

The Effectiveness Of Terrorism

Posted on July 31, 2022

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/the-effectiveness-of-terrorism/>

Introduction

Research on the effectiveness of terrorism asks whether violent organizations achieve political objectives through attacks, not merely whether they cause fear, casualties, publicity, or economic disruption. Max Abrahms's "Why Terrorism Does Not Work" and Robert Pape's "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism" approach this question differently. Abrahms argues that organizations relying heavily on attacks against civilians rarely obtain their stated policy goals because governments infer from indiscriminate violence that the attackers have extreme or unlimited intentions (Abrahms, 2006). Pape argues that suicide terrorism can follow a strategic logic and has often been used in campaigns intended to pressure democratic states over military presence and territorial control (Pape, 2003). These arguments are not exact opposites. A tactic can be strategically motivated without producing the desired outcome, and a campaign can achieve publicity or organizational survival while failing to secure its declared political objective. Evaluating effectiveness therefore requires clear definitions of the outcome, the time horizon, the target of the attack, the organization's actual goals, and the counterfactual question of what would have happened without the violence.

Defining Strategic, Tactical, and Organizational Effectiveness

Terrorist organizations can pursue several objectives simultaneously, including territorial change, policy concessions, prisoner release, regime destabilization, recruitment, publicity, organizational survival, polarization, or disruption of negotiation. These outcomes should not be treated as equivalent. An attack may be tactically successful because it reaches a protected target, organizationally useful because it attracts recruits or resources, and strategically unsuccessful because the government rejects the group's political demand. Kydd and Walter (2006) identify several strategic logics of terrorism, including intimidation, provocation, spoiling, outbidding, and attrition, showing that not every campaign seeks an immediate concession. Some violence is intended to trigger a government overreaction, undermine moderate rivals, or destroy a peace process rather than to produce a negotiated policy change. This distinction helps explain why different studies can reach different conclusions about whether terrorism "works." A researcher focused on declared policy objectives may code a campaign as unsuccessful, while a study of political polarization may identify substantial effects. Effectiveness therefore must be defined before cases are

compared, and descriptive impact should be separated from endorsement or legitimacy.

Abrahms and the Problem of Civilian Targeting

Abrahms examined twenty-eight organizations on the U.S. State Department's Foreign Terrorist Organization list and coded forty-two policy objectives, concluding that the groups achieved only a small share of their stated goals (Abrahms, 2006). His explanation centers on target selection. When organizations attack civilians, governments and publics may infer that the group's ambitions are broader than its stated demand and that concessions will not end the threat. Abrahms calls this a correspondence-inference mechanism: observers infer preferences from behavior. Violence against military targets connected to a specific territorial dispute can appear more limited than indiscriminate attacks against civilians, although such attacks can still fail or be unlawful depending on context. Civilian targeting may also strengthen hard-line political responses, reduce sympathy for the attackers' cause, and narrow the bargaining space available to leaders. The argument does not demonstrate that every attack on civilians produces identical effects, nor does it prove that organizations always state their true priorities publicly. It does, however, distinguish the capacity to impose harm from the credibility required to obtain concessions from a target government.

Pape and the Coercive Logic of Suicide Campaigns

Pape's analysis of suicide terrorism from 1980 through 2001 emphasizes organizational strategy rather than individual irrationality. He argues that many suicide campaigns were connected to efforts to compel democratic states to withdraw military forces from territory the attackers regarded as their homeland (Pape, 2003). Suicide attacks can signal resolve because participants expect to die and organizations invest heavily in recruitment, preparation, and publicity. Pape identifies cases, including campaigns in Lebanon, in which organizations interpreted subsequent withdrawals or negotiations as evidence that coercion had succeeded. His argument therefore concerns both objective outcomes and organizational learning: groups may repeat a tactic because they believe earlier campaigns produced concessions. Strategic logic, however, is not the same as strategic effectiveness. A government withdrawal may have several causes, including military cost, domestic politics, alliance changes, mission objectives, diplomatic agreements, and violence from multiple actors. Demonstrating that an attack occurred before a policy shift does not by itself establish that the attack caused the change. The key analytical problem is constructing a credible counterfactual against which coercive influence can be assessed.

Research Design, Selection, and Competing

Interpretations

Ashworth et al. (2008) criticized Pape's research design on the grounds that cases are selected around the presence of suicide terrorism and that outcomes can be interpreted in ways that exaggerate coercive success. A stronger causal test would compare campaigns with relevant alternatives and examine whether concessions would likely have occurred without suicide attacks. Abrahms's design has limitations of its own. Publicly stated goals may be unrealistic or incomplete, organizations can change priorities over time, and the U.S. Foreign Terrorist Organization list is a policy-based sample rather than a neutral census of all violent organizations. Coding success also requires judgment when outcomes are partial, delayed, or accompanied by strategic losses elsewhere. English (2016) similarly emphasizes that terrorism can produce varied short- and long-term consequences that resist one universal success rate. These methodological disagreements matter because claims about effectiveness depend on which campaigns enter the dataset, how goals are defined, and what counts as a concession. Statistical comparison is valuable, but historical context remains necessary for interpreting causation and organizational intent.

Political Effects Beyond Immediate Concessions

Terrorism can affect politics even when it does not produce the policy outcome publicly demanded by an organization. Gould and Klor (2010), examining terrorism and political attitudes in Israel, found that exposure to violence can influence electoral preferences, but the relationship is not necessarily linear or uniformly favorable to the attackers' objectives. Kydd and Walter's framework likewise shows how violence may seek to provoke repression, discredit moderates, or demonstrate greater militancy than rival groups (Kydd & Walter, 2006). These mechanisms make organizational competition an important part of the analysis. An attack that appears ineffective against the state may still strengthen one faction relative to another or undermine a negotiation the organization opposes. Such outcomes can be destructive rather than constructive: stopping a peace process or increasing communal polarization is different from creating a durable political settlement. Freedman (2014) notes that terrorism is often strategically problematic because organizations struggle to translate violent disruption into lasting political control or legitimacy. The effects of terrorism therefore occur across several audiences, including governments, supporters, rivals, communities, and international actors.

Analytical Implications for Counterterrorism

The literature on effectiveness also illuminates how state responses can alter the strategic environment without implying one universal counterterrorism formula. If some organizations seek provocation, indiscriminate retaliation can create the polarization or grievance they hoped to generate. If civilian attacks reduce the credibility of organizations as bargaining partners, government

responses that also disregard civilian protection may weaken the distinction on which that loss of legitimacy depends. Pape's emphasis on military presence directs attention to how deployments and territorial disputes enter organizational narratives, while Abrahms's work directs attention to target selection and perceived intentions. Kydd and Walter (2006) show that different terrorist strategies create different informational problems for governments, meaning that the same response may not have the same effect across campaigns. Defensive security, intelligence, criminal investigation, military force, political negotiation, and community resilience address different mechanisms and carry different costs. The research therefore supports analytical differentiation rather than a single claim that terrorism either universally succeeds or universally fails. It also reinforces the need to distinguish immediate tactical disruption from long-term political outcomes when evaluating both non-state violence and state response.

Conclusion

Abrahms and Pape illuminate different dimensions of terrorist strategy. Abrahms finds that organizations in his sample rarely achieved their stated policy objectives and argues that civilian targeting can signal extreme intentions that make governments less willing to concede (Abrahms, 2006). Pape shows that suicide campaigns are often organized around strategic theories of coercion and that groups may interpret military withdrawals or negotiations as evidence that the tactic imposes meaningful pressure (Pape, 2003). Subsequent criticism demonstrates that neither claim can be evaluated without careful attention to case selection, goal coding, counterfactuals, and time horizon (Ashworth et al., 2008). Terrorism can generate fear, publicity, polarization, organizational competition, and sometimes policy movement, while still failing to produce stable realization of a group's broader political aims. Destructive goals such as spoiling negotiation may also be easier to achieve than creating a durable political order. The most precise conclusion is therefore not a simple yes-or-no judgment about effectiveness. Outcomes vary according to the strategy pursued, the targets selected, the political context, the government response, and the standard by which success is measured.

References

- Abrahms, M. (2006). Why terrorism does not work. *International Security*, 31(2), 42–78.
- Ashworth, S., Clinton, J. D., Meirowitz, A., & Ramsay, K. W. (2008). Design, inference, and the strategic logic of suicide terrorism. *American Political Science Review*, 102(2), 269–273.
- English, R. (2016). *Does terrorism work? A history*. Oxford University Press.
- Freedman, L. (2014). Terrorism as a strategy. *Government and Opposition*, 49(2), 314–339.
- Gould, E. D., & Klor, E. F. (2010). Does terrorism work? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(4),

1459-1510.

Kydd, A. H., & Walter, B. F. (2006). The strategies of terrorism. *International Security*, 31(1), 49-80.

Pape, R. A. (2003). The strategic logic of suicide terrorism. *American Political Science Review*, 97(3), 343-361.