

# **Al Qaeda: Dealing with the International Terrorism Phenomenon**

Patrick J. Meyer

## **INTL504 Analytics I**

*"Fight and kill the disbelievers wherever you find them, take them captive, harass them, lie in wait and ambush them using every stratagem of war."*

***Prophet Mohammed : Qur'an:9:5***

*"We're in a new world. We're in a world in which the possibility of terrorism, married up with technology, could make us very, very sorry that we didn't act."*

***Condoleezza Rice***

### **Introduction**

September 11, 2001 brought Islamic Terrorism to the global stage in the way of four hijacked airliners that crashed into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania. The phenomenon of the Islamic Terrorism is not necessarily new, but it is new in that the United States had never dealt with it on its own soil to this extent. The United States' first taste of radicalism came in 1979 when the United States Embassy in Tehran was overrun by radical Iranian students, who held 53 American hostages for 444 days. The 1980's were the beginning of the radical Islamic attacks against the United States and those friendly to the United States. In 1981, member of the Muslim Brotherhood attacked and killed Egyptian President Anwar Sadat, a known friend of the United

States. 1983 witnessed that largest death toll to date of Americans at the hands of Islamic terrorism. The bombing of the United States Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon, and the Marine Barracks, five months later also in Beirut, Lebanon. A total of 305 Americans were killed. A number of individuals were either kidnapped or killed by radical Islamic terrorist organizations throughout the 1980's. The first Islamic terrorism within the United States took place on February 26, 1993. The World Trade Center was badly damaged when a car bomb was planted and detonated in an underground garage. The men that carried out the attack were followers of Umar Abd al-Rahman, an Egyptian cleric with ties to the Muslim Brotherhood and the then fledgling Al Qaeda. The Khobar Towers attack, in Saudi Arabia, was also carried out by Islamic radicals. A fuel truck carrying a bomb exploded outside a United States Military housing facility, several Islamic radical groups claimed responsibility, but there are many signs pointing to Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda was directly responsible for the United States Embassy bombings in East Africa. The virtually simultaneous attacks of the United States Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania were a coordinated attack planned, organized, funded, and carried out by members of Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda continued its attacks against the United States with an attack on the United States Warship, the U.S.S. Cole in October 2000. The September 11, 2001 attacks killed 3025 people, which led to the United States formation of the Global Coalition Against Terrorism.

Islamic Terrorism is the common verbiage used to describe the violence associated with Islamic fundamentalism. Islamic fundamentalism claims to

defend the Islamic culture, society, and values against political, perceived imperialistic and cultural influences of non-Muslims and especially the West. Islamic Terrorism has been directly associated with Islamic Fundamentalism. Islamic Fundamentalism describes religious ideologies seen as advocating a return to the fundamental ethos of Islam, the Quran and the Sunnah. There is a definite distinction between a true fundamentalist and a terrorist using fundamentalism as a reason to use terrorism.

The United States and many of the other Western countries continue to be targets of Islamic terrorism due to the presumed influences, which are looked on negatively by the radicals and fundamentalists. The radicals and fundamentalists are using various interpretations of the Quran in order to gather followers of their cause. Islam is a peaceful religion; however, the interpretations are aimed towards the particular goal of the individual interpreting the Quran's text. The Islamic Terrorists continue to declare that the acts of terrorism are dictated by their interpretation of the Quran.

As previously stated, the United States formed the Global Coalition Against Terrorism in order to counter one specific organization, Al Qaeda. Since the beginning of the "War on Terrorism", the United States has toppled the Taliban, the government that refused to cooperate in the capture of Al Qaeda members within its borders. The destruction of the Al Qaeda training camps, which ended the mass training of new Al Qaeda recruits. Al Qaeda has been disrupted, their capabilities have been severely reduced, but Al Qaeda remains a viable threat to attack the United States again.

## Literature Review

Since the Al Qaeda attack on September 11, 2001, there has been a large amount of information circulated in regards to the organization. Obviously, that information was a direct result of the attack and provides a wealth of information however much of that information lacks a predictive analysis or assessment. Mr. Ben Venzke's book, The al-Qaeda Threat: An Analytical Guide to al-Qaeda's Tactics & Targets (2003) is gives an in depth look at Al Qaeda's tactics, targets, and goals. Mr. Venzke goes to great lengths to explain the types of targets Al Qaeda has previously mentioned in interviews and questions posed to members after capture or during court proceedings. Mr. Venzke provides an assessment for each of the targets that has been identified and these assessments fit with the methodology that Al Qaeda is using in regards to tactics, both known and unknown. Mr. Venzke lists airport as a potential target. Mr. Venzke provides testimony from Ahmed Rasam, the Algerian national that intended to bomb Los Angeles International Airport, who was questioned by the FBI after capture. According to the FBI, Ressay said he and other Algerian nationals received training around 1998 at camp Khalden in Afghanistan on scenarios to bomb various US targets, including airports within the United States. Mr. Venzke's assessments are particularly interesting in the fact that the assessments break down the groups alleged ability to affect such an attack and the breakdown of the target, an example listed by Mr. Venzke was a city's water supply, this was broken down to a specific buildings water supply. Mr. Venzke's book is one of the few that provide an analytic assessment of what Al Qaeda might do in the future.

Mr. Paul Davis' book, Deterrence and Influence in Counterterrorism: A Component in the War on al Qaeda, provides an historical view of what the United States has done in response to previous terrorist attacks attributed to Al Qaeda. Mr. Davis examines strategies that can be used to either deter or influence a terrorist organization, Al Qaeda in particular. Mr. Davis articulates a very important realization that may go unnoticed, but may be the answer to fighting Al Qaeda. Mr. Davis states "even if the terrorists are not generally be deterred, specific terrorist actions may be deterred even today. We know empirically that terrorists feel constraints, which they argue and plot among themselves, review and adapt strategies, worry about their perceived constituencies, and sometimes back away from tactics that seem to have gone too far." Mr. Davis also relates that "terrorists pay attention to and dislike operational risks." Mr. Davis makes another important comment, "committed terrorists do not reform, but they do change actions." This is very import to remember when analyzing the current situation that the United States and the World face when dealing with Al Qaeda.

Mr. Paul Pillar's book, Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy is a publication that looks at the current (2001) foreign policy the United States considers when dealing with acts of terrorism. Mr. Pillar examines the terrorist group as an individual actor in the worldly view, but there are influences behind these groups that would allow for the comparison to politics and economics similar to an individual state. Mr. Pillar categorizes these states as "sponsors", such as the Taliban in Afghanistan for Al Qaeda, "enablers", such as the Sudan, who

allowed Osama bin Laden to re-establish Al Qaeda in that country prior to the United States pressure, which forced the Sudan to expel bin Laden and his organization, and “cooperators”, many of the Middle Eastern countries could be put in this category due to the support received from within their borders, not necessarily direct governmental support, but support the government knows is being provided to Al Qaeda. Mr. Pillar annotates that since the end of the Cold War, terrorism is a priority in regards to national security and that much of the international terrorism has been shaped by larger worldly political events. The Saudi Arabian government’s election to use United States military forces to protect the Kingdom following Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait is a perfect example. Mr. Pillar explains that many terrorist events are aimed at a particular government or governments for political reasons and events such as, gaining leverage, political or diplomatic disruption, influencing governmental behavior, provoking governmental response, action which result in a cost that will change allegiances, revenge, and simple hatred. All of the above mentioned events have a definite influence on the United States and the foreign governments that the United States deals with; therefore, terrorism has a far reaching effect on United States policy worldwide.

Mr. Marc Sageman’s book Understanding Terror Networks, highlights the fact that many people, to include policymakers, do not understand the inner workings of a terrorist organization. Policy in regards to terrorism is hard enough to formulate, but not knowing or at least understanding a terror network, makes the generation of policy even that much more difficult. Mr. Sageman covers the

virtual origin of the terrorism that the United States faces today. Mr. Sageman also indicates that much of the information previously thought about terrorism no longer fits the mold. As witnessed on September 11, 2001, the majority of the terrorists were middle aged, educated and religious. The significance of this fact alone suggests that Al Qaeda is targeting this type of individual and preying on their misgivings and troubles in life and of course a flawed interpretation of the Quran. Mr. Sageman effectively illustrates how terrorist groups, especially Al Qaeda, are organized in the same basic nature as a government. This covers the governing body, an economic arm, a military or operations arm, and a media/public relations arm which virtually mirror that of an organized working government. Mr. Sageman pointed out terrorist groups, not unlike the Soviet Union during the Cold War, plan operations that span the globe. The weapons systems that are employed are designed to mass destruction, not unlike the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The only real difference is that the terrorist organizations, such as Al Qaeda, are not as susceptible to the pressures of being a recognized international body.

Chapter 12 of the 9/11 Commission Report is suggestions on what the United States should do in order to prevent another attack similar to that of September 11, 2001. The very first recommendation is that no sanctuaries be given to the terrorist elements, to include Al Qaeda. The report also suggests that the United States defend its ideals abroad vigorously, which are being done to this day, and if the United States does not define its intentions in regards to Middle East peace and advancement, the terrorist elements, Al Qaeda, certainly will.

Another recommendation is a counterterrorism strategy that includes a political and economic strategy to assist the countries of the Middle East to enhance the prospects of the future in these countries. The report suggests that the United States engage with the International Community in order to fight terrorism, not only in the United States but Worldwide. Terrorism is not the sole responsibility of the United States, but the entire World. Terrorism can strike anywhere, which we have seen; therefore, a comprehensive worldly strategy must be developed and the continued pressure from the International Community will hopefully put such a strain on the terrorist organizations, Al Qaeda, that the terrorist activities will be curtailed. There needs to be a unite of effort with the United States and the International Community in order to defeat terrorism, anything less will allow the terrorists to continue.

### **Actors & Perceptions**

Terrorism has a devastating effect on many issues and these effects are felt not just by the intended target, but many times by the countries/individuals that deal with the target. Terrorists can strike anywhere and at any time, more often then not, there will be little to no warning that an attack is likely; therefore, the International Community has a major role to play in confronting this phenomenon. The United States is, by default kind of, considered the major player in the fight against terrorism and for good reason. Al Qaeda, who has allowed a number of other Islamic organizations to merge under the Al Qaeda umbrella, is and will remain to be a threat to the national security of the United States: therefore it is essential to analyze the most influential actors involved in

the potential scenarios and the individual actors' perspective on Al Qaeda's ability to strike the United States homeland again.

### **The United States**

Obviously, the United States is concerned about another terrorist attack on United States soil. The main reason is the national security issues brought on by another terrorist attack and the ability for Al Qaeda to operate within the borders of the United States. The continued United States military presence in the Middle East is also going to be a continued source of friction between the United States and Al Qaeda, but the United States has its worldly commitments and commitments that it made to the individual governments within the Middle East. The United States is not going to suspend the current missions in Afghanistan and Iraq in order to appease a terrorist group or any other state/nation that threatens the United States.

### **Economics**

With the current state of the United States economy, and the funding of the War in Iraq and the War in Afghanistan, funding the continuous fight against terrorism may become an issue. An obvious reason that the United States is interested in the Middle East and continues to forge new relationships or improve relationships in the area is due to the vast amount of oil. The United States economic system depends greatly on the oil from the Middle East and any change could drastically affect the recovery of the United States economy. Continued pursuit of Al Qaeda is going to continue to be a political issue to the funding that it costs. One of the weaknesses of the overall economy in the United

States is its dependence on foreign oil and it looks like that will continue for the foreseeable future.

## **Politics**

The United States has been and will continue to be the leading force behind Global Coalition Against Terrorism. Terrorism in the United States is a politically charged debate. After September 11, 2001, every single politician was 100% supportive of the United States Military action against Al Qaeda and the Taliban government. There has been a continued effort not to allow Al Qaeda to resurface and openly train, organize, plan, and conduct additional attacks against the United States. It has been roughly 8 years since Al Qaeda was successful in attacking the United States, this has led some politicians to question the continued efforts against Al Qaeda. There have been a number of plots that have been uncovered and prevented due to the continued efforts of the United States and the International Community, so without successful attacks, some politicians believe that the effort to counter Al Qaeda should be reduced. At this time, it would not be beneficial to anyone for the effort to be reduced, as it would allow Al Qaeda to regroup and attack the United States again. This may not be popular with many politicians due to the fact that it somehow links them to previous Administrations.

## **National Security Concerns**

The national security of the United States is obviously the top priority of the United States government. Prior to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack by Al Qaeda, the national security of the United States had never been

questioned. The United States had been labeled the “Great Satan” approximately 30 years ago, but there had never been such an attack or threat to our national security outside the time of war.

Terrorism and organizations such as Al Qaeda have again highlighted the United States and national security issues have arisen. The United States, with the most technologically advanced military in the World are going to protect itself and those weapons are going to be brought to bear when the national security of the United States is threatened. The United States designated a number of countries as “state sponsors of terrorism” which directly relates to the national security of the United States and the United States will use whatever means available to protect itself against the terrorism phenomenon.

For the last ten years, Al Qaeda has openly attempted to acquire weapons of mass destruction. This is a very big concern of the United States. The fact that a terrorist organization is attempting to acquire such a device no doubt has national security implications. The protection of the United States’ national security is paramount and the continued threat from Al Qaeda is a threat to national security.

### **International Community**

Terrorism is not new to the International Community neither is Al Qaeda. With the state terrorism and potential targets, the International Community is as much a factor as the United States. Al Qaeda has not limited itself or is going to limit itself to attacking the United States. Al Qaeda has and will attack other Nations interests for the sole fact that a country is friendly with the United States.

To date, the International Community has continued to support the United States in the Global Coalition Against Terrorism and will continue to do so in the foreseeable future. This fact alone is going to put a damper on the abilities of Al Qaeda. It is going to prevent Al Qaeda from establishing a base of operations it needs to effectively control its operation, which are needed to effectively carry out attacks.

### **Economics**

The economic stability of the entire International Community could be drastically affected by terrorist events, especially coordinated attacks, which Al Qaeda is capable of. As we have seen with the recent economic problems in the United States, the world economy also revolves around the economy of the United States, so another major terrorist attack in the United States would have an effect on the worldwide economy.

With the current state of the World economy and by coming out of the recent economic downturn, the need for additional resources such as oil, may drive the oil prices up once again, which could result in straining many of the larger economies. Add the potential of a terrorist attack, the threat of terrorism is going to continue to play a role in the economic issues that the International Community faces today.

The International Community's dependence on the United States' economy can not be underestimated. There are but a few individual countries that could survive if the United States' economy was to take another devastating

blow, so the cooperation of the International Community in regards to terrorism and the containment of Al Qaeda is a must.

## **Politics**

International politics are certainly out of the control of the United States, but they can and have been influenced in some form or fashion by terrorism. The 2004 Spanish general elections saw a cause and effect relationship due to a terrorist incident. There is going to continue to be political ramifications when dealing with terrorism. One of the main reasons terrorist use as an explanation for a terrorist attack is directly related to politics and certain political policies.

The fact that a certain government aligns itself with the United States politically, for the benefit of that country, opens the door to terrorists. This does not mean this it is only the countries of the Middle East are subject to this, again Spain can be used as an example. Even though Al Qaeda may not have been a major player in the Madrid train bombing, the fact that an act of terrorism can affect the outcome of an election only empowers the terrorism phenomenon even.

There is no question that many in the International Community that have a very little wiggle room when it comes to politics and terrorism. Obviously, many of these such countries are located within the Middle East. This is due primarily to the support received by Al Qaeda in these countries and the operational abilities in these countries. The countries of the Middle East have to balance their willingness to assist the United States in the area of counterterrorism and prevent a terrorist attack in their country or a terrorist attack that could result in a lack

popular support from the population. There is no question that the politics of the International Community has a major role in countering the affects of terrorism and Al Qaeda.

### **National Security Concerns**

The International Community has a number of concerns in regards to their own national security with the respects of protection against terrorism.

The International Communities national security concerns are going to the same as the national security concerns of the United States. Terrorism and Al Qaeda are a virus on any national security issues, especially to those countries that harbor organizations similar to Al Qaeda. At this point, it does seem likely that any country will elect to harbor Al Qaeda. As previously stated, the Sudan allowed Osama bin Laden to reside within its boarders after his expulsion from Saudi Arabia, but once it was identified that Al Qaeda had gotten a foothold in Sudan, the United States “insisted” that the Al Qaeda friendly government in Sudan push bin Laden and Al Qaeda out or suffer the consequences. Al Qaeda then returned to Afghanistan, where the Taliban welcomed them. The Taliban refused to surrender bin Laden and Al Qaeda after the September 11, 2001, attack on the United States and did suffer the consequences. With that example, the International Community is not going to jeopardize there individual national securities in order to assist Al Qaeda

### **Pakistan**

Pakistan became a major player in this analysis in 2003 after the United States invasion of Afghanistan, which pushed the majority of Al Qaeda into the

tribal areas of Pakistan. Pakistan has been, for a number of years, a supporter of the organizations like Al Qaeda and the Taliban. Pakistan was the launching pad for the fledgling Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden after the Soviet Union invasion of Afghanistan and the continued fight against the Soviet Union by the Mujahedeen. Al Qaeda's support office for the fight against the Soviet Union was located in Pakistan and familiarity of that location undoubtedly led Al Qaeda back after the invasion of Afghanistan. The United States continues to use Diplomatic means to get Pakistan on board in regards to terrorism and counterterrorism measures. The Diplomatic approach is due to Pakistan being one of the states that the United States deals with with kid gloves because of the fact that Pakistan maintains a nuclear arsenal.

### **Economics**

Pakistan is an impoverished and underdeveloped country which has suffered for decades due to internal political disputes, low levels of foreign investments, and the declining exports from Pakistan. Pakistan's major exporting partners are the United States, China, and the United Kingdom, this also puts pressure on Pakistan to cooperate in the United States and United Kingdom counterterrorism measures. Pakistan's economy continues to digress; therefore, the continued cooperation or appearance of cooperation with the United States and the International Community is a must. The constant instability in Pakistan is going to continue to wreak havoc on the economy of Pakistan and there is no end in sight to the current economic situation.

### **Politics**

The political situation in Pakistan is similar to the economic situation, shaky at best. Pakistan's current President, Asif Zardari, is the husband of former President Benazir Bhutto, who was assassinated, after she took power from Pervez Musharraf. Musharraf took power after a military coup in 1999 when he was a General in the Pakistani military. There is no question that Pakistan needs to cooperate with the United States if there is any hope for Pakistan to advance in the International Community. Time will tell if the Pakistani President can control the tribal areas in western Pakistan, the area that has provided sanctuary to terrorists for years.

### **National Security Concerns**

Pakistan's national security concerns come on two fronts; internal and external. The internal national security concerns are fueled by crime and corruption as well as the battle for land in the western tribal areas. The western tribal areas have housed terrorists, many of which are showing continued displays of aggression against the current government. In previous administrations, the military has been able to fend off much of the aggression by brokering deals with the tribal leaders and many of the brokered deals were unknown to the sitting government. The inability to administer a proper government without external aid and total control over an at times rogue military leaves Pakistan susceptible to potential regime changes, similar to the recent history of Pakistan itself.

Pakistan's external security concerns are relevant to the situation with India and Kashmir. It is never a good thing to have two nuclear nations unhappy

with each other and there be friction of certain territory. The situation with India and know the situation in Afghanistan are putting Pakistan in a very difficult position. The above mentioned external issues are going to plague Pakistan for years to come and they affect many of the things that Pakistan is able to do on the world stage.

### **Al Qaeda**

Al Qaeda burst upon the public consciousness with its attack against the United States on September 11, 2001. The organization itself, by some accounts, has been around since 1989. Al Qaeda is not a “state” within the world community, but has elevated itself to a major contributor to worldly events. Al Qaeda evolved from the Maktab Al Khidamat (Services Office), a Muslim organization founded in 1980 to raise and channel funds and recruit foreign mujahedeen for the war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. Osama bin Laden inherited the organization after the death of its founder Abdullah Yusuf Azzam. Osama bin Laden has funded much of Al Qaeda’s activities with his own funds and by using his connections with the Saudi royal family and the petroleum billionaires of the Middle East region. Osama bin Laden and the fledgling Al Qaeda forced the Soviet Union to withdraw from Afghanistan in 1989, due to the resistance of bin Laden. With the success of prompting the withdrawal of the Soviet Union and the rejection of the Saudi royal family to use bin Laden and Al Qaeda to fight Saddam Hussein after the invasion of Kuwait in 1990, bin Laden turned his efforts against the only remaining superpower, the United States.

### **Economics**

Economics is not a major concern of Al Qaeda, even though it has been estimated that bin Laden himself has expended most of the money that he brought to the table. The United States and the International Community has gone after several of the entities that have been financially supporting Al Qaeda. Even with the steps taken by the United States and the International Community, the funds are still able to find their way to Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda is never going to have issues with funding, there is always going to be individuals wealthy enough in the Middle East that are sympathetic to the ideologies and goals of Al Qaeda to finance the organization. The groups and individuals that finance Al Qaeda are not subject to the “normal” economic concern of the other actors involved; therefore, Al Qaeda may have a distinct advantage in this area.

### **Politics**

The politics that Al Qaeda are concerned with are their own. The goal is to bring fundamental Islam back to its standing in the world. It is the politics of other nations that concern Al Qaeda. Al Qaeda’s goal is to affect the political elements of other nations in order to achieve their goals. The overall structure of Al Qaeda has evolved into a pseudo political system. Al Qaeda has its senior leaders like any national government, it has also spawned the following positions that can easily be attributed to a counterpart in any national government: Senior Operations Chief (President/Prime Minister), Shura Council (Supreme Court), Deputy Operations Chief (Vice President), Military Committee (Department of Defense), Money/Business Committee (Internal Revenue Service), Law Committee (Department of Justice), Islamic Study/Fatwa Committee (Religious Faction), and

the Media Committee (Public Relations.) There have been other terrorist organizations that have virtually gone unchecked by the United States and the International Community that have later found themselves on the political scene in the country that they operate, such as the PLO, Hamas, and Hezbollah. At the time of this writing, it is unknown if Al Qaeda has aspirations of moving into the political arena, but the possibilities will always be there.

### **National Security Concerns**

Al Qaeda has no concerns about national security per say. Al Qaeda is an actor and not a state, so that is not necessarily a concern; however, Al Qaeda may be concerned with the overall security of the organization. Al Qaeda has brought itself to the world stage with its actions, not unlike the Taliban in Afghanistan. We have seen what happened to the Taliban in regards to national security, so one would imagine that if the leaders of Al Qaeda have aspirations similar to those of the Taliban, security issues would come into play at some point.

### **Research Design**

There are a number of different analytical models to use when attempting a predictive study. For this study the LAMP method (the Lockwood Analytical Method for Prediction) was chosen over the more familiar methods such as the Delphi Technique and the Analytic Hierarchy Process because the LAMP method seems to best suited to international political predictions and processes. The LAMP method makes use of a number of the characteristics and processes of other predictive methods. However LAMP's primary differentiation from other

predictive methods is the recognition of the importance of “free will” on potential events. When dealing with political relations, each actor has an individual voice who at any given time can make a decision of “free will” that will change the perception and behavior of all those actors influenced by the original decision. Therefore the key to an effective predictive study by the LAMP method is to understand not just the actors, but the actors’ perceptions of events so as to effectively assess and compare the potential “decisions” to be made by each actor. LAMP is organized for the express intention of determining possible future actions by forcing the analyst to take into account the perceptions of all of the actors involved in the scenario instead of focusing on one perspective and therefore only one set of potential “free will” choices and alternate futures.

LAMP is a twelve step program, noticeably lacking in quantitative measures – instead focusing on relative probability. Each step of the LAMP process requires a review of both the event that you are trying to predict the most likely future for as well as the perceptions of each actor involved in the event.

The steps of the LAMP method as dictated by LAMP’s creators are:

1. Determine the issue for which you are trying to predict the most likely future.
2. Specify the national “actors” involved.
3. Perform an in-depth study of how each national actor perceives the issue in question.
4. Specify all *possible* courses of action for each actor.
5. Determine the major scenarios within which you will compare the alternate futures.
6. Calculate the total number of permutations of possible “alternate futures” for each scenario.
7. Perform a “pairwise comparison” of all alternate futures to determine their relative probability.
8. Rank the alternate futures for each scenario from highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of “votes” received.

9. Assuming that each future occurs, analyze each alternate future in terms of its consequences for the issue in question.
10. State the potential of a given alternate future to “transpose” into another alternate future.
11. Determine the “focal events” that must occur in our present in order to bring about a given alternate future.
12. Develop indicators for the focal events.

Studying the possible responses of the involved actors is adaptable to the LAMP process, in part because of the widely variant perceptions of each of the interested actors. Doing a simple quantitative, cost and/or benefit analysis of the situation would be unlikely to determine how each state could be convinced to respond in a specific matter based solely on historical precedent or the “free will” decisions of the heads of state. Analyzing the potential behavior of the involved actors is both timely and useful, with the behavior of Iran more and more likely to prompt a response from those actors.

There is always some concern related to any predictive study. While LAMP attempts to address the vagaries of free will, it is likely impossible to conceive of every permutation of behavior of any actor, much less three or four actors whose behavior is intertwined and often dependent on others. Similarly, while the LAMP method tried to incorporate the perceptions of each actor in order to effectively weigh potential decisions and possible futures, the inclusion of perception is only as effective as the analyst’s understanding of those perceptions. There are a variety of possible sources for bias in the general field of research and analysis; therefore, it is likely the determination of the reader and the prediction of future events may have some levels of bias and error.

## **Potential Courses of Action for Interested Actors**

One of the initial steps of a predictive analysis, once the actors and their perceptions of events have been identified, is to determine all possible courses of action for the interested actors. And while there are likely infinite permutations of behavior that are open and available to interested actors, by generalizing behavior to a certain extent it becomes clear that there are only a small number of actions available to all actors. For the United States, the International Community and Pakistan, there are really three possible courses of action: maintain the status quo, use International pressure through coercion and/or diplomatic efforts to discourage Al Qaeda from its continued attacks against the United States, or Al Qaeda will continue to attack United States interests no matter the ramifications. While some of these actions may seem unlikely in the context of specific actors and their perceptions, it is important to consider all possible scenarios in order to achieve an unbiased and effective prediction of possible events or “alternate futures.”

## **Major Scenarios**

For this analysis, Al Qaeda is both the focal point and the catalyst for the behavior of the other three states, meaning that if Al Qaeda’s interaction between Pakistan, the United States, and the International Community will be based on other issues and not relevant to this study. Within the methodology of LAMP analysis, the possible courses of action are considered “scenarios” or the different situations from which the analyst is attempting to determine the most likely future. For dealing with Al Qaeda, there are really three major scenarios

that should be considered: The United States, the International Community, and Pakistan maintain the status quo, Al Qaeda succumbs to the pressure put on the entire organization, or Al Qaeda continues its outright attacks against United States interests worldwide. Each scenario would produce a very different future and very different responses from each of the three interested state actors. In order to effectively predict the most likely future, there now must be an analysis of all possible permutations of actions by the interested actors related to the three possible scenarios.

### **Permutations of Behavior**

According to LAMP analysis, the basic equation for determining how many “alternate futures” are possible for the interested state actors in the study (United States, International Community and Pakistan) is  $X^Y = Z$ . In this equation X equals the number of actions available to each actor Y equals the number of national actors involved and Z equals the total number of alternate futures to be compared. In this analysis there are four possible courses of action for each interested actor, and there are three interested actors involved. Therefore the equation for this analysis becomes  $3^3 = 27$ , meaning there are 27 possible “alternate futures” to compare for the United States, the International Community and Pakistan. Because each scenario posed provides the same number of permutations for possible alternate futures (27), the next step is to create a table of alternate future permutations, which will then be used to perform a “pairwise comparison” of the alternate future permutations for each scenario.

For simplification purposes, there will be abbreviations used to identify alternate future scenarios in all tables to follow:

Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda = CF

Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to discourage Al Qaeda = DC

Negotiate with Al Qaeda = NG

The three scenarios will likewise be identified by abbreviations:

Scenario 1 = Status Quo (SQ)

Scenario 2 = Al Qaeda succumbs to International pressure (IP)

Scenario 3 = Continued Attacks against the United States (CA)

**Table I – Alternate Future Permutations**

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan
1	CF	CF	CF
2	CF	CF	DC
3	CF	DC	CF
4	DC	CF	CF
5	CF	DC	DC
6	DC	CF	DC
7	DC	DC	CF
8	DC	DC	DC
9	CF	CF	NG
10	CF	NG	CF
11	NG	CF	CF
12	CF	NG	NG
13	NG	CF	NG
14	NG	NG	CF
15	NG	NG	NG
16	DC	DC	NG
17	DC	NG	DC
18	NG	DC	DC
19	NG	NG	DC
20	DC	NG	NG
21	NG	DC	NG
22	CF	NG	DC
23	CF	DC	NG
24	DC	NG	CF
25	DC	CF	NG
26	NG	DC	CF
27	NG	CF	DC

## Pairwise Comparisons for Each Scenario

Using the Alternate Futures Table (Table 1) from the previous section, it is now possible to conduct a pairwise comparison of each alternate future for each scenario. A pairwise comparison is, very simply a way of comparing the likelihood of each alternate future against each other possible future. For example, using Table 1, we compare alternate future #1 to alternate future #2 in relation to the overall scenario, determining which is more likely based on the analyst's understanding of the viewpoints of the actors. Next, the analyst compares alternate future #1 to alternate future #3 again determining which is most likely to occur, again relating to the specified scenario. This continues until all possible futures have been compared to each other. The equation for determining how many pairwise comparisons are necessary is:

$X = (n-1) + (n-2) \dots + (n-n)$ . In this equation  $n$  equals the total number of alternate futures to be analyzed and  $X$  equals the total number of pairwise comparisons that must be made. For this analysis  $n$  equals 27, therefore  $X$  equals 351 pairwise comparisons to be made for each scenario. Using the alternate futures table (plus a fourth column labeled "votes") for each scenario, it is possible to create a new table that can be sorted and weighed based on the number of votes each alternate future receives. These votes will indicate which alternate futures seem more probable than then the rest, allowing for an analysis of the most likely possible futures related to each of the three scenarios.

Tables 2 through 4 contain the voting results from the pairwise comparisons made of all alternate future related to each of the three scenarios.

**Table 2**

Alternate Futures Table  
 Scenario 1 – Maintain Status Quo - SQ

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	18
2	CF	CF	DC	25
3	CF	DC	CF	18
4	DC	CF	CF	13
5	CF	DC	DC	16
6	DC	CF	DC	26
7	DC	DC	CF	13
8	DC	DC	DC	24
9	CF	CF	NG	21
10	CF	NG	CF	6
11	NG	CF	CF	9
12	CF	NG	NG	5
13	NG	CF	NG	19
14	NG	NG	CF	1
15	NG	NG	NG	10
16	DC	DC	NG	17
17	DC	NG	DC	6
18	NG	DC	DC	15
19	NG	NG	DC	5
20	DC	NG	NG	8
21	NG	DC	NG	17
22	CF	NG	DC	5
23	CF	DC	NG	9
24	DC	NG	CF	1
25	DC	CF	NG	23
26	NG	DC	CF	2
27	NG	CF	DC	19

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda  
 DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda  
 NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

**Table 3**

Alternate Futures Table  
 Scenario 2 – Al Qaeda succumbs to International Pressure - IP

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	5
2	CF	CF	DC	18
3	CF	DC	CF	10

4	DC	CF	CF	17
5	CF	DC	DC	14
6	DC	CF	DC	24
7	DC	DC	CF	13
8	DC	DC	DC	22
9	CF	CF	NG	17
10	CF	NG	CF	0
11	NG	CF	CF	6
12	CF	NG	NG	7
13	NG	CF	NG	21
14	NG	NG	CF	4
15	NG	NG	NG	13
16	DC	DC	NG	23
17	DC	NG	DC	6
18	NG	DC	DC	19
19	NG	NG	DC	11
20	DC	NG	NG	10
21	NG	DC	NG	22
22	CF	NG	DC	5
23	CF	DC	NG	11
24	DC	NG	CF	1
25	DC	CF	NG	26
26	NG	DC	CF	4
27	NG	CF	DC	22

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda

DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda

NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

#### Table 4

Alternate Futures Table

Scenario 3 – Continued Attacks Against the United States - CA

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
1	CF	CF	CF	1
2	CF	CF	DC	14
3	CF	DC	CF	6
4	DC	CF	CF	8
5	CF	DC	DC	11
6	DC	CF	DC	20
7	DC	DC	CF	6
8	DC	DC	DC	19
9	CF	CF	NG	17
10	CF	NG	CF	0
11	NG	CF	CF	8
12	CF	NG	NG	9
13	NG	CF	NG	25

14	NG	NG	CF	3
15	NG	NG	NG	17
16	DC	DC	NG	23
17	DC	NG	DC	11
18	NG	DC	DC	21
19	NG	NG	DC	16
20	DC	NG	NG	16
21	NG	DC	NG	23
22	CF	NG	DC	8
23	CF	DC	NG	13
24	DC	NG	CF	3
25	DC	CF	NG	26
26	NG	DC	CF	4
27	NG	CF	DC	23

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda  
DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda  
NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

Using the voting results from the pairwise comparisons contained in Tables 2 through 4, it is now possible to rank the scenarios in order of probability, highest to lowest, thereby determining what is most likely to happen given each specific scenario.

### **Ranking the Alternate Futures**

Tables 2, 3 and 4 from the previous section show each alternate future and the number of votes that those same alternate futures received in the pairwise comparisons for each of the three scenarios. The next step of analysis is to rank the alternate futures from the highest relative probability to the lowest based on the number of votes received by each future. Tables 5, 6 and 7 are the alternate futures tables for each scenario with each table arranged in terms of alternate future votes.

## Table 5

Alternate Futures Table

Scenario 1 - Maintain Status Quo - SQ

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
6	DC	CF	DC	26
2	CF	CF	DC	25
8	DC	DC	DC	24
25	DC	CF	NG	23
9	CF	CF	NG	21
13	NG	CF	NG	19
27	NG	CF	DC	19
1	CF	CF	CF	18
3	CF	DC	CF	18
16	DC	DC	NG	17
21	NG	DC	NG	17
5	CF	DC	DC	16
18	NG	DC	DC	15
4	DC	CF	CF	13
7	DC	DC	CF	13
15	NG	NG	NG	10
11	NG	CF	CF	9
23	CF	DC	NG	9
20	DC	NG	NG	8
10	CF	NG	CF	6
17	DC	NG	DC	6
12	CF	NG	NG	5
19	NG	NG	DC	5
22	CF	NG	DC	5
26	NG	DC	CF	2
14	NG	NG	CF	1
24	DC	NG	CF	1

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda

DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda

NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

## Table 6

Alternate Futures Table

Scenario 2 - Al Qaeda succumbs to International Pressure – IP

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
25	DC	CF	NG	26
6	DC	CF	DC	24
16	DC	DC	NG	23

8	DC	DC	DC	22
21	NG	DC	NG	22
27	NG	CF	DC	22
13	NG	CF	NG	21
18	NG	DC	DC	19
2	CF	CF	DC	18
4	DC	CF	CF	17
9	CF	CF	NG	17
5	CF	DC	DC	14
7	DC	DC	CF	13
15	NG	NG	NG	13
19	NG	NG	DC	11
23	CF	DC	NG	11
3	CF	DC	CF	10
20	DC	NG	NG	10
12	CF	NG	NG	7
11	NG	CF	CF	6
17	DC	NG	DC	6
1	CF	CF	CF	5
22	CF	NG	DC	5
14	NG	NG	CF	4
26	NG	DC	CF	4
24	DC	NG	CF	1
10	CF	NG	CF	0

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda

DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda

NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

## Table 7

Alternate Futures Table

Scenario 3 - Continued Attacks Against the United States – CA

Possible Future #	United States	IC	Pakistan	Votes
25	DC	CF	NG	26
13	NG	CF	NG	25
16	DC	DC	NG	23
21	NG	DC	NG	23
27	NG	CF	DC	23
18	NG	DC	DC	21
6	DC	CF	DC	20
8	DC	DC	DC	19
9	CF	CF	NG	17
15	NG	NG	NG	17
19	NG	NG	DC	16
20	DC	NG	NG	16

2	CF	CF	DC	14
23	CF	DC	NG	13
5	CF	DC	DC	11
17	DC	NG	DC	11
12	CF	NG	NG	9
4	DC	CF	CF	8
11	NG	CF	CF	8
22	CF	NG	DC	8
3	CF	DC	CF	6
7	DC	DC	CF	6
26	NG	DC	CF	4
14	NG	NG	CF	3
24	DC	NG	CF	3
1	CF	CF	CF	1
10	CF	NG	CF	0

351

CF = Continued Force to Deter Al Qaeda  
DC = Using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda  
NG = Negotiate with Al Qaeda

An analysis of Tables 5, 6 and 7 shows that there are some patterns of behavior both within each scenario and between the three scenarios. In the next section an analysis of the three alternate futures receiving the most votes within each scenario as these futures relate to the likely scenarios of the U.S., the International Community and Pakistan will result from each of the most likely alternate futures.

## **Analysis of Alternate Futures**

### **Scenario 1 – Maintain Status Quo**

Scenario 1 posed the question in which all three actors continue with the status quo. Nothing has really changed between the actors and there is no movement either way. This scenario is similar to what is actually happening at the writing of this paper. Remaining in this current mode is no doubt going to change.

When analyzing the potential responses to the “maintain status quo” scenario using the alternate futures, there are five scenarios that received at least twenty-one votes, indicating that these alternate futures are more likely to happen than at least 21 of the other alternate futures when compared one-on-one, assuming that all alternate futures could occur. By analyzing the top three most likely alternate futures related to the “maintain status quo” scenario (scenario 1), the relative alternate futures and the consequences of each alternate future related to the specific scenario can be compared to discover the most likely outcome for the interested actors.

**Alternate Future #6:** *The United States would prefer using Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda, the International Community chose the use of continued force to deter Al Qaeda, while Pakistan’s preference was Diplomatic or Coercive Methods to pressure Al Qaeda.* Alternate Future #6 received 26 votes, indicating that in a pairwise comparison, Alternate Future #6 is more likely to occur than all of the other alternate future permutations. This future is also the future most similar to the current relationships between the United States, the International Community, and Pakistan. Pakistan and the United States, while likely supportive of the use of the Diplomatic route and coercive methods are used in an attempt to prevent future terrorist attacks. This route was undoubtedly chosen by Pakistan due to the large number of Al Qaeda members within its borders. The United States is leaning this way because of the fact that Pakistan is a nuclear power and would try to do everything possible to prevent a terrorist organization from causing problems in a country that is a

nuclear power. On the opposite side of the spectrum, the International Community chose for the use of continued force to deter Al Qaeda. It would appear that the International Community wants to keep the pressure on Al Qaeda and not afford them the opportunity to regroup while the United States and Pakistan attempt to deal with Al Qaeda with Diplomatic means. This alternate future would likely have minimal consequences with regards to the current relationships between the three concerned states and Al Qaeda.

**Alternate Future #2:** *The United States and the International Community continued to use force to deter Al Qaeda, while Pakistan attempts to use Diplomatic or coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda.* This alternate future is perhaps the most positive future that could occur. This alternate future received 25 votes in the pairwise comparisons of Scenario 1, indicating that this alternate future is the second most likely future compared to the other twenty-six alternate futures. It appears that the United States and the International Community are going to continue to use force to deter Al Qaeda in order to prevent Al Qaeda from being able to organize, plan, and execute another spectacular attack against the United States or a member of the International Community. On the other hand, Pakistan is going to attempt to solve the Al Qaeda problem using Diplomatic or coercive methods. Pakistan is in a very precarious position, there are already political problems within the country and there is no question that Pakistan needs the United States in order to prevent any further internal or external issues. The fact that Pakistan is also a nuclear power and putting

nuclear weapons in the hands of a terrorist group, whom has already stated they have the intention on acquiring such weapons would be devastating for Pakistan.

**Alternate Future #8:** *The United States, the International Community and Pakistan all attempt to use Diplomatic or coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda.*

In this Alternate Future, all three actors chose the same method to deal with Al Qaeda. By choosing this Alternate Future the actors, the United States, the International Community, and Pakistan may believe that Al Qaeda has been hampered by the continued use of force against Al Qaeda and there is a window for the use of Diplomatic or coercive methods before Al Qaeda is able to regroup and attack again. While this may appear to be an accepted Alternate Future at the present time, if Al Qaeda should attack again, this Alternate Future would definitely not be beneficial to any of the three actors.

Based on the analysis above, there is at least a better than 50% chance of positive consequences in terms of dealing with Al Qaeda at this point. That is probably due to the fact that Al Qaeda has been on the run for the past 8 years and has not had the ability to establish a new base of operations. Although the threat of another attack is still a possibility, the likelihood of another spectacular attack has been severely reduced. All three scenarios tend to keep in mind that Pakistan is a nuclear power and those nuclear weapons can not fall into the hands of Al Qaeda.

### **Scenario 2 – Al Qaeda Succumbs To International Pressure**

Scenario 2 of this study most closely resembles the most beneficial of all the scenarios. The corresponding reactions of the United States, the International

Community, and Pakistan, therefore can be perhaps more easily analyzed, because the responses by the United States, the International Community, and Pakistan would result in no further terrorist attacks by Al Qaeda.

**Alternate Future #25:** *The United States will continue using Diplomatic or coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda, the International Community still chose the continued use of force to be used against Al Qaeda, and Pakistan wants to negotiate with Al Qaeda to find a non-confrontational resolution.* The current behavior of the interested parties in dealing with Al Qaeda is very similar to this scenario in that Pakistan wants to find the most non-confrontational means, this is mainly due to the current political/military situation in that country. If force is introduced into the alternate future equation, as the International Community would suggest, there will likely be a shift in the actors' behavior as well as their perceptions of the situation, likely leading to a paradigm shift in interstate relations between the interested parties.

**Alternate Future #6:** *The United States and Pakistan use Diplomatic or coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda while the International Community chooses continued use of force against Al Qaeda.* While Alternate Future #25 garnered extra votes and was the most likely future in relation to Scenario 2, Alternate Future #6 is the second most likely result for 2, when it was the most likely Alternate Future in Scenario #1. The United States and Pakistan maintain that the use of Diplomatic or coercive methods are the best way to deal with Al Qaeda at the current time. The International Community again chooses to continued use of force against Al Qaeda. The fact that the International

Community continues to elect using force against Al Qaeda, will hopefully lead Al Qaeda into Diplomatic relations with both the United States and Pakistan.

**Alternate Future #16:** *The United States and the International Community attempt to pressure Al Qaeda through Diplomatic or coercive methods while Pakistan attempts to negotiate with Al Qaeda.* Alternate Future #16 shows up for the first time in the Alternate Futures under the three scripted scenarios in this analysis as the third most likely response by the interested actors in Scenario 2. In this future, both the United States and International Community attempt to pressure Al Qaeda, this would appear to work in concert with the negotiations that Pakistan is attempting. This Alternate Future clear points out that the three actors do not want Al Qaeda to attempt or carry out any further attacks and is basically giving Al Qaeda a pass by not totally destroying the organization as a whole.

The analysis of Scenario #2 clearly indicates that the United States wants to suspend military operations against Al Qaeda and work the Diplomatic arm in order to deal with Al Qaeda. The current political and economic situation in the United States may have lead to the actions of the United States. In this scenario, we see the first signs of negotiation with Al Qaeda, this would definitely benefit both Pakistan and Al Qaeda. It would appear that the fact Pakistan is going to attempt to negotiate, it is due to the fact that nuclear weapons and the security of those weapons is a major concern of Pakistan.

### **Scenario 3 – Continued Attacks Against The United States**

Scenario 3 sees Pakistan trying to negotiate in all of the top three scenarios, this is in direct relation with its self protection against attack from Al Qaeda, and again, Pakistan chooses these Alternate Futures because of the fact that Pakistan is protecting its nuclear arsenal. The remaining two actors continue as in the other scenarios. This would seem to indicate that should the current status of the fight against Al Qaeda has slowed them enough to allow for attempts deal with Al Qaeda in a peaceful manner.

**Alternate Future #25:** *The United States uses Diplomatic or coercive methods to apply pressure to Al Qaeda even after Al Qaeda continues its attacks against the United States. The International Community again chooses to continue using force to deter Al Qaeda, and Pakistan elects to attempt to negotiate with Al Qaeda after Al Qaeda continues its attacks against the United States. As it does under Scenario 2, alternate future #25 comes in with the most votes under Scenario 3, and with 26 votes, alternate future #25 is more likely than all other alternate futures to occur assuming that Al Qaeda continues to attack the United States. The International Community continues to chose to use force against Al Qaeda, which can be viewed as a good strategy due to the fact that this actor is not an individual actor, therefore, Al Qaeda would have to attack multiple targets in order to retaliate. This would probably be considered acceptable to the other two actors because it would look as if the other two actors were trying to resolve the situation while the International Community was trying extend the hostilities.*

**Alternate Future #13:** *The United States attempts to negotiate with Al Qaeda in order to stop the continued attacks, the International Community continues to use*

*force to deter Al Qaeda, and Pakistan attempts to negotiate a peaceful settlement.* This is the first appearance of Alternate Future #13, and with 25 votes under Scenario 3, this alternate future virtually has no probability of occurring due to the fact that United States policy does not support negotiations with terrorist organizations. In this future, as opposed to alternate future #25 (above), the United States joins Pakistan in attempting to negotiate with Al Qaeda. The International Community's response remains the same as Alternate Future #25.

**Alternate Future #16:** *The United States and the International Community attempt to discourage continued attacks against the United States by Al Qaeda by using Diplomatic or coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda and Pakistan again attempts to negotiate with Al Qaeda for a peaceful resolution.* This Alternate future showed up as the third most likely alternate future under Scenario 2 as well, and as with its appearance under Scenario 2, the behavior of Pakistan is clearly a result of Pakistan's constant thought of self protection and the protection of its nuclear arsenal. The United States and the International Community are continuing to use Diplomatic and coercive methods to pressure Al Qaeda, primarily due to the current status of Al Qaeda and its ability to plan, organize and conduct attacks at the current time.

Now that the three most likely alternate futures have been discussed it becomes apparent that the potential use of force by either the United States or the International Community becomes a very real likelihood even if Al Qaeda continues to attack the United States. In comparison to the United States and the

International Community, Pakistan is decidedly unlikely to respond to Al Qaeda's continued attacks against the United States with force, but with other factors likely in effect, Pakistan is more likely to assist the United States and the International Community by negotiating with Al Qaeda, this action appears to be in direct relation to the fact that Pakistan is a nuclear nation and the protection of the nuclear arsenal is paramount when dealing with a terrorist organization.

### **Conclusion**

There is no question that at the present time Pakistan plays a major role in regards to dealing with Al Qaeda. The fact that the majority of Al Qaeda is currently in Pakistan and the fact that Pakistan will not let the United States or the International Community in to hunt down members of Al Qaeda puts Pakistan in a very difficult position. The Pakistani government is in no position to dictate anything at this point due to the fact that there is no control of the western tribal areas, where Al Qaeda and the Taliban have a strong foothold. The Pakistani nuclear issues and the issues with India are another reason why the United States and the International Community have to tread lightly. Al Qaeda couldn't have picked a better place to seek refuge.

The United States is going to continue to hunt down and kill or prosecute the members of Al Qaeda. The United States continues to take into account the issues surrounding Pakistan and have given Pakistan numerous opportunities to cooperate in the fight against Al Qaeda, but the internal and external issues that Pakistan continues to deal with is affecting Pakistan's ability.

The International Community is going to continue to support the United States in its fight against terrorism in order to prevent future attacks by Al Qaeda. The International Community has a number of concerns regarding Al Qaeda because Al Qaeda has not only attacked the United States, but a number of states within the International Community as well. Of course the International Community has numerous concerns about what is taking place in Pakistan.

This LAMP analysis has shown that the United States and the International Community is going to continue to take the fight to Al Qaeda in order to prevent Al Qaeda from seeking refuge in a friendly country. This will eliminate Al Qaeda's ability to reorganize, plan, and carry out attacks against the United States and the International Community. Pakistan is walking a tight rope with both the United States and the International Community, not to mention the potential for internal forces including the Pakistani military and the issues that are currently infecting the western tribal areas. This analysis also illustrated that Pakistan is in a precarious position due to the nuclear arsenal it maintains; this is also a concern of the United States and the International Community. The nuclear issue is the main reason why the United States and the International Community is being so lenient with Pakistan in regards to a more robust counterterrorism program.

## Resources

- Alexander, Y (2001). Usama bin Laden's al-Qaida: Profile of a Terrorist Network. Transnational Publishers, Inc, Ardsley, NY. 2001.
- Bergen, P. (2001). Holy War, Inc. Inside the Secret World of Osama bin Laden. The Free Press, New York, NY, 2001.
- Bergen, P. (2006). The Osama bin Laden I Know: An Oral History of al Qaeda's Leader. The Free Press, New York, NY, 2006.
- Burke, J. (2003). Al-Qaeda: Casting a Shadow of Terror. I. B. Tauris & Co LTD. New York, NY, 2003.
- Corbin, J. (2002). Al-Qaeda: The Terror Network that Threatens the World. Thunder's Mouth Press, New York, NY, 2002.
- Davis, P. (2002). Deterrence & Influence in Counterterrorism: A Component in the War on al Qaeda. Rand National Defense Research Institute, Arlington, VA, 2002.
- Emerson, S. (2002). American Jihad: The Terrorists Living Among Us. The Free Press, New York, NY, 2002.
- Gunaratna, R. (2003). Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror. Berkley Publishing Group, New York, NY 2003.
- Miller, J. (2002). The Cell: Inside the 9/11 Plot, and Why the FBI and CIA Failed To Stop IT. Hyperion Books, New York, NY, 2002.
- Nasiri, O. (2006). Inside the Jihad: My Life with Al Qaeda A Spy's Story. Perseus Books Group, New York, NY, 2006.
- Pillar, P. (2001). Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy. Brooking Institute Press, Washington, DC, 2001
- Sageman, M. (2004). Understanding Terror Networks. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, PA, 2001.
- U.S. Government. (2004). The 9/11 Commission Report. W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY, 2004.
- Venzke, B. (2003). The al-Qaeda Threat: An Analytical Guide to al-Qaeda's Tactics & Targets. Tempest Publishing, LLC, 2003.

White, J. (2002). Terrorism: An Introduction, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. Thomson Wadsworth, New York, NY, 2002.

White, J. (2006). Terrorism and Homeland Security, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition. Thomson Wadsworth, New York, NY, 2006.