NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

Deterrence and Coercion of Non-State Actors:

Analysis of Case Studies

Study Director
Dr. Keith B. Payne
President, National Institute for Public Policy

Contributors

Dr. Shmuel Bar   Dr. Robert Joseph
Dr. Patrick Garrity   Dr. Steven Lambakis
Dr. Gary Geipel   Russell Roth
Dr. Colin Gray   Thomas Scheber
Kurt Guthe   Dr. Andrei Shoumikhin
Melanie Inglis   Willis Stanley

Prepared By:
National Institute for Public Policy

October 2008

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

This report summarizes the findings from a study of conflicts between states and non-state actors (NSA). Each case study was examined to determine whether the NSA was deterred at some part of the conflict and, if so, which measures used by the state may have been instrumental for that purpose. For this analysis, ten case studies of conflicts between states and NSAs were identified, researched, and written. The case studies span more than two centuries and range in time from the conflict between the United States and the Barbary pirates in the early 1800s to more recent conflicts, such as Russia versus Chechen nationalists and Israel versus Hizballah.

Section II of this study provides an overview of this project and lists the specific case studies examined for this effort. Section III describes relevant characteristics of the NSAs in the case studies. Characteristics include the organizational nature of the NSA, whether decision-making is centralized or decentralized, the geographical location of the NSA in relation to its state opponent, and whether decision-making or control within each NSA was influenced by one or more third parties. Also discussed are the primary motives for the hostile actions of each NSA as well as the various methods used against each state. Section IV describes the methods used by each state to deter, coerce, or combat the pertinent NSA. These methods are grouped into three broad categories: threatened punishment, denial of goals, and inducements. Threatened punishment and denial are traditional elements of a deterrence or coercion strategy. The case studies also document examples of inducements; while not considered a tool of deterrence or coercion, inducements have been used in combination with deterrence and coercion measures to influence NSA decisions and behavior.

Section V provides additional summary observations relevant to deterrence of NSAs. These observations include: whether or not deterrence of an NSA is likely to be a high priority goal for a state; even if deterrence is not a goal, how it may be achieved as a concomitant effect of measures to defeat the NSA; deterrence, if achieved, may be

fragile—limited in time and scope; and contextual factors—some unrelated to the immediate conflict—may prove instrumental in influencing decisions by NSA leaders. Section VI discusses key findings from this study which may be of value to contemporary defense planners who are responsible for strategies to deter and coerce non-state opponents.

To provide a ready reference guide for the reader, appendix A includes a short summary of each case study. The completed research papers detailing each of the case studies are compiled in a separate document entitled, Deterrence and Coercion of Non-State Actors: Analysis of Historic Case Studies, Volume II. Appendix B includes a biographical sketch of each of the contributing authors. Appendix C provides a discussion of deterrence in the contemporary environment that includes threats from NSAs.

II. Introduction and Purpose of the Study

This study was sponsored jointly by the Director of Net Assessment and the Defense Policy Analysis Office. The study was initiated to investigate the feasibility for deterrence strategies against non-state actors (NSAs).

Coercion and deterrence are not identical functions. The following are working definitions:

> *Coercion:* Methods, including the use or threatened use of force, to compel adversary leaders to change behavior—*to cease* or undo an action that has already been taken, or to cause those leaders to take action that they would not be inclined to take without the threat or use of force.

> *Deterrence:* Methods, including the use or threatened use of force, to influence the decision calculus of adversary leaders to *not* undertake a specific action. Methods typically used for deterrence during the Cold War involved threats of punishment and, to a lesser extent, denial of the adversary's goals.

For the sake of simplicity, this study tends to use the term deterrence even though the boundaries between coercion and deterrence shift and overlap in practice. In all cases the states sought to eliminate the threat or to coerce the NSAs to change behavior in some way (e.g., for the Barbary Coast piracy case study, to cease attacks on American merchant shipping in the Mediterranean; for the British in Mesopotamia, to submit to the authority of the state). In some of these cases, the methods used by the state resulted in the NSA retaining the ability to continue hostile action against the state, but refraining from doing so. For such cases, this paper considers deterrence to have been operative— at least for a time.

The issue of deterrence of non-state actors is relevant to the current and projected national security environment for a variety of reasons. Over the past few centuries, non-state actors have posed security challenges to states, including the United States, in a variety of ways. A rich history of conflicts between states and non-state actors can be compiled for analysis. More recently, with the availability of modern weaponry and advanced technologies, the potential for NSAs to threaten states has increased in lethality.[1] This reality was evidenced by the tragic events of September 11, 2001 and is underscored by reports that terrorist groups seek weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Indeed, President George W. Bush has stated that the most serious threat facing the United States is the nexus of violent extremism and WMD.[2]

This study concludes that many prevalent views of deterrence and non-state opponents are inaccurate. Commonly held views regarding deterrence of NSAs typically include the following:

- NSA leaders cannot be deterred because they are irrational.
- NSAs cannot be deterred because they have no territory or state-based assets that can be held at risk.
- If NSAs could be deterred, we should be able to devise a universal approach—a template—for deterring this category of adversary. (This aspiration follows the thinking that an approach comparable to Secretary of Defense McNamara's "Assured Destruction" metric is waiting to be uncovered).

This study chronicles and analyzes ten case studies of conflicts involving states and NSAs. The case studies provide empirical evidence that the commonly held views, listed above, regarding deterrence of NSAs are mistaken. NSA leaders have been deterred. In cases where NSAs were deterred, this was often done through methods that differ

---

[1] See the discussion in, Martin Shubik, "Terrorism, Technology, and the Socioeconomics of Death," *Comparative Strategy*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (Oct./Dec. 1997), pp. 399-414.

[2] "The gravest danger to freedom lies at the perilous crossroads of radicalism and technology. When the spread of chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, along with ballistic missile technology—when that occurs, even weak states and small groups could attain a catastrophic power to strike great nations." President George W. Bush, commencement address at West Point, June 1, 2002, in *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, June 10, 2002, p. 946.

significantly from the Cold War tactics of holding at risk the assets presumed to be of highest value to the adversary. For cases in which the NSA involved was compelled to change its aggressive behavior against its state opponent, there was no uniform pattern of methods used by each state that could be applied as a template. Instead, when a state successfully deterred its non-state opponent, it often was the result of a combination of methods found via painful experience to be suited to the unique characteristics and motives of the NSA as well as a variety of contextual factors.

The report of the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review included an initiative to move beyond Cold War thinking about deterrence and called for "tailored deterrence," customized for each specific adversary to deter specific actions in specific situations.[3] The case studies developed during this investigation provide examples of states tailoring (through trial and error) combinations of methods—threats of punishment, denial of objectives, and sometimes inducements—in order to change the behavior of NSA leaders.

A word of caution is in order. For the ten case studies developed for, and used in this investigation, deterrence of the NSA was seldom an explicit goal of leaders of the states. Typically the states sought to defeat the NSA and eliminate the threat. The case studies are not offered as examples of well-thought-out strategies intended explicitly for the purpose of deterrence; rarely was that the case. For most states, strategies evolved over time through trial and error. In some cases elimination of the threat could not be accomplished in a timely manner. However, actions by states resulted in NSA leaders changing their behavior in ways that suggest that they were deterred from continuing their preferred course. Sometimes deterrence of the NSA was operative only for a limited time and a new round of aggressive actions by the NSA followed changes in contextual factors or erosion in the effectiveness of state actions contributing to deterrence.

---

[3] Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Defense, February 6, 2006), p. 49.

Case Studies

Ten case studies involving conflicts between states and non-state actors were compiled for this effort. Each of the case studies attempts to characterize the nature of the conflict, the leaders of the NSA, the methods used by each state against its non-state opponent, and the results of those methods. The case studies are listed below:

- *The United States and Barbary Piracy: 1783-1805*

- *Pancho Villa an the Punitive Expedition: 1916-1923*

- *The Anglo-Irish War: 1919-1921*

- *British Deterrence and Coercion in Mesopotamia: 1919-1932*

- *Urban Terrorist Groups in Continental Europe: 1970s-1980s*

- *Soviet Reponses to Terror Attacks at the Time of Civil War in Lebanon: September-October 1985*

- *Deterring Non-State Terrorist Groups—The Case of Hizballah: 1985-2006*

- *Aum Shinrikyo Case Study: 1989-1995*

- *Deterring Non-State Terrorist Groups—Palestinian Groups—Fatah and Hamas: 2000-2006*

- *Russian Responses to Terrorism: The Chechen War: 1994-2006*

Appendix A provides a short description of each of the case studies. These summaries are provided to give the reader a highly condensed summary of the context and noteworthy events for each case study. The completed research papers detailing each of the case studies are compiled in a separate document entitled Deterrence and Coercion of Non-State Actors: Analysis of Historic Case Studies, Volume II.

The case studies developed for this effort span roughly 200 years and involve 10 different conflicts between states and NSAs. They range in duration from less than a year to over two decades and cover many regions of the world—North America, Africa, the Middle East, Europe, the Caucasus, and Northeast Asia. From these varying regions come a

number of different cultural issues and contextual factors that are important in understanding the dynamics of each conflict. While each of these case studies includes some unique factors, they all point to the useful and enduring lessons presented in Section VI of this report.

III. Characteristics of Non-State Actors in Case Studies

Organizational Arrangements

Characteristics of an NSA, such as organizational structure, cultural factors, location, proximity to the territory of the state adversary, and relationship with host or patron states can affect the potential feasibility and practicality of deterrence. Is the NSA centrally organized with a well-defined chain of command, or is it decentralized with numerous autonomous cells? Is the NSA dependent on one person for its leadership and inspiration or is the organization resilient to the elimination of key leaders? These distinctions will play an important role in the ability of a state to apply pressure to the appropriate nodes of power with the hopes of deterring or coercing. The case studies discussed in this report cover both centralized leadership (such as the Irish Republican Army (IRA) in 1919 and the Red Army Faction (RAF) in the 1970s and 1980s) and decentralized NSA leadership (such as the Palestinian group, Hamas).

Operational Area

The physical location of the NSA vis-à-vis its state opponent is an important consideration. Some case studies involved an NSA located within the territory of its state adversary, while other case studies involved an NSA that was located in state-occupied territories or external to the state with which it was in conflict. If the NSA is located within the adversarial state's territory, it may be easier for the state to employ effective denial measures and make credible punitive threats. The fact that an NSA resides internal to its state opponent makes it susceptible to the laws and norms of the state with which it is in conflict, thus allowing the state to directly influence the environment within which the NSA must operate. At the same time, states combating NSAs on its own

territory may be constrained by concerns over injuring innocent citizens as it considers punitive or disruptive actions against NSA cells. The state may be more willing to accept collateral damage from an action against the NSA if the NSA resides within another state that permits the NSA to operate from sanctuaries within its borders. In addition, the state may have less opportunity to gather the pertinent intelligence on a group operating outside of its territory, thus limiting its knowledge of how best to threaten or punish the necessary nodes of the NSA reliably. The state may also have unique limitations and legal restrictions affecting its options vis-à-vis an NSA located within its borders. All of these factors may affect the avenues through which intelligence may be gathered and deterrence and coercion strategies put into practice.

Host and Patron States

Considering whether deterrence is feasible and practicable requires us to understand how to deter specific opponents from specific actions under specific conditions. For some scenarios, there may be multiple decision-makers to be deterred with diverse motivations. Therefore, an important characteristic to consider is whether the NSA has an identifiable host or patron state that is complicit in the behavior of, and perhaps the continued existence of, the NSA. For example, Lebanon is the *host state* for the NSA, Hizballah. The weak government of Lebanon has allowed Hizballah to function within its territory and, over time, representatives of Hizballah have been integrated into the Lebanese government. Over the years, the Israelis have sought to bring pressure against Hizballah *indirectly* by pressuring the government of its host state, Lebanon, to take stronger action to restrain Hizballah.

A *patron state* is one that provides leadership, direction, or support, including political, financial, and material support to an NSA. It may also provide sanctuary to an NSA, including some form of protection from punitive threats. An example of this can be found in Syria, which allows Palestinian terrorist leaders to reside and operate from Syrian territory. This form of sanctuary complicates (although it does not remove) Israeli options for directly striking terrorist leaders.

8

Iran serves as a patron to Hizballah. It supplies Hizballah with intelligence, arms and funds, and directs much of its activities and strategic objectives. This external support and leadership make it difficult for the Israelis to cut off funding, arms, and material to Hizballah and complicates Israeli options for punitive action out of concern over escalation to a larger war that could include Iran and Syria. Consequently, the roles of patron and host states are very important when identifying and evaluating the key decision-makers behind the behavior of an NSA, when identifying the types of threats that may provide greatest leverage, and when identifying the channels of communication that may best display those threats. The cases examined in this study include several where host or patron states played a key role that substantially affected the motives and decision-making of NSAs and, therefore, significantly affected the dynamics of deterrence.

For some of the case studies, the NSA had neither a host state nor a patron that had to be considered in bringing pressure to bear on the NSA leaders. For example, the Irish Republican Army in 1919-1921 operated independent of influence by a host or patron state. Thus, in the British-IRA case study, the British focused primarily on pressuring Michael Collins, the charismatic leader of the IRA, in order to change his decision calculus. At the other end of the spectrum, some NSAs had both a host and one or more patrons that had to be considered in a strategy to coerce NSA-related decision-makers. For example, in the case study involving Israel versus Hizballah, the Israeli government was confronted with the challenge of bringing pressure to bear against Hizballah leaders, the leadership of the host state in Lebanon, and Hizballah's sponsors in Syria and in Iran.

Figure 1 provides an overview of characteristics of the NSAs in the case studies.

Characteristics of NSA		U.S. versus Barbary Regencies (1783-1805)	U.S. versus Mexican Revolutionaries (1915-1917)	Britain versus Irish Republican Army (1919-1921)	Britain versus Shi'a and Kurdish Groups in Mesopotamia (1919-1932)	European States versus Euro-Terrorists (1970s-1980s)	USSR versus PLO/ Hizballah (1985)	Japan versus Aum Shinrikyo (1989-1995)	Israel versus Hizballah (1985-2006)	Israel versus Fatah and Hamas (2000-2006)	Russia versus Chechen Separatists (1994-2006)
Organizational Structure	Centralized Leadership	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X (Hamas)	X (94-96)
	Decentralized Leadership				X					X (Fatah)	X (99-06)
NSA Region	North America		X								
	Europe			X		X					
	North East Asia							X			
	Caucasus										X
	Middle East				X		X		X	X	
	North Africa	X									
NSA Proximity to State	Internal: On Territory of State			X		X		X			X
	External: Adjacent to State		X						X	X	
	External: Separated from State	X			X		X				
NSA Patron / Allies	No Patrons/Allies		X	X	X	X		X			X
	One or More Patron/Ally	X					X		X	X	

Figure 1. Matrix of Characteristics of Non-State Actors

NSA Motives and Methods

NSA Motives. If a state wishes to coerce the leaders of an NSA in order to change its behavior, it will be important to understand the motives and goals of the NSA leaders (as well as the motives of the host state and patrons, if applicable). The NSAs in the case studies were in conflict with states that typically possessed superior resources. Leaders of these NSAs often were motivated by a combination of factors.   A few were motivated by economic gain or prestige (e.g., the Barbary regencies versus the U.S.). Others sought to correct a perceived injustice, such as the inability to govern or freely express the cultural identity of a minority (e.g., a violent group of Basque separatists known as the ETA). Still others sought political power; some (e.g., European terrorists such as the Red Brigades in Italy and the RAF in Germany) wished to ignite a revolution and overthrow the existing political order, while Hizballah (in Lebanon) and Pancho Villa (in Mexico)

worked to acquire a place of influence within the government on whose territory they operated.

Religion, in combinations with other motivating factors, played a role in several of the case studies. For example, Shi'a and Kurdish groups in Mesopotamia were motivated in part by a fusion of political and religious factors. The Barbary Coast regencies that included Tripoli were Islamic; they considered piracy against ships from non-Muslim countries to be fair game and lucrative targets. In Japan, Aum Shinrikyo professed religious motivations as well as a desire to overturn the existing social and governmental structure and replace it with a visionary structure. Hizballah is motivated by its Islamic roots as well as its opposition to Israel, the desire to gain political power within Lebanon, and its service to its state sponsors (patrons).

NSA Methods. In the cases examined, the NSAs employed a spectrum of methods (hostile actions) against state opponents to achieve their goals. These methods included: attacks on civilians within, and external to, the state; attacks on commerce; attacks on military forces; attacks on state leaders; and kidnappings or hijackings. In almost all of the cases, the NSAs engaged in various kinds of attacks on civilians or state leaders. In some cases, such attacks were intended to serve a strategic goal. For example, in the IRA case, Michael Collins used attacks on civilians and constabulary forces in order to provoke an overreaction by the British and thereby unite the Irish populace to support a struggle for Irish independence and exploit the moral qualms of British politicians. In other case studies, attacks against citizens of the state were carried out for tactical gains. For example, the Red Army Faction kidnapped prominent civilians in West Germany in order to exchange them for imprisoned RAF leaders.

The methods used by each NSA affected the types of methods the state considered to counter, deter, or coerce a change of behavior by the group in question. Methods used by an NSA will likely influence how willing a state will be to pursue deterrence, or, in contrast, if the state will instead be compelled to destroy and eliminate the group. For example, both West Germany and Italy dealt with their terrorist problems in the 1970s

11

with an expansion of police powers that had been initially opposed by their citizens as a rollback of civil liberties. Such sweeping government action was necessary in part because softer measures like traditional policing and seeking accommodation with the terrorists had proven unable to stem the violence. Over time, as the tactics of the Red Army Faction in West Germany and the Red Brigades in Italy became more violent, the citizens in those countries became more supportive of a stronger role by the government in confronting terrorists. Similarly, in the Russia-Chechen case study, outrage over the Chechen terrorist bombing of Russian civilian apartment buildings in 1999 freed Moscow's hand to undertake significant repressive and punitive actions during the subsequent reoccupation of the breakaway Russian territory.

An understanding of NSA motives and methods can also, as in the case of the 1920s IRA, provide important indicators whether negotiations can have a role in achieving a settlement. Both the IRA and Britain proved willing to make serious concessions and the IRA was willing and able to enforce the agreement in Ireland. A negotiated agreement was feasible because the IRA of that time was controlled under the central authority of Michael Collins, a leader who had motives and goals that facilitated pragmatism. This is in contrast to the Israeli experience with Yasir Arafat's Fatah which was not centrally controlled, appeared unable to enforce its will on other Palestinian factions or its own subordinate warlords, and was further constrained in what it could do by the activity of the more extreme Palestinian faction, Hamas, which continued to endorse violence and adhere to its declared goal of the elimination of the state of Israel.

Figure 2 provides a summary of primary motivations of NSAs and the methods used by each as documented in the case studies.

NSA Motives and Methods Used		Case Studies of Conflicts Between States and Non-State Actors (NSA)									
		U.S. versus Barbary Regencies (1783-1805)	U.S. versus Mexican Revolutionaries (1915-1917)	Britain versus Irish Republican Army (1919-1921)	Britain versus Shi'a and Kurdish Groups in Mesopotamia (1919-1932)	European States versus Euro-Terrorists (1970s-1980s)	USSR versus PLO/Hizballah (1985)	Japan versus Aum Shinrikyo (1989-1995)	Israel versus Hizballah (1985-2006)	Israel versus Fatah and Hamas (2000-2006)	Russia versus Chechen Separatists (1994-2006)
NSA Motives	*Economic Gain*	X	X								
	Influence/ Prestige	X	X				X				
	Separatism			X		X (ETA)					X
	Opposition to Occupation			X	X				X	X	
	New Order					X		X			
	Political Power		X						X		
	Religion	X						X	X	X (Hamas)	X (99-06)
NSA Methods	*Attacks on Civilians in State*		X	X		X		X	X	X	X
	Attacks on Civilians External to State								X		
	Attacks on Commerce	X									
	Attacks on Military Forces	X	X	X	X				X	X	X
	Attacks on State Leaders					X		X			
	Kidnappings/ Hijackings	X	X			X	X		X	X	X

Figure 2. Matrix of Motives and Methods Used by Non-State Actors

The section that follows summarizes the methods used by states against each non-state opponent. In the case studies, combinations of methods were used by each state with varying degrees of success to defeat or coerce the non-state opponent.

IV. Methods Used by States Against Non-State Actors

The case studies document a wide variety of methods used by states to defeat, deter, or coerce NSAs. The methods fall into the two principal categories: (1) punishment (both demonstrated and threatened) of those responsible for the actions of the NSA; and (2) denial of NSA objectives. For decades, these two fundamental strategies of deterrence—punitive and denial deterrence—comprised the foundation of the U.S. strategy to deter

the Soviet Union from aggression against the United States and its allies.[4] Both methods also played important roles in the case studies for influencing the behavior of NSAs. In addition to threatened punishment and denial, the case studies provide examples of conflicts in which states combined inducements with these deterrence strategies to deal with NSAs. Punitive and denial threats may overlap in practice, but for discussion purposes here they are separated as follows:

> **Threatened Punishment.** Threatened punishment is typically directed at an adversary's leadership and at assets highly valued by the leadership. The goal is to link the prospect of punishment to a particular type of aggression to try to influence the NSA's cost-benefit calculations and thereby its decision-making. The case studies provide examples of threats of punitive actions by states directed against the NSA leadership, host or patron states, and valued assets of the NSA, its host, or its patron. Threatening the NSA itself with punishment may be regarded as a direct deterrent strategy; threatening that NSA's host or patron in the expectation that they will put pressure on the NSA may be regarded as an indirect deterrent strategy. In most cases such punitive threats alone were not sufficient for the desired deterrent effect.

> **Denial.** The ability to deny an adversary its goals—whether the goals are political, territorial, material, or other—has been a long-standing element of U.S. deterrent strategy against states. The case studies illustrate that denial measures play a very important role in conflicts with NSAs. Measures taken by states to deny an NSA its objectives have included defensive measures, anti-terrorist laws, establishment of specialized response capabilities to counter NSA tactics (e.g., commando units for hostage rescue), military operations to disrupt NSA activities, and refusal to negotiate with NSAs. Typically, states sought to eliminate the threat by extirpating the NSA. The goal of eliminating the threat by decisively defeating non-state adversaries, however, typically proved difficult. Denial methods were used by states to defend

---

[4] For an early discussion of punitive and denial forms of deterrence, see Glenn H. Snyder, *Deterrence and Defense: Toward a Theory of National Security* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp. 14-16.

against NSA threats, to attrite NSA threat capabilities, and to reduce the consequences of NSA attacks. Although not often fully successful for these purposes, such measures had an important—if occasionally unexpected—concomitant deterrent effect. At times, these measures combined to convince NSA leaders that hostile acts would not achieve the desired effect or would prove too difficult, too dangerous, or too costly.

Inducements. In the majority of case studies examined, states combined some form of inducement with punitive and denial deterrence measures to help bring about a change of behavior by the NSA. The effectiveness of inducements for this purpose was dependent upon the NSAs' motives, goals, and willingness to accept tactical or strategic conciliation. NSAs with limited demands and goals (such as the IRA in 1921 and the Barbary Coast regency of Tripoli in 1805) were more amenable to concession and a negotiated settlement than NSA leaders with more radical goals, such as the elimination of the opposing state (e.g., Hamas).

States often came upon a workable combination of deterrence and inducement strategies following a long and painful learning process. They learned by experience how to structure a deterrence strategy for the specific NSA and context they confronted, and to combine it with inducements to achieve the desired deterrent effect. The case studies provide numerous examples of states devising strategies roughly suited to specific characteristics of the context, cultures, motivations, and decision-making relationships for each NSA. The chart below summarizes the methods used by states against their non-state adversaries for each of the case studies. In the discussion that follows, the report describes each type of method used by states against NSAs.

Methods Used by State against NSA		U.S. versus **Barbary Regencies** (1783-1805)	U.S. versus **Mexican Revolutionaries** (1915-1917)	**Britain** versus **Irish Republican Army** (1919-1921)	**Britain** versus **Shi'a and Kurdish Groups in Mesopotamia** (1919-1932)	**European States** versus **Euro-Terrorists** (1970s-1980s)	USSR versus **PLO/ Hizballah** (1985)	Japan versus **Aum Shinrikyo** (1989-1995)	**Israel** versus **Hizballah** (1985-2006)	**Israel** versus **Fatah and Hamas** (2000-2006)	**Russia** versus **Chechen Separatists** (1999-2006)
Punishment	Leadership	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
	Noncombatants/ Infrastructure	X		X	X		X		X		X
	Military Escalation	X	X	X					X		
	Host		X						X		
	Patron/Allies	X					X		X	X	
Denial	Disrupt Operations		X	X		X			X	X	X
	Eliminate Sanctuary					X (ETA)			X		X
	Defenses	X							X	X	
	Legal Authorities			X		X					X
	Prison Policies					X					
	Refusing to Negotiate for Hostages					X					X
	Anti-Kidnapping/ Anti-Hijacking Units					X					X
Inducements	Limited Autonomy/ Self-Rule			X	X	X (ETA)				X	X (99-06)
	Prisoner Release/ Amnesty Policies				X	X					X (99-06)
	Restraints		X						X		
	Other Concessions	X					X				

Figure 3. Matrix of Methods Used by States Against Non-State Actors

Punitive Threats for Deterrence

Punitive threats include: direct threats to NSAs and their leaders; threats to patron or host states; and threats to family members or others that NSA leaders might value. States also threatened or periodically demonstrated its ability to damage to assets (such as infrastructure, bridges, power plants, etc.) in order to put pressure on NSA leaders. Punitive threats employed in the case studies include the following:

- U.S. punitive threats to Tripoli—the prospect of continued naval assault on the port of Tripoli and an attempt at regime change—played a significant role in conjunction with denial measures (e.g., attacks on Tripoli's corsairs, convoying of merchant ships) and inducements (limited financial concessions to Tripoli's pasha) in leading to a treaty in 1805.

- Sustained military operations by the U.S. in northern Mexico inflicted significant losses on Pancho Villa and his men and the threat of further escalation motivated the reluctant provisional government of Mexico (the host state) to take greater responsibility for pursuing and reining in Villa.

- Israel threatened, and in some cases demonstrated, a willingness to take punitive action in response to specific acts of terrorism by Fatah and Hamas. Israeli military operations into Palestinian territory often were conducted directly in response to terrorist acts. These incursions brought pressure to bear on leaders of the Palestinian Authority and disrupted the activities of Palestinian militants. Threatened punishment also involved a two-year siege of Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat's Ramallah headquarters. Arafat, however, did not yield to this threat. Punishment also was inflicted on citizens of Gaza and the West Bank (curfews, closures, incursions) in anticipation of their grassroots pressure on Palestinian leaders to curtail the violence—an effect that did not materialize. More directly, the family homes of terrorists, in particular suicide bombers, were demolished in an attempt to attach a personal cost beyond the risks of participating in Fatah and Hamas terror operations. This tactic had mixed success and was used by Israel for a limited time.

- Israeli attempts to pressure Hizballah by punishing Lebanese civilians (e.g., attacks on infrastructure, the creation of refugee flows) appears to have been unsuccessful, in part because Hizballah as a creature of Iran was less beholden to its Lebanese host government, its patron, Syria, or the Lebanese population.

- The Soviet Union is reported to have threatened to punish harshly those involved in the 1985 kidnapping of its diplomats and intelligence officers in Beirut (through demonstrated willingness to murder and mutilate family members) and their NSA sponsor Iran (via direct attack). The timing of the hostages' release suggests that the threat of a missile attack (with nuclear connotations), reported to have been made against Iran, may have been the lever that moved Hizballah leaders.

- Russia took an uncompromising attitude toward Islamic terrorists during the Dubrovka and Beslan mass hostage-takings. Russian leaders demonstrated a willingness to capture or kill hostage-takers, even if many innocent Russian citizens became casualties in the process.

- The British, both in their "counter-atrocities" against the IRA and their strategic bombing of civilians in Mesopotamia, demonstrated that democracies can at times impose very brutal measures. These punitive strategies produced some success in changing NSA behavior but, in both case studies, ultimately turned elite opinion in Britain against London's policies. In the Irish case, this approach ultimately led to significant concessions by Britain in order to terminate the bloodshed. In Mesopotamia, punitive air strikes on civilians were tolerated long enough by elites in London to allow the British to police their mandate with limited resources until such time as they could develop an exit strategy.

- Targeted killings of NSA leaders and decapitation of NSA organizations were used by states in numerous case studies with varying effect. The French government's killing and imprisonment of the leaders of Direct Action ended the group's existence, while other less fragile European terrorist organizations, such as the German Red Army Faction, were able to continue terrorist operations during a series of events in which RAF leaders were killed or captured. Moreover, this tactic of targeting NSA leaders appears to have actually backfired in the case of the Italian Red Brigades; arresting and killing the leaders created vacancies that were filled by more violent terrorists. Israel has been successful in targeting and killing several senior officials of Hamas, but has typically refrained from similar tactics against Hizballah. The Israeli-Hizballah case study includes instances in which Hizballah responded to Israeli attempts at targeting Hizballah leaders with its own attacks on "soft" Israeli targets outside of the region. This tactic by Hizballah leaders apparently has deterred Israel from use of targeted killings, in general, against Hizballah.

While the case studies demonstrate that punitive deterrent threats are available to states willing to use them and that such direct pressure on NSA leaders and/or indirect pressure via patrons can be effective, these measures alone have had mixed success of limited duration. The case studies provide ample evidence of the need for denial measures, used in combination with punitive threats, to more effectively deter hostile actions and protect citizens of the state.

Denial Measures and Deterrence

Measures to deny NSA objectives and complicate operations can also make useful contributions to deterrence. The case studies catalogue a wide range of denial measures used against NSAs with deterrent effect. Many denial measures can have some obvious overlap with measures intended to create punitive fears. These include: military forays to disrupt NSA operations and force NSA leaders underground; defenses; laws that give greater authority to governments to detect NSA communications and preparations for attacks; and, prison policies that keep NSA leaders, once captured and incarcerated, from exercising leadership while behind bars.

Disruption Operations. A number of actions by states to deny their opponents sanctuary and operational freedom of action fit under this category. For example, Israel maintained a military presence in the Lebanese security zone from 1985 to 2000 and routinely conducted operations to find and disrupt Hizballah activities. Israel also conducted military incursions in the West Bank and Gaza to keep Hamas and other Palestinian rejectionist leaders on the run and to disrupt terrorist preparations in areas know to be centers for such operations. Similarly, the British conducted intrusive military operations in 1919-1921 to impede IRA-related activities. Disruptive measures can be effective tools but are accompanied by the potential for civilian casualties and a resulting backlash. For example, an Israeli military incursion, named "Defensive Wall," into the West Bank in 2002 resulted in charges of excessive civilian casualties in the Jenin refugee camp. International pressure from this incident caused Israeli officials to

curtail future incursions into heavily-populated civilian areas. This deprived Israel of a relatively effective disruption tactic with denial deterrent effect.

Eliminating sanctuaries. Denying NSA adversaries a sanctuary from which to plan and operate was used with significant deterrent effect in several case studies. In the Euro-terrorist case study, the Basque separatist group, ETA, initially used safe areas in France to operate freely and carry out violent attacks against Spanish targets. Only after French officials cooperated with Spanish authorities in eliminating these sanctuaries and in extraditing captured ETA leaders was Spain able to conduct an effective campaign against ETA and limit, but not eradicate the threat. Similarly the West German and Italian governments conducted lengthy campaigns to force terrorist leaders underground and deny them freedom to plan, communicate, and operate against the state. This tactic appeared to have the significant effect in demoralizing radical leaders who were cut off from family and society. Over time, the psychological difficulties inside the group took a toll on the cohesion of the group. A quote from the writings of one of these terrorists, the Italian terrorist memoirist "Giorgio," is particularly revealing:

> What I'd really like to do is go away. Just leave, take a long long trip somewhere, get away, body and mind, somewhere different. I am so tired, and when you enter this long tunnel that life has become, you just need to forget the idea of a future. There are no roads out of here. One way out, of course, would be the Revolution. But let's not kid ourselves. More likely, it will be prison. Or worse. You don't think about it, of course, but then you can hardly imagine going on like this for the rest of your life either. … The life we lead does not encourage solidarity, but rather tension, resentment, and constant conflict.[5]

Defenses. Purely defensive measures include Gaza checkpoints and the Israeli security barriers to minimize opportunities for suicide bombers to reach Israeli civilian targets. Such measures increased the difficulty for Palestinian terrorists to carry out attacks and increased the likelihood that they would be detected and killed or captured before they could complete their mission. In another case study—the U.S. versus the Barbary regencies—the U.S. used defensive measures by adding armed naval escorts to some

---

[5] Shugaar, Antony (trans.), *Memoirs of an Italian Terrorist: Giorgio* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2003) pages 60, 163.

merchant convoys in the Mediterranean. Without naval escorts, merchantmen were easy prey for Tripoli's corsairs.

Refusing to Negotiate with Terrorists. An important topic related to denial deterrent measures is the question of negotiating with terrorists. The case studies provide evidence that negotiations leading to inducements can embolden NSA leaders to make further demands. Partial successes can inspire confidence in the NSA's tactics that moved the state to negotiate. This can work against the state's deterrence strategies.

For example, the RAF was initially successful at kidnapping West German officials and holding them as hostages until imprisoned RAF members were released. The West German government quickly observed that such actions motivated the RAF to continue kidnapping German civilians for coercive purposes. Once the West German government adopted a policy of refusing to negotiate over hostages, and demonstrated its resolve—even with the prospect of the death of the hostages—the RAF kidnappings ceased. The Russian experience with Chechen nationalists is even more dramatic. To help deter terrorist attacks, Moscow adopted a policy intended to "demonstrate the utter futility of terrorist activities" by using massive lethal counterforce while essentially refusing to spare the lives of involved civilians. Moscow's resolve was tested and demonstrated during the mass-hostage-taking events at a theater in the Dubrovka area of Moscow (2002) and in a public school in the town of Beslan, South Ossetia (2004). Both events resulted in the deaths of the terrorists as well as large numbers of the hostages—in the case of Beslan, mostly children. Presented with the daunting prospects of cost and failure, Chechen nationalists have not since attempted similar actions.

Prison Policies. States often found that leaders of NSAs could operate quite efficiently from prison—apparently reducing the NSA's fear of prison and the debilitating effects of capture on NSA operations. West Germany had to enact new prison laws that made a crime of carrying communications between imprisoned RAF leaders and their comrades

who remained at large. Spain had to disburse incarcerated ETA members among geographically separated prisons to keep them from collaborating while behind bars. Some states (e.g., Russia, Germany, Italy, Spain) employed unique prison-release policies for reformed NSA members in order to reduce the popular base of support for the NSA cause and to obtain information about NSA operations and organization. These measures increased the fear of capture for individual NSA leaders and the challenge incarceration posed to the effective functioning of the NSA.

In general, denial measures, employed for the purpose of defeating the NSA or limiting the potential damage that the NSA might cause, demonstrated to the NSAs that their actions were more likely to be thwarted, their actions—if successfully carried out—were unlikely to cause the intended effect, and the intended goal of the NSA hostile action was unlikely to be achieved. At the very least, such defensive measures can complicate NSA planning and operations, thus raising the potential for failure. Failed operations are themselves a net loss to NSA resources and can be a blow to NSA leadership and prestige. The clearest example of this is from the European terrorist case. In response to a Red Army Faction airliner hijacking in October 1977, the German military demonstrated an ability to end the hostage-taking successfully by force using a specialized unit, GSG-9, to seize the plane while on a runway in Mogadishu, Somalia. In a flawless surprise rescue mission, GSG-9 freed all of the passengers and killed the terrorists in Mogadishu. Two high-ranking RAF leaders in prison were so demoralized at this failure they committed suicide in their cells. There were no further hijackings by the RAF.

Inducements in Support of Deterrence and Coercion

It may seem intuitive, based on the extreme goals of many NSAs and the corresponding goal of states, that the states in the case studies were not eager to offer concessions or inducements to NSAs. However, in multiple cases, inducements or concessions to NSAs appear to have had some value *when used in combination with deterrent or coercive threats*. This combination was employed by states to reach an accommodation with the

22

NSA leaders, to encourage defections from NSA ranks, or to undermine the NSA's base of support. For example, in its treaty with the IRA in 1921, Britain accepted many of the IRA's key demands for self-rule while not compromising its core objectives (protecting its basing rights and the status of Irish citizens under the crown). In another example, the United States, although loath to accept the tribute system of the Barbary regencies, did make payments to the pasha of Tripoli as a condition of the treaty of 1805 (in addition to threatening further escalation of naval action and a land campaign aimed at the pasha's overthrow).

Another form of inducement is amnesty for "reformed" or "penitent" NSA members. Amnesty, selectively used, can serve to undermine support for the NSA, either from the cadres or its popular base. For example, amnesty was offered by Britain to rebellious Shi'a and Kurd tribesmen as the British prepared to disengage from its mandate in Mesopotamia. Similar to an amnesty, "social reinsertion" was offered by the Spanish government to imprisoned ETA terrorists, provided they publicly renounced violence.

The Russian approach to amnesty in the second Chechen war was both more nuanced and comprehensive. Moscow was willing to accept "repentant" rebels to serve in a proxy role in its surrogate government in Grozny. These new allies provided Moscow with intelligence on their former Chechen comrades who did not reconcile with the new order and a proxy force with intimate knowledge of the local conditions. As an added incentive for the rebels to desist, the Kremlin made clear that it had no patience for negotiating or compromising with irreconcilables. As noted earlier, Russia responded aggressively to successive hostage-taking episodes—even at the cost of civilian casualties—and passed a number of laws underscoring its intent to respond with force in all such cases.

The case studies also included examples in which inducements, offered as straightforward compliance with NSA demands, *were unproductive or counterproductive*. For example:

- The West German government's exchange of imprisoned RAF leaders for kidnapped citizens simply led to more kidnappings until the government changed its policy, refused to negotiate for hostages and demonstrated a willingness to use force to free the hostages.

- The Soviet Union's prompt compliance with kidnappers' demands to pressure Syria and withdraw its personnel from Lebanon did not earn the release of its hostages in Beirut in 1985.

- Russia granted Chechnya a large degree of autonomy in 1996 as it disengaged from the "first Chechen war," but this was not enough to inoculate neighboring republics from Chechen incursions or deter the 1999 terrorist bombing of several apartment buildings in Russia.

Leverage Through Threats to Third Parties

To be effective, threatened punishment may need to be directed at more than NSA leaders. This may be important in cases where the NSAs depend on patron or host states. An example of this is the reported Soviet threat in 1985 to strike Hizballah's patron, Iran, as a way to compel Hizballah to release its Soviet hostages. In other examples of indirect pressure, U.S. diplomatic and military pressure on the provisional Mexican government in 1917 compelled reluctant Mexican leaders to more aggressively combat the threat posed by Pancho Villa and his men. In addition to patrons or hosts, there is also the possibility of threatening others who can influence NSA decision-makers, for example, social networks or a constituent population on which an NSA depends for support. However, the existence of patrons, hosts, or a social network does not automatically imply that NSAs will be coerced by this type of pressure. For example, Israel has had limited success at indirectly pressuring Hizballah by threatening its host state, Lebanon, or its patrons, Iran and Syria. Specifically, in 1993 and 1996 Israel conducted military operations to pressure the host state, Lebanon, into reining in Hizballah leaders. Neither

operation achieved the intended effect.[6] In fact, the Israeli strategy of trying to pressure the Lebanese government by attacking infrastructure targets and creating refugee flows northward toward Beirut had negative consequences in the court of international opinion and within the domestic Israeli political debate. In both operations, media reports of civilian casualties in Lebanon led to pledges by Israeli leaders to refrain from future strikes in civilian areas. Predictably, Hizballah continued conducting its planning and operations in heavily populated areas.

In a different case, the United States of Thomas Jefferson's day had little ability to pressure the Ottoman patron of the Barbary regencies to influence the newly assertive pasha of Tripoli. Further, U.S. attempts to use Algiers as an intermediary to indirectly pressure Tripoli actually backfired and became an additional point of friction between the U.S. and Tripoli (the pasha viewed this as a personal affront to his prestige).

In sum, the evidence regarding the ability of states to pressure NSAs indirectly through a third party is a mixed bag in terms of effectiveness. However, in cases in which NSA decision-making is influenced significantly by a patron or a host state, pressure including threatened punishment against NSA leaders and applicable third-party leaders is likely to be needed for an effective strategy for coercion or deterrence.

---

[6] Operation Accountability took place in July 1993. The concept behind the operation was to induce indirect deterrence through massive artillery, air and naval fire around Lebanese civilian targets that would cause massive flight of Lebanese refugees to the north. Israeli bombing destroyed Lebanese infrastructure and civilian targets, such as major electricity stations and bridges. "Accountability" was the result of the Israeli understanding that direct deterrence would not yield results in the case of Hizballah, and hence the only option was to generate indirect deterrence through the host state – Lebanon. Operation Grapes of Wrath occurred in April 1996. The goal of the operation was to cause increasing damage that would force large numbers of refugees to move to the north and put pressure on both the Hizballah leadership and the Lebanese government. The Israeli air force attacked rocket launchers, Hizballah installations and personnel, as well as civilian infrastructure (houses, bridges and the Beirut electric power stations), while the Israeli navy blockaded the ports of Lebanon south of Beirut. Hizballah retaliated with massive rocket fire on Israeli population centers along the border. The operation ended abruptly in the wake of a misfire of an Israeli artillery shell which fell in the midst of a UN refugee camp in Kafar Qana.

Intelligence to Inform a Deterrence or Coercion Strategy

For deterrence, the case studies demonstrate the importance of detailed, current intelligence about the NSA—the key leaders, the culture, NSA motives and goals, as well as capabilities of the NSA. An understanding of these matters can improve the chances of crafting an effective strategy for deterrence. Sometimes the most valuable information is obtained from unexpected sources. In the case of the Barbary regencies, critically valuable insight was provided by U.S. consuls in the region who had close experience with the regencies, in some cases as captives.

NSAs may recognize their vulnerability to intelligence gathering by states that possess superior technical capabilities and curtail specific actions in order to limit their risk. One of the factors that led the IRA to come to terms with the British in 1921 was alarm at the degree to which the British had penetrated the organization. In the same way, Palestinian factions have at times attempted to achieve cease-fires as a response to Israel's perceived "intelligence dominance" (and thus limit their vulnerability to Israeli action based on this assumed knowledge). As implied by the last example, NSA perceptions of vulnerability may be as important as actual vulnerabilities for deterrence purposes. It should also be noted that NSAs too may suffer from a deficit of knowledge about their state adversaries or from misperceptions about public and state behavior in response to their actions. For example, Hizballah's misreading of Israeli "red lines" in 2006 led to an action (kidnapping of two Israeli soldiers) that inadvertently ignited the summer-2006 war.

In a more extreme case, Aum Shinrikyo's view of the world, Japanese society in particular, and the chain of events it sought to put in motion were almost unrecognizably distorted from reality. The unique nature of the Aum Shinrikyo case demonstrates the need for authorities to be agile enough to recognize a broad range of threat indicators, many of which may not conform to preconceptions of how an NSA ought to behave. For example, had Japanese authorities been sensitized to look for limited, technically flawed, or even abortive behavior relevant to an emerging WMD capability, Aum's activities in 1993 (anthrax) and 1994 (sarin) might have triggered sufficient scrutiny that the March

1995 attack on the Tokyo subway could have been anticipated and possibly prevented. Similarly in today's terrorist threat environment, evidence of limited technical competence in jihadi internet discussions of WMD should not lead to the complacent assumption that these groups will not ultimately develop or acquire such capabilities. Simply put, these activities betray an interest that may find form in unexpected ways.

The Record of Deterrence and Coercion in the Case Studies

Examination of the case studies suggests that the common notion that terrorists cannot be deterred is mistaken; deterrence and coercion can be effectively employed against NSAs. Examples from the cases demonstrate that states can use strategies of deterrence to modify NSA decision-making and behavior.

- The Barbary regency of Tripoli agreed to a treaty with the Jefferson administration on reasonable financial terms in important part because of the sustained threat from U.S. naval action against the port city over several years and the prospect of regime change that was threatened credibly by an overland military force marching on Tripoli. A one-time cash payment to the Pasha of Tripoli provided an effective inducement to conclude the treaty of 1805.

- As the result of an extended U.S. military incursion into northern Mexico to kill or capture Pancho Villa, the Mexican revolutionaries led by Villa observed "redlines" that included ceasing aggression against U.S. interests in Mexico and along the U.S.-Mexican border.

- The effectiveness of British operations in northern Ireland to disrupt IRA activities and the threat of further British military escalation in Ireland, combined with the inducement of limited Irish self-rule, contributed to the IRA's willingness to accept terms of peace that fell short of the IRA goal of full Irish independence.

- In Mesopotamia, British air attacks provided a relatively affordable way for Britain to quell unrest among Arab tribes. Over time, however, the Shi'a and

Kurds became familiar with the limitations of air power and devised countermeasures that limited the coercive effects of British tactics.

- Accounts of the 1985 Soviet attempt to secure the release of hostages being held in Beirut suggest that Hizballah complied with Moscow's wishes in response to a missile threat to Hizballah's patron, Iran, and out of concern by the kidnappers that the Soviets would retaliate against their family members.

- In the 1990s, Israel demonstrated its willingness to conduct disruptive military operations against Hizballah in southern Lebanon. After Israel's withdrawal from the southern Lebanon "security zone" in 2000, the prospect of the reapplication of this type of tactic against Hizballah motivated its leader, Hassan Nasrallah, to restrict Hizballah's actions and comply with a number of de facto "redlines" established over time by Israeli-Hizballah skirmishes. This deterrent relationship ended in August 2006 when Israel responded to the Hizballah kidnapping of two Israeli soldiers with a major military operation into Lebanon. The breakdown of deterrence can be blamed, in part, on the erosion over time of the effect of Israel's declaratory statements (made prior to the 2000 pullout) that threatened punishment in response to Hizballah aggression. In the years following the pullout, these declaratory statements were not periodically reaffirmed by Israel.

- The European governments of West Germany and Italy were successful in countering radical extremists (the Red Army Faction and Red Brigades) through sustained campaigns that relied on a broad range of denial measures, punitive threats, and when applicable, inducements. This combination of strategies appears to have "worked." West German and Italian measures forced NSA leaders underground. Cut off from society, family, and friends for years, the leaders of these radical groups became demoralized and the cohesion of the groups disintegrated.

The case studies also provide evidence that states in conflict with NSAs can also be vulnerable to deterrence and coercion by the NSAs:

- Between 1994 and the 2006 Second Lebanon War, Israel refrained from targeted killings of senior Hizballah leaders and limited its responses to Hizballah provocations. This restraint by Israel came after Hizballah demonstrated its ability to act beyond the immediate area and inflict casualties on Israelis. Hizballah bombed the Israeli embassy and the Jewish community center in Buenos Aires in retaliation for the killing of Hizballah's secretary general (Abbas Mousawi), the abduction of another leader (Sheikh Mustafa Dirani), and an air strike on its Ein Dardara training camp in the Bekaa Valley. (More recently, Hizballah asserts that Israel was responsible for the February 2008 killing of one of its leaders, the terrorist mastermind Imad Mughniyeh, and has vowed revenge.)

The case studies demonstrate that at least some NSAs can be coerced and deterred at least some of the time. The types of circumstances in which coercion or deterrence is more likely to be effective typically include the following factors:

- Central leadership and control of NSA and its operations.
- Lack of third-party support or control that significantly influences the behavior of the non-state actor.
- NSA operates in territory accessible by the state (no sanctuary for NSA operatives).
- NSA motives and goals that are not immediate and absolute—there is some "room" for tactical retreat or compromise (however labeled).[7]

V. Additional Observations on the Deterrence of Non-State Actors.

The discussion in the preceding sections addressed the characteristics and motives of NSAs, methods used by states to counter, deter, or coerce NSAs, and whether or not deterrence of NSAs should be considered feasible in principle. The observations

---

[7] See the discussion of this point in, Keith B. Payne, *The Great American Gamble: Deterrence Theory and Practice From the Cold War to the Twenty-First Century* (Fairfax, VA: National Institute Press, 2008). Pp. 340-346.

discussed in this section involve the possible consideration of deterrence as a secondary goal or concomitant effect as well as contextual factors that can affect decisions by NSA leaders.

Deterrence as a Goal or as a Concomitant Effect

The Cold War experience has conditioned many to think of deterrence as the priority strategy or objective.   And, it may be either or both. An observation from the case studies is that deterring NSAs is often not the primary aim of states under threat; deterrence, however, can be a by-product of efforts by a state to protect its citizens by defending against and seeking to eliminate the NSA threat.

In many of the case studies, the state objective was simply the elimination of the NSA threat. For example, once Japan recognized that Aum Shinrikyo posed a threat, the objective was eliminating that threat rather than deterring or shaping the organization's future behavior. Similarly, the U.S. Punitive Expedition to Mexico was dispatched to "kill or capture" Pancho Villa. However, when U.S. actions failed to attain that goal, but Villa ceased his assaults on American territory and interests, U.S. leaders viewed deterrence of Villa's band as an acceptable outcome.

Deterrence might be considered the priority goal in circumstances in which the NSA cannot be eliminated or the continued existence of the NSA can be tolerated (e.g., the Barbary regencies). Deterrence may also be a primary goal in circumstances in which other priorities demand the attention and resources that would otherwise be required to defeat the NSA (e.g., the British strategy in Mesopotamia was shaped by the pressing demands of policing a global empire and complicated by a treasury depleted from the First World War). Alternatively, there are examples in which eliminating the NSA threat was practical (e.g. the French quickly defeated the terrorist group Direct Action) or the limited understanding and cooperation needed to establish deterrence is political

30

anathema for the state (e.g., Israel vs. Hamas—an organization with a declared goal of eliminating the Jewish state).

While deterrence may not be the priority objective of the state, it is possible that deterrent effects will be the concomitant or incidental effect of steps taken to defeat the NSA or limit damage done by the NSA. This may be considered a secondary strategy of concomitant denial deterrence. As noted above, in the case of the European terrorist groups (e.g., Red Army Faction, Red Brigades), the pressure of living underground— disconnected from family, friends, and society—eroded the will of the cadres to continue the revolutionary struggle. Demoralization was the incidental effect of the state's attempts to shut down the terror groups. Demoralization undermines motivation to undertake further attacks and thus contributes to deterrence. More recently, a similar effect has been noted regarding the current conflict in Iraq. Evidence released in February 2008 by the Multi-National Force headquarters in Iraq suggests that, since the summer of 2007, al Qaeda in Iraq has been facing a decline in morale similar to that noted in the case study involving urban terrorist groups in Europe.[8]

The observation that deterrent and coercive leverage may be had as the result of actions taken for other reasons (e.g., to defeat the NSA opponent or defend against the NSA threat) is noteworthy. It suggests that states may find important advantage in being opportunistic—observant enough to see the potential for these by-products and flexible enough to take advantage of them when possible.

Deterrence May Be Limited in Time and Scope

The long duration of some of the case studies involving NSAs provides some empirical evidence that deterrent effect can be achieved over time but, once achieved, may be difficult to sustain. Its effectiveness may be limited in time and scope by the unique characteristics of the NSA and the immediate circumstances. Important characteristics

---

[8] Two captured al Qaeda documents, an assessment by a mid-to-high level emir and the diary of another operative, paint a bleak picture of the terrorist group's prospects. See the operational update by RADM Gregory Smith, Director of the MNF-I's Communication Division, Feb. 10, 2008, available at http://www.mnf-iraq.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=16930&Itemid=131.

of the NSA, the state, and the context within which the conflict is played out are all subject to change, particularly in conflicts that extend over years. For example, the credibility of the U.S. threat in 1805 to escalate the conflict with Tripoli was due in part to the history of gradually increasing U.S. naval operations along the coast of North Africa over a period of years. The treaty concluded in 1805 between Tripoli and the United States halted attacks on U.S. merchant ships from Tripoli's corsairs—until the context changed. The War of 1812 required the U.S. to give higher priority for its naval operations to combating the British, and in this changed context Tripoli once again resumed its hostile actions.

During the 1990s, Israel occupied the security zone in south Lebanon and its disruptive operations against Hizballah resulted in a significantly decreased level of violence against Israelis. This was one factor in the decision by Israeli leaders to withdraw from the security zone in May 2000 and rely on the threat of future military operations in Lebanon to deter Hizballah leaders. However, over time the lack of a significant Israeli response to probing operations by Hizballah forces in the occupied Shab'a Farms area, and the failure of Israeli leaders to periodically restate declaratory threats (made prior to the May 2000 Israeli withdrawal from the security zone) gradually led Hizballah's leaders to believe that the kidnapping of Israeli soldiers would be tolerated. This hostile action by Hizballah was the catalyst for the summer-2006 war.

Deterrence is Unpredictable

The case studies indicate that deterrence is unpredictable and thus unreliable as an *exclusive* means of dealing with NSA threats. The threats that work in some cases are only adjuncts to a broader approach in others, and fail either in availability or effectiveness in still other cases. This description suggests the importance of being aware that a state's understanding of deterrence can evolve throughout an engagement with an NSA—yielding some benefits following a learning process. In many cases, the utility of deterrence and coercion is determined by how well a state is able to learn about and adapt to its NSA adversary as NSA leaders revise their tactics in response to measures used by

the state. Perhaps equally important is whether the state has the capabilities and the resolve to pursue denial and defeat strategies that, over time, might yield collateral opportunities for deterrence and coercion—and the agility to adapt as necessary to take advantage of emerging deterrence opportunities. For example, in some of the case studies the NSAs overplayed their hands (e.g., European urban terrorists, Chechen nationalists) and violent acts committed by NSAs undermined their support within the local population. In several of the case studies, the state exploited the opportunity—the climate of decreased public tolerance of the NSA—by enlisting informants from within the local population and enacting more intrusive laws designed to combat the terrorists and increase pressures from within.

Changes within the NSA leadership may also make an NSA more or less susceptible to deterrence; NSA leaders who are killed or captured may be replaced by others who are more cautious or more aggressive. Also, unique technical or operational skills may need to be recovered (e.g., replacement of a particularly skilled bomb-maker) or growing factionalism from leadership changes or sustained pressure by the state may divide the group.

Contextual Factors and Deterrence

Finally, the broader contextual factors surrounding conflicts between a state and an NSA suggest important variables that help shape how the state operates. For example, the U.S. response to Pancho Villa was ultimately shaped by connections between events in Mexico and the course of war in Europe. Even though Villa and his gang posed no existential threat to the United States, President Wilson wanted to appear strong and resolute to European leaders (and to the U.S. electorate). However, the "underwhelming" performance of the U.S. trying to eliminate Villa's gang had just the opposite effect on German leaders.

The Israeli case study involving Hamas and Fatah demonstrates the effect that changes in context can have on decision-making. In the fall of 2000, the second intifada was

initiated in the wake of failed Mideast peace talks. However, two events in 2001 affected the decision calculus of Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat. The first occurred in early 2001: Ariel Sharon was elected prime minister in Israel. The second occurred on September 11th in the U.S.: the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Soon after these attacks, Arafat called for a moratorium on terror operations because he believed that, in the post-9-11 environment, the West would have little tolerance for terrorist attacks and therefore would not impose restraint on Sharon's responses to Palestinian violence. This fear inspired by far-flung events served to deter terrorist attacks in Israel.

VI.   Summary of Key Findings

From the cases examined for this study, some practical advice can be suggested for officials charged with understanding today's NSAs and deterring their activities. This set of insights, rules of thumb, and cautions may have particular merit because it derives not from a priori presumptions, deductive logic, mirror-imaging, an abstract model, or even from knowledge hard won in battling a single non-state enemy. It follows from broad, real-world experience involving a variety of NSAs, third parties, geographic settings, historical periods, security challenges, strategies, tactics and tools (of both states and their non-state enemies), and conflict outcomes. It should be useful to intelligence analysts, defense planners, and decision-makers engaged in the ongoing quest to better understand the potential for deterrence of NSAs.

1.   *Hostile actions by non-state actors can be prevented by deterrent measures.*

The blanket statement, "terrorists cannot be deterred," though often made, is not supported by the record. In certain circumstances, terrorists have been deterred. Planning premised on the false belief that deterrence applies only to traditional nation-states would exclude options that could be effective in thwarting terrorist organizations and other non-state groups. As with all deterrence problems, success or failure will

depend on the details. The particular characteristics of an NSA—its leadership, personnel, organization, objectives, motivation, location, support, and capabilities—as well as other states involved will determine the NSA's susceptibility to deterrence or coercion. In addition, changes in the broad context within which a non-state actor operates can make deterrence or coercion either more or less difficult; political, social, or economic developments, for example, may strengthen or undermine the NSA's position. Deliberate efforts to alter that context might be a way of indirectly influencing the behavior of a non-state actor, especially if the adversary has demonstrated the ability to resist more direct pressure.

At the same time, deterrence, while possible, is not highly predictable. The results of deterrence strategies will vary. There will be cases where deterrent options indeed are inapplicable or infeasible. Members of a NSA may be so highly motivated to achieve their objectives that they are "beyond deterrence." NSA leaders might be vulnerable to deterrent threats, but unable to exercise the control necessary to rein in their subordinates. Where the character of the NSA and circumstances make deterrence possible, the effect of deterrent threats still may not be predictable; threats that work in one context might prove unproductive in another. In some cases, deterrence strategies may force only a change in an NSA's tactics or a tactical retreat. In other cases, the favorable effects from deterrent or coercive measures may be only temporary or localized, but nonetheless useful. Deterrent threats and counter-terrorism operations might be sufficient to discourage an NSA from carrying out a large-scale attack against civilians, but not to end altogether the violent activities of that group. Israel's long struggle with terrorism shows that, in contrast to the experience of the Cold War, deterrence of non-state actors will break down, perhaps repeatedly, and need to be reestablished through, among other means, demonstrations of force. While states may have opportunities to exert pressure that deters non-state actors, there is very limited evidence that members of these groups will be "self-deterred" by moral or ideological inhibitions. In only one case considered here was evidence found of a group member restrained by his qualms: an Aum Shinrikyo follower who, in preparing for an attack on the Tokyo subway, decided not to load improvised briefcase sprayers with botulinum toxin.

2. *There is no single formula for deterring or coercing non-state actors.*

"Tailored deterrence," a concept endorsed by the Defense Department, means what the phrase plainly implies: a state's deterrent strategy is likely to be more effective to the extent that it is informed by an understanding of the specific opponent and circumstance. Deterrence or coercion of non-state actors must be viewed as an empirical problem specific to each opponent. Diverse non-state adversaries, with varied traits, in different contexts, should be dealt with through deterrent or coercive designs that take these differences into account. Comparison of case studies, or any other analytic technique, cannot produce a how-to manual for deterring the full range of terrorist and other non-state groups; the variations among past, present, and potential conflicts with non-state actors are simply too great. Detailed review of a representative set of case studies can help, however, in suggesting the types of information about the opponent that may be helpful, the spectrum of deterrent tools that may be useful, the variety of audiences that may be important, and the spectrum of communication channels possible.

Deterrent or coercive efforts with a prospect for success require specifying objectives, understanding the relevant aspects of the adversary's decision-making and behavior, determining the adversary's vulnerabilities, employing appropriate means to exploit those pressure points, and assessing the resulting effects. One difference in the treatment of NSAs and states might be the relative reliance placed on deterrence by threat of punishment and deterrence by denial (the latter involves making the adversary see contemplated attacks as too difficult, costly, or impracticable). Punitive threats commonly are used to deter states. For NSAs that cannot be easily threatened—because of their clandestine nature, decentralized or distributed organization, relative autonomy, or operation from a sanctuary—deterrence by denial may be of greater necessity and value.

3. Attempts to deter or coerce NSAs can draw on an array of possible methods and means.

Deterrent and coercive options for dealing with NSAs include both punitive and denial threats, which, under the right circumstances, might be combined and coupled with appropriate inducements. Punitive threats can be directed against leaders, rank and file, supporting networks, and state patrons. The penalties threatened can include death, imprisonment, harm to kin, economic loss (for suppliers, bankrollers, and state patrons), and regime change (for state patrons). The composition, dynamics, and authority of the leadership of a non-state actor will factor in the effectiveness of counter-leadership targeting or threats intended to force leaders to restrain lower echelons and foot soldiers. The credibility of punitive threats may depend on periodic applications of force against the NSA. The putative Cold War model—where the deterring power deploys certain forces, makes threats, and expects that the opposing power will hear, interpret and assess the threat in a fashion that makes deterrence "work" reliably and predictably—has little relevance to these contemporary considerations of deterrence. In addition, as in the past, the deterrence of NSAs is likely to take place in the context of violent interaction as well as careful calculation.

Denial measures against non-state groups can complicate their planning, impede their activities, demoralize their personnel, frustrate their ambitions, and thereby discourage them from undertaking hostile actions. Measures that can produce these effects include disruptive attacks by military forces, aggressive and sustained operations by domestic law enforcement agencies, penetrations by intelligence organizations, interdiction of supplies of money and materiel, and protection of potential targets. It is important to note that deterrence by denial frequently is the concomitant effect of military or law enforcement efforts aimed at defending against or defeating non-state actors. Intelligence analysts should be alert to indications of this incidental effect and, when recognized, military and law enforcement officials should be prepared to exploit it in their plans and operations. By the same token, whether a cessation of attacks is due to measures that hinder a non-state actor from acting or results from the deterrent effect of such measures may be difficult to determine but important to understand.

The combination of threatened punishment and denial measures can serve to deny an NSA adversary sanctuary and force its leaders underground. As demonstrated in the case study of urban terrorists in Europe, the long-term effects of life on the run, cut off from family, friends and society, can be demoralizing to NSA leaders and can foster discontent within the group.

In some cases, restraint by non-state actors also might be encouraged through inducements. These can include concessions that partially accommodate the demands of the non-state actor without endangering the core interests of the state. Strategies for deterring or coercing non-state actors often have involved combinations of punitive threats, denial threats, and inducements. Unless linked with threats, however, inducements are likely to be ineffective or even counterproductive. For example in Europe during the 1970s and 1980s, full amnesty for imprisoned terrorists did nothing but embolden those extremists and their comrades. Conditional leniency, on the other hand, offered to those already under pressure from counter-terrorism operations, led many to desert, and often betray, fellow terrorists. Russia has made similar tactical use of amnesty in its battle with Chechen rebels.

4. Deterrence or coercion of a non-state actor may be a multilateral matter.

The prominence of some past and present international confrontations fosters the view that deterrence is primarily a two-sided affair: NATO deterred a Warsaw Pact invasion of Western Europe, the U.S.-South Korean alliance deters a North Korean attack, the United States deters Iran from closing the Strait of Hormuz, and the United States deters Chinese aggression against Taiwan. In conflicts with non-state actors, this almost certainly will not be the case. The problem might be one of deterring or coercing multiple, diverse audiences simultaneously, just as the United States at the turn of the nineteenth century had to employ military force to coerce Tripoli into reaching an acceptable settlement and, at the same time, deter interference by other Barbary regencies (Algiers, Tunis, and Morocco).

In some cases, it may be possible, or necessary, to influence a non-state actor indirectly, by exerting pressure on a third party, which could be its state patron or host, or an important supportive constituency. States with terrorist organizations within their borders might have better information on the locations and movements of these groups than that available to outside intelligence services. Authoritarian regimes might have security apparatuses better suited to suppressing local terrorists. Pressuring another state to subdue a non-state actor would be akin to a combination shot in pool, where the cue ball first hits an intermediate object ball in order to put the ultimate object ball in the pocket. This tactic has been used with success on occasion. The results of such efforts, however, are mixed: Israel at various times has attempted to coerce Syria into restraining the Palestinian terrorist groups it harbors and the authorities in Beirut into curbing Hizballah, the Lebanese-based group allied with Iran. In those instances, Syria felt little need to comply with Israeli demands because it knew the Jewish state could only push so far for fear of escalation to war with Damascus. In Beirut, Lebanese officials did nothing to restrain Hizballah because they lacked the power. Israel has had few, if any, options for forcing Iran to hold back Hizballah, in part because of the geographic separation between the two states.

Third-party surrogates sometimes can be useful instruments for countering NSAs. They thus may become an important part of any denial or punitive deterrence strategy. Their aid may result from coercive threats made by the state opponent of the non-state actor, from a mutual interest in seeing the NSA suppressed, or from a combination of the two. The desire of the Mexican government to have the U.S. Army's Punitive Expedition withdraw from Mexican territory provided a strong incentive to pursue Pancho Villa and his band, but that government also had reasons of its own for restraining Villa. The Irish Free State, created by the treaty ending the 1919-1921 Anglo-Irish War, had the legitimacy, which the British did not, to crush in a ruthless manner the Irish Republican Army irreconcilables opposed to any compromise with London. In Chechnya, Russia installed a pro-Moscow regime, albeit one with some measure of autonomy, which then fought against separatists who continued to resist Russian rule.

Third parties are important in one other respect: the success or failure of a state in deterring or coercing a non-state actor will affect its reputation in the eyes of others, friends as well as foes, and thus its potential to deter or coerce adversaries in other confrontations. The leaders of the early Republic believed that success against the Barbary regencies would greatly improve the standing of the United States with the powers of Europe. The underwhelming performance of the U.S. Army against Pancho Villa diminished concern in Berlin about the military consequences of U.S. entry into World War I and made the decision to declare unrestricted submarine warfare less difficult for the German government. British officials feared that failure to prevent Irish independence would have a domino effect elsewhere in the empire. Moscow has had similar worries regarding Chechen separatism. Israel places a premium on its military reputation to deter state and non-state foes alike, thus the Israelis' serious concern that the deficiencies revealed in the 2006 Second Lebanon War could weaken deterrence vis-à-vis not only Hizballah, but also Syria and Iran. Those planning, commanding, and conducting operations and campaigns against non-state actors should keep in mind that others are watching and drawing lessons. The immediate and primary focus may be on deterring or defeating the enemy at hand, but the wider and longer term implications of doing well or badly should not be ignored and may be more important than the immediate contingency.

5. *Deterrence or coercion of NSAs should not be considered in isolation from broader efforts to counter such groups.*

Deterrence alone is unlikely to be a complete strategy against NSAs. Properly employed, it may be a useful element of a broader strategy. Steps to deter or coerce should be guided by an overarching design for dealing with a particular adversary.

Deterrence alone may hold the threat in check while not eliminating the threat. Such a limited goal is likely to be acceptable only if there is no better choice. States typically aim to eliminate and defend against hostile NSAs, and deterrence effect tends to follow from these efforts rather than being the result of a unique strategy dedicated solely to

deterrence. The leaders of Israel have sought, as one Israeli analyst has put it, to "extirpate" their terrorist enemies. Despite decades of effort, and notable Israeli successes, the terrorist threat remains. Deterrence has become part of Israeli strategy by default. Deterrent and coercive threats are used in combination with other Israeli counter-terrorist actions, which themselves can have deterrent effects as by-products.

6. *Accurate intelligence enables—but does not guarantee—the deterrence or coercion of non-state actors.*

The cases included in this study do not treat intelligence questions in depth. Nonetheless, when considered as a whole, they suggest the importance of intelligence in identifying and understanding NSAs, adopting counters, gauging progress, and refining strategies and tactics accordingly. For a variety of reasons, the Japanese government failed to gather intelligence on the Aum Shinrikyo cult, and therefore was unaware of the threat it faced and unable to take action against the group prior to the sarin attack on the Tokyo subway. Intelligence collection and analysis has lent support to the Israeli tactic of targeted killings to disrupt and deter attacks by Palestinian terrorist groups. In attempting to control the restive Shi'ite and Kurdish tribes of the post-World War I British mandate in Mesopotamia, the Royal Air Force (RAF) used intelligence provided by political officers on the ground to concentrate punitive air attacks on the most troublesome villages and to evaluate the results. (It should be noted that the effectiveness of this "air control" waned as the tribes became accustomed to the bombings and adopted countermeasures.) Toward the end of the Anglo-Irish War, improved intelligence gathering allowed the British to capture large arms caches, which crippled the IRA operationally and made it more amenable to a peace treaty.

The cases do not, however, offer examples of systematic efforts to acquire and analyze intelligence primarily for the purpose of deterring or coercing non-state actors through detailed understanding of the adversary's decision-making, vulnerabilities, and possible reactions to pressure. The absence of examples may reflect limitations of the case studies and the fact that, as noted, deterrence or coercion usually has not been the principal aim of strategies directed against non-state actors. The value of directing intelligence

41

gathering for the specific purpose of supporting strategies of deterrence is likely to be very high vis-à-vis NSAs given the considerable variation involved. As noted above, deterrence of NSAs can "work," but only a robust understanding of the characteristics of NSAs and circumstances is likely to help us discern when, where, and against whom is deterrence a practicable strategy.

7. *Domestic constraints may affect, though not necessarily in a determinative way, the strategies, tactics, and means available for deterring or coercing non-state actors.*

For liberal democracies, certain deterrent or coercive measures that may be effective in principle also may be politically unacceptable, at least initially. Examples include measures perceived to infringe on civil liberties or those that include harm to noncombatants. These constraints may weaken or disappear, however, under the exigencies of severe conflict with a non-state actor. In Japan, legal protections for religious groups inhibited police investigation of Aum Shinrikyo. In the U.K., opposition at home was one reason the RAF did not use chemical bombs against the tribes in Mesopotamia, but otherwise did not influence the conduct of air operations, including the attacks on villages. European countries afflicted by terrorism at first were constrained in their responses by various legal concerns, but growing public revulsion at terrorist brutalities enabled changes to the laws that increased police powers, expanded the use of search warrants and checkpoints, extended pretrial confinement of terrorists, speeded the trials of these defendants, limited contacts between terrorists and their lawyers, imposed stiffer sentences for unrepentant terrorists, and isolated prisoners thought to be directing terrorist attacks from their cells. In Israel, despite some domestic opposition and frequent protests from abroad, Israeli officials have been willing to employ harsh counter-terrorism measures—targeted killings, bulldozing of houses owned by the families of terrorists, military operations to pressure civilian populations in which terrorists operate—because of the severity of the threat it confronts. In contrast to liberal democracies, the Soviet Union and its authoritarian Russian successor have evinced fewer scruples in their dealings with Chechen separatists and those responsible for kidnapping Soviet diplomatic and intelligence officials during the Lebanese civil war.

It is worth pointing out that in at least one case, an NSA adopted a strategy that purposefully exploited the compunctions of its opponent in order to advance its cause. In the Anglo-Irish War, the IRA deliberately incited bloody reprisals by the British as a way of both intensifying the enmity of the Irish people and creating crises of conscience for liberal politicians in London.

8. *Common views about the deterrence of non-state actors are at odds with the results of this empirical review.*

In sum, the findings based on the cases for this study challenge some of the conventional wisdom regarding the deterrence and coercion of NSAs as well as some of the truths about deterrence inherited from the Cold War. Under certain circumstances, NSAs can in fact be deterred. Where deterrence or coercion of an NSA is feasible, it will not necessarily be the priority objective. Deterrence or coercion of a non-state actor may not be limited to two parties, but may involve multiple parties interacting in unique ways. A tailored approach that distinguishes among audiences and circumstances should be employed in attempting to deter or coerce NSAs. Generic threats communicated indiscriminately may deter, but a strategy informed by an understanding of the target and context should have a greater chance being effective. Preventing hostile action by an NSA may not be simply a matter of deterrence by threat of punishment. For most of the case studies examined, when deterrence was achieved denial methods played a significant, if not primary, role. And inducements—in combination with intimidation—can contribute positively to efforts to deter or coerce non-state actors.