TERRORIST LEARNING VIEWED THROUGH A STRATEGIC LENS

EXPLAINING DAESH'S RISE TO POWER

by John Helferich

لا إله إلا الله

Bild: Acedrecordz: AQMI Flag asymmetric. CC BY-SA 4.0

WISI ONLINE 1/2021

BSH

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

John Helferich studied Media and Communication Studies (MKW) at the University of Mannheim and - as part of the Ontario/Baden-Württemberg regional programme - at Western University in Canada. After working as a journalist and in adult education, he completed a Master's degree in "International Security" at the Institut d'études politiques de Paris (Sciences Po) in France. His thesis entitled *Arms Export Controls under Siege of Globalisation - Defeated Nation States or Voluntary Surrender* deals with the challenges of extraterritorial arms export controls and was published by Tectum Verlag in 2020. He is currently continuing his academic education with a PhD in International Relations at St Antony's College, University of Oxford. During his doctoral studies, he is focusing on issues of European integration in the field of security and defence policy. His research focuses on the origins of the EU defence initiatives adopted under the 2016 Global Strategy.

PICTURE

Own Illustration
Source: AQMI Flag symetrical: Acedrecordz
Licence: CC BY-SA 4.0

DATE OF PUBLICATION

February 2021

WISSENSCHAFT & SICHERHEIT ONLINE

Wissenschaft & Sicherheit Online, WiSi Online for short, is the electronic publication series of the Academic Association for Security Studies (BSH). Publications in WiSi Online are subject to a two-way anonymous review process. WiSi Online has been published under ISSN 1667-9641 since 2015.

IMPRESSUM

© Bundesverband Sicherheitspolitik an Hochschulen (BSH)

Editorial: Cornelia Bohl, Stefan Maetz, René Muschter, Philipp Thimm, Jan Heidbüchel, Lena Alt
Layout and Design: Jan Heidbüchel, Cornelia Bohl

CONTACT

http://www.sicherheitspolitik.de/publikationen/wisi-online/
wisi-online@sicherheitspolitik.de

Terrorist Learning Viewed Through A Strategic Lens

Explaining Daesh's Rise To Power

ABSTRACT

Terrorist groups, like any kind of organisation, learn from their own experiences as well as from those of others. However, these processes of organisational learning and adaptation have not yet been sufficiently understood, especially in view of the profound military-strategic transformations that some groups have undergone in the 21st century. The question to be examined is how terrorist organisations have learnt to exert pressure on state actors more effectively thereby increasing their chances of survival and expansion. Particularly, the terrorist methods of Daesh are analysed through the concept of the 'exterior manoeuvre' as advanced by French strategist André Beaufre. Combining strategic concepts with performative approaches, it is shown how learning processes at the strategic level have enabled Daesh to exploit vulnerabilities of Western nation-states in unprecedented ways. As a consequence, it is suggested that counterinsurgency measures should take greater account of the insurgents' strategic aspirations beyond the battlefield, which can strongly influence the course of the war.

KEY WORDS

Terrorism, Conflict, Military Strategy, Middle East, Methods of Learning

Terrorism and Learning

The question how terrorists learn has recently sparked a lively debate in academia and political journals alike, with the underlying assumption that if states find out how terrorists acquire and distribute knowledge, they will be able to intervene in these processes and can therefore stop groups from evolving (Mumford 2015). From cognitive psychology, which focusses on the appropriation of new knowledge, to behaviourist theories that highlight reinforcement and practice, to organisational theorists who focus on changes in institutional procedures, every field has added value to this discourse. In order to locate the approach that this essay will take, the broader debate will be briefly outlined. Subsequently, this essay's approach, which draws from previous ones, while adding a strategic perspective, shall be illustrated.

In fact, there seem to be two dominant ways of thinking about this topic, one from a rather exclusively theoretical perspective and the other, which is more empirically focussed on the learning curves of distinct terror organisations in history and draws little from theory. The works by Kettle and Mumford (2010; 2017), for instance, are representative of a battle for definitions that has taken place. The authors suggest separating learning into different processes such as identification, retention, distribution and implementation and assume that in order to thwart terrorist learning it is important to intervene in these distinct processes (Kettle/Mumford 2017: 525). Furthermore, they reject a number of definitions such as the frequently cited one by Dolnik, defining terrorist learning as an "act of introduction of a new method or technology or an improvement of an already existing capability", for not establishing the concept as a broader outcome of a larger process of learning (ibid.; Dolnik 2007: 10). Instead, they arrive at an apparently more operational definition, stating that terrorist learning is "the acquisition of knowledge to inform terrorist-related activities in the future" (Kettle/Mumford 2017: 530). However, this broad definition has so far not been sufficient to gain deeper insights into the transformations of insurgent groups or to provide concrete policy advice.

On the other side of the spectrum are approaches by, for example, the RAND Corporation or Noriyuki Katagiri (2015), who have created larger, almost encyclopaedic works that link analyses of different groups' learning experiences together. Yet these studies have not been able to translate data into a more general theory or model on terrorist learning. A rather innovative approach has been undertaken by the Max-Planck-institute in Halle, Germany. The researchers aim to approach terrorist learning by interviewing former members of terrorist groups about their combat experiences in order to identify learning structures.[1]

This outline shows that it has been difficult to bridge the gap between theory and practice in this matter. Taking the difficulties of the current discourse into account, this paper avoids getting wrapped up in terminological issues by looking at terrorist learning as a form of adaptation

[1] For an overview of the Max-Planck Research Group see: https://www.eth.mpg.de/howterroristslearn

that has allowed movements to survive and expand. It will combine theory with empirical evidence by looking at terrorist learning through a strategic prism, drawing from the works of classic military strategists such as Carl von Clausewitz, André Beaufre and Captain B. H. Liddell Hart. Since it has been difficult to establish broader conclusions on the micro and meso level, it is suggested to take a step back and try to identify how insurgence groups have learnt over time on a macro/strategic level. The goal is to first trace back the strategic culture of effective insurgent groups today and put them into the context of a learning process that has started after WWII. In a second step, the effects of learning on the strategic level shall be analysed with particular reference to Daesh. The goal is less to develop a learning theory but more to identify a certain evolution that illustrates how groups have managed to exert more pressure on their adversaries while at the same time becoming more robust and increasing their longevity in a conflict. In the case of Daesh, this can be described as a "paralyse and deter strategy" carried out as part of a "high-tech media jihad" (Rose 2014: 2). Due to the small scope of the paper, this analysis will not be exhaustive, however, the empirical results allow to draw first operational conclusions for policymakers.

Terrorism versus Insurgency

To begin with, it is useful to make certain terminological clarifications with regard to the terms terrorism and insurgency. Due to the multifaceted conflicts that have occurred in the Middle East, Africa but also in Europe over the last decades, the meaning of the terms terrorist group and insurgent movement has blurred. Some authors, such as Louise Richardson (2006), have tried to distinguish the two stating that terrorists are primarily interested in revenge and that they measure the success of their attacks by how much attention they receive (Richardson 2006: 5). In contrast, insurgent movements would aim to build their own state by wearing down the enemy until they can engage in conventional warfare and establish governing structures (ibid.; Byman 2007: 4). Yet, these differentiations are misleading when applied to modern organisations such as Daesh, which has the goal of establishing a so-called "Islamic State" based on Sharia Law, yet they have also engaged in a variety of revenge attacks and are vitally interested that their deeds receive attention. A solution to this conceptual issue is to classify groups, such as Daesh, as insurgent movements that employ terrorism as a method to achieve their political goals. It follows that conceptually not all insurgent movements necessarily engage in terrorism, although empirically this is by far the most likely case (Byman 2007: 4). Hence, the term terrorism is to be understood as a method i.e. "the sub-state application of violence or the threat of violence to sow panic and bring about political change" (Laqueur 2004: 450).[2] According to this definition, states could also apply terrorist tactics and the carpet bombing on Dresden at the end of WWII has often been discussed in that context (Grosscup 2006: 81). For the purpose of this article, however, terrorism shall be framed as a conflict of the weak against the strong - in material terms. Therefore, the opposition between Daesh and Western nation states is the focus of interest rather than the interactions between Daesh and other militias.[3]

A further distinction relates to what Robert Cassidy (2006) and others have termed "global guerrillas" of the 21st century as opposed to regional groups involved in "traditional" or "classical" insurgency (Cassidy 2006; Gompert 2007; Kilcullen 2009). What defines global guerrillas, such as modern Al-Qaeda or Daesh, is that they are international in terms of their organisation, objectives, intent and recruitment base (Cassidy 2006: 12). In contrast to regional groups, operating within one state or region, global guerrillas share several defining features. Not only are such groups extremely aware of the psyche of their recruits and enemies but, beyond that, they "appreciate the potential for a new, diffuse form of insurgency that can simultaneously utilise and attack globalisation" (Gompert 2007: 11).[4] Daesh, for instance, employs the doctrine of a decentralised global jihad based on drawing individuals and other terrorist movements worldwide into a common ideology. These ideas transcend traditional insurgency and "reveal the capacity of the jihad to learn and thus to change and perpetuate" (ibid.).

In addition, some scholars in the early 2000s predicted a revolution in military affairs (RMA) which would affect the material/technological capabilities of insurgent movements (Hoffman 2006; Hammes 2006). Concepts such as "advanced irregular warfare" or "fourth-generation warfare" suggest that the technological gap between states and insurgent groups will close as a result of globalisation.[5] This would allow insurgents to make use of encrypted command systems, for instance, or to employ cutting-edge hacking methods. Empirically,

[2] Laqueur (1999) identifies more than 100 different definitions of terrorism (5). For more information see also Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) *Guide to the Analysis of Insurgency.*

[3] Militia is defined as "a paramilitary force motivated by religious or political ideology, especially one that engages in rebel or terrorist activities in opposition to a regular army" Oxford English Dictionary (2020).

[4] Killcullen (2009) adds the notion of "accidental guerrillas", suggesting that many extremists today had no intention of fighting, but were coerced by extremist movements often in response to Western states' meddling in the region.

[5] The concept of advanced irregular warfare was coined by Hoffman (2006) whereas 4GW was first developed by Lind et al. (1989) and later refined by Hammes (2006). Both concepts have been criticised for their lack of conceptual clarity and for merely repacking the traditional clash between insurgents and nation-states. For an overview of the debate see: https://mackenzieinstitute.com/2009/01/on-fourth-generation-warfare/

these predictions have not yet fully materialised, even though the technological capabilities of insurgent groups have certainly improved. In some areas, such as Daesh's strategic use of small drones, the insurgents' tactical skills may even surpass those of Western nation-states' militaries.[6]

Against this background it is not surprising that former US Secretary of Defence Robert Gates declared in 2007 "we expect that asymmetric warfare will be the mainstay of the contemporary battlefield" (Mazarr 2008: 34). The question remains, though, how exactly have terrorists learnt "to harass and frustrate larger regular armies" over time (ibid.)?

The Strategic Learning Process

Arreguin-Toft (2005) has shown that between the early 1800s and WWII materially weak actors won only a third of all wars, yet after 1945 they have won more than half of them (Arreguin-Toft 2005: 4). I shall briefly outline how that learning process evolved on the strategic level and from there segue into Daesh's strategic approach. In his book "Adapting to Win" Noriyuki Katagiri (2015) shows that before WWII insurgence groups tried to fight states in conventional ways, moreover they did not learn from their defeats as they employed the same strategy in several conflicts with the effect that "these groups were repeatedly crushed rather quickly" (Katagiri 2015: 11). Drawing from different conflicts he analyses that the average duration of extra-systemic wars before WWII is 2.7 years, whereas after 1945 it increases to 7 years. Furthermore, as the conflicts start to last longer the rate of victory of insurgent groups goes up (ibid.). Similarly, Beaufre (1998) writes that before 1939 "people were blinded by the black and white theories of the 19th century that drew a sharp distinction between peace and war and that there was no alternative" (Beaufre 1998: 129). The alternative that he is speaking of is indirect strategy, a concept framed by Liddell Hart (1998:18). The strategist reconsiders the way Clausewitz' was read with the idea to put less emphasis on the importance of numbers in military force. Based on the theory of Liddell Hart, the greatest possible effect for achieving the political goal should be reached by engaging as little as possible in combat - through indirect strategy (1998: 342). Arguably, insurgent groups managed to increase their longevity because they moved away from a direct approach i.e. the open use of force and material resources to obtain "the essential freedom of action" (Beaufre 1998: 127). In conflicts where the material strength varies significantly between opponents, it is hardly possible to "disarm the enemy of his entire military capabilities" in a Clausewitzian way (Clausewitz 1955: 77). Instead, one shall attempt to reach refined military objectives by dislocating the enemy and "seeking strategically advantageous situations" through movement and surprise (Liddell Hart 1998: 339).

In fact, in regular warfare, even superiority in numbers will lead to a defeat, if the insurgent group does not apply guerrilla tactics, as states' higher level of organisation allows them to mobilise their troops faster (Biddle 2004).[7] Katagiri (2015) illustrates this using the example of the Dahomean War between Dahomean Rebels and the French forces in West Africa in 1890 (Katagiri 2015: 63). Even though the Dahomean forces were initially twice the size of the French army their failure to reflect on previous defeats made them lose the war over time (ibid.). Drawing from Mao, Katagiri (2015) argues that the only way for an insurgent movement to win is to avoid open combat in the early stages of the conflict and instead to drag the war out. In that way, the group can adapt in sequences from guerrilla war to conventional war to finally begin state-building (ibid.; Chaliand 1994: 185). Since the political objective, the Clausewitzian "Zweck" of the Dahomean forces was much higher, namely independence, survival, and autonomy than that of France, which would merely lose a colony, the right strategy would have been to hold out as long as possible and build a shadow state, while continuously inflicting costs on the French so that the political cause of the dominating state diminishes.

According to Beaufre, this realisation was something that each generation had to learn afresh despite the long history of guerrilla tactics (1998: 114). However, this conclusion can be slightly misleading as it implies that terrorist groups generally evolve in isolation of each other and are incapable of learning from the experiences of other groups (Clarke 2019). It seems though that the communicative interactions between groups have been growing as a result of globalisation and technological progress. This has led to multifaceted learning processes and situations in which terrorist groups that are profoundly different in their background, motivation and endgames are able to provide learning platforms for others (Fürstenberg/Görzig 2020). Nowadays, it is increasingly common for groups to share their experiences online or even to collaborate with experts from foreign groups when training their own recruits (Forest 2006: 17).[8]

A more general finding that applies to most insurgencies is that "the longer the insurgent movement lasts the

[6] Joachim Bertele, Security Advisor to the German Chancellor on Daesh's use of drone tactics, SciencesPo conference on the future of National Security, 22th November 2017.

[7] This ties into Biddle's (2004) argument that even in asymmetric warfare of the 21st century state's advances in technology or material superiority more generally will not determine positive war outcomes if not accompanied by proper force employment, doctrine and tactics (Biddle 2004: 190).

[8] Forest (2006) illustrates this with the example of the FARC guerrillas, who were allegedly trained in urban terrorist tactics by three IRA members arrested in Bogota in 2001.

higher will be its chances to survive its infantile diseases and to take a root" (Galula 2010: 10). A successful example of how an insurgent group learnt to consolidate its structures step by step is the Algerian war in 1956. Said Ferdi (1981) describes in detail how the Algerian insurgents succeeded in bringing the local political structures under their control through coercion and attacks, thereby taking a toll that was too heavy for the French public to bear (Ferdi 1981: 161). It is argued that this strategy has been a rational learning process that was triggered by recurring defeats in open confrontations with the French forces. Similarly, the Taliban insurgency provides an example of a group that learnt to bring local structures under their control in order to inflict political costs. Afsar et al. (2008) argue that in the early days of the Taliban - under commander Mullah Omar - the group was known for their "Robin Hood like actions" as the "protector of the people" (Afsar et al. 2008: 68). In the mid-2000s, however, the group gave up on this strategy and sought to coerce local populations to provide shelter and hiding in an effort to increase civilian casualties from coalition airstrikes. This led to an increase in civilian deaths and drove "a wedge between the coalition forces and the population" (ibid.). Moreover, it changed the coalition forces' perception of the population as de facto supporters of the Taliban. This exhaustion strategy has been described as the "war of the flea" aimed to make the enemy suffer the dog's dis-advantages: "too much to defend; too small ubiquitous and agile an enemy to come to grips with" (ibid; Johnson/Mason 2007: 81; Taber 1965). Arguably, the demonstrated strategic learning process stands behind all (effective) insurgent activities today.

The Proliferation of Indirect Strategy

After having outlined this evolution of strategy, the question remains how insurgent groups managed to acquire this knowledge and improve their strategic approaches. In this regard, Katagiri (2015) remains vague as for him organisations have shown rather weak performances when it comes to learning. This is because several groups have used the same ineffective strategy against their adversaries over decades (Katagiri 2015: 35). He argues that this was due to the availability of military technology that "favour a conventional strategy and force structures" (ibid.). The second major constraint in learning strategy is the availability of communication technology so that groups can learn about past experiences from other groups. The reason why Maoist theory was spread around the world and inspired revolutions in Latin America and elsewhere was because it coincided with innovations in communication technology (Katagiri 2015: 36). Due to increasing globalisation, more insurgency leaders were educated in Europe and exposed to the theories of revolutionary thinkers such as Marx and Lenin, which enabled them to rethink revolutionary warfare.

While Katagiri (2015) illustrates that sequencing is an important co-determinant of successful insurgencies, his analysis is predominantly focussed on the concept of military victory. Beaufre (1994;1998), on the other hand, employs a concept that puts emphasis on inflicting political costs at the dominant state as a means of deciding a conflict. The recent conflict with Daesh in the Middle East provides an example of indirect strategy that was not only successful to a certain degree but also novel in its approach. The argument is that non-state groups have learnt to increasingly exploit the "new vulnerabilities" of nation-states by finding novel ways of inflicting political costs. The effect is that Western democracies find it more and more difficult to engage in insurgence conflicts abroad (Laqueur 2004: 450).

Daesh: The Effective Application of Indirect Strategy

Even though Daesh did not follow a typical Maoist rise to power due to the fact that they split from Al-Qaeda Central, Daesh proved to be well versed at learning indirect strategy (Hoffman 2016; Hassan 2018).[9] Drawing from Beaufre (1998) one can identify a significant learning process that separates Daesh from previous terror groups when it comes to applying erosion tactics (115). The first important element of the erosion tactic is to hold out materially, which means to ensure a supply of money and weapons so that the troops can be maintained (ibid.). Especially at the beginning, Daesh managed to do this in exceptionally successful ways. The group's large amounts of oil exports, coupled with bank robberies in northern Iraq as well as raids on military depots, provided them with both money and advanced weaponry (Moore 2017). In addition, just like the Aum Shinrikyo in Japan at the time, Daesh has been one of the most effective groups at looting and kidnapping (ibid.). Another important source of funding constituted the financial and material support provided by individuals and states that supported the group's ideology. Weiss/Hassan (2015) argue that Islamist terror groups have been more successful in securing funding than others, which has encouraged even groups with more secular aims to adopt an Islamic cloak (Weiss/Hassan 2015: 181). Daesh, however, has taken the marketing of its ideology to the extreme by even setting up professional propaganda departments as discussed below. This unified their base and let them become the best-funded terror group on earth according to the Washington Institute (Zimmermann 2017: 19).[10]

Even more important than the material sphere in war is

[9] For an overview of Daesh's evolution, see: https://edition.cnn.com/2014/08/08/world/isis-fast-facts/index.html and https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2018/11/isis-origins-anbari-zarqawi/577030/

[10] For a detailed outline of Daesh's funding, see: https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/upload/infographics/Islamic-State-of-Iraq-and-al-Sham-ISIS-Funding.pdf and https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/jns/files/450-3020-2-pb.pdf

the psychological sphere, which Beaufre (1998) deems "essential in indirect strategy" (117). The strategist argues that every military operation needs to be conducted with the end to achieve psychological success, which according to him is the only "true success" in indirect strategy (ibid.). For instance, it is vital to hold up the morale of the insurgent troops in order to make believe that one is fighting the morally just fight and that despite inferiority in numbers the conflict will be won. In this respect, social media is a central feature of modern terrorism as a means of gaining access to the minds and eyeballs of millions. In terms of Daesh, it appears that never before has an insurgence group managed to use propaganda and indoctrination in such effective ways and the term "high-tech media jihad" seems to aptly describe this phenomenon (Rose 2014: 2; Huyghe 2007). Among Western social media strategists who have discussed Daesh's propaganda, two particularly strong domains stand out:

(1) recruitment through the spread of ideology via high-tech productions primarily by the al-Hayat Media Centre (e.g. the video series Mujatweets),

(2) animation of military victories and terror attacks to reinforce group morale and distract from military defeats.[11]

Similar to the Aum in Japan, Daesh managed to recruit experts for different fields, as in the case of Baraa Kadek, a Syrian journalist who joint in 2013 and set up the so-called `news agency´ Amaq which even involves a mobile app and an English language magazine called Dabiq.[12] Unlike previous terror organisations, Daesh offered several easy to access platforms for journalists and as they uploaded many of their messages in several languages, they could often be directly transferred to people around the world. On top of that, their content production was often highly professional. In the words of Australian Army information specialist Jason Logue, "they mastered the concept of propaganda of the deed", meaning the mise en scène of military victories, "like no other group before" (Logue 2015: 2).[13] This enabled them to expand their recruitment base across the globe. Following the official establishment of the `caliphate´ in June 2014, there has been an exponential increase in the number of Daesh foreign fighters in Iraq and Syria, from around 6,000 in 2013 to an estimated 20,000 in 2015, up to more than 40,000 foreign fighters in 2017, according to UN data (IISS 2020).[14]

By late 2015, Daesh had expanded to such a level that it would have been strategically wiser to consolidate control over the won territories and to build institutions while making all efforts to deter Western governments from launching a concerted counter-offensive on the ground (Hansen-Lewis/Shapiro 2015: 151). Stopping the territorial expansion, however, would not have been in line with the group's mission as "the waging of war to expand the caliphate is an essential duty of the caliph" (cited in Wood 2015: 59). The group thus continued its military expansion by fighting Syrian and Iraqi forces in the open and gradually began to suffer from overextension.[15] In sum, the main source of Daesh's success lies less in the thought-out application of offensive strategy but instead results from the effective spread of ideology – as part of indirect strategy. The question remains, however, as to what military-strategic calculus lies behind the propaganda directed at the enemy in the West? After all, a high level of group morale alone is not sufficient to achieve military victory when being confronted with the strongest armies in the world.

Daesh's Exterior Manoeuvre

Clausewitz noted that when the destruction of the enemy is unlikely due to unequal material or moral forces, one can engage in other strategies for example by trying to "paralyse the enemy" (Clausewitz 1955: 143). This is the lens through which one shall look at Daesh's strategy to counter Western democracies. Instead of being aimed to lead to direct military victory, the terror attacks and propaganda efforts have to be seen as political tools as part of a wider "exterior manoeuvre" to reach the politico-military objective (Beaufre 1994: 1023). According to Beaufre (1994), the "likelihood of success of an operation is dependent upon the success of action on the worldwide-plane" (ibid.). In contrast to the "internal manoeuvre", which takes place on the actual battlefield, the external manoeuvre refers to actions intended to have an impact outside the theatre of war. It is argued that Daesh's actions beyond the battlefield are central to explaining why the group has managed to sow chaos for five years and continues to do so, now especially through splinter groups in Africa and elsewhere. There are two central parts to Daesh's exterior manoeuvre: first, the terror attacks in the West and, second, the violent propaganda campaigns through execution videos. Each time the audience is the Western public as well as governing elites and both activities work together to generate one

[11] The al-Hayat Media center was established in 2014 and produced print and digital content in different languages to promote the Daesh ideology to wester audiences.

[12] See: discussion on Wired & Vice: https://www.wired.com/2016/03/isis-winning-social-media-war-heres-beat/

[13] For an analysis of the `propaganda of the deed´ see: https://thestrategybridge.org/the-bridge/2016/1/3/propaganda-of-the-deed

[14] Press Release: UNSC, 'Greater Cooperation Needed to Tackle Danger Posed by Returning Foreign Fighters, Head of Counter-Terrorism Office Tells Security Council', 28 November 2017.

[15] Furthermore, Russian bombings coupled with US airstrikes in north-east Syria and finally the Turkish military operation in 2019 all contributed to the military defeat of Daesh, which lost its last territory in March 2019.

dominant strategic effect: the paralysis and deterrence of the enemy in order to strengthen the group and increase its freedom of action.

Paralysis through Terror Attacks

In order to achieve a paralysis effect, Beaufre (1998) argues, one can use "from the subtlest to the most brutal procedures" (Beaufre 1998: 111). Daesh opted for the latter one and strategically unleashed a level of violence that was "beyond anything we have ever seen" (Friis 2015).[16] For instance, the terror attacks in several European countries made Daesh look more threatening than their actual capabilities suggested and thus increased the group's international profile. In addition, the spread of images of a burning Eiffel Tower or the Big Ben which are supposedly untouchable symbols of the `West´ did not only evoke memories of the destroyed Twin Towers but also enforced the notion of omnipresent vulnerability or at least the end of Western invulnerability. The idea was to send the message "we can attack anyone, anywhere at any time and you cannot stop us". Also, the most recent call to "Jihadi fighters" to take knives and cars to attack in Europe and the US (rather than coming to Syria to fight) is in line with that logic.[17] Needless to say, there are several strategic advantages to knives and cars such as that they require less skill and are more difficult to detect by law enforcement, but even more important is that they have a strong emotional effect. The use of vehicles for instance creates a constant threat environment as people are surrounded by them during their day-to-day lives.[18] In that way, everyone becomes a potential attacker. Knives, on the other hand, are often associated with rage and brutality as they trigger "a more visceral and graphic experience" and instil more fear than e.g. ballistic weapons (Niiler 2014). Liberal democracies seem particularly ill-equipped to defend themselves against such attacks by virtue of their openness. The combined effect is a sense of losing control in a way that each new attack increases political pressure on decision-makers to counter the threat and restore a feeling of security.

While it is difficult to evaluate the psychological effects of this strategy on the public as a whole, certain observations can be made. It becomes increasingly evident that terror attacks have a strong potential to create social division. A recent study by Böhmelt et al. (2020) analyses the social impact of all terrorist attacks in Europe after 9/11 on the basis of a spatial-econometric model. It finds that terror attacks indeed lead to increasingly negative perceptions of minorities, especially when the attack happens within the home country of a citizen.[19] Similarly, the *Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution* in Germany states that Islamist terrorist attacks play an important role in right-wing extremist propaganda, contributing to a five-fold increase in right-wing extremist crimes in 2014.[20] Ultimately, it appears that the terror campaign of Daesh in the West represents what is at the core of the terrorism method, that is fear, social division and publicity, yet this time with the implicit goal of paralysis and deterrence. The goal of deterrence is reached when governments decide that the struggle against the insurgent group is too politically costly in relation to the security gains. In the context of the Madrid attacks in 2004, a document was found in which Al-Qaeda sympathisers precisely state this goal. The authors of the document identify Spain as the "weakest link" in the US-led coalition due to the country's high level of "public opposition to the war" (cited in Neuman 2007: 14). As US withdrawal was unlikely, the aim was "to make one or two US allies leave the coalition because this will cause others to follow suit and the dominos will start falling" (ibid.).

By contrast, it is also possible to think that terror attacks provide incentives for states to commit more to counter-terrorism efforts abroad, especially when they are already involved in the conflict. For the terror attacks to go "unpunished" and to create a lasting paralysis effect, it is important to constantly remind the opponent of the costs that a counter-offensive would entail. Here, the functional role of the execution videos provides important insights.

Deterrence Through Violent Propaganda Campaigns

Previous works have already pointed out that one function of Daesh's propaganda campaign was to deter (Zech/Kelly 2015; Spens 2014). Yet, most research falls short in explaining the strategic calculus and learning processes that stand behind these efforts. Admittedly, it would be too far of a stretch to argue that media content alone determines the course of war. While this is rarely the case, propaganda can be an important factor and reinforce existing dispositions (Jowett/O'Donnell 2018: 4; Hansen 2015).

In the scholarly discourse, two dominant reasons are usually advanced to explain Western states' reluctance to

[16] This statement was issued by Chuck Hagel, US Secretary of Defence from 2013 to 2015, in response to the execution videos: https://www.politico.com/story/2014/08/chuck-hagel-isil-defense-james-foley-110241

[17] Daesh's book `Muslim Gangs´ entails instructions on how to spread hatred, raise money and carry out attacks.

[18] Another example of the legacy of Daesh are the bollards that can now be found at the entrances of most pedestrian zones, which are in some ways a reminder of Western vulnerability (Shevetsov et al 2017).

[19] Furthermore, the findings suggest that this effect travels across borders meaning that the size of the effect increases the closer the attack is to the national border (Böhmelt et al. 2020: 439).

[20] From 2014 to 2015 right-wing extremist crime increased from 170 to 894 cases and has since fluctuated on that level reaching 925 in 2019. The proliferation of right-wing violence is also associated with an increase in left-wing extremism (see BKA Report 2015, 45; 2019, 54): https://www.verfassungsschutz.de/embed/vsbericht-2019.pdf https://www.statewatch.org/media/documents/news/2016/jun/germany-bfv-annual-report-2015-de.pdf.

fight Daesh on the ground. First, the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan led to the realisation that it is very difficult to (successfully) exit these conflicts once states have become deeply involved in them.[21] Second, the extreme complexity of the conflict in Syria and the numerous actors involved in it made it difficult to develop a coherent set of long-term strategic goals. In addition to these structural elements, this article argues that the violent propaganda videos provided another impetus that discouraged states from sending ground troops, which has been largely overlooked so far. Moreover, given the professional propaganda infrastructure that Daesh built over time and the narratives it constructed, this strategy was not the result of happenstance, but a learnt behaviour to pursue deliberate politico-military goals.

The video series revolving around the execution of American and British journalists and aid workers are emblematic of that approach. The series began with a video titled "A message to America" published on YouTube on 19 August 2014. It depicts the execution of US Journalist James Foley as an act of retaliation for US airstrikes in Iraq. The video concludes with images of another kneeling hostage (the US photo-journalist Steven Sotloff) and a warning towards Obama that the life of this American citizen depended on his next decision. It proved to be no empty threat. On 2 September 2014, a similar video was uploaded to various platforms showing the beheading of Steven Sotloff.[22] The narrative connection between the videos indicates that they were not `made on the spot´, but strategically constructed with medium and long-term goals in mind. During the autumn of 2014, these beheading videos played a remarkable role in media and public debates and on several occasions, Western leaders had to justify their ban on using ground forces (Friis 2015).[23]

To gain insights into the military-strategic function that the videos aimed to fulfil, it is proposed to use the prism of Beaufre's exterior manoeuvre. Furthermore, findings from post-structuralist/performative approaches to visual imagery shall help to deconstruct the effects of the execution videos. As mentioned earlier, visual images may affect the politics of war by shaping "the interpretative schemes within which war is understood and responded to" (Friis 2015: 731; Hansen 2015). Moreover, visual representations of war may function as an "ontological-political condition or a condition of possibility for political action" and thereby affect the course of war indirectly (ibid.). The Daesh beheading videos arguably shaped the perception of Daesh as a military actor, and, accordingly, affected which political responses appeared sensible.

Based on this logic, the execution videos served as a frame of reference that made politicians think about whether and how they would engage with Daesh. In view of the strategic production and dissemination of the content, it appears that the terrorist group consciously aimed to create public outrage and political pressure. Indeed, while in January 2014 Obama had called Daesh a "junior varsity team", in his statement after the first video, in August 2014, he referred to the group as "cancer" stating that the beheadings represented "an act of violence that shocks the conscience of the entire world".[24] The very existence of these videos as discourse markers in the West is related to their function of deterrence. As such, the videos constituted a situation where an insurgent group provided the interpretative schemes for the West to understand the conflict. This has been unprecedented on that scale, as usually most foreign interventions are mediated by national news outlets or governments. In fact, most of the time, debates on foreign-interventions do not even accumulate to form a salient public discourse.[25] Arguably, this is hardly surprising as in Western "post-heroic societies" it has become increasingly difficult for politicians to win public support by endorsing foreign interventions, which are always at risk of undermining peace values (Münkler 2007). In this case, however, the images of "Jihadi John" were all over the news in 2014 and created visual facts that became in some ways terrifying symbols of Daesh. It provided a frame of reference for politicians and the public that could not be evaded. For policymakers this is particularly problematic as during a ground intervention their monopoly of information would be severely undermined. What supports this claim is that the US and UK police fiercely worked to censor the execution videos, issuing repeatedly that watching them would be a crime (Halliday 2014).[26] Besides this meta-level aspect of deter-

[21] In his Address to the Nation, on 6 December 2015, Obama stated: "if we occupy foreign lands, ISIS can maintain insurgencies for years, killing thousands of our troops, draining our resources". https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/06/address-nation-president

[22] Thereafter, three more videos were released, allegedly showing the beheadings of British aid workers David Haines and Alan Henning and American aid worker Abdul-Rahman Kassig.

[23] In September 2014, an NBC News/Wall Street Journal survey found that American voters regarded the US as less safe in the weeks following the broadcast of the Sotloff and Foley beheadings than at any point since 9/11: https://newscms.nbcnews.com/sites/newscms/files/14901_september_nbc-wsj_poll.pdf. At the same time most voters refused a ground invasion in 2014 (Doherty/ Weisel 2014): https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2014/10/22/support-for-u-s-campaign-against-isis-doubts-about-its-effectiveness-objectives/.

[24] The "JV team" comment was often referenced later. It was issued in an interview published by the New Yorker on 27 Jan. 2014. The latter comment was issued during 'Remarks on the death of James W. Foley in Syria from Edgartown, Massachusetts'.

[25] In this regard one may ask how much the European public is aware of events relating to the UN and EU missions in Mali? Usually, debates about foreign military interventions only erupt when mandates need to be prolonged or dramatic incidents involving casualties take place.

[26] In the UK for instance watching the videos could lead to prosecution under anti-terror laws.

rence, the videos' content provides another important stimulus.

Public support is especially low for interventions which appear to be (a) dangerous and (b) far away from the homeland in geographical and psychological terms (Kavanagh et al. 2020: 55).[27] Arguably, Daesh animated exactly these kinds of aspects in their videos, which have been described as a "modern guillotine execution spectacle with YouTube as the town square" (Kozlowska 2014). Based on construal theory in psychology, it can be argued that the image of the medieval caliphate in the desert mentally creates spatio-temporal distance to the theatre of war and the people in it (Krebs and Rapport 2012; Alper 2020). Furthermore, the lack of familiarity generates social distance and in combination with the stylised physical violence, this reinforces the idea that it is better to only engage with this threat from a safe distance (ibid.).[28] For politicians, this presented a catch-22 situation. On the one hand, public outrage over the videos demanded a strong condemnation and a solution to the problem. This led some policymakers to describe the videos as a "terrorist attack" or even a "declaration of war".[29] On the other hand, the complexity of the conflict coupled with Daesh's mediatisation made the political costs of quickly ending their reign appear extremely high. While a concerted counter-offensive would imbue high political and emotional costs in the long term, not engaging with Daesh could lead to more social division and undermine trust in political elites in the short term.

In sum, there is ample reason to believe that Daesh's propaganda machinery made a successful ground intervention appear increasingly difficult, as executions of NATO soldiers would have been too hard for the public to bear over time. Daesh seems to be the first insurgent group that has learnt to orchestrate performative elements in modern media so effectively. The group strategically created visual facts that altered its perception and increased the costs of an intervention on the ground. In the words of Beaufre (1964), the exterior manoeuvre serves to assure more liberty of action "while paralysing the adversary through a thousand ropes of deterrence - just as the Lilliputians were able to chain down Gulliver" (Beaufre 1964: 60). The execution videos can be described as such a string of ropes, which tied down Western states - as they were hit by terror attacks. Especially, in the years 2014-2016, Daesh was able to paralyse Western democracies while boosting their morale with every further conquest. It was not least because of their success that Daesh was able to export its ideology to Africa, where Boko Haram and a splinter group of al-Shabaab swore allegiance to the Islamists in 2015. On the other hand, the USA and its European allies confined themselves to combat that poses small political risks, namely air warfare from a great distance, supported by the Kurdish YPG on the ground.[30] In Clausewitzian terms, one may say that this paralysis and deterrence strategy was credible in order to compel the enemy to do Daesh's will (Clausewitz 1955: 143).

Learning to Exploit New Vulnerabilities

Laqueur (2004) speaks of a "new vulnerability" of Western states which on a material level resulted from technical progress that allowed the building of more vulnerable "high-tech megacities" (Laqueur 2004: 451). More important seems to be though states' psychological disposition today, which is the result of experiences with colonialism, Vietnam and especially the Gulf Wars that did not lead to "decisive victories" and lasting periods of peace. Past interventions abroad came at a high political price and therefore decreased the political capital to engage in military interventions today (Blainey 1988: 3). Nowadays, Western countries are predominantly interested in keeping the risk of military losses as small as possible which results in the reduction of "point defences" inside conflict zones as effective means to reduce terrorist expansion (Luttwak 1987: 201). Terrorist groups like Daesh seem to have learnt how to exploit this by escalating to a more unlimited fight. The new rule seems to be the higher the level of escalation and brutality, the higher the political costs they can inflict. As Laqueur (2004) argues, a hundred years ago terrorists would avoid attacks that harm innocent family members of a targeted person, whereas now there seem to be no limits because groups have realised that "indiscriminate murder serves the political aim" (Laqueur 2004: 452). As illustrated in the case of Daesh, the extremely violent propaganda and their mise en scène provided a strategic advantage to the group in line with the notion of the "paralyse and deter strategy". The consequences of this process are twofold: first, it becomes increasingly difficult for liberal democracies to defend themselves materially and psychologically; second, in post-heroic societies, it is a difficult challenge for policymakers to terminate an intervention with a positive outcome in relation to the objectives of the war (Clausewitz 1955: 570; Münkler 2007). Consequently, Western countries might find themselves be-

[27] It should be noted that there are several other factors that affect public opinion on military interventions such as, for instance, elite cues. For a discussion on Syria see: https://www.sciencespo.fr/ceri/en/content/united-states-and-syrian-crisis-influence-public-opinion-non-intervention-policy

[28] Counter to this argument, the dissemination through social media renders the videos more immersive, which may reduce psychological distance according to some contrual theorists (Breves/Schramm 2020). For a discussion of construal theory in IR see (Krebs and Rapport 2020).

[29] See Office of the Press Secretary, 'Press briefing by Principal Deputy Press Secretary Eric Schultz and Deputy National Security Advisor Ben Rhodes'; Similarly, John Kerry tweeted 'ISIL [ISIS] must be destroyed/will be crushed' (Friis 2015: 735).

[30] see Heinrich Böll Stiftung (2015) "Airstrikes alone won't defeat ISIS". https://www.boell.de/index.php/en/2015/12/02/airstrikes-alone-wont-defeat-isis

yond their political capabilities to continue interventions in the Middle East and have to withdraw more and more military activity, which could mean that gradually the territory falls into the hands of local warlords or terrorist groups as currently feared in Afghanistan (Von der Buchard 2020). This is not to be read as a normative critique or argument that any military intervention in Syria would have been wiser. It is to highlight the complex context within which decision-making is taking place in the age of high-tech media terrorism.

Conclusion: Thwarting Terrorist Learning

Policymakers would benefit from looking at the propaganda campaign coupled with the terrorist attacks in the context of a learnt exterior manoeuvre, taking into account the notion of performativity. It appears evident that they cannot simply be subdued as blind violence against the so-called "infidels" without a strategic calculus. This paper has argued that insurgent movements have gone through a strategic learning process, which makes counterinsurgency efforts more challenging. Groups seem to have better understood what the weak points of states are, namely their political capital to engage in these conflicts. It appears that the recent developments in technology have benefited terrorist groups in myriad ways. Not only did it improve their communication abilities within the group as well as their interconnectedness with other organisations, but it also enabled them to exploit new vulnerabilities through the strategic use of audio-visual media (Laqueur 2004). Particularly, the experience with Daesh shows how the notion of performativity begins to play an important role in the group's strategic thinking about how to deny their opponents "the probability of victory" (Clausewitz 1955: 161).

If we grant belief to Beaufre (1998), the root of many defeats were actions that took place outside the actual war theatre. Consequently, we need to pay closer attention to the strategic calculus behind insurgent groups' activities beyond the battlefields. Placing the war against Daesh and its allied groups in the context of a "global insurgency" as advanced by Cassidy (2006) and Gompert (2007) will likely have deep implications on doctrine and interagency coordination. Arguably, if policymakers want to stay ahead of the learning curves of these groups they need to embrace approaches that look at insurgent strategies from the eyes of specific organisations. Ideally, the goal must be to stop them from expanding as early as possible. Furthermore, to counter the military expansion of terrorist groups, policymakers would be well advised to seek to understand how certain groups combine offensive strategic approaches with indirect strategy.

Finally, it seems difficult to subsume the diffuse ways in which different groups have learnt under one theory with practical relevance. The concept of learning remains nevertheless useful because it puts emphasis on how groups interact with their environment and respond to stimuli they receive from friends and foes. Understanding these reception and interaction processes from the "terrorist's eye-view" will be key in order to prevent and stop global guerrillas. Future research could further explore how different insurgent groups understand and incorporate the so-called new Western vulnerabilities into their strategic approaches. Particularly, one may ask under what conditions the mediatisation of violence in an attack serves a specific military-strategic goal (Borum 2004). To conclude, the discourse of terrorist learning would benefit from combining strategic perspectives with post-structuralist and psychological axioms in order to enlarge our understanding of asymmetric warfare.

QUELLEN

ALPER, Sinan (2020): Explaining The Complex Effect Of Construal Level On Moral And Political Attitudes. Current Directions In Psychological Science, 29(2), 115-120.

AFSAR, Shadid/SAMPLES, Chris/WOOD, Thomas (2008): The Taliban: An Organizational Analysis. Military Review, May-June: 58-72.

ARREGUÍN-TOFT, Ivan (2005): How The Weak Win Wars: A Theory Of Asymmetric Conflict (Vol. 99). Cambridge University Press.

ATRAN, Scott (2006): The Moral Logic And Growth Of Suicide Terrorism, In: The Washington Quarterly, 29(2), 27-147.

BACON, Tricia/ARSENAULT, Elisabeth (2019): Al Qaeda And The Islamic State's Break: Strategic Strife Or Lackluster Leadership?. Studies In Conflict & Terrorism, 42 (3), 229-263.

BEAUFRE, André (1998): An Introduction To Strategy. Hachette-Pluriel.

BEAUFRE, André (1994): Indirect Strategy In The Nuclear Age, In Gerard Chaliand,(1994): The Art Of War In World History: From Antiquity To The Nuclear Age, Los Angeles University Of California Press.

BEAUFRE, André (1964): Dissuasion Et Stratégie. Armand Colin.

BIDDLE, Stephen (2004): Military Power: Explaining Victory And Defeat In Modern Battle. Princeton University Press.

BLAINEY, Geoffrey (1988): Causes Of War. Free Press.

BORUM, Randy (2004): Psychology Of Terrorism. University Of South Florida Tampa Department Of Mental Health Law And Policy.

BÖHMELT, Tobias/BOVE, Vincenzo/NUSSIO, Enzo (2020). "Can Terrorism Abroad Influence Migration Attitudes At Home?" American Journal Of Political Science 64: 437-451.

BREVES, Priska/SCHRAMM, Holger (2020): Bridging Psychological Distance: The Impact Of Immersive Media On Distant And Proximal Environmental Issues. Computers In Human Behavior, 115, 106606.

BYMAN, Daniel (2007): Understanding Proto-Insurgencies. RAND Counterinsurgency Study-Paper 3.

CASSIDY, Robert (2006): Counterinsurgency And The Global War On Terror: Military Culture And Irregular War. Greenwood Publishing Group.

CHALIAND, Gérard (1994): Stratégies De La Guérilla. Payot.

CLARKE, Colin (2019): How Terrorist Groups Learn: Implications For Al-Qaeda. Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI).

CLAUSEWITZ, Carl (1955): De La Guerre (Ed. De Minuit).

DOLNIK, Adam (2007): Understanding Terrorist Innovation: Technology, Tactics And Global Trends. Abingdon: Routledge.

DOHERTY, Carroll/Weisel, Rachel (2014): Support For US Campaign Against ISIS; Doubts About Its Effectiveness, Objectives. Pew Research Center.

FERDI, Said (1981): Les Débuts De La Guerre d'Algérie, Stratégie De La Guérilla–Anthologie Historique De La Longue Marche A Nos Jours. Edition Gallimard, 119-125.

FOREST, James (2006): Teaching Terror: Strategic And Tactical Learning In The Terrorist World. Rowman And Littlefield Publishers.

FRIIS, Simone (2015): "Beyond Anything We Have Ever Seen: Beheading Videos And The Visibility Of Violence In The War Against ISIS". International Affairs, 91(4), 725-746.

FÜRSTENBERG, Michael/GÖRZIG, Carolin (2020): Learning In A Double Loop. The Strategic Transformation Of Al-Qaeda. Perspectives On Terrorism, 14(1), 26-38.

GALULA, David (2010): Counterinsurgency Warfare: Theory And Practice. Pentagon Press.

GARTENSTEIN-Ross, David (2017): The Manchester Attack Shows How Terrorist Learn In: The Atlantic.

GOMPERT, David (2007). Heads We Win- The Cognitive Side Of Counterinsurgency (COIN). RAND Counterinsurgency Study Paper 1 (Vol. 1). Rand Corporation.

GROSSCUP, Beau (2006): Strategic Terror: The Politics And Ethics Of Aerial Bombardment. Zed Books.

HALLIDAY, Josh (2014): Police Warn Sharing James Foley Killing Video Is A Crime. The Guardian, 20.

HAMMES, Thomas (2004): 4th-Generation Warfare: Our Enemies Play To Their Strengths. Armed Forces Journal, 40.

HANSEN, Lene (2015): How Images Make World Politics: International Icons And The Case Of Abu Ghraib. Review Of International Studies, 41(2), 263-288.

HANSEN-LEWIS, Jamie/SHAPIRO, Jacob (2015): Understanding The Daesh Economy. Perspectives On Terrorism 9.4: 142-155.

HASSAN, Hassan (2018): The True Origins Of ISIS. The Atlantic, 30.

HOFFMAN, Frank (2006): Complex Irregular Warfare: The Next Revolution In Military Affairs. Orbis, 50(3), 395-411.

HUYGHE, Francois-Bernard (2007): Message Et Terreur, Acteurs Et Vecteurs, In Sécurité Globale, No 1, Autumn 2007, 1 – 12.

IISS (2020): ISIS Foreign Fighters After The Fall Of The Caliphate, Armed Conflict Survey, 6:1, 23-30, DOI: 10.1080/23740973.2020.1761611

JOHNSON, Thomas/MASON, Chris (2007): Understanding The Taliban And Insurgency In Afghanistan. Orbis, 51(1), 71-89.

JOWETT, Garth/ O'DONNELL, Victoria (2018): Propaganda & Persuasion. Sage Publications.

KATAGIRI, Noriyuki (2015): Adapting To Win: How Insurgents Fight And Defeat Foreign States In War. Philadelphia: University Of Pennsylvania Press.

KAVANAGH, Jennifer/ FREDERICK, Bryan/POVLOCK, Mathew/PETTYJOHN, Stacie/O'MAHONY, Angela (2018): The Past, Present, And Future Of US Ground Interventions: Identifying Trends, Characteristics, And Signposts. Rand Corporation.

KETTLE, Louise/MUMFORD, Andrew (2017): Terrorist Learning: A New Analytical Framework. Studies In Conflict And Terrorism, 40:7, 523-538.

KILCULLEN, David (2011): The Accidental Guerrilla: Fighting Small Wars In The Midst Of A Big One. Oxford University Press.

KREBS, Ronald/RAPPORT, Aaron (2012): International Relations And The Psychology Of Time Horizons. International Studies Quarterly, 56(3), 530-543.

KOZLOWSKA, Hanna (2014): Should We Be Seeing Gruesome Acts? And If So, Where?. New York Times, 25.

LAQUEUR, Walter (2004): The Changing Face Of Terror. The Use Of Force: Military Power And International Politics. Sixth Edition/Ed. By R. Art, K. Waltz. Boulder: Rowman And Littlefield Pub. Inc, 450-457.

LIDDELL HART, Basil (1998): Stratégie (Paris: Perrin).

LIND, William/NIGHTENGALE, Keith/SCHMITT, John/ SUTTON, Josef/WILSON, Gary (1989): "The Changing Face Of War: Into The Fourth Generation." Marine Corps Gazette: 22-26.

LOGUE, Jason (2015): How Insurgents Are Seizing The Initiative In The Information Environment. Australian Army Intelligence Corps Journal, Bridges Review.

LUTTWAK, Edward (1987): The Logic Of War And Peace. Cambridge: Belknap Pr.

MAZARR, Michael (2008): The Folly Of Asymmetric War, In: The Washington Quarterly, 31(3), 33-53. Doi:10.1162/Wash.2008.31.3.33.

MUMFORD, Andrew (2015): How Terrorist Groups 'Learn': Innovation And Adaptation In Political Violence, In: British Academy Review 26.

MÜNKLER, Herfried (2007): Heroische Und Postheroische Gesellschaften. Merkur, (700), 742-752.

NEUMANN, Peter/SMITH, Michael (2007): The Strategy Of Terrorism: How It Works, And Why It Fails. Routledge.

NIILER, Eric (2014): Knife Vs. Gun: What A Weapon Reveals. Retrieved December 11, 2017, Retrieved From Https://Www.Seeker.Com/Knife-Vs-Gun-What-A-Weapon -Reveals- 1768455243.Html.

RICHARDSON, Louise (2006): Roots Of Terrorism. Campus Press.

ROSE, Steve (2014): The ISIS Propaganda War: A High-Tech Media Jihad, In The Guardian. Retrieved From https://www.Theguardian.Com/World/2014/Oct/07/Isis-Media-Machine- Propaganda-War.

SHVETSOV, Alexey/Sharov,Victor/Shvetsova, Svetlana (2017): Method Of Protection Of Pedestrian Zones Against The Terrorist Attacks Made By Means Of Cars Including Off-Road Vehicles And Trucks." European Journal For Security Research 2: 119-129.

SPENS, Christiana (2014): Shock And Awe: Performativity, Machismo And ISIS. E-International Relations, 2(11).

TABER, Robert (1965): The War Of The Flea: Guerrilla Warfare In Theory And Practice. New York: Lyle Stuart, Inc., 27-28.

VON DER BUCHARD, Hans (2020): Germany Expresses 'Serious Concern' Over US Troop Withdrawal From Afghanistan. Politico.

WEISS, Michael/HASSAN, Hassan (2015): ISIS: Inside The Army Of Terror. Phaidon Press.

WOOD, Graeme. (2015): What ISIS Really Wants. The Atlantic, 316(2), 78-94.

ZECH, Steven/ KELLY, Zane (2015): Off With Their Heads: The Islamic State And Civilian Beheadings. Journal Of Terrorism Research, 6(2).

ZIMMERMAN, Katherine (2017): America's Real Enemy, Critical Threats American Enterprise Institute.