Evolution of a Body of Knowledge: An Analysis of Terrorism Research", *Information Processing & Management,* Vol.33, No.1 (1997): pp.91-106.

[22] See: Jonny Burnett and Dave Whyte, "Embedded Expertise and the New Terrorism", *Journal for Crime, Conflict and the Media,* Vol.1, No.4 (2005): pp.1-18.

[23] Andrew Silke, "The Devil You Know: Continued Problems with Research on Terrorism", *Terrorism and Political Violence,* Vol.13, No.4 (2001): pp.1-14.

[24] For example, see: Avishag Gordon, "Terrorism and the Scholarly Communication System", *Terrorism and Political Violence,* Vol.13, No.4 (Winter 2001): pp.116-124.

[25] Edna Reid (1997), *op.cit.*

[26] Martha Crenshaw, "Current Research on Terorrism: The Academic Perspective", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.15 (1992): p.1.

[27] Bruce Hoffman, "Current Research on Terrorism and Low-Intensity Conflict", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.15 (1992): p.26.

[28] Frank Schorkopf, "Behavioural and Social Science Perspectives on Political Violence", in Schorkopf et al (ed), *Terrorism as a Challenge for National and International Law: Security versus Liberty?* (Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, 2003).

[29] Alex Schmid, "The Response Problem as a Definition Problem", in Alex Schmid and Ron Crelinsten (eds.), *Western Responses to Terrorism* (London: Frank Cass, 1993). Also see: Alex Schmid, "Frameworks for Conceptualising Terrorism", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol.16, No.2 (Summer 2004): pp.197-221.

[30] Martha Crenshaw (1992), *op.cit.* p.2.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Martha Crenshaw (2000), *op.cit.* p.417.

[33] Anton du Plessis, "International relations theory and the discourse on terrorism: Preliminary reflections on context and limits", *Strategic Review for South Africa*, Vol.23, Issue.2 (November 2001): p.134.

[34] For example, see: John Horgan, *The Psychology of Terrorism* (London: Routledge, 2005).

[35] Gordon H. McCormick, "Terrorist Decision Making", *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol.6 (2003): pp.473-507.

[36] Bruce Hoffman and Gordon McCormick, "Terrorism, Signalling, and Suicide Attack", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol.27 (2004): pp.243-281.

[37] Tore Bjorgo (ed.), *Root Causes of Terrorism* (London: Routledge, 2005).

[38] Brynjar Lia, *Globalisation and the Future of Terrorism: Patterns and Predictions* (London: Routledge, 2005).

[39] Charles Tilly, "Collective Violence in European Perspective", in T.R. Gurr (ed.) *Violence in America*, vol. 2 of *Protest, Rebellion, Reform* (Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage Publications, 1989).

[40] Donnatella dela Porta (ed.), *Social Movements and Violence:Participation in Underground Organizations*, (Greenwich: JAI Press, 1992). Also see: Donatella della Porta and Sidney Tarrow (eds), *Transnational Movements and Global Activism* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2004)

[41] Martha Crenshaw (2000), *op.cit.*: p.409.

[42] Quintan Wiktorowitcz (ed), *Islamic Activism: A Social Movement Theory Approach* (Bloomington, IN.: Indiana University Press, 2004). Also see: Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller (eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992)

[43] David Leheny (2005), *op.cit.*

[44] Charles Tilly, *Trust and Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

[45] Manuel Castells (ed.), *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Edward Elgar, 2005).

[46] Austin T. Turk, "Sociology of Terrorism", *Annual Review of Sociology,* Vol.30 (2004): pp.271-86.

[47] Robert Pape, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (New York, NY.: Random House, 2005).

[48] Quintan Wiktorowitcz, "Suicide Bombings – Do Beliefs Matter?", unpublished manuscript, September 2004.

[49] David Cook, *Understanding Jihad* (Berkley, CA.: University of California Press, 2005).

[50] Fejsal Devji, *Landscapes of Jihad* (Cornell University Press, 2005)

[51] Montasser Al-Zayyat, *The Road to Al-Qaeda* (London: Pluto Press, 2004).

[52] Fouad Hussein, *Al-Zarqawi – The Second Generation*

[53] Colin S. Gray, "Thinking Asymmetrically in Times of Terror", *Parameters,* (Spring 2002): pp.5-14.

[54] Andrew Silke (2004), *op.cit.:* p.xviii.

[55] Gaetano Joe Ilardi, "Redefining the Issues: The Future of Terrorism Research and the Search for Empathy", in Andrew Silke (2004), *op.cit.*

[56] See for example, Raphael S. Ezekiel and Jerrold M. Post, "Worlds in Collision, Worlds in Collusion: The Uneasy Relationship Between the Policy Community and the Academic Community", *Terrorism and Political Violence*

[57] This is best exemplified by the work of Rohan Gunaratna. For example, see footnotes 36, 37, 59, 60, 61 in: Rohan Gunaratna, "Ideology in Terrorism & Counter-Terrorism: Lessons from combating Al Qaeda an Al Jemaah Al Islamiyah in Southeast Asia", *CSRC Discussion Paper,* 05/42, September 2005.

[58] Thomas Copeland, "Is the "new terrorism really new? An analysis of the new paradigm for terrorism", *Journal of Conflict Studies*, Vol.11, No.2 (Fall 2001): pp.2-27.

[59] See: Paul Wilkinson, "International Terrorism: the Changing Threat and the EU's Response", *Challiot Paper,* No.84 (October 2005).

[60] For example, see his address to Hawaii National Chamber of Commerce, September 2005 and many other interviews to the media.

[61] Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou, *Non-Linearity of Engagement: Transnational Armed Groups, International Law, and the Conflict between al Qaeda and the United States* (Cambridge, MA.: Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, Harvard University, July 2005): p.9.

[62] John Arquilla and David Ronfeldt, *The Advent of Netwar* (Santa Monica, CA.: RAND, 1996); Jörg Raab and H. Brinton Milward, "Dark Networks as Problems", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol.13, No.4 (2003): pp.413-39; Manuel Castells, *The Rise of Network Society* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996, 2000).

[63] Brad Macallister, "Al Qaeda and the Innovative Firm: Demythologizing the Network", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol.27, No.4 (July/August 2004): pp.217-239; Renate Mayntz, "Organisational Forms of Terrorism: Hierarchy, Network or a Type sui generic", *MPIfG Discussion Paper* 04/4 (Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung, May 2004); Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*, (San Fransisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

[64] Russ Marion and Mary Uhl-Bien, "Complexity Theory and al-Qaeda: Examining Complex Leadership", *Emergence,* Vol.5, No.1 (2003): pp.54-76.

[65] Shaul Mishal and Maoz Rosenthal, "Al Qaeda as a Dune Organization: Toward a Typology of Islamic Terrorist Organizations", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.28, No.4 (2005): pp.275-294.

[66] Michael Vlahos, *Terror's Mask: Insurgency Within Islam*, Occasional Paper of the Joint Warfare Analysis Department of the Applied Physics Laboratory, John Hopkins University (May 2002).

[67] Philip G. Cerny, "Terrorism and the New Security Dilemma", *Naval War College Review,* Vol.58, No.1 (Winter 2005): pp.11-33.

[68] Xavier Raufer, "Al Qaeda: A Different Diagnosis", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.26 (2003): pp.391-98.

[69] David C. Rapoport, "The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11", *Anthropoetics* 8, No.1 (Spring/Summer 2002).

[70] Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars Organised Violence in a Global Era* (London: Polity Press, 2003). For the so-called "new barbarism" thesis see: Robert D. Kaplan, The Coming Anarchy (Vintage, 2001). For a rejoinder, see: Dag Tuastad, "Neo-Orientalism and the new barbarism thesis: aspects of symbolic violence in the Middle East conflict(s), *Third World Quarterly,* Vol.24, No.4 (2003): pp.591-599.

[71] Albert J. Bergesen and Yi Han, "New Directions for Terrorism Research", *International Journal of Comparative Sociology,* Vol.46, Nos.1-2 (2005): pp.133-151.

[72] A valuable contribution is: Lindsay Clutterbuck, "The Progenitors of Terrorism: Russian Revolutionaries or Extreme Irish Republicans?", *Terrorism and Political Violence,* Vol.16, No.1 (2004): pp.154-181.

[73] Andrew Silke, "The Road Less Travelled: Recent Trends in Terrorism Research", in Andrew Silke (2004), *op.cit.*

[74] Colin Flint, "Terrorism and Counterterrorism: Geographic Research Questions and Agendas", *The Professional Geographer*, Vol.55, No.2 (2003): pp.161-169.

[75] Austin T. Turk, (2004), *op.cit.* Also see: William D. Casebeer and James A. Russell, "Storytelling and Terrorism: Towards a Comprehensive 'Counter-Narrative Strategy'", *Strategic Insights*, Vol.4, Issue 3 (March 2005).

[76] Ulrick Beck, *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity* (London: Sage, 1992).

[77] See: A.P. Schmid and J de Graaf, *Violence as Communication: Insurgent Terrorism and the Western Media* (London: Sage Publications, 1982).

[78] Thomas R. Mockaitis, "Conclusion: The Future of Terrorism Studies", *Small Wars & Insurgencies,* Vol.14, No.1 (March 2003): pp.207-212

[79] John Steinbruner, "Terrorism: Practical Distinctions and Research Priorities", *International Studies Review*, Vol.7, No.1 (March 2005): p.137.

[80] Jonathan B. Tucker (ed), *Toxic Terror: Assessing Terrorist Use of Chemical and Biological Weapons* (MIT Press, 2000); and John Parachini (ed), *Motives, Means, and Mayhem: Terrorist Acquisition and Use of Unconventional Weapons* (RAND, 2005). Also see: Robin Frost, "Nuclear Terrorism Post-9/11: Assessing the Risks", *Global Society,* Vol.18, No.4 (October 2004): pp.397-422.

[81] Gary Ackerman, "WMD Terrorism Research: Whereto from Here", *International Studies Review*, Vol.7, No.1 (March 2005): p.137.

[82] *Ibid.*

[83] Gavin Cameron, "Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism Research", in Andrew Silke (2004), *op.cit.:* p.86.

[84] For example, see: Lars Nicander and Magnus Ranstorp (eds.), *Terrorism in the Information Age – New Frontiers* (Stockholm: Swedish National Defence College, ACTA B29, 2004).

[85] See: Russ Marion and Mary Uhl-Bien (2003), *op.cit.*; and John L. Petersen, *Out of the Blue: How to Anticipate Big Future Surprises* (Oxford: Madison Books, 1999). Also see: Mark Duffield, "War as a Network Enterprise: the New Security Terrain and Its Implications", *Cultural Values,* Vol.6, Nos.1-2 (2002): pp.153-165.

[86] Martha Crenshaw, "An Organizational Approach to the Analysis of Political Terrorism", *Orbis,* Vol.29, No.3 (Autumn 1985): pp.473-487. Also see the authoritative overview of research on terrorist decision-making: Gordon McCormick (2003), *op.cit.*

[87] Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York, NY.: Columbia University Press, 1999).

[88] A valuable exception is C.J.M. Drake, *Terrorists' Target Selection* (London: Palgrave, 1998).

[89] "Future of Armed Resistance: Cyberterror? Mass Casualties?" Final Report on a Conference Held May 15-17 2000 at the University Pantheon-Assas (Paris-II) available on:
http://www.nps.navy.mil/ctiw/files/substate_conflict_dynamics.pdf

[90] See: Martha Crenshaw (2000), *op.cit.:* p.416.

[91] It should therefore not come as a surprise that RAND is leading this scholarly inquiry, see: Brian A. Jackson, et.al. *Aptitude for Destruction: Organizational Learning in Terrorist Groups and Its Implications for Combating Terrorism, v.1* (Santa Monica, CA.: RAND, 2005).

[92] An exception is: Brian A. Jackson, "Technology Acquisition by Terrorist Groups: Threat Assessment Informed by Lessons from Private Sector Technology Adoption", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.24 (2001): pp.183-213.

[93] John Steinbruner, "Terrorism: Practical Distinctions and Research Priorities", *International Studies Review*, Vol.7, Issue 1 (March 2005): p.137.

[94] For example, see: Ian F. W. Beckett, *Modern Insurgencies and Counter-Insurgencies: Guerillas and their opponents since 1750* (London: Routledge, 2001) and Bard E. O'Neill, *Insurgency & Terrorism: From Revolution to Apocalypse* (2nd edition) (Potomac Books, 2005). For an exceptionally useful study on the contribution of low-intensity conflict literature, see: Bruce Hoffman, "Current Research on Terrorism and Low-Intensity Conflict", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.15 (1992): pp.25-37.

[95] See: Kenneth Waltz, *Man, The State and War* (Columbia University Press, 1959); and Conor Gearty, "Terrorism and Morality", *RUSI Journal* (October 2002).

[96] Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism and the Liberal State* (London: Macmillan, 1977). In addition, see: Magnus Ranstorp and Paul Wilkinson (eds.), *Terrorism and Human Rights* – A Special Issue of Terrorism and Political Violence, Vol.17, Nos. 1-2 (Winter 2005).

[97] See: Peter Chalk, *West European Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism: The Evolving Dynamic* (Macmillan, 1997); *Peter* Chalk and William Rosenau, *Confronting 'The Enemy Within': Security Intelligence, the Police, and Counterterrorism in Four Democracies* (Santa Monica, CA.: RAND, 2004).

[98] See: Raphael Perl, *Combating Terrorism: The Challenge of Measuring Effectiveness*, CRS Report for Congress (23 November, 2005)

[99] See: Paul K. Davis and Brian Jenkins, *Deterrence and Influence in Counterterrorism: A Component in the War on al Qaeda* (Santa Monica, CA.: RAND, 2002). Also see: Doron Almog, "Cumulative Deterrence and the War on Terrorism", *Parameters,* (Winter 2004/5): pp.4-19 and Jonathan Stevenson, "Terrorism and Deterrence", *Survival,* Vol.46, No.4 (2004): pp.179-185.

[100] See: Alex Schmid (2004), *op.cit.*; Peter Chalk, "The Response to Terrorism as a Threat to Liberal Democracy", *Australian Journal of Politics and History,* Vol.44, No.3 (September 1998): pp.373-388; Ami Pedazhur and Magnus Ranstorp, "A Tertiary Model for Countering Terrorism In Liberal Democracies: The Case of Israel", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol.13, No.2 (Summer 2001): pp.1-26.

[101] See: Martha Crenshaw (2000), *op.cit.*: pp.416-17; Dennis Pluchinsky, "Academic Research on European Terrorist Developments: Pleas from a Government Terrorism Analyst", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism,* Vol.15 (1992): pp.13-23.

[102] Charles Parker and Eric Stern (2003), *op.cit.*

[103] For a unique list of research questions, see: Martha Crenshaw, "Current Research on Terrorism: The Academic Perspective", *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, Vol.15 (1992): pp.1-11.

[104] See: Leonard Weinberg and Ami Pedazhur, *Political Parties and Terrorist Groups* (London: Frank Cass, 2003). Also see: Robert Ricigliano (ed.), *Choosing to Engage: Armed Groups and Peace Processes* (Accord: 2005).

[105] For a list of prioritized research areas, see: *Terrorism: Perspectives from the Behavioral and Social Sciences,* Panel on Behavioral, Social, and Institutional Issues, Committee on Science and Technology for Countering Terrorism, National Research Council (National Academy Press, 2002): pp.50-56.

[106] These categories contain further sub-categories, see: Alex P. Schmid, "Towards Joint Political Strategies for De-legitimising the Use of Terrorism", in Alex P. Schmid (ed), *Countering Terrorism through International Cooperation* (Milan: ISPAC, 2001): pp.266-273.

[107] For example, see: "Making Sense of Transnational Threats", *Occasional Papers,* Vol.3, No.1 (October 2004); and "Rethinking 'Alternative Analysis' to Address Transnational Threats", *Occasional Papers,* Vol.3, No.2 (October 2004). Both studies are available publicly on CIA's official website.

[108] Michael Hermann, Christopher Andrew, and Martin Rudner represent a small but extremely authoritative scholarly community in this field and some with past professional experience in the intelligence community. For example, see: Michael Herman, *Intelligence Power in Peace and War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996);   The most prominent journals are: *International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence* (Routledge)*; Defence Intelligence Journal* (Joint Military Intelligence College); *Intelligence and National Security* (Routledge)

[109] *9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States* (New York, NY.: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004).

[110] For example see the work of Allison Jamieson in *The Heart Attacked: Terrorism and Conflict in the Italian State* (London: Marion Boyers, 1989); and Joanne Wright, *Terrorist Propaganda: The Red Army Faction and the Provisional IRA, 1968-86* (London: Macmillan, 1991).

[111] Steinbruner's comments focus on civil conflicts and efforts to resolve them and connections to terrorism but they equally imply the state of knowledge, see: John Steinbruner, (2005), *op.cit.*

[112] Additionally my gratitude extends to Anne Louise Eksborg, the Director General of SEMA, and Under-Secretary of State Dan Eliasson, Ministry of Justice Department, for their presence at the conference and their willingness to contribute with incisive key note addresses. Equally my gratitude goes to Conference Moderator Ulf Wickbom for his extraordinary skilful stewardship during the conference day and to Professor Dennis Töllborg for providing as always stimulating and provocative analysis of the balance between civil liberties and security from a local Swedish perspective. Last but not least I would like to thank the Swedish National Defence College and principally the President Henrik Landerholm, Christina Weglert, Lars Nicander and his entire wonderful CATS team for their continuous support on the day and subsequently in bringing this project to a successful conclusion. I am particularly grateful to Anders Stävberg for his administrative skills and magnificent support.

[113] Andrew Silke, (2001), *op.cit.*

[114] Stephen Sloan, "International Terrorism: Academic Quest, Operational Art and Policy Implications", *Journal of International Affairs,* Vol.32, No.1 (1978).

[115] Walter Laqueur, "Reflections on Terrorism", *Foreign Affairs*, (Fall 1986).