

JOURNAL OF STRATEGIC SECURITY

Volume II, Number 2

May 2009



Henley-Putnam University.

INTELLIGENCE
COUNTERTERRORISM
PROTECTION

Published Quarterly by the Henley-Putnam University Press

JOURNAL OF STRATEGIC SECURITY

Vol. II, No. 2
May 2009

Editor

Thomas B. Hunter, M.A., M.Litt.

Assistant Editors

Gary Ackerman, M.A.

Monte Bullard, Ph.D.

Denise Greaves, Ph.D.

Ed Urie, M.S.

Kim Lewis, M.I.M.

Jeremy Tamsett, M.A.



Henley-Putnam University™

INTELLIGENCE
COUNTERTERRORISM
PROTECTION

Published Quarterly by
Henley-Putnam University Press
www.henley-putnam.edu

Copyright © 2009 by Henley-Putnam University

All rights reserved. No part of this publication shall be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without written permission from the publisher. No patent liability is assumed with respect to the use of the information contained herein. Although every precaution has been taken in the preparation of this publication, the publisher and author(s) assume no responsibility for errors or omissions. Neither is any liability assumed for damages resulting from the use of the information contained herein.

Paperback ISSN: 1944-0464

eBook ISSN: 1944-0472

Warning and Disclaimer

Every effort has been made to make this publication as complete and as accurate as possible, but no warranty of fitness is implied. The information provided is on an “as is” basis. The authors and the publisher shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damages arising from the information contained in this publication.

Editorial Advisory Board

Major General Craig Bambrough, USA (ret.)
Dr. Donald Goldstein, Institute for Defense Analyses
Dr. Richard J. Kilroy Jr., Virginia Military Institute
Dr. William C. Green, California State University, San Bernardino
Dr. Sheldon Greaves, Henley-Putnam University

Correspondence concerning essays submitted for consideration should be directed to: Editor@Henley-Putnam.edu

Guidelines for manuscript submissions can be found on the Henley-Putnam University Web site at www.Henley-Putnam.edu. Materials that have been previously published or are under consideration for publication elsewhere will not be accepted.

Questions or correspondence concerning book reviews may be directed to Editor@Henley-Putnam.edu. Unsolicited book reviews will not be accepted.

Henley-Putnam University and the staff of the *Journal of Strategic Security* disclaim responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by any contributor.

The Journal of Strategic Security is published quarterly by Henley-Putnam University Press and is an imprint of Happy About (<http://happyabout.info>, info@happyabout.info or 408-257-3000).

Table of Contents

Targeted Killing: Self-Defense, Preemption, and the War on Terrorism.....	1
Al-Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb	53
Section One: The War for Independence: A State is Born.....	55
Section Two: The Tuaregs.....	60
Section Three: Algeria’s civil war and 9/11	63
Section Four: Jihad goes Global	67
The Importance of Intelligence in Combating a Modern Insurgency	73
Fragility: Next Wave in Critical Infrastructure Protection	91
Book Reviews.....	99
Film Review	104

Targeted Killing: Self-Defense, Preemption, and the War on Terrorism

Thomas Byron Hunter, M.A., M.Litt.

Killing a man is murder unless you do it to the sound of trumpets.

—Voltaire

Summary

This paper assesses the parameters and utility of “targeted killing” in combating terrorism and its role within the norm of state self-defense in the international community. The author’s thesis is that, while targeted killing provides states with a method of combating terrorism, and while it is “effective” on a number of levels, it is inherently limited and not a panacea. The adoption and execution of such a program brings with it, among other potential pitfalls, political repercussions.

Targeted killing is defined herein as the premeditated, preemptive, and intentional killing of an individual or individuals known or believed to represent a present and/or future threat to the safety and security of a state through affiliation with terrorist groups or individuals.

The principal conclusions of this paper are that targeted killing:

- Must be wholly differentiated from “assassination” and related operations involving the intentional targeting of an individual during wartime, in order to be considered properly and rationally.
- Is a politically risky undertaking with potentially negative international implications.
- Is the proven desire of some terrorist groups to conduct attacks involving mass casualties against innocent civilians that may, in the future, cause states to reconsider previous abstention from adopting targeted killing in order to protect their populace.
- Can serve to impact terrorists and terrorist groups on a strategic, operational, and tactical level.
- Has historically had both negative and (unintentionally) positive impacts for terrorist groups.
- Oftentimes exposes civilians to unintentional harm.

The methods of investigation include a thorough review of the available literature: books, published and unpublished essays, interviews of

selected individuals (to include academics and retired members of military and police forces), and the author's independent analysis.

Introduction

This paper examines the dynamic of “targeted killing” as it relates to the phenomenon of modern international terrorism and the individual state's rights to self-defense.

Due to the nature of modern international terrorism, particularly in its suicide form, and its emergence on the world stage primarily after the September 11, 2001 attacks, academic focus on this type of potential response—targeted killing—has been limited. Consequently, this paper endeavors to contribute an essentially new and largely unexplored insight into targeted killing as it pertains to the state's right to defend its citizens.

Given the paucity of scholarly study on targeted killing, and the natural reluctance of nations to acknowledge any formal policy, there is relatively little published literature (aside from a small number of essays appearing primarily in academic journals) against which to balance the findings and conclusions presented in this paper. The bulk of the available literature used as reference material herein was derived from works pertaining to related topics, such as assassination, conventional and unconventional warfare, counterterrorism, and the norm of state self-defense.

This paper also makes extensive use of case studies involving groups (e.g., HAMAS, Irish Republican Army [IRA], etc.) and cites both “covert” and “overt” state policy as employed over the last 30 years by nations such as Israel and Great Britain in order to better elucidate the motivating factors and the risks involved in this dynamic.

Defining and Explaining Targeted Killing

Discussions pertaining to a national-level policy of premeditated killing of suspected or known terrorists have been hampered historically by the lack of accurate and agreed on definitions of this type of policy. Terms such as “extrajudicial killing,” “extrajudicial punishment,” “selective targeting,” “assassination policy,” “named killing,” and even “long-range hot pursuit” have been used to describe this specific type of activity.¹ While some of these terms may have partial merit, others serve only to confuse the discussion and hinder debate.

For the purposes of this paper, the author adopts the term “targeted killing” for the following reasons: first and most importantly, this type of offensive counterterrorism action frequently elicits emotional and subjective reactions in the public at large,² which can result in more pejorative designations, effectively hindering rational and unbiased discussion of the topic. Second, targeted killing is not equivalent to assassination—a term frequently and mistakenly applied to targeted killing—and thus to equate the two results is a misnomer that, again, hampers the discussion.

The author defines targeted killing as the premeditated, preemptive, and intentional killing of an individual or individuals known or believed to represent a present and/or future threat to the safety and security of a state through affiliation with terrorist groups or individuals. The latter portion of this definition is of particular importance, because the unique nature of terrorism provides states with the specific rationale for the implementation of a policy of targeted killing.

Targeted killings, whether conducted by Israel, the United States, Great Britain, or other nations, are more frequently the result of action undertaken not by conventional military forces, but rather by specialized troops, such as special operations forces (SOF), police, and intelligence agents, as discussed in greater detail in the following text. Alternately, some nations have turned increasingly to specialized equipment, such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) in order to stalk their prey. These specialized troops and equipment have proven to be an essential component of targeted killing, due primarily to the elusive and clandestine nature of terrorists themselves.³

Rather than operating from fixed bases, terrorists often use the basements of homes, rented apartments, caves, nomadic encampments, and other locations from which they conduct their planning and subsequent attacks. Moreover, their travel is often concealed, as they do not move about in marked military personnel carriers, but rather in civilian vehicles that are nearly impossible to distinguish. In response to the tactics, conventional weapons of war such as tanks and heavy bombers are all but useless. This type of warfare requires a combination of accurate intelligence, highly trained and specialized soldiers, and oftentimes the use of unique and advanced tracking and detection equipment. Such is the nature of targeted killing.

It is for these reasons, and those cited in later sections of this paper, that targeted killing has become a preferred, although inherently limited, method of reducing the threat of terrorism—particularly that posed by specific individuals. While defining this action and providing its

basic operational methodologies are relatively simple undertakings, the implementation of this action by the state must also be justified at a governmental level, and to define and agree to such a course of action is a complex undertaking.

Targeted Killing versus Assassination

Before proceeding with an examination of targeted killing as a method of state self-defense in the war on terrorism, it is important to differentiate between targeted killing and assassination. This is an important distinction in the context of this discussion for two primary reasons: to clearly illuminate the differences between the two, and secondly, to demonstrate that targeted killing is not a method for expressing political or ideological differences, but rather a purely defensive act intended to protect the state and its populace.

Though numerous scholars and other experts have tried, the concept and practice of assassination has proven a complicated concept to define.⁴ Decades of research and the resultant books and papers have failed to result in comprehensive and shared parameters and characteristics for this complex concept. For purposes of this discussion, assassination is defined as the premeditated killing of a prominent person for political or ideological reasons.

Assassination, as a political tool, was long considered an acceptable and rational action. As a method of statecraft, it dates back to the earliest recorded governments and includes the death of Julius Caesar in March 44 B.C. Since that time, individuals, groups, and states have participated in the killings of prominent persons (usually heads of state or senior government officials) in order to further their own political or ideological goals. One notable government body was, in fact, based on the concept of assassination. The Ismailian sect founded by Hasan ibn-al-Sabbah had, as its primary function, assassination. Indeed, it has been long believed that we derive the term “assassination” in use today from the “assassins”—the *Hashashi* of this sect, though the validity of this belief is currently under debate.^{5,6}

The practice of assassination was long used as a method of expediting political or ideological goals is, as mentioned, a matter of historical fact. What is also equally clear is that assassination, as we term it here, has not been used to preemptively eliminate an individual who planned, personally or as part of a larger group, to asymmetrically attack a given state.⁷ Instead, this particular type of killing is reserved for the elimination of political and ideological opponents of prominence.

Despite this background, assassination is today considered a politically and morally unacceptable activity, and has fallen into disuse as a tool in the statecraft of modern nations, though formal steps to renounce its use came about only in the latter half of the twentieth century.^{8,9} Even the United States, which formally outlawed political assassination in 1970 with the signing of Executive Order 12333, was not above employing such tactics, particularly during the Cold War.¹⁰⁻¹²

We are able to draw a distinct line between assassination and targeted killing. In sum, assassination is the killing of an individual or group of individuals for purely political or ideological reasons. Targeted killing, in contrast, is the killing of an individual or group of individuals without regard for politics or ideology, but rather *exclusively* for reasons of state self-defense.

The Norm of Self-Defense

The norm of self-defense may (in its simplest and most basic form) be said to be the right of a sovereign nation to defend itself from internal and external aggression. Self-defense in its truest sense is, of course, the right of *every* nation, none of whom are bound to United Nations Security Council (UNSC) approval in order to exercise this right. In the most basic example, if a nation is invaded by a neighbor, it has the right to use force to repel that invasion. It need not wait until it has pleaded its case to the UN and received Security Council approval to do so. Such a requirement would violate a basic tenet of sovereignty.

This simple example is not intended to suggest that self-defense is not a complex issue, with many different components and arguments relating to its implementation. Innumerable books, articles, papers, and dissertations have been written describing and assessing the various conditions and limits of this norm.

For example, as highlighted in David Rodin's *War & Self-Defense*, there is a difference in the culpability of the aggressor and the innocence of the defender.¹³ There is also the issue of historical background, such as in the case of lands taken from a people by force, who then later rise up to reclaim it.¹⁴ The question then arises: who is the aggressor and who is the defender? As stated in the introduction, this paper does not seek to answer these broader questions of the norm of self-defense, but rather seeks to clarify whether targeted killing is a justified form of self-defense, and under which conditions it may be employed.

In this international world in which sovereign nations endeavor to exist peacefully despite border disputes, fragile treaties, political differences, and other dynamics, self-defense sometimes becomes not a mere matter of black and white, as suggested in the initial example, but rather a complex, multilayered consideration. The UN was formed, in part, to untangle this web and to give nations a forum in which to air grievances and settle disputes peacefully. As history has shown, this effort has proven successful in some cases, less successful in others.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, and into the twenty-first century, it has become evident that terrorism, particularly conducted by non-state actors employing transnational terrorism (that is to say without respect for national borders), has become commonplace. Thus, the traditional methods of warfare and self-defense have been thrust into disarray and challenged to their core. States have largely responded to this threat on an individual level, choosing to react to the threat in their own particular ways, while citing their right to self-defense. In some cases, and increasingly so following the attacks of 9/11 and the resulting actions of the United States, this has meant an escalation in instances of military preemption—attacking before the terrorists themselves can strike.

Needless to say, this proactive approach to countering terrorism has resulted in no small number of instances in which states have found themselves up against the previously solid walls of national sovereignty. As terrorists established safe havens in Afghanistan during the 1990s, for example, the United States has chosen to launch missile strikes against bases there in an effort to kill the terrorists it believed, or knew to be, planning attacks against it.¹⁵ There was little political fallout from these attacks, as nations began to realize that the new terrorist threat, particularly that posed by Islamic extremists, differed greatly from the domestic threats historically posed by the IRA in the United Kingdom, Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA) in Spain, and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), who typically stayed within the geographic area in which they had their primary grievances.

This is not to say that states did not recognize the threats posed by terrorists operating regionally. For example, the best-known case of targeted killing, the Israeli pursuit of Black September terrorists following the 1972 Munich Olympics, occurred throughout Europe and the Middle East (see later case study for further details). Thus, there is ample evidence that in some of these cases, states chose to operate in violation of other states' sovereignty in order to conduct reprisals or to otherwise eliminate perceived terrorist threats.

Self-defense and preemption, while perhaps less controversial now than in times past, remains a vociferous subject of international debate. And this debate rises to one of its most heated levels when discussing the practice of targeted killing. Nonetheless, this practice remains at the forefront of the counterterrorist actions of nations such as the United States, Israel, Russia, and, until recently, Great Britain. The inherent nature of transnational terrorism precludes much of what may have previously proven effective against conventional enemies in wars past, such as tanks, massed ground forces, and artillery barrages.

Today, the threat hides in cities, mountains, slums, refugee camps, and caves—virtually anywhere it can find a safe haven from which to operate. Therefore, these conventional tools are largely an anachronism (save the unique case of Afghanistan). The rise of targeted killing, then, comes as little surprise due to its specific nature of limiting offensive action to those individuals and locations in which the enemy can be found and engaged.

The United Nations, Self-Defense, and Preemption

The right of a nation to take action to defend itself is spelled out in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which states:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.¹⁶

Many nations have cited Article 51 as a basis for their primary right to undertake unilateral military actions, citing the requirement of self-defense, with or without UN approval. This has, in some cases, worked out well for the acting state (resulting in little or no argument in the UN), yet in some cases, as with the Israeli attack on Iraq, resulted in international condemnation.

Targeted killing is, without question, a form of preemption. Its goal is to proactively eliminate terrorists before they have a chance to inflict harm

on the affected state's citizens and or homeland. However, in many cases of preemption, the states undertaking this action have not sought or been granted authority to do so under the auspices (or even with the sanction of) of the UNSC, and thus the action may be viewed as illegal.¹⁷ For this reason, states taking part in a program of targeted killing against a terrorist threat risk political capital and international prestige when taking such unilateral action.

This type of "anticipatory self-defense" has taken many forms over the years, such as Israel's strike against Arab targets in the opening hours of the Six Day War in 1967.^{18,19} While a conventional attack (as opposed to asymmetric) and unrelated to terrorism, it is clear that ample evidence existed to convince Israel that a wide scale invasion was imminent and that it needed to strike first in order to survive the expected conflict.²⁰ While undertaken without UN authorization, the negative political consequences of this action were few, due to the obvious nature of the pending threat.

Israel was not so lucky in 1981, when it unilaterally bombed Iraq's Osirak nuclear reactor complex, which it claimed was being used to create nuclear weapons for use against Israel. Following the attack, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted a highly critical resolution, followed by an even more strongly worded resolution that appeared tantamount to a threat against Israel, should it repeat its attack.^{21,22} Thus, while Israel may have eliminated a potential future threat, it suffered greatly for its actions in the court of world opinion.

So, it appears clear that the concept of self-defense, even as defined in Article 51 is a flexible and debatable concept. As Thomas Frank astutely concludes in *Recourse to Force*:

When the facts and their political content are widely seen to warrant a pre-emptive or deterrent intervention on behalf of credibly endangered citizens abroad, and if the UN itself, for political reasons, is incapable of acting, then some use of force by a state may be accepted as legitimate self defense with the meaning of Article 51.²³

The recourse to targeted killing (in itself, preemption), then, may be viewed as a legitimate self-defense in the war against terrorism. As the threat is often transnational and asymmetric, the UN is institutionally and materially ill equipped to deal with each terrorist threat as it arises and spreads. Thus, nations are largely left on their own to resolve the problem.

Targeted Killing and Conventional Warfare

One distinction that must be made is that between the use of targeted killing in conventional warfare, with its inherent restrictions as found in the Geneva Conventions, and that of asymmetric warfare. Tradition and the unwritten military code of conduct on the battlefield, too, played a role in restricting the specific targeting of individuals, at least for period of time.

For example, the tacit prohibition of the intentional and specific killing of generals and other senior officers in wartime is largely a result of historical precedent in which a sort of gentlemen's agreement existed whereby such activity was considered uncivilized.²⁴ This is not to say, however, that such killings did not occur. During the 1700s and 1800s, sharpshooters on opposing military vessels often targeted officers in order to disrupt command and control and to lower enemy morale.²⁵

There is also evidence that the presence of a particular officer in battle may have merited special attention from the enemy. For example, during the battle of Trafalgar in 1805, British Admiral Lord Horatio Nelson was felled by a sniper's bullet. There can be little doubt that the French marksman in that incident was aware that he was targeting Nelson, due not in the least to the distinctive uniforms worn by officers on both sides during the battle.²⁶

More to the point, however, is the decision by which a nation's political or military leaders target a specific individual of the opposing military forces. The goal of such an action is, ostensibly, to remove an officer of such high regard that his death would constitute a significant degradation of enemy warfighting capability—a perfectly legal and acceptable action in the conduct of warfare—provided such actions are taken openly and not through the use of what the Geneva Conventions describe as “perfidy,” as described in the following text.

Examples of a state choosing to target an individual military commander include (but are certainly not limited to) the failed British attempt to kill German Field Marshal Irwin Rommel during the North African campaign, the successful British–Czech plot to kill SS Obergurppenführer Reinhard Heydrich in 1942, and, more recently, U.S. efforts to eliminate Saddam Hussein and his sons during the early days of Operation Iraqi Freedom.^{27–29}

A valuable case study in this context is that of the purposeful and premeditated killing of Japanese Admiral Isoroku Yamamoto during World

War II. In April 1943, American code breakers intercepted a message indicating that Admiral Yamamoto would be traveling by air between military bases in the South Pacific. News of this movement was immediately sent to the highest echelons of both the military and civilian leadership, and a mission specifically intended to kill the admiral was approved.³⁰ On April 18, 1943, American fighter planes intercepted a flight of Japanese military aircraft transporting Yamamoto to a nearby Japanese base. In the ensuing engagement, Yamamoto's aircraft was shot down and the admiral was killed.

One could make the case that the premeditated killing of Yamamoto and the other cases cited here constitute evidence of targeted killing. If we are to argue that targeted killing is the "premeditated, preemptive, and deliberate killing of an individual or individuals known to represent a clear and present threat to the safety and security of a state," then perhaps such an argument might have some merit. This is not the case, however. If we put considerations of terrorism aside for the moment, it is evident that military leaders, being part of a military at war, are valid and legitimate targets, the killing of whom is justified under the laws of war.

What is important here is the manner in which the killing is attempted. The 1977 protocol to the Geneva Convention specifically forbids the use of "perfidy," such as masquerading as a civilian or as a representative of a neutral party (such as the Red Cross).³¹ In this case, if a soldier used such methods in order to gain proximity to a given target, he would be in violation of the Geneva Convention and (ostensibly) prosecutable under international law as a war criminal.

By way of example, the plan to kill General Rommel involved the use of commandos who, infiltrated behind enemy lines via submarine and using other methods of operational subterfuge, operated largely within the boundaries of the Convention, to include wearing Allied military uniforms. However, the killers of Obergurppenführer Heydrich in 1942 took a much different approach, wearing civilian clothes and operating outside the parameters of accepted military conduct.³²

Thus, we can see that the targeting of military leaders of an opposing armed force while in a state of war is a legally acceptable action, and does not represent an example of targeted killing. But what happens when the leader of a given state is deemed responsible for harboring terrorists, or sponsors their nefarious activities?

Self-Defense and Targeting State Leaders

As argued previously, the targeting of prominent individuals, such as heads of state, clearly falls under the rubric of assassination. However, one could argue that when that official has direct involvement with and is supportive of a terrorist organization, then his protected status should be called into question—and becomes even more pertinent if that official wears the rank of a military officer. States are clearly responsible for making distinctions between assassination of heads of state and the targeted killing of terrorists, though the issue is, at best, a murky one.

Israel, for example, consistently vacillated on its position as to the targeted killing of Yassir Arafat. Citing his ongoing guidance of and support for Palestinian terrorism, Israeli leaders frequently named Arafat as a legitimate target. Prior to his death, Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon assured President George Bush that he would not kill Arafat. This assurance was reportedly later withdrawn.³³ Ultimately, for reasons unknown, Israel did not undertake such an operation.

Another case study of interest is that of the U.S. attack on Libya in 1986. Following the bombing of the La Belle disco in Germany, the United States unilaterally attacked Libya in retribution and to strike terrorist training facilities located in the country.³⁴ Accordingly, the majority of targets chosen were linked to known or suspected terrorist activities. One of the targets selected, however, included one of the five personal residences of Libyan president Muḥammad Khadaḥi. Though the presence of his home was known to planners, there is no evidence to indicate that Khadaḥi himself was intentionally targeted; however, nor was there any effort made to remove the residence from the list.

The ensuing attack resulted in the destruction of numerous facilities (including the Khadaḥi residence in which his 18-month-old adopted daughter was killed), aircraft, vehicles, ships, and an estimated eighty soldiers.³⁵ In the years following the raid, Libyan support for terrorism waned and eventually disappeared. The United States and Libya have discussed the removal of Libya from the list of state sponsors of terrorism.³⁶ Some scholars and authors have argued that the raid on Libya directly influenced Khadaḥi to opt out of the terrorist business.³⁷

While the factual argument could be made that the leader of a state might justifiably be considered a viable option for targeted killing, it

is highly unlikely that any state would proceed with such an action without careful consideration. Such a decision might force the state to withstand the likely perception that it has embarked on a state-sponsored assassination—and risk becoming an international pariah.

Counterterrorism and Conventional Warfare

Targeted killing is not the killing of a terrorist during routine military or security operations, such as bombing a suspected terrorist camp simply to deny its use by extremists, or raiding a suspected safe house in which unknown terrorists may be located. Targeted killing, for the purposes of this paper, is limited to the specific selection of an individual or individuals, who are then tracked down and intentionally killed due to their specific involvement in a terrorist group or action.

This is not to say that a targeted killing cannot occur as part of a larger operation. The scope of the targeted action need not be limited to a strike on a single vehicle, for example. Such was the case with U.S. air operations in Afghanistan following the terrorist attacks of 9/11; a targeted killing (or an attempt at targeted killing) may be conducted as part of a coordinated offensive against a larger enemy (e.g., the Taliban). Such an attempt took place on October 7, 2001, when U.S. warplanes bombed the residence of Mullah Omar, leader of the Taliban. While this attack did not succeed in eliminating its target, it does provide a clear example of a state incorporating targeted killing into a larger overall military campaign.

Additionally, given the dynamic nature of counterterrorist operations, and even during conventional operations, there are occasions when intelligence is uncovered which may lead to the location of a named, wanted terrorist. Tactical intelligence data surfacing in a larger military engagement may present important opportunities for a coordinated targeted killing operation. This can occur in virtually any larger military operation targeting terrorists, such as was often demonstrated during the U.S. campaign in Afghanistan. It comes as no surprise, therefore that a targeted killing operation may, on occasion, arise as a hastily coordinated effort stemming from a much larger military engagement.

Thus, we can see that the death of a terrorist (even a wanted and named terrorist) that occurs coincidentally during the course of a military offensive or operation cannot be termed “targeted killing.” If intelligence is uncovered, however, during such an action, then a targeted killing may be instigated and acted upon even while that offensive is underway.

Considering Weapons of Mass Destruction

Weapons of mass destruction (WMD), pose potentially the greatest risk of creating massive casualties in the event of a terrorist attack. These weapons (to include the compounds or agents that comprise the lethal component of the same) are generally considered in the following four categories:

1. Nuclear (stolen nuclear warheads, “suitcase nukes,” etc.)
2. Radiological (“dirty bombs”)³⁸
3. Biological (Anthrax, botulinum toxin, plague, smallpox, etc.)³⁹
4. Chemical (biotoxins, blister agents/vesicants, nerve agents, etc.)⁴⁰

Any one of these four categories of weapons brings with it the possibility of a catastrophic level of casualties, depending, of course, on the wide variety of variables inherent in the type, method of delivery, location, and other critical aspects of employment. Thus, potentially, targeted killing becomes an exponentially more important consideration when assessing whether a given terrorist or terrorists are, at any level, pursuing WMD for use in an attack. Individuals who would be likely to rise to the top of the list as candidates for targeted killing in this regard include (in no particular order of importance):

1. Scientists providing technical expertise in the production or construction/weaponization of WMD devices or compounds;
2. Terrorists known to be actively seeking to obtain WMD;
3. Terrorists known to be in possession of WMD;
4. Sympathetic logisticians or supporters working on behalf of a terrorist group to procure WMD.

Obligated to protect its citizens, a state must now consider the new threats posed by terrorists who may be, or actually are, in possession of WMD, in a light perhaps not previously considered by states expecting more conventional threats. In such cases—where a state may know or believe that terrorists are in possession of WMD and planning an attack involving these devices—the motivation and incentive to conduct a targeted killing will understandably become a greater priority.

According to Walter Laquer, in *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*, the threat posed by these weapons has heralded an entirely new dynamic with regard to the terrorist threat:

For the first time in history, weapons of enormous destructive power are both readily acquired and harder to track. In this new age, even

the cost of hundreds of lives may appear small in retrospect...there is as much fanaticism and madness as there ever was, and there are now very powerful weapons of mass destruction available to the terrorist.⁴¹

Also to be considered in this category are the related threats posed by terrorists who may seek to strike at nuclear power plants or chemical facilities in order to release radioactive gasses or toxic clouds to cause mass casualties. Following 9/11, numerous U.S. government agencies concluded that American nuclear power plants were indeed vulnerable to such attacks, and suggested steps to increase security.⁴² These concerns are not new, of course, but these concerns must not be excluded from any discussion of the terrorist threat to such facilities.⁴³

These latter threats are included here specifically to highlight the threat that may be posed by a single individual or a small group of individuals who, while not in possession of WMD, may cause mass casualties due to the nature of their target. In short, terrorists need not bear WMD in order to represent a threat equal to the use of WMD.

It may be said, then, that states should be more inclined to consider offensive, pre-emptive actions in order to counter these new terrorist threats. To rely on previously sufficient or accepted modes of “counter-terrorism” or “antiterrorism” may expose the state to a level of risk not previously understood or appreciated.⁴⁴ Therefore, we can see that it is possible that states may come to consider or even rely on targeted killing as an accepted form of preemption, or, in fact, realize that it may have no alternative than to resort to this course of action, even if such a consideration was once anathema to the national consensus and consciousness against such a practice.

Who Conducts Targeted Killings?

Due to the fact that targeted killings are largely carried out in the utmost secrecy, it is difficult to ascribe any single killing to any particular individual, unit, agency, military, or even a given nation. In some cases, such as attacks on Palestinian extremists in the Gaza Strip, the perpetrator is almost exclusively Israel, which is often ascribed responsibility for such incidents.⁴⁵ But whom, then, does Israel call on to carry out such actions? An examination of this dynamic provides insight into the delicate nature of targeted killing and, for that reason, is warranted here.

Typically, states call on the most secretive elements of their national civilian and military agencies to conduct these operations. In particular, those

assigned to such missions are usually drawn from intelligence, special operations, or other elite professions. The reasons for this are obvious: specialized training in reconnaissance, close quarters combat, explosives, communications, and clandestine or covert operations.

It is this latter skill and experience that usually provides states with the most valued component of a targeted killing operation: plausible deniability. Plausible deniability is the specific effort of a state to conceal the nature and relation of the targeted killing team and its action to the sponsoring state. In this way a state can participate in this activity with, ostensibly, little risk that a discovered attack will be attributed to it, thus avoiding possible political repercussions on the world stage or even retaliation from the target's supporters, if any.

Thus, in Israel, these missions are typically assigned to members of the Mossad (responsible for human intelligence collection, counterterrorism, and covert action), Shin Bet (internal security), Aman (military intelligence) or one of a number of highly trained police or military special operations units, such as the elite Sayeret Matkal.⁴⁶

In the United States, a few select units carry out these types of operations. These include the Central Intelligence Agency's Special Activities Staff (within the Directorate of Operations), the U.S. Army's Delta Force, and the U.S. Navy's Naval Special Warfare Development Group (also known as SEAL Team Six).⁴⁷ Other, more conventional units may also be called on, as needed, to conduct such operations (particularly in the event that these more specialized units are not within an acceptable striking distance of a fleeting target, though these instances are likely rare.

These units, which have similar counterparts in dozens of other nations, including Russia, France, and Great Britain, are specifically trained to operate clandestinely and covertly, including operating in civilian attire, using false documentation and identities. They are equally proficient in the use of small arms, explosives, and other requisite skills.

It is important to note the nature of these personnel, as their ability to operate without attribution to their sponsor state is of paramount importance in most instances of targeted killing. Unless a state chooses to make public its participation in such actions, that state must possess these requisite skills in order to undertake such missions. Thus, we can see that states without these types of operatives are limited in their abilities, and may not be able to make use of targeted killing without risking national or international exposure and the problems inherent therein.

State Study: Israel

For decades, Israel has been the world's leading practitioner of targeted killing. It has consistently cited its need to defend its citizens from the actions of Palestinian terrorists and related threats. This policy has sparked no end of debate, both within Israel and around the world.⁴⁸ Nonetheless, it has also resulted in the only known codification of the prerequisites for targeted killing.

In April 2002, Israeli Defense Force (IDF) lawyers set forth the following four conditions for targeted killing:⁴⁹

- There must be well-supported information showing that the terrorist will plan or carry out a terrorist attack in the near future.
- The policy can be enacted only after appeals to the Palestinian Authority calling for the terrorist's arrest have been ignored.
- Attempts to arrest the suspect by use of IDF troops have failed.
- The targeted killing is not to be carried out in retribution for events of the past. Instead it can only be done to prevent attacks in the future which are liable to toll multiple casualties.

In January 2003, former Israeli intelligence officials claimed that Israel had expanded its policy of targeted killing to the discharging of such action in other nations, including the United States.⁵⁰ This assertion was vehemently denied by current Israeli officials, but historical evidence is clear on the fact that Tel Aviv has previously authorized such operations.⁵¹

However, codified or not, rarely does an instance of targeted killing conducted by the Israelis go without notice or some form of public remonstrance. The greatest recent political fallout from Israel's ongoing application of this practice occurred in 2004 with the killing of HAMAS spiritual leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin.

Case Study: The Killing of HAMAS Spiritual Leader Sheikh Yassin

On March 22, 2004, founder and spiritual leader of the Palestinian terrorist group HAMAS, 67-year-old Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, was killed by guided missiles fired from an Israeli helicopter as he was pushed in his wheelchair from a mosque en route to his vehicle. The killing sparked protests in the Middle East and formal condemnation from nations such as Britain and France.^{52,53}

As the founder of HAMAS, Yassin was an early participant in the planning of terrorist activities. His role in recent years however, at least in public perception, was that of primarily that of a spiritual rather than an operational leader. Because much of the world viewed his killing through a religious prism, Israel was placed in the awkward position of justifying the death of an elderly, crippled man who was bound to a wheelchair and unable to take an active role in terrorist attacks.

The political fallout from his death was multiplied because world opinion felt the killing had a negative impact on the ongoing and sensitive Middle East peace process. It was for this reason that the world audience called into question his killing (though this was also due to its negative impact on the sensitive Middle East peace process): how could Israel justify killing an elderly, wheelchair-bound civilian who was obviously not going to be participating in any attacks himself?

From Israel's perspective, given Yassin's continued affiliation with HAMAS—he often blessed those who took part in attacks against Israelis—he clearly represented a terrorist threat and was complicit in their actions. Nonetheless, this answer, when coupled with the widespread media coverage of Yassin in his wheelchair prior to the attack and later photos of the destroyed wheelchair generated widespread criticism and condemnation of Israel in the world community.

In sum, the targeted killing of Yassin is an example of an operation that was technically justifiable and well within the parameters produced by the Israelis, but which was condemned by the international community and which cost Tel Aviv a large amount of political capital.

In February 2005, Israel announced a package of concessions to the Palestinians that included an end to the policy of targeted killings.⁵⁴ Whether or not Israel adheres to this decision will depend on the level of future Palestinian terrorist aggression. Should such attacks resume and escalate, it is likely that Israel will opt to resume its policy of targeted killing as an early response.

State Study: United States

Prior to 1985, the United States preferred to remain in a reactive posture with regard to international terrorism. Following the hijacking of the Italian cruise liner Achille Lauro by Palestinian terrorists, and the resultant execution of U.S. citizen Leon Klinghoffer, this posture became more forward leaning. According to former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin

Netanyahu, the genesis of this more offensive approach originated, in part, in a series of discussions between Netanyahu and then-Secretary of State George Shultz.⁵⁵ In a 1985 speech at the Jonathan Institute, Shultz stated:

Can we as a country, can the community of free nations, stand in a purely defensive posture and absorb the blows dealt by terrorists? I think not. From a practical standpoint, a purely passive defense does not provide enough of a deterrent to terrorism and the states that sponsor it. It is time to think long, hard, and seriously about more active means of defense—defense through appropriate preventive or preemptive actions against terrorist groups before they strike.⁵⁶

Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Bush Administration was confronted with having to respond, more aggressively than ever before, to the threat of international terrorism.⁵⁷ Washington did not wait long, however, before making it clear to the world that a new era of “anticipatory self-defense” had been ushered in, and that the United States would follow this course of action in order to kill or capture terrorists worldwide.⁵⁸

President Bush further outlined this more aggressive, offensive approach to counterterrorism in a speech to the 2002 graduating class at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point:

Our security will require transforming the military you will lead—a military that must be ready to strike at a moment’s notice in any dark corner of the world. And our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives.⁵⁹

Since that time, the United States has conducted innumerable global counterterrorist operations, both successful and unsuccessful targeted killings against such prominent terrorist figures as Osama bin Ladin and Mullah Omar and their key lieutenants.⁶⁰ So intent is the United States to locate these individuals that it has included many on an official “wanted” list, which offers multimillion dollar rewards for information leading to their apprehension.⁶¹

Case Study: The Killing of al-Harithi

The most public example of targeted killing by the United States against an individual terrorist occurred on November 3, 2002, when a Predator

UAV, armed with Hellfire guided missiles, was used to attack a vehicle in which the terrorist was traveling.⁶² The resulting explosion killed all in the vehicle, including the suspected target, Abu Ali al-Harithi, an al Qaeda leader and one of the terrorist network's top figures in Yemen.

Officials in the United States still refused to admit responsibility for the attack, though a significant amount of reporting indicates that the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) operated the drone. The day following the attack, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld was asked if the United States had been involved in the explosion. He did not identify those responsible for the attack, though he did seem well aware of the target.

The following exchange is insightful and is provided as an example of the plausible deniability with which the United States and other nations often approach public questions about incidents of targeted killing.⁶³

Q: Mr. Secretary, what can you tell us about the car explosion that was reported today in Yemen? Were any U.S. forces involved in that? And have you learned anything about the aftermath of who was killed in that event?

Rumsfeld: I've seen the reports. And the discussion in one of the reports—I didn't notice whose report it was, but it looked like a wire service report of something out of the region—it said that Harithi might be involved, in which case, as I recall, he was in fact one of the people that is thought to have been involved with the USS Cole.

Q: Have you confirmed that through government sources?

Rumsfeld: No. I have not. And needless to say, he has been an individual that has been sought after as an al Qaeda member, as well as a suspected terrorist connected to the USS Cole.⁶⁴ So it would be a very good thing if he were out of business.

It is clear that targeted killing has become an accepted American foreign policy option, with a tacit rationale in self-defense. While this undoubtedly will result in questions about its legality and, perhaps more importantly, the volatile issue of the U.S. military conduct of operations abroad, there is little question that this practice will continue.

The policy of targeted killing, as adopted by the United States, has also caused consternation among legal observers who feel that this method of premeditated killing crosses the boundary set forth in Executive Order 12,333, which bans assassinations. However, it is clear that the United

States justifies this approach as part of its “global war on terror,” and thus applies the rules of war. Simply put, it argues that terrorists are not civilians, and are in fact enemy combatants, and are thus legitimate targets.

This assessment can be supported when considering that, as both terrorism and counterterrorism are forms of asymmetric—not conventional—warfare, it is difficult to ascribe the same methodologies and judgments that might have been present in World War II. For example, no longer is the enemy wearing distinct uniforms, carrying their weapons openly, or even obeying the spirit of the Geneva Convention.

Additionally, given that the “battlefield” is undefined and that a terrorist attack can occur anywhere, the armed interdiction of a terrorist must sometimes necessarily occur in locations and at times not necessarily preferred or chosen by the authorities. That targeted killings occur is, in some cases, an act of necessity in order to prevent an imminent attack. While this argument will be addressed in full later on in the text, it is sufficient here to note that the United States, like other nations, must necessarily reserve its right to self-defense, particularly against an asymmetric threat such as terrorism.

State Study: Great Britain

Great Britain’s long history of involvement in Northern Ireland brought with it innumerable challenges in attempting to combat the terrorist threat. These challenges resulted in many changes to British law as it pertains to terrorism, as well as the adaptation of the security and military forces to combat it on the ground. The inclusion of Great Britain in this discussion also serves to highlight the difficulties inherent in justifying targeted killing. Specifically, it clearly presents the challenges present even in the face of what appears to be overwhelming evidence that a targeted killing was undertaken to stop terrorist actions immediately prior to and, in fact, during their execution.

The Loughall case, which we will examine here, also highlights numerous ancillary aspects of targeted killing, namely, the question of an unspoken policy (allegedly in place during the 1970s and 1980s) of “ambushing” IRA terrorists rather than attempting to effect their arrest, the hazards of targeted killing and collateral damage, and the potential for political backlash in the event of a questionable (or legally challenged) interdiction.

In an effort to provide improved tactical guidance to its military forces in Northern Ireland, the British government mandated the distribution of

the “Yellow Card.” The Yellow Card was, quite literally that: a laminated card to be carried at all times by British military personnel. On the card were the official guidelines for the use of force by British soldiers.

Among the general rules were (selected rules provided verbatim):⁶⁵

- Never use more force than the minimum necessary to enable you to carry out your duties.
- If you have to challenge a person who is acting suspiciously you must do so in a firm, distinct, voice saying “HALT—HANDS UP.”
- If the person does not halt at once, you are to challenge again saying “HALT—HANDS UP” and, if the person does not halt on your second challenge, you are to cock your weapon, apply the safety catch, and shout, “STAND STILL I AM READY TO FIRE.”

Of course, the soldier could not simply engage any individual he wished, Yellow Card or not. He had to have reasonable cause, such as the perception of a legitimate threat to himself or his fellow soldiers.

Mark Urban offers in his book *Big Boys Rules* that as the term “ambush” was often used by officers briefing their men prior to a counterterrorist operation, and that the Yellow Card was thus often disregarded, such is evidenced in this interview between Urban and an SAS member:⁶⁶

URBAN: What is the mission on an ambush?

SAS MAN: You know what the mission is on an ambush, everybody knows what the mission is on an ambush.

URBAN: Tell me what you think it is.

SAS MAN: I know that when you do an ambush you kill people.

Case study: Loughall, Northern Ireland

In May 1987, British intelligence units began monitoring several well-known and active IRA terrorists who were planning an attack against a Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) station in Loughall, Northern Ireland.⁶⁷ In anticipation, both the SAS and police surveillance experts worked out a coordinated effort to monitor the terrorists for days prior to the expected attack. Authorities also staked out the location where the explosives to be used in the attack were located, a farmhouse located just kilometers from the RUC station.

On the day of the planned bombing, the two terrorists were joined by six other group members who approached the station in a van and a stolen

tractor, to which had been affixed a massive 200-pound explosive device. The terrorists planned to drive the tractor into the RUC compound and detonate the device, thus leveling the station. After the attack, they would steal any weapons in the station, then beat a hasty retreat.⁶⁸

At least fifty armed military and police personnel (including additional SAS personnel flown into Northern Ireland specifically for this action) had taken up hidden positions around the area in order to interdict the terrorists. In an interesting twist, the SAS also posted men inside the station, despite the assessment that the station itself was the target. The mission briefing described the operation as a “massive ambush.”⁶⁹

Unaware of the presence of the authorities and the impending ambush, the terrorists arrived, alighted their vehicle, and opened fire on the station. At the same time, the tractor was driven up to the gate of the compound, where the terrorists lit the fuse to detonate the device, which exploded and partially destroyed the station. As they opened fire, however, the combined SAS/police force reacted, firing an estimate 1200 rounds at the gunmen.⁷⁰ All IRA personnel were killed in the ensuing gun battle, as was one civilian, who happened to be driving through the area at the time of the ambush.

While it may be argued that this incident was a clear case of self-defense, the European High Court in 1991 ruled against the United Kingdom, citing violations of the human rights of the eight dead terrorists.⁷¹ While the court did not rule the shootings illegal, they did determine that the ensuing investigation conducted by the British government was in violation due to what the court deemed “faulty effectiveness of investigation into shooting.”⁷² This result demonstrates, again, the political risks states run in conducting what may be a justifiable case of targeted killing.

Additionally, it appears that there can be no argument that the force sent to interdict the terrorists in this case was intentionally placed in that position not to arrest them, but rather to kill them. Had the authorities wished to simply arrest the eight men, this could have been accomplished in the days preceding the attack.⁷³ Thus, despite denials by the British military and legal challenges brought to the European High Court, the Loughall incident appears to be a textbook case of targeted killing.

When Is Targeted Killing Justified?

While this paper avoids ascribing moral or ethical judgments to this discussion of targeted killing, it is of value to examine the circumstances

in which states can legitimately claim that the use of targeted killing is within the norm of self-defense. In any offensive lethal action, there exist any number of opportunities for accidents and abuse. As mentioned earlier, there are no universally accepted laws governing the use of targeted killing. Each nation is responsible for applying its own domestic laws and concepts of self-defense when considering this option. In the absence of actual laws, therefore, it may be beneficial to examine a hypothetical scenario in which targeted killing might be justified as self-defense.

For example, if a terrorist were observed packing a vehicle with explosives, wiring the explosives to a handheld detonator, then driving that vehicle toward a crowd of soldiers or a crowded marketplace (or a police station, in the case of the Loughall incident described earlier), it seems reasonable to assume that eliminating that terrorist would be justified. In this case, it would appear that there could be little argument against the idea that a terrorist who is in the process of carrying out a terrorist attack is a legitimate subject for targeted killing.⁷⁴ The duty of a state to protect its citizens from this threat is clear and unassailable, and the terrorist's death (assuming for the sake of argument that he could not be captured alive) is a necessary outcome.

This example of a terrorist in action is the exception to the rule, of course. Many times, targeted killings take place far from the scene of an attack, both in time and place. For example, in the case of the U.S. targeted killing of al-Harithi, his detection and interdiction took place two years and hundreds of miles away from the act for which the United States held him accountable: the attack on the USS Cole. In this case, the United States cited al-Harithi's ongoing and active membership in al Qaeda as the basis for his killing.

So, we can see that the dynamics of international terrorism severely test the one truly effective countermeasure that is able to combat it: targeted killing. Just as there is no universally accepted definition of the term, there is equally no universally accepted norm under which its use is permitted, even in what might seem the most direct cases of state self-defense.

As mentioned previously, killings conducted for political reasons rather than for direct security concerns are not targeted killings, but rather assassinations. For example, as cited in the case of Israel's elimination of Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, there are individuals whose elimination may serve both purposes. The death of Yassin both eliminated a high-ranking

politico-religious figure, and it may also have had a negative effect on HAMAS's ability to wage its terrorist campaign.

However, within the world of terrorism and insurgency, it is often difficult to differentiate between those participating in terrorism directly, and those providing political, moral, or spiritual leadership. Very often, these are intertwined. In these instances, nations can be expected to mold and modify their explanations for a given killing to fit the circumstances (particularly to avoid either a domestic or international political backlash). For example, Russia's killing of senior Chechen military leaders may, on one hand, be justified in that they are indeed in command of troops in the field. On the other hand, they are also serving in senior political positions. This dual responsibility often provides the aggressor state with justification for eliminating political leaders under the pretext of eliminating a terrorist threat.

Targeted Killing at the Strategic, Operational, and Tactical Levels

It is difficult to determine at what stages and with what results targeted killing may be considered to have "worked." The value placed on the success of such a mission is wholly dependent on the expected outcome. Do the aggressors intend, with such a killing, to bring about the collapse of a given group? Or, are the goals less grand, simply with the intention of preventing a specific attack?

The answer may be more internalized, rooted in the motivations and methodologies of the terrorist group itself. Does the group seek death as part of its operational repertoire, or even as the means to an end, such as in the case of martyrdom? Or, does it endeavor to keep its operatives alive, so as to fight another day? There are three areas which must be considered here in order to fully answer this question: strategic, operational, and tactical. These issues are critical when determining whether a targeted killing can even possibly be considered successful.

Strategic

In answering the first series of questions, the preponderance of information leads to the conclusion that the targeted killing of senior leaders or individuals does not lead to the dissolution or usually even a severe degradation of that group's capabilities or intentions. This is particularly true in the case of those groups with long, established histories and large or highly motivated memberships, or a wide support base (e.g., al Qaeda, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia [FARC], or Spain's ETA).

These include terrorist groups, for example, that are seeking national identity.⁷⁵ Smaller groups, such as the Red Army Faction and the Red Brigades survived the killing and imprisonment of key leaders and continued operations for years.

To borrow a conclusion from senior RAND terrorism analyst Brian Jenkins in his commentary in *Newsday* (December 3, 2003):

The more an enterprise draws from deep roots or has a broad base, the less the effect of the death of its leader. It is not the loss of a single leader that fells a movement, but the elimination of its leadership, operational capabilities, constituency and conditions.⁷⁶

Additionally, the elimination (particularly the violent termination) of a leader, who has gained a “mythic” status among his supporters, can serve to demoralize a terrorist movement. As this mythic quality can often serve as a force multiplier in a terrorist campaign, the elimination of this element can have a strong impact. This is particularly true if the leader has previously identified himself (or is perceived by followers) to be immune to capture or death at the hands of the enemy.

Yet, these considerations do not wholly limit the potential effectiveness or applicability of targeted killing. It is likely that, less established, newly founded groups may be more susceptible to such actions. This is an important consideration when states are confronted, for example, with the phenomenon of splinter groups—smaller, usually more violent offshoots of larger, more established (and oftentimes more politically reasonable) terrorist groups. As such, splinter groups are inherently (as least in their nascent stages) not as well supported as their parent body. They are more vulnerable to eradication through the arrest or the killing of their ostensibly more radical leaders.

This is to say that such groups are ostensibly less well financed, less well supported, and more reliant on an individual or a small group for their moral guidance and operational viability. Thus, this critical node of the splinter group is a key element (likely *the* essential element) in its existence, the removal of which would likely result in its deformation and eventually dissipation.

Another, possibly more important aspect of the debate surrounding targeted killing is that it may serve as a viable tool in strategic efforts to reduce terrorism. The difference here lies not in the target selection, *per se*, but rather in the motivations and beliefs of the targeted group itself. Within those terrorist groups whose goal is not martyrdom, but rather

survival (e.g., IRA volunteers), the effects of targeted killing are much different. While Islamic extremist terrorists may seek death as a way to enter a desirable religious afterlife, and thus are not deterred by the deaths of comrades by whatever means, this is not the case with many secular groups, or groups that do not share a given belief system.

Thus, while targeted killing may not prove a disincentive to those former groups, the reality is much different among groups who seek to survive their attacks and “live to fight another day.” This difference may also complicate the efforts of those groups seeking to survive and flourish in the long run. For example, according to one former British SAS veteran with 20 years’ experience in Northern Ireland and in other conflicts, the killing of group members, particularly leaders, had a decisively negative impact on future recruiting efforts.⁷⁷ It is also possible that such elements that may be present among secular terrorists, such as the quite understandable fear of being killed, may also prove a strong disincentive in the face of a (either overt or covert) targeted killing campaign.

Operational

In an operational sense, the selective elimination of key personnel, particularly those with critical skills (i.e., bomb makers, logisticians, recruiters, financiers), is likely to have a detrimental effect on the short to mid-term operations of any terrorist group. Certainly, the larger the group, the less the impact, due to the probability of a group being able to replace that individual—or to shift another, equally qualified individual into the role of the displaced member.

Additionally, and particularly in the case of Islamic extremism, the sheer volume of potential recruits greatly reduces the overall operational impact of targeted killing. As the daily occurrence of suicide bombings in nations around the world proves, despite the number of terrorists killed in such attacks, the supply of candidates for the next day’s attacks appears limitless. This, too, affects not only the operational perspectives on targeted killing, but that of its strategic questions as well. In an environment in which the targets are ostensibly perpetual, can targeted killing truly have an impact to a significant enough level to justify its risks?

It may be argued that, when faced with a seemingly constant influx of suicide volunteers, states must nonetheless act to interdict these individuals when and where they appear, to both interrupt the flow of new recruits and to (ostensibly) preclude future attacks. The idea of inaction against such a known threat is unthinkable in a modern state. Thus, while targeted killing has only a limited impact on some terrorist groups,

it is a necessary and logical tool for use in preventing future attacks. Much like the multitude of hapless soldiers who swarmed up out of the trenches into the face of machine gun fire in World War I, the enemy had to be engaged, lest they overrun friendly forces and gain territory.

In fact, while this assessment is partly based on the author's analysis, it may be that targeted killing serves as an operational deterrent to terrorism. With the practice, at least as conducted by the United States and Israel, well known to civilians and terrorists alike, it is possible and even likely that this knowledge may force terrorists to operate in a more clandestine mode, thus hindering their operational capabilities, perhaps even reducing the number of attacks.

In some cases, even the threat of targeted killing may be sufficient to produce a positive result (i.e., the release of hostages). One example of this occurred in June 1985, when Shiite terrorists hijacked a TWA flight en route from Athens to Rome. The plane was then diverted to Beirut, Lebanon. There, the terrorists tortured several passengers, eventually executing one U.S. Navy diver and tossing his body onto the tarmac, in plain sight of international news crews.

In the days that followed, the terrorists removed the hostages from the plane and dispersed them throughout Beirut, in an effort to complicate any possible armed rescue attempt.

According to an account by former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in *Fighting Terrorism*, the office of the U.S. Secretary of State asked his advice as to how they should proceed. Netanyahu responded: "Issue a counter-threat,' I told him. 'Make it clear to the terrorists that if they so much as touch a hair on any of the hostages' heads, you won't rest until every last one of them has been hunted down and wiped out.'"⁷⁸

The Secretary's office later reported back to Netanyahu that they had acted on his advice and the results had been positive. A few weeks later, all the hostages were released unharmed. While this release was due, in part, to a previously negotiated settlement unrelated to the hijacking and subsequent kidnapping, it is possible that the counter-threat of targeted killing achieved its desired result.

Another, slightly different, example of this potential by-product of targeted killing occurred in December 1975 when two IRA terrorists, quite literally on the run from authorities, barged into an occupied apartment and took two civilian hostages. The incident ended on the sixth day when authorities announced that an SAS team had arrived on scene and was

prepared to storm the apartment.⁷⁹ In this case, the perceived threat to their lives presented by the presence of the SAS was enough to cause the terrorists to surrender.

It is important to note—there is no evidence to indicate that the intentions of the SAS team at the scene were in any way related to a predetermined course of targeted killing. It must be noted, however, that the *reputation* of the SAS as feared, ruthless killers was widely believed throughout the United Kingdom, and particularly in Northern Ireland. This mythology would play itself out over the next decade, when the SAS killed at least 28 IRA members in various confrontations.⁸⁰

Despite these potential and actual benefits, it must be noted that attempting to reduce a group's operational capabilities through targeted killing is of limited utility when posed against groups practicing advanced security measures. In *Inside Al Qaeda*, author Rohan Gunaratna identifies one crucial aspect:

To ensure al Qaeda's operational effectiveness, the group stresses the need to maintain internal security, dividing its operatives into overt and covert members functioning under a single leader...al Qaeda's global network has survived by its members strictly adhering to the principles of operational security.⁸¹

The continued "success" of al Qaeda (measured in its ability to conduct major terrorist attacks worldwide despite international efforts to eradicate it) is a testament to its members' adherence to operational security. More importantly, for purposes of this discussion, this ongoing viability is evidence of the ineffectiveness of targeted killing (as practiced by the U.S. in this case) in providing a significant detriment to the group's operational capabilities.⁸²

Tactical

Targeted killing may be said to "work" in its most obvious sense when it directly results in the thwarting of an imminent terrorist attack; the surveillance and interdiction of known, armed terrorists en route to an airport, or driving a truck laden with explosives toward a city centre, or even a lone, armed terrorist entering a subway system. All of these would likely be considered justifiable killings, and would most certainly be examples (if successfully interdicted) of the effective use of targeted killing. In this, its most elemental form, is found its most immediate and appropriate function.

One example is the SAS killing of three IRA terrorists in Gibraltar in 1988. While this case is an ongoing matter of debate as to whether the SAS soldiers involved intended to kill the IRA terrorists, this provides a concrete example of the efficacy of surveilling and intentionally engaging named terrorists known to be planning an imminent attack.

In early 1988, three known IRA terrorists traveled to Gibraltar with the purpose of planting a large explosive device in a car to target British soldiers during a changing of the guard ceremony at the governor's residence.⁸³ The SAS team was warned that the device might be detonated by a remote control in the hands of one of the terrorists. To prevent this, British and Spanish intelligence services cooperated in their efforts to surveil the trio as they traveled from Ireland to Gibraltar.

On the afternoon of March 6, a small SAS team confronted the three and, in the ensuing melee, shot all three dead. The resultant investigation (mandatory in cases of the military's use of lethal force outside a combat zone) revealed that the IRA members were all armed, though there was no bomb in the car (the device was later located in a neighboring town), and the killings were declared legal following a military tribunal. No bystanders and none of the SAS personnel were injured.

Clearly, the actions of the SAS in this case thwarted an imminent attack that almost certainly would have killed and injured numerous British soldiers and visiting tourists. This case, if in fact the order was given to kill the individuals, served to prevent an atrocity that would otherwise have taken place. Thus, in this sense, we have strong indicators that targeted killing can indeed serve as a lawful and proactive measure in combating terrorism.

On the tactical level, targeted killing has its most obvious application: stopping a terrorist before he has the opportunity to conduct an imminent attack. A sovereign state has the duty to act to protect its citizenry, and in cases where a clear and present danger exists, such as in the case of an imminent terrorist attack, targeted killing becomes a more viable option than perhaps in the preceding two categories.

When Does Targeted Killing "Fail"

As we have seen, targeted killing can have a beneficial impact on several levels for those states waging counterterrorist campaigns. However, it is equally important to analyze the numerous ways in which a policy of

targeted killing can backfire and create a host of unforeseen problems for states that engage in this type of action. Among the most important potential weaknesses of targeted killing are the possibilities of collateral damage, creating martyrs, the failure to exploit potential terrorist resources through capture rather than killing, and the possibility of negative international political repercussions.

Collateral Damage

One issue to be considered is clearly that of “collateral damage”—more specifically, the potential for loss of life among innocent bystanders at the scene of an attack. While the killing of an innocent person directly (such as the Mossad’s failed operation in Lillehammer) is indeed quite rare, the nature of terrorists, operating not from fixed bases but rather in virtually any environment, increases the likelihood of civilian exposure.⁸⁴ The potential risk is posed to those who may happen to be walking by a booby-trapped vehicle, sitting in an outdoor café next to a wanted terrorist, or merely sauntering down a city street as a missile attack is launched from a nearby helicopter.

Some notable recent examples include the following:

Date	Target	Method	Result
May 30, 2004	Wael Nassar, head of Izzedine al Qassam, Hamas’ military wing	Airstrike, Israeli Air Force	Target and bodyguard killed; one civilian killed ⁸⁵
March 22, 2004	Sheikh Ahmed Yassin	Airstrike, Israeli Air Force	Target killed; six bystanders killed, numerous injured ⁸⁶
June 10, 2003	Abdel Aziz Rantisi, Leader of Gaza-based HAMAS unit	Airstrike, Israeli Air Force	Target escaped; six civilians killed ⁸⁷
July 23, 2002	Salah al-Shahada, Hamas military leader	Airstrike, Israeli Air Force	Target killed; 14 civilians killed, 140 injured ⁸⁸
October 7, 2001	Mullah Omar, Taliban leader	Airstrike, U.S. Air Force	Target absent; two civilians killed ⁸⁹
November 9, 2000	Hussein Abayat, Fatah member	Airstrike, Israeli Air Force	Target killed; two civilians killed ⁹⁰

There are innumerable other examples like these, though usually involving lower-ranking terrorists. The fallout from collateral damage continues to plague targeted killing operations and draws greater attention to the potential for innocent loss of life. For example, on July 15, 2005, the Israeli Air Force launched a missile attack against a van as it transited a street in Gaza City, killing four HAMAS terrorists, including the bodyguard of a high-ranking group member.⁹¹ The van contained a cache of homemade rockets and explosives, which subsequently detonated, sending shards of fragmentation hundreds of yards in all directions.⁹² No bystanders were reported killed or injured, but given the nature of the cargo and the location of the van on a city street, the potential for such casualties was obvious.

The potential risk of injuring or killing bystanders, then, is clear due in no small measure to the elusive nature of the target and the terrorist's proclivity for operating in urban areas or locations otherwise crowded with civilians. Unless the preoperational intelligence is fully accurate and can verify that there are no explosives or other potentially lethal items in the possession of the terrorist, there can be no way to predict the outcome of a violent encounter. Even in the absence of the use of a vehicle, the chaotic results of a missile strike or a booby-trapped car bomb cannot be accurately and definitively predicted. In these and other scenarios, civilians are often inadvertently placed in harm's way due to the dynamic nature of hunting down and killing terrorists, whatever their location.

The Martyrdom Effect

Another potential downside to targeted killing is what, for the purposes of this discussion, is termed the "martyrdom effect." This well-known dynamic occurs when a terrorist, particularly one held in high esteem by group members and followers, is killed at the hands of security forces. This can result in the perceptual uplifting of that terrorist to near mythic status, thus inspiring followers to avenge the killing, and thereby fostering an ongoing cycle of violence. While the subject of martyrdom is sufficiently vast to fill tomes, it is beyond the scope of this paper to fully address this phenomenon. Its impact on targeted killing, however, necessitates a cursory discussion here.

As detailed earlier, even if the killing does not result in retributive attacks, it can also serve to increase (not decrease) the morale of a given group. Such events are frequently witnessed following the death of a senior group member and the ensuing mass funeral marches common throughout the Middle East. Billboards throughout the Gaza Strip and

elsewhere, for example, extol the sacrifice and bravery of suicide bombers and other terrorists who have met violent ends.

Such is the nature of terrorism today, particularly Islamic extremist terrorism, whereby martyrdom has become not just a by-product of a terrorist act, but *per se* a primary motivation for that act in itself.⁹³ This phenomenon is unlike the Irish hunger strikers of the 1970s or any of the deaths of secular terrorists in action where martyrdom was not the primary motivation for individual involvement in an action resulting in death. Such was the case with the IRA's Bobby Sands (a hunger striker whose death caused a major outpouring of sympathy and support within the Northern Ireland Republican community and elsewhere). In some cases these deaths did indeed result in their elevation to what may only be described as martyr status.

Thus, we can see that there is an important difference between the "martyrdom" of a secular terrorist (which arises primarily from respect and acknowledgment of sacrifice for a given action) and that of a religious terrorist (whose martyrdom is accepted as the final reward of his actions from a higher power). That difference is that the secular terrorist desires to live beyond the attack cycle, while the religious terrorist *seeks and expects* his death as part of the attack itself.

Killing versus Capture

Another factor that must be considered is that of the choice made by states to kill rather than capture a known terrorist. In the short term, particularly in instances of an expected imminent attack, targeted killing may be unavoidable to prevent the loss of innocent life. However, in those cases in which a terrorist or terrorists are monitored for long periods of time and do not appear to be involved in a near-term attack, their killing may not only be unnecessary but might also eliminate a potentially valuable source of intelligence.

A good example of this was the arrest of senior al Qaeda planner Khalid Sheikh Mohammad (aka KSM) in March 2003 by Pakistani police officers. It is clear from the evidence that these forces could easily have killed KSM, had they chosen to do so. Instead, recognizing the potentially vast amount of intelligence they could gather from him regarding previous and future planning for terrorist attacks, they opted to arrest rather than kill him. The resulting interrogations revealed valuable insight into al Qaeda and their global network and operations.⁹⁴

Information gleaned from the interrogation of captured terrorists can result in the capture or killing of higher-ranking group leaders, the

disruption of attack planning, interdiction of lines of communication, and a host of other related benefits.⁹⁵ Therefore, while the targeted killing of a terrorist may seem the most expedient course of action in some cases, it is clear that the termination of a person who may hold valuable information (potentially far out of proportion to his own value within an organization) could prove counterproductive when considering the prosecution of a long-term counterterrorist campaign.

Political Repercussions

The last element considered in this section is the potential for negative political repercussions. While states commonly reserve the right to self-defense, the unique nature of terrorism (namely, the likelihood that wanted terrorists may flee beyond the borders of the state) can sometimes mandate that states consider conducting operations outside their own sovereign territory. Due to the potential for overwhelming political fallout, not to mention the possibility of inciting a wider conflict with a neighbor, it is rare that a state will risk authorizing such operations.

Following Israel's killing of Sheikh Yassin, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom vociferously condemned the attack.⁹⁶ Of the major world powers, only the United States refused to condemn the attack, citing Yassin's involvement with terrorism and Israel's "right to self-defense."⁹⁷ Prominent non-governmental organizations, such as Amnesty International, also condemned the attack, stating that, "once again Israel has chosen to violate international law instead of using alternative lawful means" and that "the assassination of Sheikh Yassin is likely to further escalate the spiral of violence."⁹⁸

To further compound Israel's public "black eye," the Algerian government on March 23, one day after the attack, sponsored a draft resolution in the UNSC condemning Israel for its actions. Eleven members of the UNSC voted in favor, three abstained, though the United States ultimately quashed the resolution by exercising its veto powers.^{99,100} This did not preclude UN Secretary General Kofi Annan from publicly condemning the attack: "Such actions are not only contrary to international law, but they do not do anything to help the search for a peaceful solution."¹⁰¹

Clearly, such overt targeted killings do not go unnoticed on the world stage. States must be willing to risk the most severe forms of international condemnation (e.g., UN resolutions, the possible risk of treaty pull-outs, economic sanctions) should they choose to pursue targeted killing as a tool in their counterterrorism arsenals.

Case Study: The 1972 Munich Olympics and the Israeli Response

Perhaps the most notable example of a targeted killing campaign that resulted in negative international repercussions was conducted by Israel following the 1972 Munich Olympics. This case study provides an example of the potentially disastrous consequences when states partake in unilateral actions (particularly prolonged actions) against perceived or known individual terrorist threats. While a detailed examination of the Black September operation and the complex events surrounding it are beyond the scope of this paper, the relevance of this particular event merits special attention here, and for that reason, will be discussed in greater detail than in the previously outlined case studies.

In September 1972, a team of eight heavily armed terrorists from the pro-Palestinian group Black September attacked an apartment block housing Israeli athletes in Munich, Germany.¹⁰² In the resulting action, the terrorists killed two athletes outright, and took nine hostages. Protracted negotiations ensued, involving representatives from numerous countries, including Egypt, Germany, and Israel. During this time, the entire event was televised worldwide to an audience of hundreds of millions—thus granting the terrorists the audience they so greatly desired.

These negotiations resulted in an agreement by which the terrorists would be granted safe passage out of Germany. However, upon arrival at the airport, German police opened fire. In the ensuing gun battle, all Israeli hostages, five of the eight terrorists, and one German policeman were killed. Three of the terrorists were taken into custody, though soon released, when Palestinian terrorists hijacked a Lufthansa flight and demanded their safe return of their imprisoned comrades.¹⁰³

In the aftermath of the attack, senior Israeli officials (including Prime Minister Golda Meir) decided to form a covert action team to track down and kill those individuals who participated and planned the operation. The team was given permission to operate worldwide in its efforts to fulfill its mission. The operatives were selected from both the military special forces and intelligence (Mossad) communities and hand picked for their ability to operate covertly and their willingness to undertake missions resulting in the targeted killing of their prey. Among these were personnel from the elite Sayeret Matkal counterterrorism unit, equivalent in the West to Great Britain's SAS and Russia's Spetsnaz ("spetsialnoye nazranie," or "special purpose troops").

It is indeed rare for a state to sanction official targeted killing teams with a global mission. It is rarer still for this sanction to come from the highest level of a state government.¹⁰⁴ Such was the sentiment in Israel at the time, the public bursting with outrage over the atrocity, that Meir recognized that the actions of Black September could not go unanswered. “We will smite them wherever they may be,” she stated in an address to the Knesset soon after the attack.¹⁰⁵

In the months that followed, the Israeli team hunted down and killed numerous members of Black September around the world, in Lebanon, Italy, and France. It was in Norway, however, that the Israeli operation unraveled. In the mistaken belief that it had tracked down one of its most wanted terrorists, Ali Hassan Salameh, a small team of Mossad operators gunned down an individual on a public street in Lillehammer, Norway. The dead man turned out not to be Salameh, but rather Ahmed Bouchiki, a Moroccan waiter who was returning from a cinema with his pregnant wife. Simon Reeve, in *One Day in September*, describes the shooting and the events that followed as “one of the greatest disasters in the history of the Mossad.”¹⁰⁶

Norwegian authorities soon arrested many of the team who had participated in the incident, some of whom were later sentenced to prison terms. Their confessions led to arrests in France, a public trial in Norway, and worse for the leadership in Tel Aviv, exposure of Israel’s blatant disregard for national borders and outrage at conducting an illegal targeted killing on foreign soil.

In the end, the retaliatory missions launched by Israel did eventually result in the deaths of most Black September terrorists involved in the Munich massacre; the killings were conducted in secrecy and with plausible deniability to distance Israel from the actions. However, the Lillehammer disaster not only exposed Israel’s secret intelligence network to public scrutiny, but more importantly prompted deterioration in its international prestige, leading to significant political fallout.

Conclusions

Targeted killing has always been and will remain a double-edged sword. While states may need or choose to eliminate known or perceived threats posed by individuals, the risks, as stated previously, can be immense. There are a number of important conclusions we can draw from the

arguments and case studies cited in this paper. First, the practice of targeted killing will continue into the foreseeable future, with states prepared to risk political capital and collateral damage in order to enforce their perceptions of self-defense. Second, this practice will remain controversial in the legal battlefields of the UN, The Hague, and in other centers of international legal order and debate. It remains for each individual state to decide if the risks of targeted killing are worth the rewards.

On a more practical level, however, it appears that targeted killing, as a tool of counterterrorism, is a weapon of only limited strategic utility. There is little evidence to indicate that the killing of a specific individual, no matter how high ranking, will have a lasting impact on that group's ability and willingness to continue to wage a terrorist campaign. This is particularly true for those groups with widely shared ideologies and characteristics, long operational histories, and a wide member and support bases. Conversely, it must be stated, targeted killing may be more effective when employed against smaller groups or those less well established and more reliant on a single leader or leaders for their ongoing operations.

Targeted killing does, on the other hand, offer states a method of dealing tactical and operational blows against terrorist targets. This is particularly true in the case of interdicting terrorists known to be preparing or undertaking an imminent terrorist attack. Additionally, the elimination of terrorists who contribute specific and hard-to-replace skills may also impact groups in the short to medium term.

At best, the results of state campaigns of targeted killing have been mixed. In some cases, it is certain that the elimination of individuals has prevented pending and future attacks. In other cases, this tool appears to have been used in a preventative sense—eliminating individuals involved with terrorism (e.g., the SAS ambush at Loughall), but with no evidence to indicate that they represent a clear and present threat (Sheik Yassin).

Clearly, terrorism presents states with security challenges that differ greatly from those posed by conventional warfare. States have been forced to adapt to these challenges. This has involved the modification of existing laws, the creation of new laws, the development and deployment of specialized military and security units, as well as new technologies designed to assist these forces. Equally as controversial as some of these

adaptations has been the adoption of contentious and politically risky policies that hinge on the already debatable concepts of anticipatory self-defense and preemption.

As we have seen, the majority of states have not chosen to appeal to the UN for justification in defending themselves from terrorism (at least not on a case by case basis, and certainly not in terms of seeking permission) in those cases in which targeted killing was applied. States have, instead, chosen to allow vague guidelines, such as citing Article 51, to justify their offensive counterterrorist campaigns. This vagueness permits states to operate in a grey world in which they are able to cross national boundaries, both in terms of sovereign borders and international agreements. In the final analysis, it is interesting to note that Israel, the most prolific and experienced practitioner of targeted killing, is the only state known to have made an official effort to set out the conditions in which its military may conduct such operations.¹⁰⁷

However, as already noted, the ongoing terrorist quest for methods of attack that will cause mass casualties may alter the landscape on which we have to date viewed targeted killing. So to many, the fear of terrorists flying a jetliner into a nuclear power plant or chemical farm causes justifiable concern. As the potential risk of massive loss of life at the hands of even one terrorist becomes more realistic, it is likely that states will adopt more flexible approaches to self-defense. Targeted killing, still considered an internationally debatable method of preemptive action, may become less of an ill-thought of arm of counterterrorism, and more valued as a potentially efficient and effective method of self-defense.

Inevitably, states will still have to consider the immeasurable and innumerable possible consequences of embarking on even a single targeted killing operation due to the reasons cited earlier, namely the potential for collateral damage, martyrdom, and political fallout. It is this debate—the risk versus the reward—that states will have to consider as they seek new and potentially controversial methods to defend themselves from the specter of terrorism or opt to continue their agenda of targeted killing.

Appendix A

Selected International Incidents of Targeted Killing: 1973–2004

Date	Primary Target(s)	Method	Location	Perpetrator ¹⁰⁸	Result
April 17, 2004	Abd al-Aziz al-Rantisi, successor to Sheikh Yassin	IAF Apache helicopter using guided missiles	Gaza City	Israel ¹⁰⁹	Target killed
March 22, 2004	Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, HAMAS spiritual leader	IAF Apache helicopter using guided missiles	Gaza City	Israel ¹¹⁰	Target killed, seven others killed, more than 20 injured
February 13, 2004	Zelimkhan Yanderbiyev, former Chechen president	Booby-trapped car	Qatar	Russia ¹¹¹	Target killed, along with two bodyguards
November 3, 2002	Qaed Senyan al-Harithi, al Qaeda senior operative	U.S. Predator drone, equipped with guided missiles	Yemen	United States ¹¹²	Target killed, along with five passengers
March 19, 2002	Chechen warlord Omar Ibn al-Khattab	Letter impregnated with unidentified poison	Chechnya	Russia, via Federal Security Service (FSB) ¹¹³	Target killed
October 18, 2001	Atef Abayat, senior member of al-Aqsa Martyrs' Brigade	Booby-trapped car	Israel, near Bethlehem	Israel ¹¹⁴	Target killed, along with two passengers
April 21, 1996	Chechen warlord Dzhokhar Dudayev	Guided missile ¹¹⁵	Chechnya	Russia ¹¹⁶	Target killed

Date	Primary Target(s)	Method	Location	Perpetrator ¹⁰⁸	Result
March 7, 1988	Three members of the IRA	Small arms	Gibraltar, UK	UK, via Special Air Service (SAS) ¹¹⁷	All three targets killed
May 8, 1987	Eight members of the IRA	Small arms	Loughall, Northern Ireland	UK, via Special Air Service (SAS) ¹¹⁸	All eight targets killed
April 10, 1973	Yusuf al-Najjar, head of Fatah intelligence arm;	Clandestine commando operations	Beirut, Lebanon	Israel ¹¹⁹	All targets killed

Endnotes

- 1 See Gal Luft, “The Logic of Israel’s Targeted Killing,” *Middle East Quarterly*, Winter 2003, Volume X, Number 1.
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 David Tucker, “Counterterrorism and the Perils of Preemption Problems and Command and Control,” in Betty Glad and Chris Dolan (eds.), *Striking First: The Preventative War Doctrine and the Reshaping of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004), pgs. 75–89.
- 4 See, for example, Murray Clark Havens, et al, *The Politics of Assassination* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), pgs. 2–6.
- 5 Edward Hyams, *Killing No Murder: A Study of Assassination as a Political Means* (Great Britain: Panther Modern Society, 1970), pgs. 39–46.
- 6 Despite the modern acceptance that the term “assassin” was derived from the Ismaili sect as cited previously, the author would like to note that there is considerable modern debate as to the legitimacy of assigning the heritage of the term “assassin” to the Ismaili sect. The primary argument against this is well summarized by Farhad Daftary in *The Assassin Legends: Myths of the Isma’ilis* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1994). In this work, Daftary attributes the misnomer to a convoluted progression of misunderstanding and mistranslation. According to Daftary, “The western tradition of calling the Nizari Isma’ilis by the name of Assassins can be traced to the Crusaders and their Latin chroniclers as well as other occidental observers...the name, or more appropriately misnomer, Assassin, which was originally derived under obscure circumstances from variants of the word hashish, the Arabic name for a narcotic product, and which later became the common occidental term for designating the Nizari Isma’ilis, soon acquired a new meaning in European languages; it was adopted as a common noun meaning murderer.”

While a complete understanding of this new look into the origins of the term assassin is beyond the scope of this paper, the author wishes to acknowledge the ongoing debate as to the proper assignment of the term.

- 7 The author acknowledges here that the caveat of asymmetric warfare, versus conventional warfare, is essential. In large part, historic kingdoms and states were largely threatened only by parties of roughly equal size and makeup. This is to say, more simply, the primary method of warfare has been state versus state rather than today's more ambiguous threats from individuals and small groups. Therefore, the concept of self-defense was one thought of primarily in those terms (see the cited example of Israel prior to the Six Day War). It is for this reason, clearly, that the concept of targeted killing has only recently entered the lexicon and arena of academic and political discussion.
- 8 As cited by Steven R. David in his paper "Israel's Policy of Targeted Killing," in *Ethics and International Affairs: 2003* (Vol. 17, No. 1), "there is no established norm against targeted killing, but there is against assassination." (pg. 115). Mr. David provides an excellent assessment of this differentiation in this paper as well (see pgs. 112–116).
- 9 Ward Thomas, *The Ethics of Destruction: Norms and Force in International Relations* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2001), pgs. 47–85.
- 10 The specific prohibition on assassination is found in Executive Order 12333, Parts 2.11 and 2.12. The verbatim text demonstrates the clear guidance: "2.11 *Prohibition on assassination*. No person employed by or acting on behalf of the United States Government shall engage in, or conspire to engage in, assassination. 2.12 *Indirect participation*. No agency of the Intelligence Community shall participate in or request any person to undertake activities forbidden by this order." Notable, for purposes of this discussion, is the lack of any definition of assassination in EO 12333, which, it could be argued, leaves the legal guidance vague enough to make targeted killing a viable tool of statecraft. See <http://www.tinyurl.com/cqydm> (<http://www.cia.gov/cia/information/eo12333.html>)
- 11 In 1970, the U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Government Operations released its report entitled "Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders." This report concluded that the United States was involved in the killings of foreign political leaders, and took part in plans for further such killings. Individuals cited as actual or potential targets included Cuban President Fidel Castro, Dominican leader Rafael Trujillo, and South Vietnamese President Ngo Dinh Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu. See *Alleged Assassination Plots Involving Foreign Leaders* (Amsterdam: Fredonia Books, 2001). This document can also be found online in numerous locations, including <http://www.tinyurl.com/c8fozo> (<http://www.aarclibrary.org/publib/church/reports/ir/contents.htm>).
- 12 The author was able to discover at least one U.S. military paper that recommended that selective assassination should be further studied as a possible option for the U.S. government. See "Selective Assassination as an Instrument of National Policy," (Washington: Loompanics Unlimited, 1990). The author of this study was described as a U.S. Air Force captain, though his name and the ultimate purpose of

this study remain unknown. It is the author's opinion that this study was the result of an academic program, possibly undertaken at one of the national war colleges.

- 13 David Rodin, *War & Self-Defense* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), pg. 189.
- 14 Rodin, pg. 190.
- 15 In August 1998, the Clinton Administration authorized cruise missile strikes against a number of targets in Afghanistan and Sudan. These strikes were carried out partly in retaliation for the earlier terrorist suicide bombings of U.S. Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania. The president later stated that there was "compelling information they were planning additional terrorist attacks against our citizens and others with the inevitable collateral casualties and ... seeking to acquire chemical weapons and other dangerous weapons." <http://www.tinyurl.com/r9pl> (<http://www.cnn.com/US/9808/20/us.strikes.01/>)
- 16 <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/chapter7.htm>
- 17 The author acknowledges here that, in the case of self-defense, states are more likely to act without deferring to the UNSC based on their perception that the threat posed against them is of sufficient concern. This is to say that states will act to ensure their survival, rather than defer to any international body for approval on a course of action.
- 18 Thomas Franck, *Recourse to Force: State Action Against Threats and Armed Attacks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), pgs. 97–108.
- 19 Eric Hammel, *Six Days in June: How Israel Won the 1967 Arab-Israeli War* (New York: iBooks, inc., 1992), pgs. 165–171.
- 20 The evidence which led Israel to war included reconnaissance of enemy positions, observations of troop buildups, belligerent talk from enemy leaders (most notably Egyptian president Gamal Nasser), and other obvious indicators. Perhaps most important and provocative among these, however, was the closure of the Straits of Tiran, which effectively blockaded the politically important Israeli port of Eilat—one of the primary reasons Israel went to war with Egypt in 1956. See Hammel, pgs. 33–37 and 40–42.
- 21 UN Security Council Resolution 487 (1981). <http://www.tinyurl.com/c58okx> (<http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NRO/418/74/IMG/NRO41874.pdf?OpenElement>)
- 22 A/RES/37/18, November 18, 1982, <http://www.tinyurl.com/djhsj5> (<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/37/a37r018.htm>)
- 23 Franck, pg. 96.
- 24 A review of the historical literature reveals many discussions and instances of senior military officers refusing to consider the targeted killing of their counterparts in battle. For example, according to one interesting anecdote, the following exchange took place between the Duke of Wellington and a nearby English artilleryman. Upon seeing French general Napoleon Bonaparte across the field of battle, the artilleryman exclaimed, "There's Bonaparte, sir. I think I can reach him. May I fire?" The Duke, aghast at the suggestion, replied, "No, no. Generals

commanding armies have something else to do than shoot at one another.” See Elizabeth Longford, *Wellington: The Years of the Sword* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), pg. 472.

- 25 Geoffrey Bennett, *The Battle of Trafalgar* (Great Britain: Pen & Sword Military Classics, 2004), pgs 205–210.
- 26 Whether Admiral Lord Nelson was intentionally singled out as a target prior to or during the battle of Trafalgar is a matter of ongoing debate, though it appears that he may have been targeted once identified by the enemy. According to one account, found in the memoirs of a French sharpshooter who claimed to have fired the fatal shot, “On the poop (deck) of the English vessel was an officer covered with orders and with only one arm. From what I had heard of Nelson, I had no doubt that it was he.” See Geoffrey Bennett, *The Battle of Trafalgar* (Great Britain: Pen & Sword Military Classics, 2004), pg.206. The author could find no credible evidence that the French had given orders for the purposeful killing of Nelson prior to the engagement and his death appears to have been the legitimate outcome of open warfare at sea. It should also be noted that at least one modern study of Trafalgar concluded that Nelson was killed by a stray or ricocheted bullet. See Roy Adkins, *Trafalgar: The Biography of a Battle* (Great Britain: Little, Brown, 2004), pg. 206.
- 27 For an excellent accounting of the failed British attempt to kill Rommel, see Michael Asher, *Get Rommel: The Secret British Mission to Kill Hitler’s Greatest General* (London: The Orion Publishing Group Ltd., 2004).
- 28 For a detailed accounting of this operation, the author recommends Callum MacDonald, *The Killing of SS Obergurppenfuhrer Reinhard Heydrich* (London: Macmillan, 1990).
- 29 Mike Ryan, *Special Operations in Iraq* (Great Britain: Pen & Sword Military, 2004), pgs. 42–46.
- 30 There is some debate as to whether President Roosevelt himself approved the ambush, though at least two authors have cited messages obtained during their research that appear to verify this claim. It is clear, however, that senior U.S. military commanders approved this mission, to include Admiral Chester Nimitz, commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet. See, for example, Carroll V. Glines, *Attack on Yamamoto* (New York: Orion Books, 1990), pgs. 1–12.
- 31 See Article 37 as found in the “Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol 1 Adopted on June 8, 1977 by the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law applicable in Armed Conflicts.” <http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/93.htm>
- 32 While the perpetrators were not military personnel, but rather that of an Allied intelligence agency, they were under the operational control of the British military and, as such, their conduct was clearly in violation of the Geneva Convention protocols against the use of perfidy.
- 33 See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/israel/Story/0,2763,1202273,00.html> and http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/english/doc/2004-04/24/content_325957.htm

- 34 The incident referred to here occurred on April 5, 1986 when terrorists detonated a two-kilogram improvised explosive device (IED). The resulting blast and fire killed two U.S. servicemen and a Turkish woman and was subsequently cited as the tripwire that brought about Operation El Dorado Canyon. <http://www.tinyurl.com/danao> (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/1653848.stm>)
- 35 David B. Cohen, "Revisiting El Dorado Canyon," *White House Studies*, Spring 2005, p. 21. http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0KVD/is_2_5/ai_n16107461/pg_21
- 36 <http://edition.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/africa/09/20/libya.sanctions/>
- 37 See, for example, Major Ralph J. Jodice III, USAF, "El Dorado Canyon: Strategic Strike, National Objectives," Command and Staff College, 1990; and Walter Boyne, "El Dorado Canyon," *Air Force: Journal of the Air Force Association*, March 1999, Vol. 82, No. 3.
- 38 A "dirty bomb" is a mix of explosives, such as dynamite or semtex, with radioactive powder or pellets. When the dynamite or other explosives are set off, the blast carries radioactive material into the surrounding area. A dirty bomb cannot create an atomic blast, but rather works by disseminating radiological material throughout a given area.
- 39 The U.S.-based Centers for Disease Control (CDC) provide an exhaustive list of such agents, including detailed information on many biological agents that maybe used by terrorists. <http://www.bt.cdc.gov/agent/agentlist.asp>
- 40 <http://www.bt.cdc.gov/agent/agentlistchem-category.asp>
- 41 Walter Laquer, *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pg. 4.
- 42 See, for example, U.S. Congressional Research Service report "Nuclear Power Plants: Vulnerability to Terrorist Attack," dated February 4, 2005. <http://www.tinyurl.com/cfqv7a> (<http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RS21131.pdf>)
- 43 In 1986, RAND analyst Bruce Hoffman released an unclassified report entitled "Terrorism in the United States and the Potential Threat to Nuclear Facilities" (Santa Monica: RAND, 1986) on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy. This report highlighted many of the same concerns that confronted security officials in the months following 9/11.
- 44 For the purposes of this paper, antiterrorism reflects more passive measures such as education, surveillance, liaison training, and advising; counterterrorism refers to offensive measures to prevent and deter terrorism with active interdiction such as targeting and elimination.
- 45 It should be noted that some deaths involving Palestinian militants, while appearing to be the work of the Israeli government, are sometimes perpetrated by dissident or warring internal factions of the Palestinian liberation movement.

- 46 For further information on Israeli assassination and targeting killing involving the Mossad and other special units, see Gordon Thomas, *Gideon's Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad* (Thomas Dune Press, 1999) and Alexander Calahan, "Countering Terrorism: The Israeli Response to the 1972 Munich Olympic Massacre and the Development of Independent Covert Action Teams" (Marine Corps Command and General Staff College, April 1995).
- 47 Thomas B. Hunter, "The Other SAS: The CIA's Special Activities Staff," *Jane's Intelligence Review*, June 1999, pgs. 52–54.
- 48 This debate is highlighted in *Ethics and International Affairs: 2003*, Vol. 17, No. 1. Papers of interest in this volume include Steven R. David, "Israel's Policy of Targeted Killing," (pgs.111–126) and the response to this paper by Yael Stein, "By Any Name Illegal and Immoral," (pgs. 127–139). The author also recommends the critical discussion of the Israeli policy by Michael L. Gross, "Fighting by Other Means in the Mideast: A Critical Analysis of Israel's Assassination Policy," *Political Studies: 2003*, Vol. 51, pgs. 350–368.
- 49 Amos Harel and Gideon Alon, "IDF Lawyers Set 'Conditions' For Assassination Policy," February 4, 2002. <http://www.tinyurl.com/dxl28p> (<http://www.haaretz-daily.com/hasen/pages/ShArt.jhtml?itemNo = 125404>)
- 50 Richard Sale, "Israel to Kill in U.S., Allied Nations," UPI.com, <http://www.tinyurl.com/dfj3u> (<http://www.upi.com/view.cfm?StoryID = 20030115-035849-6156r>)
- 51 The most notable case involving Israeli targeted killings across international borders occurred after the massacre of Israeli athletes in Munich during the 1972 Olympic Games. In the days following the attack, the Israeli government met secretly to decide on a course of action to respond to these events. The conclusion of this meeting led to a covert campaign to track down and kill each member of the Black September Organization responsible for planning or participating in the attack. The ensuing campaign led the Mossad hit team to various countries around the world in their pursuit, to include the accidental killing of a civilian in Norway (for which the agents were arrested). In this case, it can be argued that Israel was pursuing an act of self-defense, in eliminating individuals known to have taken part in the planning or execution of terrorist activities against the state. However, it is also reasonable to assume that Israel had ulterior motives in its action: intimidation and revenge. The subsequent hunt for and killing of the Munich Olympics terrorists no doubt caused those who had played a part in the massacre to feel their own sense of terror, in that they had become the hunted rather than the hunter. It also demonstrated to the world that Israel was willing to cross borders and patiently seek out anyone who it felt represented a terrorist threat to the state, though this did ultimately, have negative international repercussions.
- 52 <http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/rosenberg200403221459.asp>
- 53 http://www.info-france-usa.org/news/statmnts/2004/yassin_032204.asp
- 54 CNN.com, "Source: Israel to end targeted killings," February 4, 2005. <http://edition.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/meast/02/03/mideast/>

- 55 Benjamin Netanyahu, *Fighting Terrorism: How Democracies Can Defeat the International Terrorist Network* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001), pgs. 67–68.
- 56 Benjamin Netanyahu, *Terrorism: How the West Can Win* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1986), pgs. 16–17.
- 57 This should not be construed to mean that the United States has never envisioned a preemptive policy against terrorism. Benjamin Netanyahu, in his book *Fighting Terrorism* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2001) that then-Secretary of State George Shultz stated at a conference on counterterrorism that, “It is time to think long, hard, and seriously about more active means of defense—defense through appropriate preventive or preemptive actions against terrorist groups before they strike.” (pg. 69)
- 58 For an in-depth analysis of U.S. foreign policy under the Bush Administration, see Betty Glad and Chris J. Dolan, *Striking First* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- 59 The full text of this speech can be found at the official White House website (<http://www.whitehouse.gov>). See specifically <http://www.tinyurl.com/3x5mm> (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>)
- 60 Numerous reports indicate that the United States attempted to kill Taliban leader Mullah Omar using a Predator UAV equipped with guided missiles. The attack succeeded in destroying a number of vehicles, but Mullah Omar was apparently in a nearby building at the time of the attack, safe from the explosion.
- 61 Publicly available information indicates that the “Secretary of State may offer rewards of up to \$5 million for information that prevents or favorably resolves acts of international terrorism against U.S. persons or property worldwide.” The *Rewards for Justice* Web site (<http://www.rewardsforjustice.net/>) indicates that rewards were paid for information leading to the location of Qusay and Uday Hussein, who were subsequently killed by U.S. military forces (ostensibly as a direct result of the provision of this information). While perhaps not wanted for their involvement in terrorism, this evidence indicated that the United States is willing to use such information for purposes of locating and killing specific individuals. It is clear from this example and from this assessment that the purposefully vague language “information that prevents or favorably resolves acts of international terrorism” leaves the legal door open for U.S. use of this information for purposes of targeted killing. This assessment should not be construed to indicate that the sole purpose of the rewards program is to provide intelligence to facilitate killings. The program has indeed resulted in the successful arrests and convictions of numerous high profile terrorists, such as Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, Ramzi Yousef, and Mir Amal Kansi. It may be interesting to note that the capture and subsequent conviction of Kansi resulted in his execution on November 14, 2002.
- 62 Walter Pincus, “U.S. Strike Kills Six in al Qaeda,” *Washington Post*, pg. A1, November 6, 2002. This article can also be found online at <http://www.tinyurl.com/cesg3s> (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename = article&node = &contentId = A5126-2002Nov4¬Found = true>)

- 63 Department of Defense News Briefing, November 4, 2004.
http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/2002/t11042002_t1104sd.html
- 64 The USS Cole, a U.S. Navy destroyer, was heavily damaged during an al Qaeda suicide boat attack on October 12, 2000, in the Yemeni port of Aden. The attack killed seventeen American sailors and injured thirty-nine.
- 65 These verbatim quotes were drawn from an actual Yellow Card obtained by the author during the course of research for this paper.
- 66 Mark Urban, *Big Boys Rules* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1993), pg. 164.
- 67 For a detailed accounting of the Loughall incident, see Mark Urban, *Big Boys Rules* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1993), pgs. 224–237.
- 68 IRA terrorists frequently stole weapons from police facilities in order to augment their own supplies of small arms. Forensic examinations of the weapons used by the IRA at Loughall revealed that they had been used previously in the murders of policemen and soldiers.
- 69 Urban, pg. 228.
- 70 Urban, pg. 232.
- 71 European Court of Human Rights, “Subject—Matter of Judgments Delivered by the Court in 2001,” pg. 23. Cases cited: No. 24746/95, No. 28883/95, No.30054/96, and No. 37715/97. <http://www.tinyurl.com/d3wkmb>
(http://www.echr.coe.int/Eng/EDocs/SUBJECT_MATTER_2001_TABLE.pdf)
- 72 Ibid.
- 73 This argument does not discount the myriad difficulties that authorities likely would have encountered had they tried to arrest the terrorists. It is highly unlikely that all eight IRA men would have been in the same location. Indeed, available information indicates that at least some of the terrorists were living in the Republic of Ireland in the days leading up to the attack. Thus, effecting their arrests would have posed considerable difficulty. Moreover, the police did not know exactly who would carry out the attack until the time of the attack itself.
- 74 In fact, it may be argued that a police or military force that fails to interdict such an individual would be delinquent in its duties. Such was the case in the 1983 terrorist bombing of the U.S. Marine Barracks in Lebanon, in which 243 U.S. personnel were killed.
- 75 David E. Long, *The Anatomy of Terrorism* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), pgs. 29–64.
- 76 <http://www.rand.org/commentary/120303ND.html>
- 77 Author interview, retired 22 SAS operative. July 15, 2005.
- 78 Netanyahu, pg. 71.
- 79 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/315216.stm>
- 80 See Mark Urban, *Big Boys Rules* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1993).

- 81 Rohan Gunaratna, *Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror* (United Kingdom: C. Hursts & Co. Ltd., 2002), pgs. 78–79.
- 82 The author acknowledges here that al Qaeda is no longer a monolithic organization, such as it may have been described prior to 9/11 and the international military offensive that drove it from its bases in Afghanistan. Today, al Qaeda is a loose-knit consortium of like-minded Islamic extremists who, though in disparate locations and without a central command and control network, continue to observe these guidelines for operational security.
- 83 There have been numerous articles, books, and documentaries published that describe the Gibraltar incident in detail. See, for example, “Death on the Rock,” a documentary produced for ITV in Great Britain. Further information on this excellent program can be found here: <http://www.tinyurl.com/4yccf> (<http://www.museum.tv/archives/etv/D/htmlD/deathonthe/deathonthe.htm>)
- 84 For example, in a paper published in 2003, Steven R. David, Professor of Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University, noted that between the start of the second *intifadah* in 2000 and the fall of 2002, some twenty Palestinian militants had been killed, though these attacks had claimed the lives of an estimated fifty innocent bystanders. See Steven R. David, “Israel’s Policy of Targeted Killing,” *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 2003, pg. 111.
- 85 <http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/05/29/mideast/index.html>
- 86 <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2004/03/22/world/main607747.shtml>
- 87 <http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/04/19/un.rantisi/index.html>;
<http://www.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/04/17/mideast.violence/index.html>
- 88 <http://archives.cnn.com/2002/WORLD/meast/07/23/mideast/>
- 89 <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/central/11/28/ret.omar.attack/>
- 90 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1017534.stm
- 91 The author recognizes here that this incident may not have been a targeted killing, in that it is not known if they were seeking to eliminate a specific individual. The example is used primarily to highlight the innumerable variables present in conducting limited military strikes against specific targets and the potential for unexpected consequences (i.e., the exploding rockets).
- 92 “Israeli Airstrike on Hamas Van Kills Four,” Associated Press, July 15, 2005.
<http://www.tinyurl.com/cypyuw> (http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20050715/ap_on_re_mi_ea/israel_palestinians_10;_ylt=AreByz8qMA3q4HDpGNR7docUvioA;_ylu=X3oDMTBiMWo4NW9mBHNIYwMlJVRPUCU1)
- 93 *The Economist*, “Martyrdom and Murder,” January 8, 2004.
http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm?story_id=2329785
- 94 <http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/ksm.htm>
- 95 A salient example of this occurred in Algeria during the insurgency that occurred between 1954 and 1962. While at first struggling against the Algerian insurgency,

the establishment of a robust intelligence organization (Centre de Coordination Interarmees) soon resulted in the arrests and interrogations of thousands of individuals, some of whom were actively involved in acts of terrorism against the French presence there. The intelligence gained from some of these interrogations resulted in effective and efficient action against the insurgents and their supporters. See Peter Harlcerode, *Fighting Dirty* (London: Cassell & Co., 2001), pgs. 211–268.

- 96 The Times Online, “World leaders condemn Yassin assassination,” March 22, 2004, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,1-1047221,00.html>; CNN.com, “Leaders condemn Yassin killing,” March 23, 2004, <http://www.tinyurl.com/cvua5d> (<http://edition.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/03/22/hamas.reaction/>; EUBusiness.com), “EU ministers condemn Yassin ‘assassination’,” March 22, 2004, <http://www.eubusiness.com/afp/040322122424.socccfav>.
- 97 White House Press Briefing, March 22, 2004. <http://www.tinyurl.com/2lj4g> (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/03/20040322-4.html>)
- 98 Amnesty International press release, “Israel/Occupied Territories: Amnesty International strongly condemns the assassination of Sheikh Yassin,” March 22, 2004. <http://www.tinyurl.com/dnca74> (<http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGMD150292004?open&of=ENG-PSE>)
- 99 United Nations Press Release, SC/8039, March 25, 2004. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2004/sc8039.doc.htm>
- 100 Associated Press, March 23, 2004, “U.S. Vetoes U.N. Resolution Condemning Killing of HAMAS Leader Yassin,” <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,115242,00.html>.
- 101 <http://www.un.org/apps/sg/offthecuff.asp?nid=564>
- 102 For more thorough recounting of the attack and the ensuing Israeli program of targeted killing “Operation Wrath of God,” please see Simon Reeve, *One Day in September* (England: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2000) and Alexander Calahan, “Countering Terrorism: The Israeli Response to the 1972 Munich Olympic Massacre and the Development of Independent Covert Action Teams,” (Marine Corps Command and General Staff College, April 1995).
- 103 Reeve, pgs. 183–186.
- 104 It is worth noting, also, that Meir herself signed the death warrants for those involved in planning or perpetrating the attacks. See Reeve, pg. 192 and Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990), pg. 179.
- 105 Reeve, pg. 180.
- 106 Reeve, pg. 229.
- 107 It is further interesting to note that this codification took place only after decades of the ‘unregulated’ practice of targeted killing, and just two years before the policy was redacted by the Israeli government.
- 108 Due to the clandestine nature of many targeted killings, the actual perpetrators of the attack often does not claim direct credit. Thus, the author endeavored to

determine the author of the attack in the cases cited in Appendix A, through press reporting and the available literature.

- 109 http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3635755.stm
- 110 <http://edition.cnn.com/2004/WORLD/meast/03/21/yassin/>
- 111 <http://www.jamestown.org/terrorism/news/article.php?articleid=2368259>
- 112 <http://www.tinyurl.com/cy87mj> (<http://www.theage.com.au/articles/2002/11/05/1036308311314.html?oneclick=true>)
- 113 <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1952053.stm>
- 114 <http://www.tkb.org/KeyLeader.jsp?memID=6282>
- 115 The missile that killed Dudayev was reportedly fired after his location was pinpointed during his use of a satellite phone. Russian signals intelligence (SIGINT) reportedly intercepted the phone call and passed the coordinates to a Russian missile unit kilometers away, which then engaged the target. See Michal Fiszer, Jerzy Gruszczynski, "Bolt from the blue: Russian land-based precision-strike missiles," *Journal of Electronic Defense*, March 1, 2003.
- 116 http://www.amina.com/article/did_nsa.html
- 117 <http://www.tinyurl.com/h3zub> (http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/september/30/newsid_2542000/2542719.stm)
- 118 http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/talking_point/forum/760385.stm
- 119 <http://www.fas.org/irp/eprint/calahan.htm>

Selected Bibliography

Adkins, Roy, *Trafalgar: The Biography of a Battle* (Great Britain: Little, Brown, 2004).

Bennett, Geoffrey, *The Battle of Trafalgar* (Great Britain: Pen & Sword Military Classics, 2004).

Buckley, Mary, and Fawn, Rick, *Global Responses to Terrorism* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Clausewitz, Carl von, *On War* (Great Britain: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 1997).

Conboy, Kenneth, *Shadow War: The CIA's Secret War in Laos* (USA: Paladin Press, 1995).

Connor, Ken, *Ghost Force: The Secret History of the SAS* (London: Cassell, 1998).

Corbin, Jane, *The Base: Al Qaeda and the Changing Face of Global Terror* (Great Britain: Simon and Schuster UK Ltd, 2003).

Daftary, Farhad, *The Assassin Legends: Myths of the Isma'ilis* (London: I.B. Tauris, 1994).

Dinstein, Yoram, *War, Aggression, and Self-Defense* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Franck, Thomas, *Recourse to Force: State Action Against Threats and Armed Attacks* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Freedman, Lawrence, *Deterrence* (UK: Polity Press, 2004).

Glad, Betty and Dolan, Chris (eds.), *Striking First: The Preventative War Doctrine and the Reshaping of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004).

Gunaratna, Rohan, *Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror* (London: Hurst and Company, 2002).

Hammel, Eric, *Six Days in June: How Israel Won the 1967 Arab-Israeli War* (New York: ibooks, inc., 1992).

Harclerode, Peter, *Fighting Dirty: The Inside Story of Covert Operations from Ho Chi Minh to Osama bin Ladin* (London: Cassell, 2001).

Howard, Russell D., and Sawyer, Reid L. (eds.), *Terrorism and Counterterrorism: Understanding the New Security Environment* (USA: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin, 2002).

Hyams, Edward, *Killing No Murder: A Study of Assassination as a Political Means* (Great Britain: Panther Modern Society, 1970).

Kegley, Charles W., *The New Global Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2003).

Laquer, Walter, *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Laquer, Walter, (ed.) *Voices of Terror* (Canada: Reed Press, 2004).

Levite, Ariel, *Intelligence and Strategic Surprises* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

- Long, David E., *The Anatomy of Terrorism* (New York, The Free Press, 1990).
- Longford, Elizabeth, *Wellington: The Years of the Sword* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969).
- MacDonald, Callum, *The Killing of SS Obergurppenführer Reinhard Heydrich* (London: Macmillan, 1989).
- Meir, Golda, *My Life* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1975).
- Netanyahu, Benjamin, *Fighting Terrorism* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2001).
- Netanyahu, Iddo, *Entebbe: A Defining Moment in the War on Terrorism* (USA: New Leaf Press, 2003).
- O'Sullivan, Noel (ed.), *Terrorism, Ideology, and Revolution: The Origins of Political Violence* (Colorado, USA: Westview Press, 1986).
- Ostrovsky, Peter and Hoy, Claire, *By Way of Deception* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).
- Pillar, Paul R., *Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2001).
- Pugliese, David, *Canada's Secret Commandos* (Canada: Esprit de Corps, 2002).
- Reeve, Simon, *One Day in September* (England: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2000).
- Rodin, David, *War & Self-Defense* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).
- Rowan, Brian, *Behind the Lines: The Story of the IRA and Loyalist Ceasefires* (Belfast: The Blackstaff Press Limited, 1995).
- Ryan, Mike, *Special Operations in Iraq* (Great Britain: Pen and Sword Military, 2004).
- Stevenson, William, *90 Minutes at Entebbe* (USA: Bantam Books, 1976).
- Turner, Stansfield, *Terrorism & Democracy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1991).

Wilkinson, Paul, *Terrorism: British Perspectives* (England: Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited, 1993).

Wilkinson, Paul, *Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response* (Great Britain: Frank Cass Publishing, 2005).

Author Biography

Mr. Hunter served as an intelligence officer with the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) from June 2002 to April 2007. During this time, he served in a variety of specialized analytical areas, including homeland security, detainee support, and South American narcoterrorism. While serving in the weapons branch, Mr. Hunter specialized in the analysis of terrorist tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) which included in-depth study of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and the TTP employed in their use worldwide. He earned numerous honors and awards including citations from other government agencies with whom he consulted and coordinated hundreds of finished intelligence papers. Mr. Hunter holds a master's degree in unconventional warfare from the American Military University, a master's degree in international security studies from the University of St. Andrews (Scotland) and an undergraduate degree in English and American literature from the University of Southern California.

Al-Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb

Gregory A. Smith

Preface

The devastating terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 will forever resonate in the minds of Americans. The images of billowing smoke emanating from the World Trade Center and the Pentagon caused many to ask “who could do this to us?” To answer that question we must examine the past and look at the policies enacted by our government that caused a cyclic reaction within our enemy. The same is true for other governments that seek to expand their sphere of influence without examining those critical antecedents that affect the indigenous population. These disenfranchised subjects, when facing a foreign invader or apostate government, will often draw on a shared identity, be it cultural, ethnic, religious, or political, to sound the battle cry of resistance.

This paper is organized into four chapters that focus on the terrorist group *Al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb* (AQIM). The four chapters examine different facets of the collective environment that have allowed AQIM to succeed and even thrive at times. The first chapter begins with Algeria’s war of independence with the French. It focuses on how the Algerians were able to successfully isolate the French from the population through the use of terrorism. It also lays the foundation for the concept of terrorism within Algeria to further a political agenda.

The second chapter focuses on the nomadic Tuareg people. It seeks to show how the Tuaregs were deprived by French occupiers and how European colonization cost the Tuaregs access to vital trade routes used for centuries. The intent of this chapter is to briefly explain reasons for the lack of trust between the Tuaregs and foreign forces. It also seeks to show the exceptional ability to navigate the Sahara and how smuggling has become the basis of income for many Tuaregs.

The third chapter will very briefly examine Algeria’s civil war and the emergence of modern terrorist groups. It seeks to show the politicization of Islam by the government and the struggle to return the fundamental aspects. The emergence of the Groupe Islamic Armie (GIA) and the ensuing rise of the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GSPC) played a significant role in shaping the modern landscape across the

region. It will conclude with the arrival of American forces into the region and the resulting reaction.

The fourth chapter will discuss the post-9/11 world in terms of “shaping operations” for the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) and how this caused an evolution in terrorism as a reaction to actual or perceived American hegemonic ambitions. The arrival of AQIM served as a fusion point for many smaller terrorist groups and exacerbated an already difficult situation. It will examine the many facets of AQIM’s recruiting strategy of blending ethno-nationalism with religious identity to accomplish its near and far goals. It will also discuss the collaboration between the Tuaregs and AQIM on transit issues and mutual assistance against government threats.

This paper is not a compendium of every event or in any way a complete history of the region. It is intended to reinforce the author’s notion of outlying antecedents that normally coalesce around a central issue and how the addition of a political agenda can lead these antecedents toward a fusion point. When the fusion point is met, ethno-nationalist ambitions are catapulted down the road of terrorism and the fundamental message is lost in the debris of another attack. Such is the story of AQIM...

Section One: The War for Independence: A State is Born

Introduction

To understand the mindset of terrorist groups in the Maghreb, you must understand the history of struggle in the region. This chapter will briefly examine Algeria's War of Independence with France from 1954–1962 and its immediate aftermath. Many important characters are not mentioned in this chapter as they do not relate to the overall point of this paper which is the nationalist ambitions of a people, coupled with religious identity, and portrayed in the continual struggle for control. The first instance of this modern struggle occurred in Algeria following World War II. The War of Independence was a pivotal time in North African history as colonial doctrine and Islamic ambitions met head on in what would become a continual struggle in the battle of ideologies.

The War for Independence: 1954-1962

Imperialism was the order of the day until World War II. Since as long as history has been recorded, a stronger country or band of people have attempted to conquer and control the weaker. Africa was no different. With Portugal and Spain conquering the majority of the out rim of the African continent, France, Germany, and Belgium worked their way through the center. Following the Anglo-French Agreement of 1889, France was granted significant influence over an area from the African coast to Niger River.¹ Much of this area would be known as French West Africa. This agreement gave France considerable influence over the Sahel and the Sahara.

World War II changed the composition of the boundaries in Africa as Germany saw her influence greatly diminished. The colonial powers were slowly coming to an end as Europe lay in ruins and vital resources were diverted to the rebuilding effort at home. At the same time, a man named Menachim Begin and his group Irgun launched an offensive in British Palestine. This was a new type of war as it did not involve the world powers vying for control but was a smaller insurgent group challenging a larger power for control. The insurgency levied a tremendous cost to the British and resulted in the United Kingdom, already weary from years of war, withdrawing from Palestine. The nationalistic efforts of Irgun led to the formal creation of the State of Israel. Israel's insurgency served as a model to many nations and it wasn't long until similar events sprung

up in Cyprus, Armenia, Vietnam, and Algeria. The smaller nations used the advantage of local support to isolate the occupying forces from the population.² By isolating the larger force, you diminish their influence over the mass and delegitimize their justification for maintaining a presence.

Recognizing the anti-colonial movement of the people, several smaller political parties merged to become the National Liberation Front (FLN) in 1954. These groups waged a political and military struggle for independence that began in November of that year.³ The FLN engaged in a series of bombings against French security forces in Algiers. The FLN had hoped to force French troops to remain in garrison as a safety measure. By remaining in garrison, the FLN would secure local support and increase participation in the revolution.

Leading the FLNs push for independence was Larbi Ben M'Hidi, an Algerian nationalist and devout Muslim. M'Hidi felt that Algerians were becoming westernized through the continual colonization of Algerian lands by French settlers. He and Ramdane Abane set about in establishing a guerilla campaign that focused less on direct confrontation and more on the psychological aspects of the conflict. Abane felt if the FLN could capture the imaginations of independence by the Algerian population that any hope of French success in the region would be lost.⁴ The fundamental aspect of an internal revolution, supported by the local population, in order to return to a traditional Islamic state is what drives insurgent groups such as al Qaeda to this day. M'Hidi and Abane are regarded as the fathers of the revolution and serve as an inspiration to modern Algerian insurgents.

To accomplish the task of winning the psychological war, the FLN established an underground movement known as the Zone Autonome d'Alger (ZAA).⁵ The ZAA would prepare to engage in urban terrorism and become famous in the movie *The Battle of Algiers*. In September 1956, the ZAA delivered the opening salvo by bombing several tourist locations popular with Europeans. The urban warfare insurgency had two main goals. First, it would prey on the "intruders" from Europe and dissuade further tourism. By reducing the number of European visitors and systematically eliminating French control in Algiers, the FLN would increase its foothold and continue to gain support. Second, the urban campaign would divert French resources to the defense of Algiers and allow the FLN time to build its rural uprising throughout Algeria. The future of the revolution depended on these simultaneous strategies coinciding with one another.

Ramdane Abane⁶ anticipated a French reaction and knew that it would draw the local population behind the FLN. His campaign of incessant small bombings ensured the French would respond, and respond they did. General Jacques Massu arrived in Algiers to establish order. Massu launched a counterterrorism campaign that involved rounding up suspected insurgents and committing acts of torture to secure their confession. Massu succeeded in killing Ben M'Hisi, destroying the ZAA, and forcing the FLN leadership into exile. His tactics were swift and lethal which allowed him to quickly and ruthlessly suppress the FLN. While Massu's method of rigid control of the Muslim population did eventually establish order, it cost the French the much needed support of the local population. The majority of Algerians did not lend support to the FLN but did respond by uniting under the banner of nationalism.⁷

The Battle of Algiers, while an effective counterinsurgency campaign, cost the French the overall goal of retaining Algeria as a colonial possession. They had soundly defeated the FLN at the expense of the conflict as a whole. The ensuing three years resulted in France depicted as an occupying and oppressive force that lacked popular support. With Morocco and Tunisia gaining independence in 1957, Algeria would soon follow suit in 1962.⁸ France relinquished her colonial claim to Algeria and an independent country was born.

As official independence approached, the FLN leadership met in to discuss the transition from revolutionary organization to political party. The Tripoli Program called for massive reforms and the large-scale nationalization of Algeria's industrial infrastructure.⁹ As a revolutionary group, the FLN was effective in developing a guerilla campaign that turned the struggle in their eventual favor. As a political organization, the FLN would soon realize the difficulty of establishing control in the political arena.

Post-Independence: 1962-1989

In the years following independence, the FLN tightened its grip on control of Algeria. The majority of fighting came from coups within the FLN itself and resulted in Ben Bella assuming the presidency. Ben Bella was a member of the original executive committee of the FLN during the War for Independence and had the support of the National Assembly. He spent a significant amount of time nationalizing the major industry sectors vacated by French owners who had fled. This nationalization produced an economic boom in Algeria as well as objections from smaller

political groups.¹⁰ These groups joined forces in an attempt to overthrow the Ben Bella government in 1963. Fighting erupted in the Kabylie region in the north and along the Sahel to the south.¹¹ The Algerian army, led by Minister of Defence Houari Boumedienne, put down both insurrections and consolidated his position as leader of the armed forces. Ben Bella reversed his course and attempted to include the insurgents in his government. This created a significant amount of tension and distrust between Ben Bella and the FLN leaders in power.

Tensions reached a crescendo in 1965 when Boumedienne successfully completed a coup and assumed presidency. He went on to declare a state of emergency, dissolve the National Assembly, and declare himself the absolute ruler of Algeria. Boumedienne successfully instituted a policy of non-alignment and maintained favorable relations with both the East and West. Boumedienne remained in power until he died from a blood disorder in 1978. An intense power struggle within the FLN followed with the ascension of Chadli Bendjedid. The new president did not share his predecessor's ability to balance the economy and the population. Algeria's industrial base lingered and unemployment soared through the early 1980s. A disenchanting population would look for answers to daily problems and a revised and recharged version of Islam was on the way.

Iran and Afghanistan

In 1979, a revolution occurred in Iran. Iranian students had rallied behind the religious leader Ayatollah Khomeini and succeeded in deposing the Shah. This religious revival served as proof of what could be accomplished if faithful followers combined forces under the rallying cry of Islam.¹² This religious revival created a wave of religious ideology over the greater Middle East. The colonial pastimes and feelings of dependence on foreign powers gave way to a shared religious drive that inspired millions of Muslims across the globe.

Also in 1979, Soviet tanks entered Afghanistan under the guise of restoring stability to the region. The outrage shared by Muslims around the world manifested in thousands joining the ranks of the faithful. The religious sense of duty compelled many to travel to neighboring Pakistan to join the Jihad against the occupying forces. A Palestinian teacher named Abdullah Azzam led this charge by establishing the Office of Services of the Holy Warriors.¹³ Azzam's organization would soon attract the likes of Osama bin Laden and, together, they would create the basis for the global jihadist network that would become al Qaeda.

Section One: The War for Independence: A State is Born

The spirit of the Iranian revolution and the establishment of the Mujahedeen in Afghanistan would have a lasting effect on the emerging militancy of Islam in Algeria. Clerics began to preach against the westernized appearance of Algerian women as well as the drinking of alcohol and lack of religious conviction of Algerian men. This led to a significant rise of Islamic activity and objection to the ruling government and would play a major role in the coming years.

Section Two: The Tuaregs

Introduction

To know a man, you must know his history. To identify with this man, you must understand his culture, his way of life, and his motives. Too often, we impart our ignorance on a people and expect them to comply with our demands without argument or hesitation. Western cultures expect to see these instant results without looking at the tremendous turmoil it causes to the local population. This chapter will discuss the role of the Tuaregs in this conflict. It seeks to briefly examine their history, the loss of traditional Tuareg lands as a result of European colonization, and the role of the Tuaregs in smuggling goods across the Sahara.

A Brief History

In the vast wilderness of the Sahara live a people without a state. These people, the Tuaregs, have long occupied the empty expanses of the Sahel. Moving from oasis to oasis, they often survived on traded goods and lived in tents of woven camel hair.¹⁴ Their culture thrived as the preeminent trans-Saharan traders of salt, gold, ivory, and slaves throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. For nearly 1,000 years, the Tuareg operated this caravan trade connecting the cultural centers and cities that bordered the southern edge of the Sahara via five desert trade routes to the Mediterranean Sea port cities on the northern coast of Africa.¹⁵

The French colonial ambitions in Africa soon brought them into contact with the Tuareg. French expeditions through the Sahara made their way to the Niger River and led to the creation of French West Africa.¹⁶ With territorial borders appearing along the trade routes, it wasn't long before a confrontation between the French military and Tuaregs occurred. The superior weapons of the French swiftly defeated those who resisted and forced the Tuareg to forfeit historical lands. Most were incorporated under French dominance and the tribal groups were dismantled.¹⁷ The once proud people were now subjected to French colonial rule.

Tuaregs follow the Maliki Madh'hab line of Islam. This *fiqh* was established based on the preaching of Imam Malik¹⁸ and is the third largest of the four recognized schools. Islam is the central binding factor for the Tuareg people and the offering of hospitality and shelter is an important theme when examining their relationship with radical elements within the Sahel. The Tuareg also combine Sunni Islam with pre-Islamic animistic beliefs such as Kel Asuf.¹⁹

Borders

Following the establishment of French West Africa, artificial borders were established that prevented the Tuareg people from traveling long established routes across the Sahara. This loss of vital commerce greatly affected native Tuaregs and many were forced to the cities in search of employment and shelter.

The independence movement pervaded the world following World War II. Traditional colonies of European countries were quick to capitalize on the weakened state of their former masters and North Africa was no exception. In the late 1950s, there was a tremendous push for independence from France and French West Africa soon fractured into an ethnic free-for-all. In 1960, the breakup of French West Africa resulted in the establishment of the countries of Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso, and Libya. These new countries, along with Algeria, were quick to establish territorial borders that transcended traditional Tuareg lands. The Tuaregs revolted in Mali and Niger but were defeated in both cases and attempted to reunify with fellow tribes in the region. The revolt was crushed and the Tuareg people were, in many cases, forced to abandon their traditional nomadic lifestyle in order to survive.

It is important to note the psyche of the Tuaregs during this period in terms of the potential for conflict. Environmental and economic scarcity in both cases lends themselves to the potential for violence and a general lack of trust. Environmental scarcity comes in the form of the newly established borders. Traditional routes across the Sahara were no longer accessible. The dynamic environment that had been a staple for these people was, in many cases, forever lost. The loss of revenue generated from these routes led to the economic scarcity that forces many Tuaregs to the squalor of the ghettos that had become commonplace in Africa. The lack of economic opportunity led many Tuareg to commit crimes in order to advance their economic prospects.²⁰ In both cases, forced migration due to these external circumstances would play a role in the Tuareg mindset when dealing with outside agencies in years to come.

An extreme drought occurred in the Sahel from 1968–1974. The Tuareg population in Mali was particularly affected. Many Tuaregs, along with their cherished livestock, perished during the ensuing famine. The promised assistance from the government never materialized and the Tuaregs, already distrustful of these new regional leaders, developed a bitter hatred for the Malian government. This intense dissatisfaction with the government of Mali and eventually Niger continued to fester as Tuareg conditions continued to worsen. The situation reached a

crescendo in the spring of 1990 when Tuaregs attacked a Malian police station near the border with Niger.²¹ The ensuing government crackdown resulted in hundreds of Tuaregs killed. Niger and Mali identified the Tuaregs as a security threat while Tuaregs felt the governments were persecuting them to the point of extinction.

Smuggling

With the loss of traditional trading routes, many Tuaregs began to smuggle goods as a means to survive. With their historical knowledge across the Sahara, many could find work smuggling cigarettes, drugs, and other illicit commodities. Tuaregs distrust for the governments of the region grew as captured smugglers were imprisoned for illegal commerce.

The civil war in Algeria (see Chapter three) resulted in new opportunities as Tuareg smugglers were often the only means of goods in the southern regions of Algeria. The caravans of camels were slowly replaced four-wheel drive Toyota pickups and the smuggling business boomed throughout the later 1990s. It was around this time the Tuaregs began a loose alliance with another group of people. Radical Islamic fighters, fresh from the battlefields of Afghanistan and eager to topple the apostate leaders of the region, found they had an ally in the Tuaregs. Although on opposite ends of the ethno-nationalist spectrum, both parties wanted the same thing: the removal of godless tyrants from power. The Tuaregs wanted the borders erased and a return to the traditional norms that were seized during French colonization and the creation of several independent states. The Islamic fighters wanted an Islamic state in Algeria and, ultimately, a pan-Sahelian Caliphate. The Tuareg smugglers began to transport arms along the established routes to help fuel the insurgency. A new era was brewing along the Sahara and across the Sahel.

Section Three: Algeria's civil war and 9/11

Introduction

“Mr Gorbachev, Tear Down This Wall!” exclaimed President Ronald Reagan. America rejoiced as the United States watched her archrival fall. The Cold War was ending and freedom was sweeping the globe. The mujahedin in Afghanistan had defeated the Soviet Union and demonstrated the power of Jihad. Now it was time for these brave holy warriors to return to their homes. As with every war, fighting changes a man as his convictions become deeper and his views become even more entrenched in his mind. This was the case with Islam. A conservative strand of Islam was beginning to take shape as these fighters returned home, emboldened by training and inspired by Pakistan's firebrand version of Islam. No longer would they be subjugated to apostate governments. By organizing, they could win and establish at home what they had helped in Afghanistan. Islam was on the offensive.

Riots and the GIA

Following independence from France, Algeria became a predominantly one-party government. The FLN had controlled all facets of the government from the interior to the army. They had promoted a socialist agenda and had relied heavily on oil revenues. Along the way, many Algerians felt the FLN had lost its way in terms of representing the people. The “people's party” was no longer an advocate for the people. Nowhere was this truer than Algiers.

With the fall of the Soviet Union, many Algerians who had gone to fight in defense of Islam returned home to limited economic opportunity. Serving alongside other devout Muslims in Afghanistan had a profound and lasting impact on these men. They began to see the Algerian government as rife with corruption and noted the lack of religion in daily life. Political parties, such as the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), were not making progress on reforms²² and these veterans were quickly growing frustrated. Most returnees from Afghanistan had been thoroughly indoctrinated in the Afghan philosophy of jihad until either victorious or the achievement of martyrdom.

In 1988, the price of oil fell to an unprecedented \$10 per barrel. With Algeria dependent on oil exports to support its socialist agenda, it

wasn't long before an economic crisis ensued. Algerians flocked to the streets to protest the government and demand reform. The emerging Islamic movement was quick to adopt the cause and fueled the anger of Algerians by accusing the government of abandoning the tenets of Islam.²³ President Bendjedid agreed to instill many reforms and announced the first multiparty elections would be established. The FIS gained tremendous support from the people as a movement dedicated to establishing an Islamic state in Algeria.

In 1990, the FIS wins several seats at the local elections. They are unprepared for this victory but quickly organize to prepare for the upcoming elections. The 1992 Parliamentary elections had just begun when the Algerian military interrupted the proceedings and canceled the voting. Several FIS leaders were imprisoned and the ensuing chaos led to the creation of two paramilitary organizations. The Armed Islamic Movement (MIA) would operate in the rural areas and the newly created Armed Islamic Group (GIA) would operate in the urban environment. Disagreements soon arose between the groups as the GIA felt the FIS party leaders were too accommodating and needed to follow strict Islamic rule. The MIA organized with several smaller Islamic groups and joined the FIS-backed Islamic Salvation Army (AIS). The GIA responded by declaring war on the FIS/AIS alliance.²⁴

The GIA, led by Djamel Zitouni, united under the umbrella of an anti-government guerilla organization. Zitouni expanded the organization by enlisting many former mujahedin fighters from the fields of Afghanistan. This radical ethno-nationalist organization blended the notion of religion identity as a nationalist cause. To be a true Muslim, you must unite under one banner and prepare for jihad in order to secure your homeland in the name of Islam. The GIA initially targeted government and military facilities but also became known for attacking civilians and personnel associated with the AIS.²⁵ The GIA engaged on a campaign of bombing and indiscriminate killing across Algeria throughout the mid-1990s. Several villages suspected of supporting AIS elements were burned to the ground and its inhabitants killed by brutal methods. Many of the victims, including women and children, were executed by machete attacks and had their bodies dismembered.

The primary goal of the GIA was the establishment of an Islamic state in Algeria. While many Algerians desired the same end state, the brutal nature of the GIA resulted in a significant loss of popular support. Most Algerians were terrified of the methods in which the GIA sought to promote their agenda. As the 1990s progressed several members of the GIA leadership began to disagree with the methods in which the GIA

attacked civilian targets. They realized these attacks were leading to a continual loss of popular support. These men, Hassan Hattab and Amari Saifi, issued a fatwa in 1997 calling for the GIA to cease targeting civilians and for the creation of a new Islamic organization that would carry the will of the people. Ethno-nationalism in Algeria had taken another turn.

Rise of the GPSC

Hassan Hattab was a paratrooper in the Algerian armed forces. He used his military service to further his understanding of tactics and the political situation in Algeria. Following his military service, he became a mechanic where he saw the struggles of ordinary Algerians in daily life. He became disillusioned with the Algerian government and eventually joined the GIA.²⁶ While serving as a field commander for the GIA, Hattab was enraged by the GIA's tactic of massacring Algerian civilians. He felt this tactic detracted from the original goal of binding Algerians together in the creation of the Islamic state. Hattab and several others created the *Groupe Salafiste pour le Predication et le Combat* or the Salafist Group for Preaching and Combat (GPSC).

The GPSC immediately moved out of Algiers and set up operations in two key areas. First, the Kabylie region in the north had access to the major cities along the Mediterranean yet provided cover and concealment. Its forests and mountains provided training areas and sanctuary from military intervention. To control the forests and hills was to have an advantage and the GPSC wasted no time in adopting this strategy. Second, the vast southern region along Algeria's border with Mali and Niger offered access to established smuggling routes and the freedom of movement required. Both regions were instrumental to the GPSCs overall strategy of challenging government forces at every step.

Amari Saifi, also known as Abderezzak El-Para, was a senior field commander under Hattab in the early days of the GPSC. Known as a "special forces" type of leader, Saifi often developed elaborate schemes of ambushes. His elaborate plans would lead him into direct confrontation with the Algerian military. In February of 2000, Saifi and his men conducted a large-scale attack on an Algerian convoy. The GPSC successfully killed forty-two paratroopers and set the stage for the next round of attacks. To succeed in his conquest, he'd need arms and equipment to prepare for battle. To achieve this end, he turned to his friend Mokhtar Belmokhtar.

Mokhtar Belmokhtar (MBM) was born in Algeria in 1972. He went to Afghanistan to fight the Soviets and returned in the early 1990s to Algeria. Belmokhtar moved to the southern town of Tamanrassat and began to build a smuggling ring. He made a loose alliance with the Tuaregs and often used Tuareg convoys to move his goods.²⁷ MBM lost an eye while fighting in Afghanistan and is often called “one-eyed” by those in the region. MBM joined with the GSPC is thought to be the Amir of the Saharan faction where is smuggles arms from Niger, Libya, and Chad to the GSPC operating sites in Mali and Algeria. MBM is known throughout the region and even married the daughter of a Tuareg tribal chief in order to secure the loyalty of the Tuaregs in the region.²⁸

With Hattab in charge and Saifi and MBM ready to act, the GSPC prepared for direct engagement with the Algerian government. To accomplish this feat, the GSPC developed and refined three key tactics. First, the trusted guerilla hit and run tactics was particularly effective along the roads that traversed the Kabylie region. GSPC squads could lie in ambush and attack military convoys as they moved from region to region. This also gave the GSPC the benefit of cover and concealment as well as a retreat route following the attack. Second, bombings were still a hallmark of the GSPC. To drive a truck bomb into a military checkpoint or a power station would continue to tax government resources to their very limit. Finally, more high tech equipment such as anti-aircraft artillery and surface to air missiles would allow the GSPC to engage in direct conflict if they deemed it necessary.²⁹

With the pieces in place, the GSPC had successfully carved out a viable operating area in which they could train, recuperate and reorganize, and smuggle both people and arms into and out of the region. These factors, coupled with an effective tactical campaign, allowed them to grow in influence and promote the ideology of the establishment of the Islamic state. It was around this time that the GSPC began a loose affiliation with other terrorist groups throughout the region and across the globe. GSPC emissaries visited Islamic groups in Morocco, Libya, and Tunisia. Veterans from the Afghan conflict also appeared in Yemen, Somalia, and Sudan. It was beginning to appear this small insurgency, where ethno-nationalist ambitions and local recruitment goals, would soon become part of a larger world order. The GSPC would soon become an arm of the global jihad nexus known as al Qaeda.

Section Four: Jihad goes Global

Introduction

Around 9:00 on a Tuesday morning, the world changed. Four airliners were hijacked by Islamic terrorists and the ensuing tragedy recalculated the face of terrorism in the minds of the West. America was quick to identify the hijackers as members of the terrorist group al Qaeda. In the weeks that followed, President Bush delivered a riveting speech to both houses of Congress in which he declared “You are either with us or you are with the Terrorists.” In the geopolitical world of nations, this message was clear but in the nebulous world of non-state actors, the banner of jihad went global.

The GSPC after 9/11

With the attacks in America, most terrorist groups were forced to reevaluate their positions. Attacking anything remotely American would certainly bring unwanted intervention in an ongoing campaign. American involvement in Algeria may tip the balance and cause the GSPC all of the tactical gains it had made over the past few years.³⁰

While the attacks in America were carried out by Egyptians and Saudis, most North African terrorist focused their attacks on European interests. This was in part because of the lasting colonial influences in Africa and the large number of ethnic Africans that had immigrated throughout Europe. Fundraising and support networks for the GSPC had been established throughout Europe in the United Kingdom, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and France. These cells also prepared attacks within Europe and served as safe houses for terrorists in transit. These European cells also provided logistical aid to members of al Qaeda and a loose affiliation ensued.

Al Qaeda, recognizing this affiliation, sent emissaries to visit the GSPC in 2002. Hassan Hattab, the Amir of the GSPC, was quick to renounce this intrusion as he still maintained the overall goal of the GSPC was an Islamic state in Algeria.³¹ Several other members of the GSPC saw the overall goal expand from a domestic struggle to a larger struggle in defense of Islam. Among these dissenters were Nabil Sahraoui and Abdelmalek Droukdel.³² A significant amount of infighting began and ended in June 2004 when Hattab was forced to resign as Amir. The Shura Council appointed Sahraoui as the new Amir of the GSPC. This was an important step in the transformation from domestic to global as Sahraoui had very different views than Hattab. He felt the jihad was a

global responsibility and directed the GSPC down the path of inclusion into al Qaeda's global nexus.³³

In 2003, Amari Saifi, alias El Para, staged a daring capture of thirty-two German tourists in the Algerian Desert. El Para kept thirty-two of the hostages until the German government paid approximately five millions Euros in ransom. This event led to a significant increase in troops along the borders of Mali, Algeria, Niger, and Chad. The military intervention forced El Para into Chad where he was captured by Chadian rebels and eventually turned over to Algerian authorities.³⁴ The loss of El Para and the removal of Belmokhtar from the zone 9 command signaled a turning point in the GSPCs evolution.

With Sahraoui in control, there was a significant change in recruitment and tactics. Jihadists from Tunisia and Libya were actively recruited upon completion of training in Afghanistan.³⁵ The GSPC was continuing to move toward the global nexus. In 2004, Sahraoui was killed in a fight with Algerian forces in the Kabylie region. Two members struggled to succeed Sahraoui with Droukdel emerging victorious.

Abdelmalek Droukdel was quick to establish control of the GSPC. He quickly revamped the organizational structure and set the group on a path in line with al Qaeda's strategy. Several cross border raids into Mauritania and ambushes in the Kabylie showed Droukdel's willingness to commit "spectaculars." The revamped GSPC took on a Taliban-like command and control network.³⁶

Al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb

With Zawahiri and bin Laden leading al Qaeda's charge, Droukdel soon decided to change the name to focus on the global jihad. In January of 2007, a message was posted declaring the establishment of the al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) organization. Jihadist groups around the world posted messages of congratulations to AQIM as they had joined the global jihad. This merger ended to nationalistic dreams spawned by the FLN and reinforced by the FIS. This chapter of the ethno-nationalist fight for a united Algeria, governed by the principles of Islam, was lost.

Religion versus Religious Identity

Droukdel was quick to identify with the fundamental aspect of al Qaeda. The idea that Islam was under attack and it was the duty of every Muslim

to defend Islam through jihad transcended the notion of one country. The FLN identified with religion when dealing with the colonial ambitions of France. The FLN used terrorism from 1954–1962 to further the political agenda of nationalism. Uniting Algerian Muslims against an occupation was a religious duty. The tactics of engaging French targets, to include civilians, was purely nationalistic. AQIM calls of Muslims from around the region, around the world, to help in establishing an Islamic Caliphate in North Africa. While they still primarily attack government targets, AQIM is quick to identify with the larger Islamic cause. Mobile training bases in the Sahara Desert provide jihadists from around the region with training in explosives and guerilla tactics. The use of suicide bombers has risen significantly in line with AQIM's alignment with al Qaeda. The Salafis have shunned the tribal Sufis in the region as being “colonial lackeys” and resistant to the greater ambition of independence and the Caliphate.³⁷

Conclusion

Spawned from the days of French colonial ambitions, Algeria is home to the original idea of independence. Algerians as a whole sought to marginalize French influence through defiance and unity. The National Liberation Front (FLN) resorted to domestic acts of terrorism to combat the occupation and force France to withdraw. The idea of isolating French forces from the population and driving France into repressive measures worked. The heavy handed tactics of General Massu defeated the FLN but cost the French the war. Faced with the loss of popular support, France granted Algeria her independence.

Across the region, former colonies were ceding from their colonial masters. The rise of Chad, Niger, Mali, Mauritania, and Morocco created new borders across the Sahara and Sahel. Ethnic tribes such as the Tuaregs were forced from their traditional caravans and pastoral grazing routes and relegated to a lower-class subject in a new country. The Tuaregs resorted to smuggling as a way to survive. By moving goods, cigarettes, gasoline, and arms, the Tuaregs were valuable to future separatists for two reasons. First, they knew the routes across the Sahara and were the cultured people of the region. Second, they held the governments of these new countries responsible for the loss of traditional rights to the grasses of the Sahelian savannah.

The FLN, marginalized by politics and ruling with an authoritarian notion, canceled free elections in 1990. This led to the creation of the FIS and the radical GIA. The GIA felt the FIS was far too accommodating

and resorted to a campaign of terror across Algeria and Europe. The GIA used brutal tactics to ensure compliance and often destroyed entire villages in the process. They also waged a campaign of terror in France and other European countries. Angered by the GIA's senseless killing of civilians, the GSPC was created by Hassan Hattab as a means to return to the fundamental concept of an Islamic state in Algeria. Hattab and the GSPC were primarily a nationalist group. They enjoyed warm relations with the Tuaregs and had built a formidable smuggling operation in the years leading up to 9/11.

The start of the global war of terror changed the landscape in much the same way that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had just 20 years earlier. It served as a rallying cry to many Muslims already experienced in the way of jihad. al Qaeda was quick to tie the American invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq into a global attack on Islam. Many nationalist groups were pulled from their domestic plight into a larger counterbalance to the American world order. The GSPC reorganized as AQIM and aligned itself with the global jihad. This meant an end to the traditional nationalist cause in the region and the beginning of a larger Islamic nationalist campaign.

Ethno-Nationalism takes on many faces and the global war on terror has succeeded in tying many different causes into the counterbalance to perceived American hegemonic interests in the world. The new face of resistance is Ethno-Nationalism "with a twist."

Endnotes

- 1 Reader, John. *Africa; a Biography of the Continent* 1997 Random House, New York. Pg. 575.
- 2 This is an important tactic that will be attempted by both AQ and the GSPC later.
- 3 Crenshaw, Martha. "*The Effectiveness of Terrorism in the Algerian War*". *Terrorism in Context* 1995, University Press, Penn State University. Pg. 474.
- 4 Ibid. Pg. 487.
- 5 Ibid. Pg. 485.
- 6 Abane would eventually be killed by members of his own faction during a power struggle within the FLN. Many experts believe the Egyptians, led by Nasser, participated in his killing to expand Arab nationalist influence in the region. See <http://nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/Abane-Ramdane> (accessed on Nov 1 08).
- 7 Crenshaw, Martha. "*The Effectiveness of Terrorism in the Algerian War*". *Terrorism in Context* 1995, University Press, Penn State University. Pg. 474.

- 8 Library of Congress country study of Algeria. See <http://www.tinyurl.com/cx6bog> (<http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/dztoc.html#dz0030>) (accessed on Nov 1 08).
- 9 Library of Congress country study of Algeria (accessed on Nov 1 08).
- 10 Library of Congress country study of Algeria (accessed on Nov 1 08).
- 11 These regions will play an important role as insurgent bases of operation in years to come.
- 12 Norton, Augustus. *Hezbollah* 2007 Princeton University Press, New Jersey. Pg. 36.
- 13 Investigative Project on Terrorism Web site. <http://www.investigativeproject.org/profile/103> (accessed on Nov 3 08).
- 14 Minnesota State University Web site. <http://mnsu.edu/emuseum/cultural/oldworld/africa/tuareg2.html> (accessed on Nov 3 08).
- 15 Palace Travel Web site. <http://www.festivalinthedesert.org> (accessed on Nov 10 08).
- 16 <http://www.tinyurl.com/c6a6u5> (<http://www.everyculture.com/Africa-Middle-East/Tuareg-History-and-Cultural-Relations.html>) (accessed on Nov 3 08).
- 17 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tuareg> (accessed on Nov 3 08).
- 18 http://www.sunnah.org/publication/khulafa_rashideen/malik.htm (accessed on Nov 3 08).
- 19 Kel Asuf is the belief in the spirits of nature. The Tuaregs believe in Kel Asuf and combine this with the Qur'anic belief of divination of the Prophet.
- 20 Homer-Dixon, Thomas. "Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict; Evidence from Cases" Peace and Conflict Studies Program, University of Toronto International Security, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Summer 1994), pp. 5-40.
- 21 ICE Case Studies. No. 151, August 2005. See <http://www.american.edu/ted/ice/tuareg.htm> (accessed on Nov 10 08).
- 22 Kohlmann, Evan. "Two Decades of Jihad in Algeria; the GIA, GSPC, and al Qaeda" NEFA Foundation May 2007.
- 23 Mellah, Salima. "The Algerian Islamist Movement; Between Autonomy and Manipulation" Justice Commission for Algeria, May 2004. Pg. 4.
- 24 Wikipedia page on Algeria's Civil War. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Algerian_Civil_War (accessed on Nov 11 08).
- 25 Mobley, Blake and Rosenbach, Eric. "GSPC Dossier" Center for Policing Terrorism, Jun 1 05 Pg. 6.
- 26 Nation master website on Hassan Hattab. <http://www.nationmaster.com/encyclopedia/Hassan-Hattab> (accessed on Nov 12 08).
- 27 Scheuer, James. "al Qaeda and Algeria's GSPC; Part of a Much Bigger Picture" Terrorism Focus Volume IV Issue 8. The Jamestown Foundation, April 3, 2007.
- 28 Ibid.

- 29 Mobley, Blake and Rosenbach, Eric. "GSPC Dossier" Center for Policing Terrorism, Jun 1 05 Pg. 12.
- 30 Botha, Anelli. "Terrorism in the Maghreb; the Transnationalization of Domestic Terrorism" ISS Monograph Series No 144, June 2008.
- 31 Ibid. Pg. 83.
- 32 Droukdel is also known as Abu Mossab Abdelouadoud.
- 33 Rabasa, Angela et al. "Beyond al-Qaeda; the Global Jihadist Movement" RAND Corporation Santa Monica, CA. 2006. Pg. 125.
- 34 Boudali, Lianne. "The GSPC; Newest Franchise in Al Qa'ida's Global Jihad" Combating Terrorism Center April 2007.
- 35 Botha Pg. 67.
- 36 It is interesting to note that several Southeast Asian terrorist groups also adopted this hierarchy immediately after 9/11. Al Qaeda's influence spread across the Jihadi spectrum in a very short span of time.
- 37 Author Unknown. "Political Islam, Economic Marginality, and Regional Initiatives to Combat Terrorism in the Sahel; Senegal and the Mali's River Basin" Feb 9 06 Pg. 4.

Author Biography

Senior Master Sergeant Gregory A. Smith is the command aerial gunner functional manager, Air Force Special Operations Command, Hurlburt Field, Florida. He leads, manages, and directs 254 aerial gunners in eight operational flying squadrons across two Special Operations Wings. He also serves as the senior evaluator aerial gunner for AC-130H/U standardization and evaluation section where he validates the combat readiness and proficiency of the Command's aerial gunners. He has held positions as an operations superintendent, operations flight chief, aerial gunner functional manager, and superintendent of plans, intel, and tactics with the 4th Special Operations Squadron; a special missions planner with the 16th Operations Support Squadron; and superintendent of the 16th Special Operations Wing Strategic Plans office. Sergeant Smith was the first planner from the 16th Special Operations Wing to deploy in response to the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. He single-handedly established the first Air Operations Center and then deployed deeper behind enemy lines to build the first Combat Search and Rescue Base and Joint Interagency Operations Center used in Operation Enduring Freedom.

The Importance of Intelligence in Combating a Modern Insurgency

Kevin Reamer

Throughout history the world has been plagued by insurgencies. While the underlying causes of each new insurgency have been different, they are all similar in certain areas. This similarity entails that the effective countering of an insurgency can be turned into a science with a set of guidelines to follow based on conditions on the ground. Guidelines are important because insurgencies are flexible and to defeat them the counterinsurgency must be equally flexible if not more flexible. Good intelligence is critical to the success of an insurgency. With their small, poorly equipped forces, the leaders of insurgencies need to know when to strike and when to pull back. This reliance on intelligence means that an effective counterinsurgency must also rely on good intelligence so that the counterinsurgents may know where the insurgency will strike, where they are based, how they are supplied, where they keep their weapons, and other essential pieces of information.

The United States has run effective insurgencies against the British in the American Colonies during the Revolutionary War, the Japanese in the Philippines during World War II, and provided critical aid to the Afghan Mujahideen against the Soviets during the Soviet–Afghan War. With these prior triumphs the United States should be better prepared to counter insurgencies. However, having failed in Vietnam, Somalia, and Lebanon, their successes on the side of the insurgent have not translated into success on the other side. The verdict is still out on the current counterinsurgencies in Afghanistan and Iraq but victory can be achieved in both situations.

In order to discover what actions need to be taken to wage an effective counterinsurgency and why intelligence is critical to the process, it is important to look at the past successes and failures of both insurgencies and counterinsurgencies. It is also important to note what has changed in modern insurgencies and what has stayed the same in order to ensure that effective strategies from the past will still be effective today. Lessons learned from the American Revolution, Boer Wars, Filipino Insurgency during World War II, Vietnam War, Soviet–Afghan War, and the Lebanese Civil War can help us understand the challenges facing us today in Iraq and Afghanistan. From these case studies, a broader picture can be drawn regarding the intelligence successes and failures of each war. From here, a better plan can be developed that will be effective in

eliminating the problems of the past and thus support for the insurgency can be reduced until it is no longer a viable force.

The American Revolution: 1775-1783

The success of the American Revolution is due, in large part, to the successful intelligence operations conducted by George Washington. During the French and Indian Wars, Washington had learned that “There is nothing more necessary than good intelligence to frustrate a designing enemy, & nothing that required greater pains to obtain.”¹ In December 1776, the future of the revolution was looking grim. Washington’s army had been continually pummeled by British regulars and Hessian mercenaries at Long Island, White Plains, and Fort Mifflin. The Colonial Army had managed to retreat across New Jersey and cross the Delaware River and the British decided to wait until warmer weather to put an end to the rebellion. Both sides thought the end was near until a man named John Honeyman was seized near the camp and brought before Washington as a suspected spy. Honeyman had fought beside Washington during the French and Indian Wars and was currently one of Washington’s spies. Honeyman told Washington that the British and Hessians were off guard and distracted because Christmas was approaching. Washington locked him in the guardhouse overnight to preserve his cover and then engineered his escape the same night by causing a fire. Honeyman reported back to the British commander, Colonel Rall, about his escape and that the Americans were completely incapable of mounting an offensive. This confirmed Rall’s own thoughts so he ignored the talk from his other agents saying that the Americans were about to attack. The Americans attacked during a blizzard and took Trenton. Only four of their men were wounded.² The American Revolution was saved due to the effective use of intelligence.

During his stay at Valley Forge the following winter Washington wrote letters mentioning fictitious infantry and cavalry regiments which he passed on to his double agents. The letters made it to the British and caused them to believe that Washington had over eight thousand more troops than he actually had. They concluded that he was too strong to attack at that time.³ Just as it had the previous winter, intelligence once again saved the American Revolution.

In the summer of 1780 the French landed at Newport, Rhode Island. The Culper Spy Ring warned Washington that Clinton, whose army was in New York, planned to attack the French. Washington slipped reports to British spies claiming that he was planning an offensive against

New York. Clinton called off the attack on the French forces after learning of Washington's plans.⁴ Instead of conducting an attack against an unprepared French force, Clinton's army sat in New York and waited for Washington's attack which never came. Had Clinton attacked the French at Newport it is likely that he would have been victorious.

In the summer of 1781, Clinton received American dispatches about a combined attack from Washington's army and the French forces against New York. This had in fact been the original plan but Washington changed his mind and decided to head south and attack Cornwallis instead. To trick Clinton he prepared letters stating that his original plan still stood and both his forces and the French forces would be attacking New York. He also set up a camp at Chatham, New Jersey and set boats on the shore leading the British to suspect an invasion of Staten Island.⁵ As the French and American forces moved south, Clinton's army stayed in New York and prepared for an attack that would never come.

George Washington's use of intelligence during the American Revolution paved the way for the American victory. When they used intelligence the Americans were able to fight when they knew they could win and convince the British not to attack when they knew they would lose. When the future of the revolution looked bleakest it was the use of good intelligence that brought them through it. Had Colonel Rall listened to his other intelligence reports and prepared his defenses, then the American Revolution may have been crushed at Trenton in 1776. Had the British sent scouts to Valley Forge and discovered the true strength and condition of Washington's forces, the revolution may have ended there in 1777. Had Clinton verified the reports sent to him concerning Washington's impending attack in the summer of 1780 he may have discovered it to be a ruse and defeated the French forces in Newport. Had Clinton learned from that previous deception and monitored the movement of Washington's forces and the French forces in the summer of 1781 then he may have been able to provide support to Cornwallis in Yorktown.

The insurgency and counterinsurgency of the American Revolution was significantly different than those of today. The encounters between the two forces were still set-piece battles. Despite that difference, this case study still shows that the effective use of intelligence by one side led to significant advantages. The clarity of the advantages that intelligence produced in the American Revolution provides the groundwork from which effective strategies to defeat insurgencies and the use of intelligence in those strategies can be built.

The Boer Wars: 1880-1881 and 1899-1902

The Boer Wars offer an interesting case when looking at the use of intelligence in effective counterinsurgency strategies because the two wars are close together chronologically and the wars had a different outcome. The British were resoundingly defeated during the First Boer War while the Boers were defeated despite high British casualties during the Second Boer War. These results allow a look at the different tactics used that allowed the British to succeed during the Second Boer War and caused them to fail during the first.

The First Boer War was a few months long and saw three major battles. The first battle at Laing's Nek was an attempted incursion into the Boer's territory in Transvaal. The British, led by General Colley were crushed at Laing's Nek and retreated to Schuinshoogte hill. The Boer's attacked the hill causing the British to once again retreat. The British forces used easily recognizable fighting formations, bright red uniforms, and shiny white helmets. All of which led to their downfall.⁶ The Boers were better marksmen and hid in whatever cover they could find. General Colley ascended Mount Majuba with most of his troops, approximately 375 riflemen. This is where the final battle was to take place. Historians are still unsure as to why Colley chose to take this mountain but the most accepted idea is that he wanted to make a show of force from what he saw as an unassailable position. The Boers attacked with no more than 350 men. They attacked early in the morning and performed what has been called a perfect example of fire and movement which is still being taught to this day. They used the brush and terraces as cover and advanced behind a knoll. After a lull in the firing, the Boers flanked the British and hid beyond the crest of the hill. This position allowed them to shoot the British in the backs at close range. The British began to retreat and many were shot as they fled. Some tried to hide but were rounded up by the Boers. Only one Boer was killed. This crushing defeat for the British ended the First Boer War and pushed the British to negotiate a peace settlement.⁷

Colley made several mistakes both before and during the battle. He was overconfident in the abilities of his troops and in the terrain which he chose to fight on. His belief that the position was unassailable may have been swayed had he conducted proper reconnaissance of all sides of the mountain. The knoll that the Boers were able to enter behind was a clear weak point and he should have had more troops stationed there. This lack of GEOINT enabled the Boers to exploit the terrain to their advantage. Colley also should have conducted watches and patrols around the clock so as not to be surprised by a Boer attack. Tactical intelligence on the movements of the Boers, especially just prior to the attack, would have

allowed Colley to prepare his men accordingly and set up defensive formations in positions that would have given them a wide view of the slope that the Boers were advancing on. This failure is reminiscent of the German Hessians at Trenton during the American Revolution where lack of intelligence also led to a crushing defeat in a decisive battle.

The Second Boer War was longer and the British learned from some of the mistakes they had made during the First Boer War but were slow to catch on to other mistakes. One important change that was instituted early was that they painted their red uniforms khaki. This adoption of a more camouflaged appearance made the field a little less unbalanced.⁸

The Boers had a high level of individual training and could be likened to an army of snipers. They had a high level of confidence in their own abilities and had a great degree of initiative. They did not use any particular maneuvers and instead relied on a sort of swarm technique in which they would surround the enemy and each individual Boer would close in whenever they saw the opportunity to do so. When defending an area from advancing British troops, the Boers would use the terrain to their full advantage. They would build trenches at the bases of small hills and camouflage them with leaves and branches. This allowed them to fire while standing and still be concealed. It also confused the British who would fire their artillery at the tops of the hills as they expected the Boers to occupy the higher ground. The Boers also developed what is known as a strongpoint defense. They created a series of partially roofed zigzagging slit trenches at the bases of hills. They lured the British advance in between their trenches and then opened fire on them from the front and from either side. Sometimes the Boers would create dummy trenches at the tops of hills, where the British would expect them to be, so that the British would fire their artillery at the dummy trenches. The Boers also used scouts to track the movement of the British forces so they were able to easily evade the British who always traveled in large groups.⁹

Despite the effective use of both GEOINT and HUMINT by the Boers, they were unable to effectively assault the British garrisons due to their lack of artillery. General Kitchener, who was in command of the British forces from 1900 to the end of the war in 1902, employed three strategies that proved to be decisive in the defeat of the Boers. These were scorched earth, civilian internment camps, and blockhouse chains.¹⁰ The scorched earth policy involved burning farms and slaughtering cattle. The Boers were unable to protect the farms from being destroyed and this led to large food shortages in the Boer population. The civilians from these farms were then put into camps that became overcrowded very quickly.

Over one-third of the civilians who entered the camps died from either disease or malnourishment.¹¹ The blockhouse chains were critical in hampering the movements of the Boers. A blockhouse is an isolated one-building fort used against enemies who do not possess artillery. By building a chain of these forts the British were able to see across vast distances and protect large areas from Boer attack. Even with these effective strategies, the British required a force of 4,50,000 soldiers to stop the Boers whose force was never more than 50,000.¹²

Filipino Insurgency during World War II: 1942-1945

Following the defeat of the main U.S. forces at Bataan on April 9, 1942 some of the U.S. soldiers who had been separated from the main force were left with the decision to either surrender or try to escape the islands. A few of them chose another route and decided to stay and develop a Filipino insurgency movement against the Japanese occupiers. One of the commanders, who was also one of the only commanders on Luzon who had not been captured or killed by 1943 was Lieutenant Ramsey.¹³ He traveled all across the Philippines, mostly on the island of Luzon, to recruit Filipinos into the insurgency. They did not usually fight against the Japanese patrols and usually just kept tabs on where the Japanese were, how many there were, what defenses they were building, and how many ships they had. Cells were developed in towns and villages and in the capital, Manila, that reported, through the use of runners who hand delivered messages to Ramsey's headquarters, a highly camouflaged camp on the top of a mountain.

To combat these cells the Japanese would conduct raids on villages they suspected of housing insurgents and on outposts whenever they found them. Sometimes the villages and outposts were given advanced warning through the use of scouts and sometimes they were not. The Japanese would also do sweeps of the city of Manila when they heard that Ramsey was there. They never caught him.

In 1944, they stepped up their offensive operations with a plan to place small bombs on varying timers all over the city of Manila. They created small lead bombs filled with black powder. The timing mechanism was sulfuric acid which would slowly eat through a copper plate and light matches which would ignite the black powder. The copper plates were of varying thickness depending on what time of day they were supposed to be placed so that the bombs would go off at roughly the same time. They trained saboteurs to place the bombs near fuel or ammunition where they would cause secondary explosions.¹⁴ The saboteurs went about

their normal business in Manila carrying the small bombs with them. When they got to a target they would place their bomb and activate it. The bombs were supposed to go off around midnight that night but as Ramsey and the others waited and watched the city the bombs did not go off. Two hours later, they were about to lose hope when explosions ripped through the city. The Japanese's main fuel depot was exploding and then the tanker cars at the rail station exploded. Oil lubricant tanks also exploded and the explosions continued throughout the night. Near dawn there was a massive explosion on the bay. One bomb had been placed into a 50 gallon oil drum and that drum had been loaded onto a 10,000 ton Japanese tanker. The entire Japanese tanker exploded causing a nearby tanker and cruiser to go up in flames.¹⁵ In response to this attack the Japanese constructed roadblocks all across Manila, confiscated food from the citizens, many of whom had already been starving, and doubled their patrols. None of these efforts were effective because nobody betrayed the location of Ramsey's base.¹⁶

Ramsey sent messages to General MacArthur every day via radio describing what the Japanese were doing. As MacArthur's invasion of the Philippines drew near, the messages sent out from Ramsey's base increased significantly. Reports poured in from Ramsey's scouts which detailed the Japanese defenses.¹⁷ When MacArthur's invasion force landed at Leyte Gulf on October 20, 1944, Ramsey's guerillas worked even harder. They ambushed Japanese patrols and convoys. One ambush was especially fruitful when they found the new plans for the Japanese defense of the island on one of the officers they had killed. The details of the plan were radioed to General MacArthur.¹⁸ When the American forces pushed forward, the Japanese became trapped between the Americans and the Filipino guerillas. The intelligence and support provided by the guerillas saved many American lives and shortened the amount of time it took to retake the Philippines.

This case study provides a few lessons in combating insurgents. None of the efforts by the Japanese were effective in combating the insurgency. The roadblocks did not restrict their movement since they could easily evade them. The patrols were also ineffective in restricting the insurgent's movement or catching large numbers of them because of their use of scouts to track the Japanese patrols. The patrols were also easy targets for ambush by insurgents. The cutting off of food supplies to civilians did not weaken the civilian support for the insurgency and nobody betrayed the location of Ramsey's base to the Japanese. The brutal treatment of prisoners was also ineffective in gaining any useful information about the insurgents. The insurgency continued to grow despite the efforts of the Japanese.

It is also important to note how the insurgents could inflict significant damage on the Japanese with small and simple explosives. What was essentially a pipe bomb was able to sink two Japanese tankers and cripple one cruiser simply because it was placed in a good location. The rest of the pipe bombs destroyed significant amounts of Japanese oil which could not be easily replaced.

Soviet-Afghan War and Aftermath: 1979-September 2001

In December 1979, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in order to prop up the floundering Afghan communist regime. In response, the United States significantly increased their funding of the anti-communist Afghan Mujahideen. Much of this funding went through the Pakistani ISI who distributed it to their favored commanders such as Gulbuddin Hekmatyar.¹⁹ The CIA also dealt directly with other effective commanders who were being undermined by the ISI such as Ahmed Shah Massoud.²⁰ However, this direct aid was not enough to influence post-Soviet Afghanistan.

In 1986, the United States began shipping Stinger missiles to the Mujahideen. These missiles were so effective against the Soviets that they were no longer able to carry out low-flying attack raids or evacuate their wounded by helicopter. This turned the tide of the war against the Soviets.²¹ Gorbachev began wondering what the Soviets were doing there and planned to withdraw within a year or two. The Soviets were completely surprised by the presence of this advanced weapon on the battlefield. Without any warning, the Soviets were unable to prepare any defenses against it. In 1989, the Soviets left Afghanistan leaving the communist Najibullah government to fend for itself.

In 1992, Massoud's forces captured Kabul. When they occupied the city, there were no retributions and their primary goal, according to Massoud, was to protect the Afghan people in the city. An interim government was formed with Burrudin Rabbani being declared the president and Massoud being named the minister of defense.²² However, Pakistan did not favor this government and supported Hekmatyar in his fight against the interim government. By mid-1992, the two sides began fighting on the streets of Kabul.²³ In 1994, Hekmatyar was defeated and the Pakistanis shifted their support to the Taliban, a new group formed in the madrassas of the Pakistani provinces of Baluchistan and the Northwest Frontier.²⁴

The Taliban moved out of Pakistan and into Afghanistan in 1994. They wielded brand new weapons and promised to bring an end to the violence

plaguing Afghanistan. Many Afghans initially welcomed the Taliban because they believed their pledge to stop the violence. The Taliban were able to buy many of their victories and many Afghans joined their side. When they got to Kabul in 1996, the interim government withdrew because they did not wish for the city to be damaged any further. They withdrew to Bagram Air Base to the north of Kabul.²⁵ They held the line here until U.S. military aid and bombing allowed the Northern Alliance to drive the Taliban out of Kabul in November 2001²⁶ even though President Bush did not want the Northern Alliance to be the ones to take the city.²⁷

This case study provides some important lessons in the type of strategic intelligence that should be collected in order to ensure that the situation does not destabilize in the long term. During the Soviet–Afghan War the United States was supporting the insurgency, but this lesson can be applied when combating an insurgency as well. The United States either failed to consider or failed to fully realize Pakistan’s intentions in regards to Afghanistan. Pakistan wanted Afghanistan to be a fundamentalist Islamic state that they could influence. They also wanted more radical fighters to use in their fight over Kashmir. The United States should have collected more intelligence on Pakistan’s intentions instead of allowing them to dictate who the funding and weapons went to for most of the war. When fighting an insurgency, it is important to monitor the neighboring countries very closely because support in the form of weapons, supplies, or more volunteers could flow from neighboring countries and insurgents could hide in neighboring countries.

The United States also failed to pay attention to those who saw the need to aid the Afghan interim government following the fall of Najibullah’s government. The intelligence was there and the radicals clearly had an advantage, having received most of the aid that the United States and Saudi Arabia had funneled through Pakistan, but the warnings that these radicals would be a threat were ignored. When fighting against an insurgency, the decision to pull out of that fight should be taken with great care and that decision should rely on intelligence reports. Intelligence should be collected on the country where the insurgency is taking place and on the insurgent group or groups. The reports should include how much support the government has and how much support the insurgency has, the military and police capabilities of the government, the ease with which the insurgency can inflict damage, and an analysis of whether or not the government will be able to withstand the insurgency. If the report finds that the insurgency will be able to overpower the government, then the supporting country should continue its support of the government against the insurgency.

U.S. Involvement in Lebanese Civil War: 1982-1984

The U.S. Marines came to Lebanon as peacekeepers in August 1982. They went there to facilitate the withdrawal of the PLO forces from Lebanon but America did not understand the deep history of Lebanon or the roots of their conflict which was full of passion on every side. During the first few months the Marines were there, the fighting did die down but soon the Lebanese grew tired of the lectures from the Americans and returned to their fighting.²⁸ The Marines had originally only been scheduled to be there for one month but they withdrew two weeks earlier than the deadline because all of the PLO fighters had departed and they did not want an open-ended mission. After they left, Israel invaded West Beirut and the massacres of the Palestinians at Sabra and Shatila occurred. So, the Americans returned out of guilt.²⁹

The American's thought that Lebanon already had the right political institutions and that those institutions were merely too weak in their current state so they decided to try and rebuild the central government and the army.³⁰ Unfortunately they were unaware of Lebanese President, Amin Gemayel's intentions. He used the Americans against his Muslim enemies. By training the Lebanese national army, the Americans came to be seen by the Muslims as being on Gemayel's side of the conflict rather than as being peacekeepers. It started with rocks being thrown at Marines who were on foot patrols, then a grenade injured five Marines, and then the U.S. embassy was struck by a suicide car bomber on April 18, 1983. Finally, on the morning of September 19, the Americans ceased to be peacekeepers and became just another faction in the civil war. The commander of the Lebanese Army, General Tannous claimed that Syrian- and Palestinian-backed Druze units were launching a major offensive against his army at Souk el-Gharb and they would not be able to hold out. If Souk el-Gharb was taken, the Druze would be able to fire down onto the presidential palace. Without seeking confirmation of General Tannous' report, the guided missile cruisers *Virginia*, *John Rodgers*, and *Bowen* and the destroyer *Radford* fired 360 5-inch shells at the Syrian, Palestinian, and Druze attackers. The next day the Americans discovered that only eight Lebanese army soldiers had been killed the day before. On the morning of October 23, 1983 the Marines' headquarters was struck by a suicide car bomber and 241 American servicemen were killed. On February 26, 1984 the Marines finished pulling out of Lebanon. Their 18 month stay in Lebanon had accomplished nothing because the policy makers did not have the proper intelligence to understand the conflict they were sending the Marines into.

Assessment of Intelligence Operations and Tactics

	Effective	Ineffective/Not Done
American Revolution	Give British false intelligence concerning troops movements and troop strength	British didn't seek to corroborate their intelligence through multiple sources
First Boer War	Boers exploit terrain to their advantage	British did not scout terrain—assumed it was and unassailable position
Second Boer War	Boers built fake defenses where the British thought their defenses would be and hidden defenses in other places British removed Boers base of support by burning crops and putting civilians in camps British watched Boer movements with blockhouse chains	
Filipino Insurgency	Intelligence gathered by Filipinos using cell structure Filipinos used runners for communications. Only one radio at the camp which was used to communicate with MacArthur.	Japanese patrols Japanese raids Japanese torture Japanese roadblocks

	Effective	Ineffective/Not Done
Soviet–Afghan War and aftermath	<p>Filipino scouts tracked Japanese patrols</p> <p>Japanese eventually did triangulate on radio position</p> <p>Stinger missiles devastated Soviet aircraft</p>	<p>Soviets failed to foresee introduction of advanced American weapons like the Stinger</p> <p>Americans failed to see the strengthening of the radical Islamists</p> <p>Americans did not look into Pakistan’s intentions concerning Afghanistan</p>
Lebanese Civil War		<p>Americans failed to realize Israel’s intentions</p> <p>Americans failed to understand the culture and history of the conflict</p> <p>Americans failed to see how the government was not representative of the citizens and was merely another faction</p> <p>Americans used overwhelming naval firepower without checking their own intelligence</p>

Lessons Learned

In each conflict there were effective and ineffective intelligence operations and tactics performed. In some cases only one side did anything effective. In other cases both sides were effective in different ways. The following charts categorize each operation as being either effective or ineffective/not done.

There are two effective non-intelligence operations that should be highlighted as well. These are the pipe bombs used during the Filipino Insurgency and the suicide car bombs used during the Lebanese Civil War. Once the pipe bombs were planted, there was little that the Japanese would have been able to do even if they had learned of the operation. The targets were chosen by each individual and although a few individuals were caught, the bombs still inflicted a massive amount of damage. The one that did the most damage was dropped into a barrel of oil so it was impossible to see after it was planted. During the suicide truck bombings in Lebanon, the only warning was the truck speeding toward each building. These operations are similar to the planting of improvised explosive devices by insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan. Once an IED is planted it is difficult to detect and while some can be jammed, insurgents will just revert back to lower-tech detonators that cannot be jammed such as hardwired detonators. The safer and more effective way to counter the threat of IEDs is to learn of the operations beforehand and learn where they are being kept. Each bomb has a bomb maker. Lieutenant Ramsey and the Filipinos relied upon one man, the technical director of the Manila Gas Company, to make the pipe bombs. Modern insurgents rely on many bomb makers and also ship in bombs from neighboring countries. Discovering intelligence on both of these types of operations and stopping them is critical.

False intelligence can be used by insurgents to turn people against the counter-insurgents and prevent their supply lines from being disrupted, their weapons caches from being discovered, or their cells from being discovered. A counterinsurgent force should not fall into the same trap that the British did during the American Revolution. That is why the first lesson is to gather intelligence from multiple sources.

During the Boer Wars the terrain was hilly and the Boers were able to use this to their advantage on many occasions. In Iraq, much of the combat occurs in cities. The insurgents know this terrain well. They have lived there and can blend into the civilian population. Where the Boers used trees and bushes for cover, the insurgents in Iraq use the fact that they

are inconspicuous. It is important for a counterinsurgent force to know the terrain and each part of the terrain that can be exploited. In these urban environments the civilians are in a way part of the terrain. Troops assigned to an area should get to know as many of the civilians there as they can. Getting to know the people provides counterinsurgents with multiple benefits. The troops can build trust and understanding with the people, the people may provide them with actionable intelligence, it lessens the pool of possible recruits for insurgents, and it removes those people as cover for the insurgents.

The British built chains of blockhouses so that they could contain the Boers. This was effective because the Boers had previously been able to slip by the large British garrisons and strike wherever they wanted. The blockhouse could be adapted to work in the mountains and fields of Afghanistan as well as the cities of Iraq. By creating a series of armored, unmanned observation posts along the border with Pakistan where the insurgents infiltrate, U.S. forces would gain real time intelligence on their movements. With this intelligence, U.S. forces could either move in to intercept them or call in air strikes on their positions. In an urban environment, the idea could be adapted by creating a series of small outposts throughout the city rather than concentrating forces in the large bases. Small scattered outposts would allow soldiers to protect larger areas of the cities from insurgent attacks and respond quicker when insurgents do attack. These bases would be close enough together that they could support each other if they came under attack.

The British also denied Boer civilians of their food supplies and placed them into camps. These were effective tactics against the Boers but they would not be effective against the modern insurgent. The case of the Filipino insurgency illustrated why. The Japanese had used similar techniques against the Filipinos and none of them were effective. Instead, Filipino resolve only strengthened in each instance. The modern insurgent is more like the Filipino than they are like the Boer. Tactics like torture, rounding up civilians suspected of being insurgents, and cutting off food supplies would only strengthen the resolve of the modern insurgent and provide more reasons for more people to join the insurgents. Insurgents use propaganda to recruit people and each of these tactics feed the insurgent's propaganda machine. The Taliban used propaganda during their rise to power and many Afghans got behind them because they wanted an end to the fighting. The Taliban's propaganda is all lies but they are still able to attract people to their cause with it. The counterinsurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan are noble missions. U.S. soldiers are there to protect the popularly elected government and their citizens. The insurgents lure people in with

lies about U.S. intentions. It is important to learn the sources of the propaganda and counter the propaganda with both words and actions.

It is also important to keep a close eye on the neighbors of countries that are battling insurgencies. Often these countries have their own plans for their neighbors. Weapons and volunteers have been known to cross over from bordering countries. That this happens does not necessarily mean that it is happening with the consent of that country. If it is not, then that neighboring country should be pressed to take action against those helping the insurgency. Additionally, the borders should be tightly guarded to curtail, and hopefully stop, the flow of weapons and volunteers from neighboring countries.

When fighting an insurgency it is important to understand their culture and why the conflict exists in the first place. Without collecting intelligence on these two areas, mistakes, such as the mistakes that the United States made in Lebanon, could be made. A conflict has to be understood before it can be diffused and a culture has to be understood because the culture provides the backdrop for every aspect of their life. The United States tried to interpret Lebanon in terms of American culture. This misinterpretation caused many of the problems that drove the Muslim factions in Lebanon against the United States.

Some of these tactics are being used today to combat insurgents in Iraq and Afghanistan but each one of these tactics is like a piece of a puzzle. By not using every piece, the puzzle cannot be completed and the counterinsurgency cannot progress. A counterinsurgency is a long, difficult process. An insurgency cannot be defeated through brute force. It requires the precision that only good intelligence can deliver.

Endnotes

- 1 Washington, George. "Washington to Robert Hunter Morris, Jan. 5, 1766." *The Writings of George Washington*. Ed. John C. Fitzpatrick. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931. vol. 1, pg. 268.
- 2 Owen, David. *Hidden Secrets: A Complete History of Espionage and the Technology Used to Support it*. Buffalo, NY: Firefly Books, 2002. pg. 24–25.
- 3 O'Toole, G.J.A. *Honorable Treachery*. New York: Atlantic Press Monthly, 1991. pg. 42. Fleming, "George Washington, General."
- 4 Andrew, Christopher. *For the President's Eyes Only*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1996. pg. 10.
- 5 Ibid.
- 6 Poole, H. John. *Terrorist Trail*. Emerald Isle, NC: Posterity Press, 2006. pg. 117–118.

- 7 Duxbury, G R. "The Battle of Majuba, 27 February 1881." *Military History Journal* 5.2 (1980). Nov. 22, 2008 <http://www.tinyurl.com/ca55v6> (<http://rapidhttp.com/milhist/volo52gr.html>).
- 8 Poole, H. John. *Terrorist Trail*. Emerald Isle, NC: Posterity Press, 2006. pg. 119.
- 9 Ibid. pg. 123–125.
- 10 Ibid. pg. 126.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ramsey, Edwin P., and Stephen J. Rivele. *Lieutenant Ramsey's War*. New York: Knightsbridge Publishing Company, 1990. pg. 150.
- 14 Ibid. pg. 256–257.
- 15 Ibid. pg. 259.
- 16 Ibid. pg. 261.
- 17 Ibid. pg. 285–286.
- 18 Ibid. pg. 289.
- 19 Coll, Steve. *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*. New York: Penguin Group, 2004. pg. 67.
- 20 Ibid. pg. 12.
- 21 Ibid. pg. 150.
- 22 Schroen, Gary C. *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror in Afghanistan*. New York: Presidio Press, 2007. pg. 54.
- 23 Ibid. pg. 55.
- 24 Ibid. pg. 57.
- 25 Ibid. pg. 68.
- 26 Berntsen, Gary. *Jawbreaker: The Attack on bin Laden and al-Qaeda*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2005. pg. 181.
- 27 Ibid. pg. 164.
- 28 Friedman, Thomas L. *From Beirut to Jerusalem*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1989. pg. 187–189.
- 29 Ibid. pg. 191.
- 30 Ibid. pg. 193.

Bibliography

Andrew, Christopher. *For the President's Eyes Only*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1996.

- Berntsen, Gary. *Jawbreaker: The Attack on bin Laden and al-Qaeda*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2005.
- Coll, Steve. *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001*. New York: Penguin Group, 2004.
- Friedman, Thomas L. *From Beirut to Jerusalem*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux, 1989.
- O'Toole, G.J.A. *Honorable Treachery*. New York: Atlantic Press Monthly, 1991.
- Owen, David. *Hidden Secrets: A Complete History of Espionage and the Technology Used to Support it*. Buffalo, NY: Firefly Books, 2002.
- Duxbury, G R. "The Battle of Majuba, 27 February 1881." *Military History Journal* 5.2 (1980). Nov. 22, 2008 <http://www.tinyurl.com/cjyasv> (<http://rapidhttp.com/milhist/volo52gr.html>).
- Poole, H. John. *Terrorist Trail*. Emerald Isle, NC: Posterity Press, 2006.
- Ramsey, Edwin P., and Stephen J. Rivele. *Lieutenant Ramsey's War*. New York: Knightsbridge Publishing Company, 1990.
- Schroen, Gary C. *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror in Afghanistan*. New York: Presidio Press, 2007.
- Washington, George. "Washington to Robert Hunter Morris, Jan. 5, 1766." *The Writings of George Washington*. Ed. John C. Fitzpatrick. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931.

Author Biography

Mr. Reamer spent more than 10 years in the U.S. Army, first enlisting in the Florida Army National Guard as an indirect-infantryman, and then he transitioned to active duty as a Serbian-Croatian linguist. His military career included a deployment to Iraq for over 14 months, beginning shortly after the fall of Baghdad. Currently the author works for a private consulting firm, providing direct support to U.S. government programs. The author has an MA in national security studies from American Military University and received his BS in criminology from Florida State University.

Fragility: The Next Wave in Critical Infrastructure Protection

Allan McDougall

In North America today, we are about to embark on a significant effort to repair, or even upgrade, many aspects of our infrastructure. Many of these efforts are linked to economic recovery packages. Others are based on sheer need. The challenge for decision makers and planners involves ensuring that scarce economic resources are put to their best use. Understanding the concept of fragility plays a pivotal part in reaching that understanding.

Fragility, like many other systems—particularly Information Technology (IT) systems—works on the concept of subjects and objects. *Subjects* are those entities that seek to exploit the services (or capacity) offered by the object. *Objects*, on the other hand, are those entities that deliver some good or service to the overall system. Of course, something may act as the object in one pairing and the subject in another pairing—they are not exclusive in nature. For example, the driver of a car may be considered the subject in the relationship between the driver and the car, while the car is considered the object. The car may become the subject when looking at the relationship between the car and a bridge, insofar as the car (subject) is now exploiting a service that the bridge (object) provides, namely, getting the car from Point A to Point B.

Subjects and objects can be measured using a consistent framework. The subject is measured in terms of the demand that it puts on the overall system, and these measurements are contextual. If the need for more space is the core issue, then the measurement system for the subject will likely seek to quantify how much space is required as its core criterion. If the issue rotates around the number of transactions per unit of time, the subject will likely be measured in terms of how long it takes to process a single transaction. Objects, on the other hand, are measured based upon the capacity that they deliver into the system. Object measurements will generally focus on the performance of the object and how it relates to the demands placed on it by all the subjects that seek to exploit its services.

The chance that the object will fail in terms of its relationship to the subject can be viewed in terms of three perspectives. The first, referred to as *designed fragility* can trace its roots to reliability engineering. The

engineer designs something so that it can be assured to work, given certain stringent conditions, a certain percentage of the time. Naturally, the more grave the impact associated with failure (both in terms of consequence and potential liability), the greater the assurance will need to be—and the lower the level of *designed fragility*. One might even express this in terms of fragility being the difference between all possible outcomes and those that the engineer can assure will be positive outcomes ($F = 100 - R$).

The reliability of the infrastructure can change as operating conditions change. The engineer has assured the reliability of the infrastructure based on certain operating conditions. Where the infrastructure is operating outside of those conditions, the engineer makes no such promises. Operating conditions may include factors such as temperature, humidity, chemical exposure, age, and so on. For those that have looked at Safety Management Systems, this concept will be reasonably familiar as the gradual operation of equipment outside of acceptable parameters is generally accepted as increasing the risk of failure and, consequently, hazard to the operator and those nearby. This *natural fragility* reflects the conditions present in the real world as opposed to the engineering environment.

The conditions that impact natural fragility can be episodic in nature. Seasons change as do daily conditions. Hence, *cyclical fragility* describes natural fragility and its behavior over periods of time. Not all natural fragility will operate in cycles; sometimes the fragility is more linear in nature. Natural fragility is defined in terms of two elements. First, there is the change in natural fragility that happens along a curve over time. At particular times on the curve, certain conditions may be more prevalent and, as a result, the overall fragility of the system may either suffer or improve. The second element is the wear and tear on the infrastructure as it is subjected to repeated strains. Imagine a cycle of freezing and thawing water. As the water freezes, it expands, putting pressure on things around it, like the sides of a container. As the temperature rises, however, the ice melts, leaving an empty spot that can be filled with a larger amount of water.

The following rules extend from the relationship of subjects and objects. The following rules might be called the *local fragility rules*:

- The *design fragility* of an object is the difference between the total population of outcomes less those that assured through the engineering associated with the system ($F = 100 - R$).
- The *natural fragility* of an object can be described as either the lowest number of desirable outcomes or where

$\text{Fragility}_{(\text{design})} \times \text{Factor}_{(\text{environmental impact})}$. This can also be described in terms of $\text{Fragility}_{(\text{natural})} = \text{Fragility}_{(\text{design})} \times \text{Factor}_{(\text{loss of effectiveness due to environment})}$.

- The *cyclical fragility* of an object can be described in terms of the curve defined by the maximum natural fragility over a period of time where the conditions associated with the natural fragility repeat themselves.

From a physical infrastructure perspective, these rules have two significant impacts. The first is that it is not enough for the asset protection specialist to calculate impact simply based upon the engineering specifications of the target (the object). In short, a more comprehensive, intelligent assessment of the infrastructure will need to be made to account for fragility. The core challenge here will be identifying the knowledge sets that apply to the infrastructure and then building the capacity of the assessor or, in some cases, the assessment team. The second element is that this requires much more awareness regarding the impacts of decisions and how those decisions will affect the infrastructure. If we change the conditions that surround the object, we have to understand how that will change the object and whether or not this will have an impact on how the subject and the object relate. This will be a core challenge for planners as it would necessitate maintaining running inventories of their infrastructure points and understanding how their decisions would affect those on categorical, if not individual, levels.

Understanding the relationship between these concepts is vital to the understanding of how fragility works at the local level. The local level, sometimes referred to as the tactical level, is the foundation of the strategic infrastructure system at the regional and even national level. This consideration is often neglected when one becomes preoccupied with the protection of the local facility. What needs to be understood and accounted for is how the local facility or infrastructure contributes to the overall performance of the system.

Recall that the concept of *capacity* and *demand* was touched upon earlier in the description of the subject (demanding services) and the object (delivering capacity). In a system operating at full capacity, these two elements exist in a delicate balance that cannot be disrupted without causing some level of disruption ($D = C$). Where the capacity of the system exceeds the demands placed on it and depending upon the configuration of the network, the redundancy of the system allows the system to respond to some kinds of disruption by simply rerouting to new routes and locations where there is surplus capacity available ($D < C$). On the other hand, where there is more demand than capacity ($C > D$), a situation exists where not all subjects' demands can be met.

At that point, the subject must either reroute itself (to find a new source of capacity), remove itself from the system, or become idle within the system. We have all seen this situation arise during traffic jams.

The balance of demand and capacity will determine what state subjects can remain at within the overall system. When the objects are adequately meeting demands, the subjects will continue to carry on through the system or continue to remain active until they have reached or achieved their ultimate goals. A subject can be described as being in an *active state* when the subject is continuing to attempt to exploit capacity. Subjects caught in a situation where there is no capacity to be exploited will find themselves entering a neutral or passive state. In this context, the subject is waiting for some surplus capacity so that it can be exploited. What needs to be clear, however, is that the passive subject is occupying capacity (as opposed to just space) within the system.

Let us apply these principles and concepts to a more concrete example—the surface network for the City of Ottawa, Canada. In this context, let us assume that the surface system in any given area can handle 1000 cars per minute on the highway and 100 cars per minute in the downtown core. Where there is one driver per car, then one might assume that the two aspects of the system can handle 1000 drivers and 100 drivers respectively. When there are 500 cars on the highway, there are 500 cars worth of capacity to be exploited. The system can continue to function and the cars remain active, occasionally changing lanes to exploit areas that appear to have more capacity. When there are 1000 cars operating in the system, the system is operating at capacity. Any new vehicle attempting to enter the system may cause another vehicle already in the system to slow, or even stop, meaning that the system quickly stalls behind the blockage. If, as the result of the introduction of this additional vehicle, an accident occurs, then many more subjects in the system become inactive, essentially entering a passive state. This passive state occupies more and more capacity (as defined in terms of space), until the subjects have taken up all the available capacity and the system begins to stall. Where this becomes even more challenging is when the subjects occupy an object, move into a passive state and then force the object to enter a passive state. This begins to approach the challenges associated with gridlock that occurs when vehicles simply have no alternatives or capacity to exploit, fill up the overall grid, and then become the disruption themselves.

Now consider a system that has the capacity to handle 4000 persons traveling down a particular route. Let's assume a case where carpooling means that four persons occupy one vehicle. This means that the overall

ratio of persons to cars has increased to four to one. Mass transit, such as busses, increases this ratio again, but on two fronts. The bus can handle forty persons. On the other hand, a bus only requires the space of approximately four vehicles. First, the ratio of passengers (subjects) to the bus (object) has increased to forty to one. This does not reflect the true value, however, because the bus takes up more than a car's allocated space—it takes up approximately four times that amount. That means that the space allocated would normally hold four cars and, therefore, sixteen persons. The bottom line conclusion is that the mass transit system has improved the system's capacity by approximately six cars (forty minus sixteen split with four persons per vehicle). In short, the bus has shifted the ratio of subjects to objects, creating a condition by which many can exploit a single entity in the overall system.

As a result of this analysis, we can apply certain rules when looking at the interaction between subjects and objects. These are the following:

- *Chaining Sequence Rule*—Given Subject A: Object B and Subject B: Object C, then where Object B and Subject B are the same entity, one can infer Subject A: Object C.
- *Efficiency Rule*—The efficiency of a system can be improved by increasing the Subject: Object.

At the regional level, the relationship between the subject and the object has a logical limit. This limit is based on the maximum efficiency of the subject and nature of the object. Consider the bus example. In this example, we have increased the efficiency of the subject from one to four (carpooling) to ten (the bus—forty in the space of four). We have not changed the nature of the object—it can still only handle a certain number of transactions per unit of time (4000 cars per route). In this case, the subject (bus) has become more efficient, but the ratio between the subjects (cars) to the object has not improved.

This situation leads to a condition where the *capacity* of the system gradually becomes fragile. This is because the system cannot respond effectively to the loss of the efficiency within the system. When looking at our example in Ottawa, we have to consider an aspect of *cyclic fragility* that occurred as part of the labor negotiation cycle. In December 2008, the object failed when the union went on strike, essentially dropping the value of the subject from forty persons/four cars or ten persons per car down to four units in a single car. In essence, approximately twenty-four person-trips worth of demand were suddenly forced back into the system, the equivalent of six cars per bus lost.

The result of this impact depends upon two functions. The first function is how the system can adjust its rate of performance in response to the new demand. In this case, the surface road system is not something that one can add capacity (infrastructure) quickly—it takes time to build roads. With respect to the amount of infrastructure available, the transportation system follows physically fixed routes that are necessary to the operation of the mode of conveyance. The question is not, however, about whether or not new routes can be created, but whether or not they can be adequately controlled. Additional flexibility could also be inputted to the transportation system (to an extent) in the context of aviation and marine industries, thereby altering the nature of the system. In essence, the first function describes the ability of the network to create and add capacity within the system so that the system can rebalance itself, which is a pure resiliency function.

Where the first function cannot be achieved, the second function must come into play. The second function is the attempt to locate and reroute the demand that is not being met into other avenues that offer a surplus of capacity. This may involve alternate routes, the use of side streets, and a host of other means—the important part is that the infrastructure has untapped capacity and can direct disrupted demand onto that capacity. This premise is also not new; it is the foundation of Intelligent Transportation Systems that attempt to route around traffic jams, etc.

Where the system cannot achieve these two goals, however, the next layer of fragility comes into play. This fragility is based upon the fragmentation and potential dissolution of networks. Consider that when a node or a conduit is completely filled (demand meets or exceeds capacity), then it cannot deliver any more service. These are essentially pockets within the system and, depending on what capacity they offer to the system, one will find that the impact begins to cascade upstream (where the system becomes clogged) and downstream (where the expected resources and so on fail to arrive). This is common within the airline industry, particularly during bad weather, and one only has to look at a major hub during that bad weather to see the breadth and depth of the impact.

This impact is again based upon the capacity at the disrupted points and the connections between the various nodes. When the nodes are affected, the conduits between those nodes are all affected, following the same principles as a single point of failure from the Business Continuity domain. When only one of many conduits between nodes is affected, the system may be able to adjust accordingly (such as we would see where aircraft and ships are routed to new airways or shipping lanes in response to bad weather). What should be clear to the reader, however, is that there is a level of

dependence and independence in how this impact operates. If the node is configured with set points and does not have the ability to reprioritize or adjust its own configuration (such as paid gates at an airport); then the individual lines or conduits of disruption function independently of each other. This results in a condition where the sum of disruptions must be taken into account. On the other hand, where a node has the ability to adjust and prioritize accordingly, then the calculation of disruption moves much more in line with those associated with dependent events.

Consider this example; if each service point held by the node is firmly and irrevocably allocated to one family of lines, then only those service points need to be disrupted for the whole family of lines to be disrupted. If, however, there are clauses and similar mechanisms built in that allow for the organization to move a disrupted line from one family into another group of service points (likely with a cost), then the final failure of the event is not determined by whether or not all of one administrative group of service points are disrupted. At the tactical level, the organization needs to arrange its service points and its contracts to prevent a single incident from affecting all service lines to allow for flexibility in its operational context.

Fragility, at this point, indicates the potential for fragmentation and we must, therefore, take into account the risk of disruption looking at both the infrastructure side of the equation and also the administrative side of the equation. Where all elements are vulnerable to a certain kind of attack, for instance, and there are no other options available, then the system is fragile. At the regional level, if there is only one option available that can meet all services, this local or tactical fragility can quickly affect the regional fragility—meaning that the regional system is vulnerable to a single attack at a certain point.

Finally, by looking at how the capacity lost as a result of that disruption affects the overall system—movement to and through—we can calculate the disruptions due to fragmentation and dissolution. Fragmentation occurs at key points that segregate or connect the various nodes of a network. These might be referred to as the hubs in the transportation system. Depending upon whether or not the physical, procedural, technical, and psychological measures are in place to connect behind those nodes (such as a couple of airports with the correct runways, landing systems, communications systems, trained personnel, etc), the system will cut away from the network. This leads to fragmentation.

Fragmentation and its associated impacts eventually lead to a situation where demand in the system cannot locate any reasonable route by which

it can accomplish its goals. When this happens, the system gradually fills and then collapses under its own weight. Essentially, it is overwhelmed by a shift in the demand to capacity ratio. The end result is a condition where the pressure in the system has to be relieved to such a point that it can restart its operations and generate the capacity necessary to meet demand.

Fragility, in a networked transportation system operates across all three levels: local, regional, and national or strategic. The strategic and regional levels are founded upon the capacity and vulnerabilities inherent at the local levels and then exacerbated through regional and national disconnects, the lack of redundancy, and similar factors. At the local level, an understanding of fragility must be combined with the need to conduct appropriate impact assessments in addition to understanding the vulnerabilities associated with each input that allows for work to proceed so that the potential capacity to be delivered can actually be communicated or delivered into the system. Failing to understand the concept of fragility at the local level can lead to a misinterpretation of impacts by failing to understand how the infrastructure delivers capacity within in the broader regional or national context.

Author Biography

Mr. McDougall has held positions as the Senior Inspector for Ports and Marine Facilities at Transport Canada, National Coordinator Security Policy and Projects at the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and Compliance Auditor for Fleet Security within the Canadian Coast Guard. In each of these roles, he has provided guidance and advice with respect to Physical Security and Infrastructure Assurance ranging across the local, regional, and strategic levels of government and into the private sector. He has a BMAS from the Royal Military College and a BA from the University of Western Ontario. He also has certifications in Critical Infrastructure Protection (PCIP), Antiterrorism (CMAS), and Information Systems Security (CISSP). He currently contributes on a variety of training projects within the Transportation Security community (including as a recognized trainer under the International Maritime Organization's Train the Trainer program and Transport Canada's marine security programs) and has contributed on a number of specialized courses, including the Strategic Leadership in Federal Government Security course offered to emerging Departmental Security Officers.

Book Reviews

***Afghanistan: Transition Under Threat.* By Geoffrey Hayes and Mark Sedra, editors. Ontario, Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008. ISBN 978-1-55458-001-8. Notes. Bibliography. Charts. Index. Pp. xxxiv, 309. Paper, \$29.95.**

As this review is being written, President Obama has just concluded a meeting with Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper at which one of the primary topics of discussion was the “deteriorating situation” in Afghanistan. Obama recently ordered another 17,000 U.S. troops to that troubled nation, and while Harper remains committed to his country’s pledge to help rebuild Afghanistan, Canada looks to withdraw its nearly 3000 troops by 2011. It remains to be seen whether Afghans can regain control of their country’s security situation, but given the increasing instability and a resurgent Taliban and al-Qaeda efforts, it seems likely that additional U.S. troops will be needed to prevail on what Obama has termed the main front in the war on terrorism. If nothing else, Canada’s economic assistance will be vital, but the current uncertain conditions highlight the importance of understanding *why* we are facing a “transition under threat,” as the editors have aptly subtitled this timely volume.

Hayes and Sedra have done good service in bringing together in one volume a collection of eleven papers presented in Waterloo, Canada in December 2006, at a workshop sponsored by the Centre for International Governance Innovation and co-organized by the Laurier Centre for Military Strategic and Disarmament Studies. The collected essays address three distinct, yet interrelated, aspects of Afghanistan’s transition from war to peace and are organized under the headings of “Political Transition,” “Economic Transition,” and “Security Transition.” A final section of three essays under the category of “The Canadian Case,” specifically examines Canada’s experience in Afghanistan. Despite the recent attention on the state of Afghan affairs, it was apparent to these scholars and other experts even in 2006 that the situation there was yet so uncertain as to give rise to questions about whether efforts to bring stability were “gaining ground or were on the verge of ‘strategic failure’” (p. vii). A sense of the authors’ collective foreboding that the latter situation was the most likely outcome provides a somber background for these essays.

An insightful look at the legacy of 2001’s Bonn conference and resultant agreement provide the foundation for a discussion of the political transition. In “Looking Back at the Bonn Process,” William Maley cites two significant factors as contributing to the failure to deliver fully on

the promises of Bonn. One is Pakistan's penchant for interference in Afghan affairs, and the other is the relegation of Afghanistan to a back seat in favor of Iraq, to which resources and attention have been largely diverted. Maley further cites as critical the initial decision not to expand the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) beyond Kabul, a situation that contributed significantly to disorder in outlying areas of the country.

In "Afghanistan: The Challenge of State Building," former Afghan Interior Minister Ali A. Jalali also blames the legacy of corruption in his country for the failure to provide a suitable foundation for the growth of democracy. The Afghan state clearly was unable to provide the most basic public services, most notably, security. Jonathan Goodhand rounds out the discussion of the political transition with a provocative look at how poppy production plays a central role in security affairs, asserting that drug policies are actually "undermining higher policy goals related to security and governance" (74). Goodhand echoes Jalali's lament over the lack of focus on strengthening "core state institutions," and in a plea to reconsider intensive eradication efforts he concludes that "rather than criminalizing war economies there is a need to think more carefully about how to harness the energies of war in order to pay for peace" (77).

Perhaps of most interest to the readers of this review will be the section of the book dealing with the security transition. Antonio Giustozzi's "The Neo-Taliban Insurgency: From Village Islam to International Jihad," insightfully contends that a new Taliban strategy has emerged that emphasizes building support among Muslim nations and stretching Western capabilities by creating multiple areas of unrest around the world. Rather than turning Westerners' public opinion against their countries' military efforts, Neo-Taliban focus is on winning Muslim public opinion and thereby strengthening sources of funding and volunteers. Inside Afghanistan, that means first removing pro-government forces from the fight, thus promoting the image from that point that the Taliban is waging a war against foreign aggressors.

In Mark Sedra's "Security Sector Reform and State Building in Afghanistan," the author reflects on the state of security sector reform (SSR), noting that the process of remaking Afghanistan's state security architecture "continues to be characterized by short-termism" (212) and a failure to balance long and short-term goals. Moreover, he asserts, pumping funds into unreformed state institutions still ripe for corruption will serve only to further alienate Afghans victimized by that corruption. Sedra recommends adoption of "a holistic approach that aims to change

the culture and ethos of the system,” (213) and hopes for a continuation of the momentum in placing SSR efforts on the right course for success.

Afghan Ambassador to the United States, Husain Haqqani’s article, “Insecurity along the Durand Line,” provides an historical primer describing the creation of Afghanistan’s border first with British India and then with the independent state of Pakistan, tracing the process by which the latter developed relations with the United States by portraying itself as the bulwark against Soviet influence in the region and by maintaining influence in Afghanistan. While interesting in its portrayal of Afghanistan’s views on the historical relations between that country and Pakistan, Haqqani’s version, though useful, seems decidedly partial in fixing blame. He contends that Pakistan’s historical fears of insecurity on its borders still influence Afghanistan’s external relations and must be addressed by the international community before stable and cordial relations can exist between the two neighbors.

In all, this fine collection of essays provides a useful look at where we have been and, unfortunately, where we still need to go in efforts to restore the security of Afghanistan. The book will be of interest to scholars and strategic security practitioners alike.

Edward J. Hagerty is the provost at Henley-Putnam University.

***Enemies of Intelligence: Knowledge & Power in American National Security.* By Richard K. Betts. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2007. ISBN 978-0-231-13889-5. Notes. Index. Pp. xiv, 241. \$21.50.**

We are all aware that the events of September 11, 2001 brought intense focus on our nation’s Intelligence Community (IC), with an enormous variety of corrections, reorganizations, and improvements proposed, many of which were implemented. At the same time allegations of serious error, incorrect reporting, and excessive compartmentation drew front-page headlines in U.S. newspapers and television news programs. In *Enemies of Intelligence: Knowledge & Power in American National Security*, Richard Betts explores these issues and looks at the changes that have resulted, while providing significant background and interesting evaluations of the products of those changes. He also offers his perspective of possible solutions to problems, including strategies to enhance the effectiveness of intelligence analysis and reporting.

While the intelligence business is itself based on a history of many centuries—even the ancient Romans and Greeks used intelligence to

their advantage and sometimes to their disadvantage—Betts focuses on the events of the past several decades to illustrate his points, generally from World War II to the present day. In this respect the book could be considered a commentary, or perhaps a set of proposed solutions to complex problems that are faced in today's world. He does this based on a distinctive association with the IC. Currently he is Director of the Arnold A. Salzman Institute of War and Peace Studies at Columbia University, and senior fellow at the Council of Foreign Relations. Betts is also the author of several books on military strategy and foreign policy. He has served on staffs of the Senate Intelligence Committee (the Church committee) and National Security Council in the 1970s, as a consultant to the National Intelligence Council and the Central Intelligence Agency in the 1980s, on advisory panels for the Director of Central Intelligence in the 1990s, and on the National Commission on Terrorism (the Bremer commission) in 1999–2000.

Certainly this book is not unique in the field of reviews of our current IC. The thirty-four pages of notes with footnoted references are enough to demonstrate the number of publications on this subject. Indeed, these references are really a treasure trove of materials pertinent to this complex topic, and they provide the basis for a thorough evaluation of many of the concepts. Betts draws from this vast set of publications in order to provide his own perspective regarding the intelligence processes and structure.

Betts skillfully uses his academic experience in combination with his on-the-job experience in order to define many of the problems the IC has faced in the past and those that continue to be of fundamental importance. He clearly points out that public criticism of the IC is often based on limited or even incorrect information. Many successes go quietly into the unknown, while failures most often become public. He also points out that sometimes it is difficult to clearly determine the degree of success of an operation, particularly if it preempts an enemy action. For example, if we learn through intelligence that an enemy action is forthcoming we might implement a defensive measure. If the enemy in turn realizes that a defensive measure exists and does not pursue the action, it is difficult to recognize the degree of success. Similarly, if there is insufficient real proof that an enemy action might take place, but the implementation of an appropriate defense is too expensive or complex based on the evidence available, a lack of action on our part would reflect badly on the intelligence process if the enemy action actually occurred. As noted on the book jacket, author unknown, "Betts argues that when it comes to intelligence, citizens and politicians should focus less on consistent solutions and more on achieving a delicate balance between

conflicting requirements. He also emphasizes the substantial success of the intelligence community, despite its well-publicized blunders, and highlights elements of the intelligence process that need preservation and protection.”

I must admit that when I read of his activities with the Church commission, which was extremely critical of the Intelligence Community in the 1970s, his academic experience and work with the Brookings Institution, both generally liberal environments, I did not expect to find supportable conclusions. In fact I found that he clearly expressed real problems in both the intelligence and political worlds, and made proposals that can positively affect not only the collection and reporting of intelligence, but the evaluation and analysis followed by the determination of appropriate actions based on the intelligence. Anyone involved in final intelligence product analysis or implementation of responses to threats should read this book and consider using the approaches offered by Richard Betts.

Ed Urie is a member of the Henley-Putnam University faculty and is also an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University. He is a retired U.S. Army Intelligence Officer and a veteran of CIA and NSA.

Film Review

***Body of Lies*, Warner Brothers, 2008, MPAA Rating: R, Runtime: 2 hours, Starring: Leonardo DiCaprio, Russell Crowe, Mark Strong, Golshifteh Farahani, Oscar Isaac, Simon McBurney Director: Ridley Scott, Screenwriter: William Monahan, Producer: Donald DeLine, Ridley Scott.**

Leonardo DiCaprio fights terrorists for the CIA in this rapid-fire thriller from director Ridley Scott (GLADIATOR, BLACK HAWK DOWN).

Body of Lies is about a CIA officer, Roger Ferris (DiCaprio), pursuing an elusive terrorist mastermind modeled somewhat after Osama bin Laden, and the various degrees of ethical or moral struggles with which Ferris must deal.

The film is infused with the obligatory explosions, pyrotechnics, hi-tech surveillance, gunfights, car chases, blood and gore, and of course the clichéd love interest. Ferris' exploits are monitored via satellites, drone spy planes, and cell phones by CIA Near Division Chief Ed Hoffman (Russell Crowe). Innocents are killed, careers placed into jeopardy, and trusts betrayed. Crowe seems to enjoy his role as the deceptive, amoral, hard-nosed, southern colonel-like boss, untouched by the ethical dilemmas affecting Ferris. For Hoffman, it's about getting the job done and the war won, at any cost. As the debonair director of the Jordanian General Intelligence Directorate, Mark Strong masterfully portrays the refined, erudite intelligence wizard in sharp contrast to Hoffman. Departing from the original novel by David Ignatius, director Scott casts the attractive Persian actress Golshifteh Farahani as a nurse attending to throngs of Palestinian refugees in Amman. She becomes Ferris' love interest when she treats him for a rabid dog bite suffered while chasing down and terminating one of many evil doers he encounters. Screenwriter William Monahan demonstrated faithfulness to the original Ignatius tale, and his changes do not detract from the overall story.

Counterterrorism and intelligence operations conducted by national security organs largely swim in the oceans of deception. That is where the terrorists and secrets live. Several times throughout the movie, Ferris wrestles with his conscience about deceitful acts he must commit. Ferris also challenges his boss, Hoffman, on decisions and actions Hoffman callously undertakes or directs. Lies are the *idée fixe* of the entire film. Real life intelligence and counterterrorism officers face this issue throughout their careers beginning with living undercover, ostensibly working for some other employer while actually being employed by an

intelligence organization. This sort of life takes its toll differently on different people.

As in the original novel, Ferris is Hoffman's fair haired protégé. Though Hoffman is Ferris' superior officer, the latter suffers no punishment or even reprimands for regular insubordination (mostly verbal). Hoffman spends more time monitoring Ferris and his operations while away from his Langley office than in it. Unless this is the new telecommuting technique at CIA, such activity is unprofessional, insecure, and just plain ridiculous.

Viewers will no doubt come away from the film asking themselves and others if CIA and the broader intelligence community have some of the technical capabilities displayed in the film. Without my commenting on current capabilities, movie goers should enjoy all the high-tech creations of intercepts, aerial-drone reconnaissance, and their like for what they added to the film and hope that if not already available, the technical capabilities of our national security apparatus will acquire them in the near future.

What would Hollywood do without the blood and brutality? Ferris is haunted throughout the movie by flashbacks to seeing a person tortured and ultimately killed during interrogation by a foreign intelligence service. Ferris has to make split second decisions about killing or being killed. Toward the end, Ferris himself undergoes some bloody torture that will make any audience cringe. The brutality depicted is not gratuitous but reasonably reflects reality in the struggle with terrorists. Innocents only matter to the good guys while the purveyors of terror consider everyone a fair target.

Golshifteh Farahani, as the attractive Persian nurse Aisha, is the metaphor for good and caring. She and her ministrations to refugees are the counterpoint to all the evil infecting mankind. Ultimately, Aisha (interestingly the name of Mohammed's supposed favorite wife) is the reason Ferris leaves his counterterrorist life to take a new and implicitly better road.

As for endorsing this movie, let it be said that if you have the time and inclination to sit through two hours of Russell Crowe and Leonardo DiCaprio, go for it.

Bart Bechtel is the Assistant Chief Academic Officer at Henley-Putnam University.