



Contents

PREFACE	1
SUMMARY OF DELIVERABLE 3	2
UPCOMING EVENTS	6
THE READING CORNER	7

Preface

Dear readers,

Welcome to the ninth newsletter of the FP6-project on Transnational Terrorism, Security and the Rule of Law (TTSRL). The full text of the eight previous newsletters and a selection of research and policy papers can be found on our website <http://www.transnationalterrorism.eu>

In this newsletter, we present the next set of results, focusing on the research findings of Deliverable 3 (Workpackage 2), entitled: "Theoretical approaches and policy discourse." This newsletter contains an abstract of the report and its main conclusions, the [full version](#) of which can be found [on our website](#). Policy recommendations will be published in the forthcoming policy brief.

Our aim has been to determine whether the discourse on terrorism found in different European countries reflects new concepts and aspects of security (referring primarily to the matter of terrorism) as analyzed in [Deliverable 1](#). This deliverable studied the nature and dimensions of security and how they have evolved since the end of the Cold War. Three important aspects have been identified and analyzed as a result of this reappraisal of the notion of security: new dimensions of security; the central role of the state as the main security actor; and the emergence of transnational terrorism as a security issue.

In light of the success of the TTSRL-consortium's previous newsletters, we also hope to provide you with a comprehensive overview of the main body of research carried out. We look forward to receiving your comments and would like to discuss our findings with you at our TTSRL conference in Brussels, which will be held in February 2009.

On behalf of the entire TTSRL-consortium,

Vidal Martin

Researcher TTSRL

Paulo Botta

Researcher TTSRL





Summary of Deliverable 3

The full text of this deliverable, including literature annotations and sources is available on the TTSRL-website; [click here](#).

Based on the analysis of the three dimensions identified above of terrorism as a security issue, and of their reflection in the media discourse on the subject, the following conclusions can be reached:

Dimensions of Security

The results of this part of the study confirm the conclusions of Deliverable 1 and Deliverable 2, namely, that 9/11 has proved to be a turning point and has had significant impact on the perceived threat of terrorism. After 9/11, terrorism became the main issue on the security agenda of European states.

One of the most interesting findings is that the two biggest European terrorist attacks (March 2004 in Madrid and July 2005 in London) did not generate a growing sense of urgency in European media discourses. No straightforward explanation can be given for this. Perhaps the setting of the European security agenda is excessively influenced by the US equivalent, and its sense of urgency stems primarily from there. Another possible explanation is that, following 9/11, terrorism had already become such an important issue that the attacks which followed in Europe did not constitute a real change in essence, which would explain why the media discourse remained unchanged. What is clear is that the attacks in the US were more important (in terms of the perceived threat) than the attacks which took place in Europe.

Once the problem had been identified, the next step was how to address it. In this regard, the media debate reflected two extreme positions: counterterrorism policies based mainly on military tools (an external security approach) or policies based on the development of a legal counterterrorism system (internal security approach). We are not talking about pure systems, but rather a combination of both approaches with one element prevailing over the other.

According to the outcomes of our text mining tool PARANOID, the "transatlantic gap" is clear in the counterterrorism approach: The word "rights"





plays a much greater part in the discourse within the EU, whereas it plays no substantial role in non-EU countries (Australia and the US), where a military-based discourse is much more important. Canada is more inclined to adopt the European way of thinking than that of the US.

Centrality of the state

If we understand the term "state" as a society's central political institutional decision-maker, we can argue that a "new state" is currently emerging in European society: the European Union bodies are increasing their responsibilities in many fields such as economy and finance, society and culture, and security.

In this regard, based on the results obtained in this study, it can be argued that even though levels of international cooperation between EU member states are reaching new dimensions, we cannot assert that terrorism is a wholly European issue because each state intends to preserve its functions. To clarify, we are not pushing for a European approach if this is understood in terms of an absence of national responsibilities. What we are doing is, rather, trying to determine if the European institutions are taking on those responsibilities in the context of integration. Currently, the prerogatives and capabilities of member states are combined with those of Europe.

What is clear is that the "Euro-approach" seems to focus on a strategic level, establishing the general lines and defining the problem, such as the EU Counter-Terrorism Strategy (European Union, 2005) and Action Plan (European Council, 2007). Over the last seven years (after the attacks of 9/11), Europe has developed (or tried to develop) a common legal framework to aid counterterrorism, as well as establishing international cooperation mechanisms. At the same time, national legislations have been harmonized.

On the other hand, the member states (the classical approach) are the leading institutions in functional and operational fields because the new European institutions are just beginning their work on those issues (for example EUROPOL or FRONTEX).

Transnational terrorism as a security issue

During the Cold War, security concepts were understood as pertaining to possible national threats, not transnational threats. In addition, the military component of





such analyses was particularly important. From the results obtained, we can assert that this outlook is still pertinent in the sense that terrorism is still viewed mainly as a national threat and the military element remains important. Terrorism as a common threat with a transnational dimension is accepted in theoretical discourses, but is absent from those of the media.

To organize our findings, European countries can be divided into two groups: those countries where terrorism is largely considered an internal security issue (France, Germany, the Netherlands, Russia, Spain, and United Kingdom); and those where it is considered an external issue (The Czech Republic, Denmark, Italy, Poland, Portugal and Sweden).

Accepting that terrorism is an external issue does not mean that the transnational dimension of the problem is accepted as well. One of the important findings of Deliverable 1 was that policy perceptions of terrorism have also been moving away from state-based terrorism to transnational terrorist networks, but this is yet to be reflected in the discourse of the national media.

The quantitative results suggest that those countries which view terrorism as an internal security issue tend to emphasize the "legal approach", while those that see it as a foreign security matter emphasize the "military approach". What we have identified is a trend, which does not mean that one approach excludes the other, but rather that a given country is more prone to developing policies in one of the two directions. Nevertheless, the two kinds of policies can coexist. In the Dutch case, for example, the Netherlands is facing a growing internal terrorist threat (after the assassinations of Pim Fortuyn and Theo Van Gogh and the activities of jihadist cells) but, at the same time, measures have been taken to include the military in case of a terrorist attack. The same can be said of France.

Not all the countries that conceptualize terrorism as an internal issue have the same reasons for doing so. We have identified two cases: those countries that face extremist, separatist terrorist movements at home (Spain, France, The United Kingdom) on the one hand; and those, on the other, where internal Islamic-inspired terrorism has become the main security threat after 9/11. Russia is a special case because it faces an Islamic-inspired separatist movement in Chechnya.

The first kind of terrorism (separatist or ethno-nationalistic) is still the most important in Europe. According to EUROPOL's *TE-SAT: EU terrorism situation and*





trend report 2008, there were 583 terrorist attacks in 2007 (532 separatist attacks, 21 extreme radical left-wing attacks, 4 radical Islamist attacks).

Another important piece of data reveals that 88% of the terrorist attacks in Europe occurred in France and Spain, with Corsican and Basque terrorists largely responsible. In light of this, it is quite understandable that European policymakers generally approach terrorism as a domestic phenomenon that needs to be countered by police work and law enforcement (soft-approach) rather than by military means (hard-approach).

In those countries where terrorism is considered an internal issue, Parliament has a stronger presence in the media. This can be explained at least in part by two factors: first of all, when political parties put terrorism high on the agenda, it is reflected in the media mainly through parliamentary debates and briefings. Secondly, in the aftermath of 9/11, every European country made a considerable effort to update national counterterrorism legislation in line with EU standards, and the parliamentary debates which followed were reflected in the media.

In countries where terrorism is seen as a foreign security issue, the executive power has a stronger presence in the media than the legislative power (Parliament).

Countries which have been taking part in international military operations (in Afghanistan and Iraq) tend to consider terrorism as a security problem related to national defense and military issues (for example, Denmark, Italy, Poland and Portugal). There is some overlap in the cases of Spain and the UK because they face an internal terrorist threat but also participate in international operations.

It seems clear that every country views terrorism primarily as a national concern despite the adoption of EU norms and regulations relating to the matter, seeing it as an issue that must be dealt with at a national level using national tools. It is interesting to note that while terrorist organizations are evolving into transnational networks, governments continue fighting mainly at the national level.





Upcoming Events

- **TTSRL's final conference** (Brussels, 5-6 February 2009). On 5 and 6 February, after all deliverables have been finished and published on the TTSRL-website, TTSRL will organize a final conference to present the most important and thought-provoking research results to an audience of researchers, policy makers and practitioners. Be sure to regularly check out the [TTSRL-website](#) and keep an eye on the TTSRL-newsletters, or [contact us](#) for more information about the program, registration and the speakers.
- Counter Terror Expo (February, 10-11, 2009, London, United Kingdom)
<http://www.counterterrorexp.com/>
- Border Security 2009 (4th to 5th March 2009, Warsaw, Poland)
<http://www.smi-online.co.uk/events/execbrief.asp?is=1&ref=3036&eb=#3118>
- Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Conference 2009 (April, 1-2, 2009, Sydney, Australia)
http://www.aic.gov.au/conferences/2009-anti-money_laundering/index.html
- IEEE International Conference on Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI-2009) (June 8-11, 2009, Dallas, Texas, United States of America)
<http://www.isiconference.org/2009/cfp.html>



The Reading Corner

Blood That Cries Out From the Earth, the Psychology of Religious Terrorism

James W. Jones, Oxford University Press (2008)



Blood That Cries Out
From the Earth

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS TERRORISM



In this book James W. Jones looks at religious terrorism from an unusual angle. Jones is both a clinical psychologist and an expert on comparative religion. He tries to answer the question what causes a person to kill innocent strangers in the name of religion. Research on the psychology of violence shows that several factors work to make ordinary people turn "evil." These include feelings of humiliation or shame, a tendency to see the world in black and white, and demonization or dehumanization of other people. Authoritarian religion or "fundamentalism," Jones shows, is a particularly rich source of such ideas and feelings. He finds these

throughout the writings of Islamic jihadists, such as the 9/11 conspirators. Jones applies this model to two very different religious groups that have engaged in violence: Aum Shinrikyo, the Buddhist splinter group behind the sarin gas attacks in the Tokyo subway system, and members of the extreme religious right in the U.S. who have advocated and committed violence against abortion providers. Jones notes that not every adherent of an authoritarian group will turn to violence, and he shows how theories of personality development can explain why certain individuals are easily recruited to perform terrorist acts.