TERRORISM AND POLITICAL VIOLENCE
Introduction

The attacks of 9/11 returned terrorism to the zeitgeist, resulting in increasing demands for explanations of contemporary acts of terrorism and political violence. In the aftermath of the attacks academics and policymakers alike sought a greater understanding of why and how individuals resort to violence. This understanding guided the immediate response to the attacks and influences future counterterrorism policy. Despite the importance of this task, scholars and politicians engaged in the process face serious challenges of an ontological and epistemological nature. These problems impact upon the types of questions that we need to ask when studying terrorism and political violence and will be introduced later in this chapter.

The changing nature of international politics after the end of the Cold War and the 9/11 attacks posed new challenges to efforts to define and explain contemporary terrorism. In an effort to understand and explain these changing security threats many scholars have drawn upon work conducted in neighbouring disciplines. Given this, it is important to be familiar with these discussions. As such, this chapter begins by locating terrorism studies within the broader cannon of work in international relations (IR), strategic studies and security studies. Following this, the chapter will unpack the problem of defining terrorism and introduce you to key problems and debates that exist within terrorism studies, before exploring the importance of identity in the discipline. Many of these problems and debates will be discussed in greater detail in later chapters, but they come up throughout the textbook. As such, students should familiarize themselves with the questions that this chapter poses.

At the end of this chapter you should be able to:

- Locate terrorism studies within the broader politics, international relations and security studies literatures
- Identify problems with defining terrorism
Locating terrorism studies

Before embarking on a discussion of terrorism and political violence it is imperative to locate this body of work within the wider political field. Scholars and students of terrorism studies and political violence are operating within the umbrella discipline of political science. Under this umbrella discipline are numerous sub-disciplines, many of which themselves have sub-disciplines. Terrorism and political violence falls within the discipline of security studies, which is itself a sub-discipline of IR.

IR seeks to explain the ‘interaction of actors, operating at state, sub-state and trans-state levels’ (Mabon, 2013: 8). Fred Halliday, a prominent IR scholar, argued that ‘the task of social science, IR included, is [...] namely to explain, in as persuasive a manner as possible, what has occurred and to identify what constitute significant contemporary trends’ (Halliday, 2005: 6). These trends occur across different levels of analysis: at the international level, where interactions occur between inter-governmental organizations and states; at the state level; and at the sub-state level. While IR scholars have historically focussed upon the interaction between states, the emergence of new actors within the international environment has shifted the focus away from the state and opened up new areas for analysis. This has also resulted in a broadening of focus within the sub-disciplines of IR.

Within IR, sub-disciplines focus upon different areas, ranging from exploring the foreign-policy-making process, through international political economy, international organizations, peace studies and strategic studies, to security studies, which is of paramount importance for this volume. Strategic studies and security studies have predominantly been concerned with identifying threats to a state, yet, in light of a changing international environment, the threats faced have changed. Historically, these threats have been taken to be external to a state; but by purely focussing on external threats many contemporary security threats are missed out of the analysis. Scholars such as Barry Buzan (1991), along with Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde (1998), have sought to broaden the security agenda so that a greater number of potential threats are open to analysis. By broadening the security agenda to reflect the changing international security environment, we are now able to examine threats to human security, economic security and environmental security.

One of the main areas of analysis within security studies is the phenomenon of terrorism, with terrorism studies, along with the study of political violence, concerned with understanding the relations, dynamics and reasons for the emergence of violent actions. Yet despite the location of terrorism studies within the security studies canon, many scholars have approached the study of terrorism from different disciplines, ranging from anthropology to law and psychology.

The main criticism of conventional terrorism research is that it is driven by ‘state-centric, problem-solving approaches that by and large accept the state’s definition of the terrorism problem, and that stemming from this, research on issues
pertaining to Terrorism and Political Violence should possess policy relevance. As a consequence, research into ‘terrorism’ needs a more critical engagement with the problem (Gunning, 2007: 236). This echoes much of the criticism of security studies broadly, prior to the broadening of the security agenda by Buzan and Waever (Buzan et al., 1998). However, recent moves within the literature exploring terrorism and political violence have approached the subject matter in a different way (see Jackson, et al., 2009). The emergence of critical terrorism studies has shifted the focus of analysis, offering a new research agenda for scholars of terrorism.

As Jeroen Gunning suggests, there are several reasons why the emergence of a critical turn in terrorism studies is necessary. Firstly, it is important to move beyond the dominance of state-centric approaches. Indeed, to be critical one must explicitly challenge state-centric, problem-solving perspectives and call into question existing definitions, assumptions, and power structures (Gunning, 2007: 237). The importance of the emergence of critical terrorism studies is especially important when considering some of the problems in defining terrorism, as discussed below.

It is important, at this stage, to make the distinction between terrorism and insurgency, with both falling under the banner of political violence. Insurgency is a political movement, for which terrorism is a tactic that can be, but does not necessarily have to be, used. Indeed, there are cases where insurgent groups use terrorism as a tactic (see al-Qaeda in Iraq, for example), but politically violent groups need not necessarily use fear as a tactic. Rather, insurgent groups can use guerrilla warfare as a strategy which does not target civilians. While we have located terrorism within the wider canon of security-studies literature, it is now important to unpack exactly what we mean by the term terrorism.

Definitional problems: terrorism and the ‘Holy Grail’

Terrorism as a term, despite its presence in contemporary vernacular, appears to be without a universally agreed definition. As Alex Schmid suggests, ‘terrorism’ is perhaps the most important word in the vocabulary of contemporary life (Schmid, 2004: 376), yet it remains an essentially contested concept (Gallie, 1956). The idea of an essentially contested concept emerges when groups of people disagree about ‘the proper use of concepts [...] When we examine the different uses of these terms and the characteristic arguments in which they figure we soon see that there is no one clearly definable general use of any of them which can be set up as the correct or standard use’ (Gallie, 1956: 168).

One immediate consequence of the idea that terrorism is a contested concept is the suggestion that one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter. This ethical problem is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, by Gilberto Algar-Faria. What can be agreed, however, is that the term terrorism is a pejorative label for a particular type of political violence. At this point it is pertinent to unpack what is understood by ‘violence’. In order to explore the emergence of violence it is important to know what it is that we are looking for. While this may seem obvious, many different definitions of violence also exist – often contained within the definition of terrorism.
In his influential work within the field of peace studies Johan Galtung explores understandings of violence. He identifies a narrow concept of violence, 'according to which violence is somatic incapacitation, or deprivation of health, alone (with killing as the extreme form), at the hands of an actor who intends this to be the consequence' (Galtung, 1969: 168). From this it is clear that there must be a subject and an object of the violence, with the subject intentionally instigating an act of violence upon the object. In the article Galtung offers a much broader understanding of violence to include structural and cultural violence, which has a clear impact on an individual's ability to flourish as a human. While this understanding of violence may offer explanations for the emergence of terrorism and political violence, this typically manifests itself in the narrower understanding of violence. However, several questions emerge:

- Is it possible to talk about the subject–object distinction clearly?
- Do acts of violence always have a clear subject?
- Do acts of violence always have a particular object in mind when they are committed?
- Is there always an intention to commit somatic incapacitation, or deprivation of health?

Many of these questions emerge when considering acts of cyberterrorism, as discussed by Lee Jarvis and Stuart MacDonald in Chapter 4, where acts which may appear to be cyberterrorism have no direct object, or indeed somatic incapacitation. As such, it is important to think critically about how we understand violence, for this shapes our understanding of terrorism.

Returning to the definition of terrorism, as Bruce Hoffman suggests, 'It is a word with intrinsically negative connotations that is generally applied to one's enemies and opponents, or to those with whom one disagrees and would otherwise prefer to ignore' (Hoffman, 1998: 31). However, the lack of a universal definition and the pejorative nature of the term can be problematic when it is used. Indeed, as Walter Laqueur suggests, the term terrorism is 'dangerous ground for simplificateurs and generalisateurs' (Laqueur, 1987: 9).

The search for a universally applicable definition of terrorism has been compared by scholars such as Geoffrey Levitt, Omar Malik and Nicholas Perry to the quest for the Holy Grail, with 'eager souls set[ting] out, full of purpose, energy and self-confidence, to succeed where so many others have failed' (Levitt, 1986: 97). As Nicholas Perry correctly states, unlike the Grail quest, many scholars have located a definition of terrorism, but if this is the case then perhaps we have different terrortisms rather than one terrorism.

But why is searching for a universal definition of terrorism important? In asking this question we must also ask several other questions that are analytically linked to it. Who is to identify what acts should be considered acts of terrorism? Should an act of terrorism be viewed as an independent act of violence, or should it be located as an act within a conflict, guerrilla war, or even just as a crime?

There are several reasons why possessing a definition of terrorism is important. The main reason why a definition is important is that it helps us to identify
instances of terrorism. It also aids our understanding of why terrorism occurs and helps us identify its root causes. This discussion of root causes is undertaken by Nina Musgrave in Chapter 5. Possessing a definition of terrorism also helps to identify an appropriate response to terrorism.

But, surely, we are all able to identify terrorism when we see it? We all know what terrorism looks like, and so, much like Justice Stewart on obscenity, ‘I’ll know it when I see it’ (Perry, 2004: 250), we know what terrorism is when we see it. But when we try to define it we are struck by the number of factors and complexities that we must take into account in our definition. These complexities are evident in the numerous disciplines in which scholars are researching terrorism. Those who are researching terrorism do so from numerous angles and perhaps would not necessarily consider themselves to be terrorism scholars. Indeed, scholars studying terrorism may be doing so by exploring numerous other issues including typologies of violence, area studies, the role of religion in violence, law or anthropology.

As a consequence of this varied research base, different perspectives and definitions will emerge, complicating the search for a universally applicable definition. It is important to note that there is no intrinsic essence in the term terrorism and, thus, what we understand by the term is entirely constructed. In addition, one must also consider who the people are who have to respond to acts of terrorism on the ground. At first glance it includes members of the emergency services, but when one takes a closer look the list grows longer to include:

- policymakers
- the security services
- doctors
- academics
- nurses
- lawyers
- local councils
- small business owners
- large business owners
- students
- society as a whole?

This last point is especially evident when considering the requests for all to ‘be vigilant’ and report ‘suspicious packages’ to the police. Given that terrorism impacts all facets of society, it is important to question who should be responsible for defining what constitutes terrorism. One’s first instinct would perhaps be to say that the responsibility belongs to governments or members of the judiciary, but both sets of people approach this discussion with their own agendas and biases. As it is typically governments and policymakers who are responsible for defining what constitutes terrorism (politically and legally), the emergence of critical terrorism studies is incredibly important.

While then it is increasingly difficult to agree on a definition and, moreover, on who should be doing the defining, there are key characteristics that are typically held to be key elements of terrorism:
1. The demonstrative use of violence against human beings
2. The (conditional) threat of (more) violence
3. The deliberate production of terror/fear in a target group
4. The targeting of civilians, non-combatants and innocents
5. The purpose of intimidation, coercion and/or propaganda
6. The fact that it is a method, tactic or strategy of conflict waging
7. The importance of communicating the act(s) of violence to larger audiences
8. The illegal, criminal and immoral nature of the act(s) of violence
9. The predominantly political character of the act
10. Its use as a tool of psychological warfare to mobilize or immobilize sectors of the public

(Schmid, 2004: 404)

Within this list are numerous terms that are subjective and thus open to interpretation. Take the definition of particular individuals as civilians, non-combatants and innocents as an example of this. Terrorism’s subjectivity is present in how it is interpreted, constructed and defined, which has serious consequences for countering terrorism.

Alex Schmid found 109 different definitions of terrorism between 1936 and 1980; yet in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks and the increased attention on terrorism studies (from policymakers and academics alike) this number is bound to have increased. Within Schmid’s study only three elements (violence/force, political, and fear/terror) appeared in at least half of the definitions (Perry, 2004: 250). As a consequence of this difficulty, there are several questions that arise when attempting to define terrorism:

1. Should the term terrorism be applied to governments and states in the same way as it is applied to non-state groups?
2. Should we differentiate between terrorism and the right of a people to self-determination, resistance, and to combat occupation?
3. Should the activities of national armed forces, while on official duty and in armed combat, be included?
4. Should the use of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons by states be included, given that their use is ‘terrifying’?

The first two of these clauses appear to be the key impediments to arriving at a universal definition. Indeed, we must remember that in creating a universal definition of terrorists, it is necessary to negotiate at the international level with other state actors. It is sometimes the case that these actors have been involved in acts of terrorism (under one definition or another), or perhaps have sponsored groups who have embarked on terrorist campaigns. If this is the case, and given our earlier assertion that terrorism is a pejorative term, then arriving at a conclusion that is broad enough to catch all acts of terrorism, but not so broad as to include acts that certain actors do not wish to be included, appears problematic.

Further complicating our problem is the idea that the term has been misused by the numerous media outlets reporting on acts of violence that may or may not have been acts of terrorism, an issue explored in greater detail by Cristina Archetti.
in Chapter 7. The loose use of the term has only clouded general understandings of what terrorism is, which casts doubt on whether one can fall back on our earlier idea that we’ll recognize it when we see it.

Bearing the above problems in mind, we can begin to realize why terrorism is such a difficult term to define. Schmid suggests that there are four main reasons underpinning this difficulty:

1. Because terrorism is a ‘contested concept’ and political, legal, social science and popular notions of it are often diverging
2. Because the definition question is linked to (de-)legitimization and criminalization
3. Because there are many types of ‘terrorism’, with different forms and manifestations
4. Because the term has undergone changes of meaning in over 200 years of its existence

(Schmid, 2004: 395)

This first point is especially pertinent and is reflected in the emergence and development of critical terrorism studies as discussed in the previous section. It is worth restating the importance of subjectivity here, which is reflected in the construction of threats, given interpretations of a situation that are grounded in particular socio-political and historical contexts. This idea of construction is important when considering definitions of terrorism and will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 4.

As we shall discuss, terrorism became common vernacular in the late nineteenth century with the outbreak of anarchist terrorism. This differs greatly from our understanding of terrorism today, and, as such, having a ‘catch-all’ definition of terrorism appears somewhat problematic, especially if it has to include all previous acts of terrorism, each with their own context.

Yet, despite these problems, the search for a definition of terrorism remains incredibly important. Boaz Ganor suggests that there are eight key reasons why having an internationally recognized understanding of terrorism is important:

1. Developing an effective international strategy requires agreement on what it is we are dealing with; in other words, we need a definition of terrorism.
2. International mobilization against terrorism […] cannot lead to operational results as long as the participants cannot agree on a definition.
3. Without a definition, it is impossible to formulate or enforce international agreements against terrorism.
4. Although many countries have signed bilateral and multilateral agreements concerning a variety of crimes, extradition for political offences is often explicitly excluded, and the background of terrorism is always political.
5. The definition of terrorism will be the basis and the operational tool for expanding the international community’s ability to combat terrorism.
6. It will enable legislation and specific punishments against those, involved in, perpetrating, or supporting terrorism, and will allow the formulation of a codex of laws and international conventions against terrorism, terrorist organizations, states sponsoring terrorism, and economic firms trading with them.
7. At the same time, the definition of terrorism will hamper the attempts of terrorist organizations to obtain public legitimacy, and will erode support among these segments of the population willing to assist them (as opposed to guerrilla activities).

8. Finally, the operational use of the definition of terrorism could motivate terrorist organizations, due to moral and utilitarian considerations, to shift from terrorist activities to alternate courses (such as guerrilla warfare) in order to attain their aims, thus reducing the scope of international terrorism.


The above discussion has provided a brief overview of a broad literature within terrorism studies, highlighting some of the key issues that one should be aware of when thinking about, confronting and using the term terrorism.

The evolution of terrorism

When studying the evolution of terrorism and political violence, David Rapoport’s work on the waves of terrorism provides a useful conceptual overview (2002; 2004). As noted in the previous section, the first instance of terrorism occurred in the late nineteenth century, yet acts of terrorism became increasingly common from the turn of the twentieth century onwards.

In his analysis Rapoport suggests that there have been four waves of terrorism, which suggests that acts of terrorism should not be viewed as a new phenomenon. Instead, he argues that incidences of terrorism should be traced back to the turn of the twentieth century and the first wave of terrorism, or the Anarchist Wave. For Rapoport the length of a wave is typically 40 to 45 years (apart from the New Left Wave), reflecting a human life pattern, where ‘dreams that inspire fathers lose their attractiveness for the sons’ (Rapoport, 2004: 2).

In the 1880s an initial Anarchist Wave of terrorism appeared and then continued for some 40 years. Following this, the Anti-colonial Wave began in the 1920s, and by the 1960s had largely disappeared. The late 1960s witnessed the birth of the New Left Wave, which dissipated largely in the 90s leaving a few groups still active in Sri Lanka, Spain, France, Peru, and Colombia. The fourth, or Religious Wave, began in 1979, and, according to Rapoport’s theory, it still has 20 to 25 years to run (Rapoport, 2004).

These waves were triggered by revolution, taken to be the restructuring of authority, often driven by the desire for self-determination. It is possible to identify the key events that led to the emergence of a new wave; these are summarized in Table 1.1.

While there are some shortcomings with Rapoport’s analysis, such as his failure to account for state terrorism and the idea that waves are homogenous, his view offers a way of tracking the evolution of terrorism and is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3 by Pola Zafra-Davis.
The post-Cold War context

As noted earlier in this chapter, the changing nature of international politics after the Cold War required a shift in the focus of IR. The end of the Cold War ushered in an era of increased globalization and with it the perceived growth of capitalism, secularization and democratization. This opening up of space allowed new actors to emerge, at different levels of analysis, both state and non-state. The rise of the non-state actor poses serious problems for state security and counterterrorism specifically (for our line of inquiry these are actors not affiliated to states, with the ability to influence change, located within or across state boundaries). These actors often operate across state borders, which is problematic when considering that state counterterrorism policies are typically limited to operating within their own borders. While this era allowed many to flourish, it also increased the risk posed by groups using violence as a tactic, as terrorist groups were able to take advantage of new opportunities, namely information technology, to exploit cross-border regimes, and to gather resources (Cronin, 2002/3).

The shift in focus in IR also necessitated a shift in focus for scholars of terrorism and political violence. In light of these changing international dynamics, coupled with the increased lethality of violence (Cronin, 2002/3: 42), many scholars sought to explain why certain groups resorted to violence. Post-9/11 many were seduced by the work of Samuel Huntington, particularly his idea of a clash of civilizations. Huntington’s *Clash of Civilizations* thesis first appeared in the *Foreign Affairs* journal in 1991, in the immediate aftermath of the end of the Cold War, but gained international attention in public discussion of terrorism after 9/11 (Neumayer and Plumper, 2009: 712).

Huntington suggested that conflict in the post-Cold War world would not be driven by ideology, as the Cold War was, or by the decline of the nation state; rather, he suggested that scholars missed a key factor – culture. On the first page of his article Huntington states the following:

### Table 1.1  The Waves of Terrorism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wave</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anarchist</td>
<td>Vera Zasulich wounding a police officer who had abused prisoners. Zasulich surrendered her weapon and proclaimed she was a terrorist not a killer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-colonial</td>
<td>The Treaty of Versailles broke up the empires of losing powers according to the principles of self-determination. Where this was not possible, mandates were used. However, this questioned the legitimacy of the victors’ empires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Left</td>
<td>The Vietnam War, where the successes of asymmetric warfare offered hope to those ambivalent towards the existing system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>The Iranian Revolution, which gave traction to the idea that one’s religious beliefs had greater power than political ideology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future. (Huntington, 1993: 1)

Huntington argued that with the end of the ideologically driven Cold War, conflict would occur between ‘seven or eight’ major civilizations of the world. For Huntington these civilizations are: Western; Latin American; Sub-Saharan African; Orthodox; Islamic; Sinic; Hindu; Buddhist; and Japanese. Huntington suggested that the most serious violence will occur at ‘fault lines’ between civilizations, with the examples of the Balkans, Chechnya, Kashmir, Sri Lanka and Tibet used to support this argument. For those seduced by Huntington’s argument it is the conflict between ‘the West’ and ‘Islam’ that can explain the rise of groups such as al-Qaeda, and thus much of the terrorism and political violence of the twenty-first century.

While Huntington’s thesis has serious flaws, as discussed below, its legacy in the post-9/11 world remains incredibly powerful. Its influence on policymakers in the West is reflected in some of the reviews of his book. Henry Kissinger, a secretary of state for US Presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford, suggested that it was one of ‘the most important books to have emerged since the end of the Cold War’. Zbigniew Brzezinski, a national security adviser to President Jimmy Carter between 1977 and 1981, referred to Huntington’s work as an ‘intellectual tour de force: bold, imaginative, and provocative. A seminal work that will revolutionize our understanding of international affairs’.

While for some this may seem like a compelling argument, Huntington’s thesis is riddled with severe errors. Initially, it appears that Huntington is essentializing civilizations, paying little attention to what occurs within these blocs. As Edward Said argues, ‘The personification of enormous entities called “the West” and “Islam” is recklessly affirmed, as if hugely complicated matters like identity and culture existed in a cartoonlike world where Popeye and Bluto bash each other mercilessly, with one always more virtuous pugilist getting the upper hand over his adversary’ (Said, 2001). Said is not the only scholar to offer a damning retort to Huntington. Ken Booth, the ‘father’ of the critical security studies turn, is also highly critical of Huntington, referring to this text as ‘the worst book on international politics I have read for a long time’ (Booth, 2008: 1). Despite the flaws in Huntington’s thesis, the importance of identity remains integral in our quest to understand the emergence of groups who use violence as a tactic. Yet it is important to move below this ‘civilizational’ level of analysis to focus upon the importance of identities at societal, community and individual levels. It is at these levels where differences between identities exist and friction between these different identities can emerge.
Differences exist between people from Yorkshire and Lancashire, between Christians and Muslims, between Catholics and Protestants, or between segments that cross-cut these identities. Indeed, it is pertinent to note here that individuals are often in possession of more than one identity, commonly referred to as hybrid identities, which take into account the numerous ways in which individuals define themselves. However, differences do not necessarily result in violence, or indeed even in friction. Yet when an identity appears threatened by a more dominant identity or ideology then the scope for violence increases. Cronin articulates how, for some, ‘Westernization, secularization, democratization, consumerism, and the growth of market capitalism represents an onslaught to less privileged people in conservative cultures repelled by the fundamental changes that these forces are bringing – or angered by the distortions and uneven distributions of benefits that result’ (2002/3: 46). The impact of this is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

As such, in understanding the move to violence it is important to look at the context within which this violence takes place. This often requires the analysis of the identity mix within a particular location, be it a city, county, or state. These issues are covered in Chapter 5, by Nina Musgrave, and also in Chapter 6, by Nicole Ives-Allison.

**Conclusion**

To fully understand the dynamics of terrorism and political violence it is important to be aware of the complex web of factors that have shaped the nature of the action. This book attempts to provide you with the theoretical and conceptual tools that will allow you to do that. Before beginning your journey through the book, this chapter has introduced you to some of the key debates when studying terrorism and political violence. It is important to remember where terrorism studies is located within academic discussions, namely within security studies and, more broadly, IR. In order to proceed with the study of terrorism one must be aware of the debates highlighted earlier and think critically about definitions of terrorism. Ask yourself the following questions:

- Who is providing this definition of terrorism?
- Why are they defining it in this way?
- How is violence being defined?
- Does it exclude certain acts that could also be understood as terrorism?
- If so, why?

While many of the debates and questions raised may appear daunting, the remainder of this book will unpack these issues in greater detail, offering perspectives on terrorism and political violence from numerous different contexts, reflecting Alex Schmid’s wish for co-operation between different academic disciplines within the study of terrorism.
STUDY BOX CHAPTER 1

Key reading

Study questions
1 How do you define acts of terrorism?
2 Is it possible (and desirable) to agree upon a universal definition of terrorism?
3 Why is the emergence of critical terrorism studies important?

Notes
1 Policy relevance suggests that the research conducted by scholars operating within a particular area should be useful for those engaged in the policymaking process. This is also reflected in the academy, where scholars are striving for their work to make an impact. If this is the case then the research agendas of academics appear skewed towards this policy relevancy.
2 Individuals studying terrorism can be found within the following departments: politics, philosophy, religious studies, law, human geography, sociology, anthropology, computer science, and business management.
3 The cases of Palestine and Kashmir highlight this.
4 The Balkan conflict was driven by the interaction of different religious groups.

References


