



How Fear Played a Role in Responses to Terrorist Attacks

In Five Different Countries; USA, Spain, England, Norway and France

Sunna Sasha Larosiliere

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í Stjórnmálafræði

Félagsvísindasvið



HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

How Fear Played a Role in Responses to Terrorist Attacks
In Five Different Countries; USA, Spain, England, Norway and France

Sunna Sasha Larosiliere

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í Stjórn málafræði
Leiðbeinandi: Hulda Þórisdóttir

Félags- og mannvísindadeild
Félagsvísindasvið Háskóla Íslands
Júní 2015

Ritgerð þessi er lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í stjórnmálafræði og er óheimilt að afrita ritgerðina á nokkurn hátt nema með leyfi rétthafa.

© Sunna Sasha Larosiliere 2015

Kt: 121291-2589

Reykjavík, Ísland 2015

Útdráttur

Þessi ritgerð fjallar um áhrif ótta og kvíða á stjórnámál í fimm Vesturlöndum í kjölfar hryðjuverkaárása sem áttu sér stað á fyrstu tveimur áratugum síðustu aldar. Með breyttri umfjöllun í fjölmiðlum og auknum samfélagsáhrifum hryðjuverka þvert á landamæri hefur það orðið nauðsynlegt að skilja hvernig tekist er á við hryðjuverkaógn og áhrif þess að upplifa þá ógn á almenning jafnt sem stjórnvöld. Meginumfjöllunarefni ritgerðarinnar er hvernig ótti meðal almennings og kvíði spilar inni lýðræðisleg stjórnámál. Greiningin hefst á frásögn á hvernig ótti og kvíði hafa áhrif á tilhneingingu einstaklinga til hægri valdboðshyggju (e. right wing authoritarianism) og hegðunina sem því fylgir, sem útskýrt verður með kenningunni um félagslega samsömun (e. social identity theory). Ég fjalla síðan um hvernig stjórnvöld nýta sér þessar tilhneingingar einstaklinga til að auka eigin völd í kjölfar hryðjuverka. Ég rannsaka árásirnar í New York borg, Lúndúnum og Madrid og greini þar með viðbrögð almennings og pólitísk áhrif til lengri tíma. Síðan kynni ég nýlegu árásirnar í Osló og París til þess að varpa ljósi á ósamræmi í frásögnum um áhrif og afleiðingar hryðjuverka.

Ég kemst að þeirri niðurstöðu að eftir því sem hryðjuverkahópar verða dreifstýrðari og án skýrrar forystu verður það erfiðara fyrir stjórnvöld að nýta sér ótta sem stjórnæki. Skortur á augljósum, auðþekkjanlegum óvini til þess að beina ótta almennings verður til þess að yfirvöldum tekst ekki með jafn árangurríkum hætti að nýta óttann sem gagnlegt tól í pólitískri stjórnun.

Abstract

This thesis examines the role of fear and anxiety on politics in five Western countries in the aftermath of terrorist attacks in the first two decades of the 21st century. With the transformation of terrorist incidents into major media and social spectacles in the contemporary world, it has become necessary to understand how the perceived threat of violent terrorism affects those who believe they are threatened. This thesis explores how public fear and anxiety play into democratic politics, beginning with an explanatory theoretical framework that outlines how fear and anxiety function among populations, and how this may activate tendencies towards Right Wing Authoritarianism and exclusionary behavior within the context of Social Identity Theory. I then discuss how governments may manipulate these tendencies in order to enhance their own powers in the aftermath of terrorist attacks. I then explore the events in New York City, London, and Madrid, analyzing the public reactions and longer term political effects. I then proceed to discuss the recent terror attacks in Oslo and Paris to highlight some of the inconsistencies in any explanatory narrative of the effects of terrorism.

I reach the conclusion that as the phenomenon of terrorism shifts into a decentralized, leaderless threat, it is becoming harder for states to use fear as a political tool. Without a specific, limited target toward which to channel fear, I argue that it ceases to be a useful tool of political manipulation.

Preface

This 12 ECTS credit BA thesis is my final project for my 180 ECTS Bachelors degree within the Political Science Division of the University of Iceland. It marks not the end, but solely the beginning of my academic journey. I understand that the way forward is a tedious one, especially in light of the fact that writing this thesis was a source of great mental anguish for me. I would like to thank my mentor Hulda Þórisdóttir who believed in me from the get-go, for being an amazing mentor and for putting up with me. You are an inspiration and hopefully some of your genius rubbed off on me! I would also like to give special thanks to my dear friend, Rory Cahill for the support, assistance and amazing editing skills. This thesis wouldn't have happened without you. Of course my parents played their part by annoying me and making me stick to my plan, my mother especially for her unwavering support and endless belief in my procrastinating ways. My aunt Tracey for the read-overs, thank you so much for taking the time to help me out! My friends, for all the sleepless, studying nights and motivation: namely Jóhanna for guidance, Lovísa who never allowed me to stray, Viktor and Egill for their words of encouragement and Aldís for support. Last but not least, I'd like to thank MYSELF for actually getting this done. Past Sunna didn't believe this day would come, so well done future (and present) Sunna. A WELL DESERVED pat on the back.

I chose this topic mainly because I find deviations from human norms fascinating and they can appear in any form. When I was living in Paris for a semester as an exchange student, a terrorist cell (ISIS) threatened the country and I was intrigued. Also as an American citizen who values their rights, I am concerned about the treatment of all citizens which makes me question certain tactics employed by various governments in power positions. I grew up both in New York City, USA, and in Reykjavík, Iceland. I was in Iceland at the time of the September 11 attacks but as will be demonstrated, no one seemed to be able to escape the images presented in the media when the attacks were carried out. I remember feeling scared for my family in New York, actually terrified. But hindsight is a very powerful thing and fear is a very strong emotion. Thus I decided to look at different attacks, in different countries, and see if the implementation of fear as a political tool would be analogous throughout all instances of attacks.

Table of Contents

Útdráttur	3
Abstract	3
Preface	5
1. Introduction	7
2. Terrorism Thrives With Fear	9
2.1 Defining Terrorism.....	9
2.3 Fear, Anxiety and Threats	11
3. Fear as a Political Tool: Theoretical Framework	14
3.1 (Right Wing) Authoritarianism and Social Identity Theory	14
4. New York City: 2001	17
4.1 Event Description	17
4.2 Government Reaction.....	17
4.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath	19
4.4 Summary	21
5. Madrid: 2004	23
5.1 Event Description.....	23
5.2 Government Reaction.....	23
5.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath	25
5.4 Summary	26
6. London: 2005	27
6.1 Event Description.....	27
6.2 Government Reaction.....	27
6.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath	29
6.5 Summary	31
7. Later Attacks	33
7.1 Oslo: 2011	33
7.2 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath	34
7.3 Paris: 2015.....	35
7.4 Public Reactions and Immediate Aftermath.....	35
8. Synthesis	37
Bibliography	40

1. Introduction

So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is...fear itself — nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.¹

When U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt spoke these words in 1933, he accurately diagnosed the harmful role that panic and anxiety can play in a political and economic crisis. Eighty-two years later, the populations of highly developed states in Western Europe and the U.S are among the most secure, wealthy, and longest-lived populations in history.² Yet these states are not free from internal and external threats; following the September 11th attacks in the U.S, violent terrorism has seized the attention of Western governments and their populations. The images of passenger jets flying into office buildings signified a new era of violent terrorism in the West, with multiple attacks claiming lives and symbolically striking at centers of government and society. With the media eager to seize on these spectacles, and populations under the impression that their lives are at risk, terrorism has come to occupy a significant part of governmental policies and legislation. Yet all this attention is paradoxical as terrorist attacks are rare and generally do not threaten the survival of a developed state. Thus, it is worthwhile to examine how the fear of terrorism affects politics in the aftermath of attacks. This thesis will examine five different terrorist attacks, in five separate countries where the perpetrators had similar ideological incentives but different outcomes were realized.

The purpose of this study is to examine the immediate aftermaths and long-term consequences of these attacks and understand the crucial roles played by both politicians and the public. I will not place emphasis upon economic aftermaths nor is the objective to solve the “terrorist problem.” Rather, the key term throughout this study is fear and the effects it has had on these different countries and political cultures. The core cases presented are the 9/11 attacks in New York City which arguably paved the way for how other countries deal with terrorism, as well as the Madrid train bombings, and the 7/7 London attacks. These have been the largest terrorist attacks in the West carried out by Muslim extremists, whose ideology is often portrayed as the root cause of terrorism. After my exploration of the core cases, I will present shorter explanations on the cases of Oslo and Paris for comparison. As my focus is on the reactions to terrorist attacks it is important not to focus too intently on the ideologies driving the perpetrators, yet I believe it is important to include the case of Anders Breivik (Oslo) as a counter to the idea

¹ Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, “Swearing-In Ceremony for President Franklin D. Roosevelt,” Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933. Accessed March 3, 2015. <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/swearing-in/event/franklin-d-roosevelt-1933>.

² Dan Gardner, *The Science of Fear: How the Culture of Fear Manipulates Your Brain* (New York City, NY: Plume, 2009), 7 &10.

that all major terrorists are Muslim extremists.

Diving into the toolkit of political psychology, in addition to examining fear, the constructs of Social Identity Theory, (Right Wing) Authoritarianism and Machiavellianism will serve to connect all events. I will look at the attacks and their aftermaths in chronological order in an attempt to explore what has been learned in these fourteen years, determine if a common thread links the attacks, and examine whether responses to terrorist attacks have changed since 9/11. I will also explore if the public has had a say in what ensues after each attack and whether governments implement laws using the fears of their populations. The example of the recent events unfolding in Paris will serve to highlight the route these attacks may follow in the near future, especially when the perpetrators act as members of transnational ideological groups with little or no organization. Finally, I will discuss how public fear may change in response to the new threat of decentralized terrorism.

This thesis is a bibliographic research paper. The sources that are used in this study consist mostly of scholarly reviewed articles published in scientific journals, academic textbooks and news articles. The thesis begins with a definitions chapter, which then leads into a theoretical framework. Each attack site is addressed in separate chapters that include examinations of the aforementioned contributing factors. Lastly a synthesis and an attempt at a conclusion will be put forth.

2. Terrorism Thrives With Fear

2.1 Defining Terrorism

In order to understand the use and role of fear in response to terrorist attacks, we must recognize what terrorist attacks consist of and why they incite fear. There are numerous definitions of terrorism, in both the academic and governmental spheres, which are often employed interchangeably. Governments employ different definitions to suit their own political goals and agendas.³ Scholars have continually struggled to define the specific term of “terrorism” since its conception in the early 1970s. To understand this conundrum better, Martha Crenshaw writes:

The use of the term is often polemical and rhetorical. It can be a pejorative label, meant to condemn an opponent’s cause as illegitimate rather than describe behavior. Moreover, even if the term is used objectively as an analytical tool, it is still difficult to arrive at a satisfactory definition that distinguishes terrorism from other violent phenomena. **In principle, terrorism is a deliberate and systematic violence performed by small numbers of people**, whereas communal violence is spontaneous, sporadic, and requires mass participation. **The purpose of terrorism is to intimidate a watching popular audience by harming only a few**, whereas genocide is the elimination of entire communities. **Terrorism is meant to hurt, not to destroy**. Terrorism is pre eminently political and symbolic, whereas guerilla warfare is a military activity. Repressive “terror” from above is the action of those in power, whereas terrorism is a clandestine resistance to authority. Yet in practice, events cannot always be precisely categorized.⁴

Crenshaw underscores the complexity involved in producing a simple definition of terrorism and highlights a central quality of all terrorist incidents: the desire to affect public perspective by manifesting a public threat. Terrorism can be seen as a technique of action which is available to nearly anyone, including those who lack the resources to take action in conventional politics and warfare. It is thus crucial to understand the different phenomenological frameworks available to those seeking to understand and remedy instances of terrorism.

Peter Sederburg argues that governments and institutions view terrorism through three different lenses: as warfare, as crime, and as disease.⁵ The actions a government or institution utilizes in response to terrorism vary greatly according to what view they take. The warfare perspective understands terrorism or a specific terrorist group as an enemy to be defeated in a military conflict. Thus the state uses conventional military methods in its reaction, which are generally only successful when it is possible to achieve victory over a specific, identifiable enemy. If terrorism is to be understood in the context of crime, police techniques are unsurprisingly the method chosen to combat terrorism. This carries the implication that attacks

³ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology* (New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2010), 264.

⁴ Martha Crenshaw, "The Psychology Of Terrorism: An Agenda For The 21st Century," *Political Psychology* 21, no. 2 (2000): 406.

⁵ P. C. Sederberg, "Global Terrorism: Problems of Challenge and Response," In *The New Global Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, edited by Charles W. Kegley Jr., 267-84. (Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2003), **quoted in** Alan Collins, Brenda Lutz and James Lutz, "Terrorism." In *Contemporary Security Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 273.

may not be prevented. only be contained and reduced, just as states treat crime.⁶ Sederburg's third approach to understanding terrorism is to view the phenomenon as a disease. In this perspective, states and institutions understand and attempt to confront terrorism through its symptoms (terrorist violence), and its underlying causes (e.g. economic deprivation, social alienation). The terrorism as disease framework calls for long-term strategic approaches that are able to address these root causes in an effective way. However, over the last two decades the individuals and groups responsible for terrorism have evolved significantly. Terrorists and their organizations have become globalized, decentralized, media-intelligent, and effective at recruiting or encouraging individuals for lone-wolf styles attacks.

With terrorism representing such differing groups and tactics worldwide, Sederburg suggests that none of these approaches will be effective with all manifestations of terrorism.⁷ However, we can examine how states employ Sederburg's frameworks of terrorism and how they have shifted over time. An example of this is in how the U.S changed its response to terrorism after September 11. Before the September 11th attacks, the U.S primarily viewed and reacted to terrorist attacks from the criminal perspective, tasking domestic police agencies with investigating and preventing attacks in the U.S and on U.S. citizens abroad. In the aftermath attacks, the U.S. immediately shifted to the terrorism as military enemy perspective. The Bush administration signaled this shift with their housing of terrorist suspects in a military prison and suspension of civil rights for terrorism suspects. However in Europe the criminal perspective with regard to terrorism has been and is still prevalent, creating a much different political environment around security. Certain European countries have adopted some semblance of the disease model, with recent investments in Islamic de-radicalization in the U.K. and France, but the arguably more precise disease model is generally the perspective adopted by academics and more radical political actors.

Yet whether terrorism is understood through analytical frameworks, ideology, or size and scale, it can nevertheless be agreed that terrorist violence is a form of psychological warfare which serves to generate fear by attacking an audience who represent part of a larger whole. Terrorist attacks are prone to target civilians as their casualties heighten the level of insecurity of a media audience who believes those injured or killed are "just like them." Terrorists choose their targets with due diligence as media coverage is of crucial importance for spreading the necessary fear to inflict mass hysteria. The goal of terrorism is to send the general public of a specific society into a state of insecurity by harming their peers in places of public gathering.⁸ Thus,

⁶ Same reference, 274.

⁷ Same reference, 275.

⁸ Same reference, 76.

recognizing the psychological underpinnings of terrorist tactics is key to combating terrorism in the immediate term. As terrorists seek to terrify, fear often has a decisive influence on the practice of counter-terrorism. In order to prevail over terrorism, one must attack the terror and not just the individual terrorists or organizations that carried out an attack.⁹ Yet, however persuasive this analysis may sound, many governments seem to thrive on the public's fear as they use it to concentrate their own power to the political advantage of the semi-authoritarian right (whether in the Labor government of Tony Blair or the Republican administration of George W. Bush). Now we will examine what exactly fear is, and how can it be considered both a manipulative political tool and a driving force of terrorism, and how exactly it affects individuals in a political context.

2.3 Fear, Anxiety and Threats

Fear is a primary emotion which is activated automatically at the primitive level of the nervous system.¹⁰ Experiencing fear elevates an individual's perception of risk, potentially to irrational levels. An overestimation of risk may lead to a heightened sense of distress that can ultimately harm decision-making abilities. However fear, or the awareness of heightened risk, can also cause an individual to pay greater attention to said risk and take action when and where it is needed. When fear is allowed to run amok and develop into unreasoning terror, it limits human decision-making and awareness.¹¹

Another emotion that compliments fear in blurring our perceptions is anxiety, "an abnormal and overwhelming sense of apprehension and fear often marked by physiological signs (as sweating, tension, and increased pulse), by doubt concerning the reality and nature of the threat, and by self-doubt about one's capacity to cope with it".¹² Anxiety is defined by fear but it centers more on an individual's capacity to cope with threats. Individuals experience fear as it is related to taking actions such as escape or avoidance, but this fear turns into anxiety when taking action becomes impossible or obstructed.¹³ Anxiety thus leads to elevated attentiveness to one's surroundings and intensifies perceptions of threats.¹⁴ When threats and danger are perceived, both fear and anxiety kick in but differ according to the individual's discernment of the situation. A clear and certain threat is associated with fear, and anxiety with uncertainty regarding said threat. When we experience anxiety, we are uncertain of how to respond and how to act; we tend to

⁹ Dan Gardner, *The Science of Fear: How the Culture of Fear Manipulates Your Brain* (New York City, NY: Plume, 2009), 283.

¹⁰ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 13.

¹¹ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 6.

¹² Merriam Webster, "Anxiety," <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anxiety> (accessed March 16, 2015).

¹³ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 14.

¹⁴ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology*, 51.

worry about how to react as opposed to simply avoiding or escaping the threat as we would if experiencing fear.¹⁵

With this in mind, we can ask what the proper reaction to a threat may be. It can be considered ideal to react with a certain balance between reassurance and vigilance, a condition which is most likely to transpire when one experiences an intermediate level of threat.¹⁶ However, when experiencing anxiety this lucid state of reassurance and vigilance is not assured, as the uncertainty that accompanies anxiety may close the outlet offered by taking mitigating action. It is thus much more likely that feelings of worry, fluster, and distress manifest themselves in uncertain threat situations, in turn occupying a larger share of cognitive resources. Knowing this, Hulda Þórisdóttir hypothesizes that when people feel threatened they are "...motivated to latch onto social and political attitudes that provide the most readily construed means of restoring certainty and control."¹⁷ This hypothesis derives from the idea that people can make up for their feelings of uncertainty and lack of control in one sector by positively reinforcing these feelings in another. Þórisdóttir conducted five studies on the relationship between perceived threats and political attitudes to determine whether people could be influenced by fear and thus manipulated into behaving in a certain way. When taken together, Þórisdóttir's studies offer experimental evidence for the hypothesis that various, but related threats will cause individuals to become more politically conservative (Þórisdóttir does not conclude that regardless of how people are threatened, they will always become more conservative). This is owing to the fact that each time individuals perceive a threat, "similar changes in epistemic needs and information processing occur, and these changes are generally better met by conservative rather than liberal ideological outcomes."¹⁸ Her findings also present a strong correlation between perceived threats and right-wing authoritarianism, which will be discussed further in the theoretical chapter. Therefore when individuals feel threatened, their feelings of threat affect their attitudes about society in general. Þórisdóttir's results reveal that "the more personally threatening instances from the past people recalled, the more likely they were to see the world as threatening on an ostensibly unrelated questionnaire."¹⁹ In other words, greater perceived threats make people more close-minded towards society, which would as a result lead them to become more inclined towards political conservatism. Þórisdóttir's study also suggests that individuals who perceive a greater threat level will prefer political policies framed in certain, or uncompromising terms rather than in the more

¹⁵ Same reference, 53.

¹⁶ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 16.

¹⁷ Same reference, 38-39.

¹⁸ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 40.

¹⁹ Same reference, 52.

complex and uncertain terms often employed by left-liberals. As mentioned above, individuals become anxious when facing risks and threats that are not easily solved or avoided. Þórisdóttir demonstrates that people who perceive a threatening environment react in a political manner that is not necessarily connected to the actual source of the given threat.²⁰ This relates to the central aim of my study: a population does not need to make a distinct connection between a certain threat and their political preferences in a political environment significantly affected by fear and anxiety. This is the exact situation where fear can be used as a political tool most effectively.

Whether we look into the findings of Þórisdóttir's studies or other risk perception research, what seems to remain constant is that individuals overestimate the likelihood of being killed by the things that receive the greatest amounts of news coverage and, in turn, underestimate those that do not. Events that bear high consequences but are of low probability, such as plane crashes, lightning strikes, and terrorist attacks, generally have a high propensity to induce fear.²¹ Governments use fear as a political tool when they consistently inflate a terrorist threat to the point that the misallocation of resources, time and attention distracts from other threats that could be or are more dangerous. As can be seen above, the very existence of a political tactic designed to cause panic and unthinking reaction does exactly that, often playing directly into the hands of right wing factions seeking to confront the threat directly and immediately while curtailing rights domestically. The theoretical framework will serve to highlight why we give strength to the paradoxical notion of terror in a time of relative security in the West.

²⁰ Same reference, 84.

²¹ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 57.

3. Fear as a Political Tool: Theoretical Framework

As related above, fear and anxiety lead to a heightened sense of distress which in turn distorts our view of risk and reality. Fear triggers cognitive processes based on intuition rather than logical thinking; as a result individuals in a state of fear are more easily persuaded and generally do not exhibit the sensitivity to details that would allow them to understand the vast differences between threats with differing probabilities. Our brain fosters this information in our easily-retrieved memory which blurs our risk, anxiety and fear perceptions.²² It thus becomes easy to conflate individual experiences with the threats broadcasted by the media in this state. I now turn to a definition of Right-Wing Authoritarianism in order to highlight what type of individuals are more susceptible to the politics of fear as related to terrorist threats. I follow Right-Wing Authoritarianism into more general Social Identity Theory to explain the possible consequences of the political use of terrorist threats such as social exclusion and xenophobia. Finally, I touch on the teachings of Niccolo Machiavelli to guide my discussion of the political endeavors of power-holders with regard to terrorist threats and fear, asking the question: “who benefits?” in each terrorist attack that I examine.

3.1 (Right Wing) Authoritarianism and Social Identity Theory

If governments and politicians do in fact use fear as a political tool in order to advance their own agendas, it is an important next step to consider whether some people may be more susceptible to fear mongering than others. The concept of authoritarianism draws support from the research on the relationship between threats and politically relevant attitudes. Certain research has shown that individuals who score high on the authoritarianism scale tend to be more impressionable to threatening words and messages in comparison to those with lower scores.²³ Altemeyer re-approached the subject of authoritarianism with trait based logic rather than with psychoanalysis. He employed three of the nine personality traits conceptualized which are; authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism and in turn coined Right-Wing Authoritarianism. R.W.A is psychological rather than a political term and signifies “submission to perceived authorities, particularly those in the establishment or established system of governance”.²⁴ Altemeyer claims these traits are a product of social learning, a combination of personality predispositions and life events. Individuals who score high on the R.W.A scale have greater difficulty in engaging in critical thinking which is ultimately a consequence of having

²² Ross Pomeroy, "Driving Is Much Deadlier Than Terrorism—Why Isn't It Scarier," <http://www.psmag.com/books-and-culture/driving-terrorism-deadly-dangerous-availability-heuristic-55361> Accessed March 10, 2015.

²³ Cottam et al., Introduction to Political Psychology, 23-25.

²⁴ Cottam et al., Introduction to Political Psychology, 24.

truths dictated to them by those in authority and being prohibited from challenging that authority.²⁵ People who cannot challenge their authority are more likely to ignore contradictions in what they are told. As a result, when a country chooses a scapegoat for whichever reason, people high in R.W.A are much more likely to uncritically believe that the scapegoat is responsible.²⁶ This can be seen in both the 9/11 New York City attacks and the 3/11 Madrid attacks. Seeing as certain people are already predisposed to being authoritarian personalities, not much can be done to counter it, but such traits can be enhanced and manipulated. Scholars have found that describing a worsening condition actually increases the scores on authoritarianism, which correlates somewhat with the notion of seeing the world as a dangerous and threatening place.²⁷

Perceiving the world with such fear may incite *in-group* and *out-group* behaviors, a phenomenon that the Social Identity Theory serves to explain. Coined by Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner, social identity “is that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership in a social group together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership.”²⁸ Thus we classify ourselves and others into groups: the groups we belong to are called in-groups whilst those we do not belong to are out-groups. The existence of such groups can be perilous as people are more likely to discriminate against the out-group, in favor of their own in-group. Individuals tend to compare their group with others in order gain a positive sense of self, which in turn creates a favorable distinction between groups. However there are also occurrences in which individuals accept a group’s inferiority if they believe their position is just and legitimate. Once a group compares itself to another and finds the comparison to be intolerably negative, the group might seek to find an alternative and subsequently engage in a sort of social competition in order to achieve equal standing, a specific phenomenon I examine in my discussion of the London attacks.²⁹

The mere awareness of the conspicuous presence of an out-group is enough to provoke inter-group competitiveness or discriminatory responses from the in-group.³⁰ At the inter-group level, researchers have shown that feelings of uncertainty increases in-group identification and thus when feelings of anxiety and fear come into play, we become wary of other groups. Feelings, attitudes and cognitive processes are at the forefront of our consciousness. Emotions

²⁵ Same reference, 24.

²⁶ Same reference, 24.

²⁷ Þórisdóttir, The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness, 29.

²⁸ Cottam et al., Introduction to Political Psychology, 48.

²⁹ Cottam et al., Introduction to Political Psychology, 49.

³⁰ Henri Tajfel and John C. Turner, "Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour" in *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, (Cambridge, Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 13.

permeate the mind and thus influence the whole process of deciding how to act politically.³¹ The salience of social identity groups increases this emotional intensity and consequently translates into the idea stronger that the sense of belonging to a group, the more important belonging becomes to a member's self-esteem. This intensity is also decided by perceptions we have of other groups, we react more negatively to out-groups and certainly with greater passion than to our in-groups. Groups believed to be of a threatening nature are seen rather uniformly and extreme as the threat perception increases.³²

Much of the work on the social psychology of intergroup relations has focused on patterns of individual prejudices and discrimination and also on the motivational sequences of interpersonal interactions. Striking examples of these approaches can be found within Right Wing Authoritarianism.³³ The theories are intricately connected, as individuals who score high on authoritarian scales tend to exhibit more prejudice toward low status out-groups. The three characteristics of the R.W.A personality mentioned earlier can be directly connected to ethnocentrism and prejudice. Thus when governments cite a scapegoat or a common enemy, in-group notions are heightened and fear and anxiety may blur our perceptions of the groups labelled as the out-group or enemy. People's group identity may clash with other groups, other individuals and/or other people's self-redefinitions. For instance, the individuals who seek a higher purpose by joining a terrorist group cannot always be seen as the enemy. Owing to the fact that many terrorist cells are leaderless, individuals are consequently harder to single out. No matter where it is executed, terrorism can have an overwhelming effect on the mindset of a targeted population. But how can fear be concentrated towards any specific group, cause or even a country, especially by a leaderless movement? To answer this, we must also understand that there exists another form of terror, which consists of the systematic efforts made by a government to terrorize the population of its given country. Thus the goal is to terrorize the greater audience into political submission and obedience.³⁴ Niccolo Machiavelli's words ring true in this context whereas he proclaimed that, "it would be best to be both loved and feared. But since the two rarely come together, anyone compelled to choose will find greater security in being feared than in being loved."³⁵ So in the spirit of Machiavelli, is there greater security in being feared and can fear thus be implemented as a political tool? We will now take a look at the following event descriptions and analysis of attacks carried out in the United States, Spain, England, Norway and France, in order to attempt to answer these questions.

³¹ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology*, 47.

³² Same reference, 51.

³³ Tajfel and Turner, *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, 7.

³⁴ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology*, 286.

³⁵ Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 60.

4. New York City: 2001

4.1 Event Description

When speaking of terrorism and terrorist attacks, the September 11th attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City back in 2001 have become synonymous with atrocious attacks. The attacks were carried out by 19 men who hijacked four commercial airlines planes bound for West coast destinations. A total of 2,977 people were killed in three separate locations, in New York City, Washington DC, and Pennsylvania.³⁶ The hijackers flew two airplanes into the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center, causing their collapse.. The third plane struck the Pentagon whilst the fourth plane crashed before reaching its intended target and it is presumed that the passengers and crew sought to overpower the hijackers.³⁷ These four acts of terror targeted extremely symbolic venues, corresponding to the aforementioned definition of terrorism, which entails intimidating a watching popular audience by harming a few. New York and its numerous skyscrapers can be seen as the symbols of America's power and influence whereas the Pentagon represents the country's military power as it host the US Department of Defense.³⁸ The aftermath of these attacks was extremely severe, not only affecting the United States but also the Western World to a great extent. 9/11 changed the way Americans dealt with terrorism psychologically. This section of the thesis is of a complex and sensitive nature. Many references seem to be biased in their accounts, which bear with them either a sense of conspiracy or fierce patriotism. With this in mind, in the space allowed for in such a short thesis, the focus will be on presenting the major points, potentially at the cost of not diving deeply into details and a more critical analysis of sources.

4.2 Government Reaction

After 9/11 US governmental policies changed drastically, with serious capital being relocated in order to support new bills and packages going through Congress. A prominent example was when the U.S Congress approved an emergency anti-terrorism package on September 14th, 2001 and was estimated to cost roughly \$40 billion dollars. This measure was not the only one taken in the wake of the atrocities as the Department of Homeland Security was also created, merging twenty-two governmental agencies into one.

³⁶ CNN, "September 11th Fast Facts," March 27, 2015. Accessed April 2, 2015.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/>

³⁷ BBC News, "The 9/11 Terrorist Attacks," Accessed April 4, 2015.

http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/events/the_september_11th_terrorist_attacks.

³⁸ Same reference.

On December 13th, 2001 the U.S government released a tape in which Osama bin Laden assumed responsibility for 9/11.³⁹ Despite the presence of this video confession, Bin Laden initially denied involvement in the attacks and did not claim responsibility until October 2004. Bin Laden and al-Qaeda later cited U.S. support of Israel, the presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia, and sanctions against Iraq as motives for the 9/11 attacks. In October 2001, a U.S.-led coalition launched attacks on Afghanistan forces in conjunction with the anti-Taliban Afghan Northern Alliance. This western coalition was supported by the then British Prime Minister Tony Blair as evident in his words, "we ...here in Britain stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friends in this hour of tragedy".⁴⁰

Previously, the least popular president ever to hold office,⁴¹ George Bush's approval ratings soared to 90% following the attacks.⁴² Bush remained popular among American voters and held office for two consecutive terms, despite international and domestic criticism over his borderless Global War on Terror, curtailing civil liberties with the Patriot Act, massive defense spending, and detention of foreign nationals without process at Guantanamo Bay. When speaking of an *unwinnable* war, investor George Soros describes the quandary as such;

The coining of the war on terror in the aftermath of 9/11 confused two fields of practice that have traditionally been distinct. War had been a rule bound practice of states, which usually begins with a declaration and has a clear end. Terrorism has most often, at least in recent times, been associated with non-state actors and treated as an area of crime. In naming a war of indefinite duration involving an obscure enemy who is outside the rules of war, Bush brought the War on Terror into being, and out of the tensions contained in this double-sided term, gave reasons for a range of acts that would not otherwise been considered acceptable.⁴³

As has been mentioned, people who cannot or do not wish to challenge their authority are more likely to ignore contradictions in what they are told. This gives weight to Soros' notion of the passing of acts that would not in other respects be deemed acceptable. These individuals, who are more susceptible to such manipulations, are those who score high on R.W.A scales. Research conducted by Crowson et al., titled "Does Authoritarianism Predict Post-9/11 Attitudes?" studied whether individuals who scored high on R.W.A would also be more likely to support the US-led invasion of Iraq in spring of 2003, as well as governmental efforts to place restrictions on human rights as a component of the War on Terror. They also hypothesized that R.W.A would be

³⁹ CNN, "September 11th Fast Facts," March 27, 2015. Accessed April 2, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/>

⁴⁰ BBC News, "The 9/11 Terrorist Attacks," Accessed April 4, 2015. http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/events/the_september_11th_terrorist_attacks.

⁴¹ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology*, 149.

⁴² Gallup, "Presidential Approval Ratings - George W. Bush," Presidential Approval Ratings. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx>.

⁴³ Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, "Constructivism," In *International Relations Theories*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 200.

positively associated with support for the presidency of George W. Bush following 9/11 and during the build-up to the war with Iraq. The president frequently discussed the dangers the US faced in moralistic, “we/they” terms (in-group/out-group terms). They also critically hypothesized that RWA and threat perceptions related to terrorism would be positively correlated and found a strong correlation between post-9/11 attitudes and authoritarianism. Thus the research suggests that R.W.A may function as an important individual difference factor that blurs peoples’ interpretations of traumatic events, perceptions of threat, and views about important socio-political issues. Which may ultimately bear on issues of their personal liberties and the degree to which the U.S cooperates in international affairs.⁴⁴

4.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath

How did the public react to the numerous measures implemented by the government in the wake of 9/11? People were indeed afraid after 9/11 and incidents of harassment and hate crimes against South Asians and Muslims were reported in the days following the attacks. With elevated fear and constant reminders given to the public through media and political speeches, the attacks remained vivid in their minds. The president’s first public address in the wake of the 9/11 attacks continued this imagery: “the pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing..These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.”⁴⁵ These were very graphic images sure to affect the listening public who had undoubtedly experienced mass trauma. An enemy is pointed out, in-group values are cited and fear is implemented as became evident with Gallup poll results taken in October 2001. In these polls, 40% of Americans said it was “very likely” there would be more terrorism “over the next several weeks”. Another 45% said “somewhat likely”.⁴⁶ In March of that following year, 52% said that over the next several weeks, it was “very” or “somewhat” likely there would be terrorist attacks in the US - which is a sharp drop from the 85%, 5 months earlier.⁴⁷ It is clear that if the purpose of terrorism is to terrify, the terrorists had succeeded in this case.⁴⁸ The fear that had emerged within people came in many forms, such as appearing in behavioral changes relating to transportation. After the 9/11 attacks in which planes were the weapons of choice, people unsurprisingly shifted from planes to cars. This shift lasted in the US for one year and then traffic

⁴⁴ Michael H. Crowson, Teresa K. Debacker and Stephen J. Thoma, "Does Authoritarianism Predict Post-9/11 Attitudes?" *Personality and Individual Differences* 39, no. 7 (2005): 1273-283.

⁴⁵ White House Archives."Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush 2001 – 2008." Accessed April 4, 2015. http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf, 57.

⁴⁶ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 247.

⁴⁷ Gallup, “Terrorism in the United States”. National Defense. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/4909/terrorism-united-states.aspx>

⁴⁸ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 248-249.

patterns went back to normal. However during this period road fatalities soared and amounted in an estimated death toll of 1595 individuals, more than one-half of the total death tolls of 9/11 and six times higher than the total number of people on board the doomed flights.⁴⁹ These numbers seem somewhat absurd, as people do not equate the same fear to non-imminent terrorist attacks and periodic car accidents; Instead, fear blurs our judgments and clouds our perceptions of risk without taking into account low and high probabilities of incidents.

Another insight into the emotional state of the public after the attacks was a study of the emotional reactions of people both present at the attack sites and those in close proximity. “A National Survey of Stress Reactions after the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attack” assessed the immediate mental health effects of the terrorist attacks. The survey was conducted three to five days after the attacks where a representative sample of 560 U.S adults were interviewed about their reactions to the terrorist attacks and their perceptions of their children's reactions. The results showed that 44% adults reported one or more substantial symptoms of stress and 90% had one or more symptoms to at least some degree. 84% of parents reported that they or other adults in the household had talked to their children about the attacks for an hour or more whilst 34% restricted their children's television viewing. 35% of children exhibited one or more stress symptoms, and 47% were worried about their own safety or the safety of loved ones.

This research concluded that the rates of stress reactions were highest among subgroups previously found to have relatively high rates of trauma-related stress symptoms after disasters (e.g., women, nonwhites, and people with pre-existing psychological problems), they found high rates of substantial stress reactions in all subgroups. Researchers noted that people’s potential for personalizing the attacks was large, even for those who were thousands of miles away during 9/11.⁵⁰ This gives weight to the notion that in-group feelings intensified which may lead us to blurring our perceptions of the groups labelled as the out-group or enemy.

The survey noted that Americans responded to the attacks in various ways and sought out activities that provided a sense of community. Some of the respondents avoided activities that reminded them of the atrocities, such as watching television which was associated with high level of stress (especially with the repeated viewings of terrifying images such as the planes flying into the Twin Towers). Although it has been stated that avoidance interferes with the emotional processing necessary to recover fully from trauma, in such abnormal circumstances alongside the continuous media coverage of the attacks the researchers concluded that avoidance in the short term might have well been a healthier response. The study cannot conclude from the

⁴⁹ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 3.

⁵⁰ Mark A.Schuster et al., "A National Survey of Stress Reactions after the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2001.

data presented whether parental stress caused stress in children or whether children mimicked their parents' reaction to the crisis, especially prior research has presented that parents underestimate the stress that media images cause in their children. However with such early research and data, it had yet to be seen whether stress reactions in people throughout the country will diminish, especially with presence of recurrent triggers from ongoing threats and further attacks presented through media. They concluded that concerns about future attacks could heighten anxiety. Ongoing media coverage would then serve as a traumatic reminder, resulting in persistent symptoms. When individuals anticipate disaster, their fears may worsen existing symptoms and cause new ones.⁵¹

These traumatic reminders do not serve any good purpose, as reliving such attacks cannot be healthy, which is why some scholars and journalists have actually called for the removal of 9/11 from the country's collective consciousness. In his article "Let's Forget 9/11", Tom Engelhardt argues that these invocations of the attacks should not be allowed to justify inexplicable wars, the flooding of the national security state with tax money and the encroachment on liberty in order to keep the "security state afloat."⁵² He assumes a strong stance against the revitalization of the attacks but biased or not it cannot be refuted that within 24 hours of the attacks of September 11th 2001, the first newspaper had already labelled the attack site in New York as "Ground Zero". This concept had previously been used to describe areas where a nuclear explosion had occurred. Threatening and vivid images and phrases were and are still being used in the United States. Despite the United States enjoying a terrorism free year after another, concepts such as the "Age of Terror", "War on Terror", "WWIII", "The first counter-attack to WWII", "Existential struggle" are frequently being used. In the 2003 State of the Union address for example, president Bush noted that the fight against terrorism was the latest in a succession of struggles against "Hitlerism, militarism and communism."⁵³ Engelhardt may have a strong point when he stated that, "For the nightmare of 9/11, they deserve a memorial. But we don't."⁵⁴

4.4 Summary

The Bush administration and the general media continually reminded the public of the emotions it felt during and after the attacks, creating in millions of Americans a powerful, psychologically

⁵¹ Mark A. Schuster et al., "A National Survey of Stress Reactions after the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks," *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2001.

⁵² Tom Engelhardt, "Let's Forget 9/11," Al Jazeera English. September 11, 2011. Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/09/2011910125513799497.html>.

⁵³ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 261-262.

⁵⁴ Tom Engelhardt, "Let's Forget 9/11," Al Jazeera English. September 11, 2011. Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/09/2011910125513799497.html>.

firm sense that terrorism was a grave and personal threat.⁵⁵ The government failed to put risk in perspective, and the president never attempted to downplay the threat of terrorism or emphasize the fact that terrorism does not pose a significant risk to any one person. Statistical analyst Robb Willer found a consistent and positive relationship between new terror alerts and the president's approval ratings, which means that these deathly reminders of the 9/11 atrocities actually increased his support. With the 9/11 attacks always on the public mind, it is almost impossible not to relive the emotions that accompany the attacks, especially when one is constantly reminded. Just as recently as March 19, 2015, the New York City medical examiner's office identified the remains of 26-year-old Matthew Yarnell but 1,113 victims still remain unidentified.⁵⁶ Numbers that periodically resurface in uncertain times, bring desirable outcomes for some. On June 1st, 2015 three provisions of the Patriot act expire. Section 215, the Lone Wolf provision, and the Roving wiretap provision. The biggest revision will be Section 215, which gives the NSA the authority to access people's phone records. Republican James Sensenbrenner, one of the authors of the Patriot Act has stated that these NSA surveillances haven't been known to foil any terrorist plots to date.⁵⁷ Only time will accurately tell whether the Patriot Act will be renewed and whether its Machiavellianism does indeed work by scaring people and then offering to protect them.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 262.

⁵⁶ CNN, "September 11th Fast Facts," March 27, 2015. Accessed April 2, 2015.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/>

⁵⁷ "Last Week Tonight with John Oliver: Government Surveillance (HBO)," Youtube video, 18:00, posted by "Last Week Tonight with John Oliver," April 5th, 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XEVlyP4_11M

⁵⁸ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 267.

5. Madrid: 2004

5.1 Event Description

On March 11th 2004, three days before Spain's general elections and a mere two and a half years after the attacks in New York, Madrid experienced a terrifying attack referred to as 3/11. Ten explosions that went off aboard four commuter trains during the morning rush hour resulting in the deaths of 191 individuals of seventeen different nationalities and injuring around 1800 people, making it the deadliest terrorist attack in recent Spanish history. ETA, the Basque nationalist and separation organization which has been labelled as a terrorist organization by the US and the European Union, were the original suspects in the Madrid bombing case, cited by the Spanish government. ETA immediately denied any involvement and Islamic militants based in Spain, inspired by al-Qaeda were later made prime suspects of the case. Two days after the attacks, a videotape posted by a man speaking in Arabic with a Moroccan accent claimed responsibility on behalf of an al-Qaeda inspired terrorist cell. That same day, five people were arrested in connection to the attacks and less than a month later seven suspected terrorists killed themselves and a policeman when they set off an explosion in a suburb of Madrid as police attempt to enter the building.⁵⁹ As of today, no direct al-Qaeda participation has been established and twenty-nine accused individuals stood trial back in 2007. On 31 October 2007, the Audiencia Nacional of Spain delivered its verdicts. Twenty-one individuals were found guilty on charges ranging from forgery to murder. Three of which were sentenced each to more than 40,000 years in prison, aside from those three, no one received more than twenty-three years, whilst seven individuals were acquitted, which sparked public outrage.⁶⁰

5.2 Government Reaction

The first government official to make a public statement was Juan José Ibarretxe Markuartu, the Basque regional president at that time. He stressed the fact that ETA didn't represent the Basque people and accused ETA of the attacks by stating, "when ETA attacks, the Basque heart breaks into a thousand pieces."⁶¹ With these words, a subsequent ETA backlash began. During this time in Spain, a right-wing party called the People's Party had been in power for eight years and was led by José María-Aznar. This government was already quite unpopular with the Spanish public

⁵⁹ CNN, "Spain Train Bombings Fast Facts," March 11, 2015. Accessed March 22, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/04/world/europe/spain-train-bombings-fast-facts/>.

⁶⁰ Jane Barrett, "Court Finds 21 Guilty of Madrid Train Bombings," Reuters. October 31, 2007. Accessed March 12, 2015. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2007/10/31/us-spain-trial-idUSL308491320071031>.

⁶¹ BBC News, "Scores Die in Madrid Bomb Carnage," March 11, 2004. Accessed March 12, 2015. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3500452.stm>.

as it joined the United State in the “Coalition of the Willing” during the Iraq invasion.⁶² Already in the hot seat, demonstrations were held right after the attacks across the country guided by the motto “with the victims, with the constitution and for the defeat of terrorism”.⁶³ This motto was extremely criticized by the political opposition because of the reference to the constitution, as it implied that the bombs were set by the ETA. Many did however believe, that the attacks were carried out by an Islamic group in retaliation for having Spanish troops in Iraq.⁶⁴ ETA has sought independence for the Basque region since 1959 and began using violence to further their agenda in 1968. It usually claims responsibility for its actions but denied all criminality in the Madrid bombings.⁶⁵ The situation certainly had many political interpretations but the official line seemed distorted regardless because of the controversy surrounding the handling and representation of the attacks by the government. The two main Spanish political parties, the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) and the People’s Party (PP), blamed each other and accused one another of both concealing and/or distorting evidence for electoral reasons. Political analysts later commented that if ETA had in fact been guilty, it could have resulted in the strengthening of the PP’s chances of being re-elected. One of the main reasons for this assumption is the strong anti-terrorist policy upheld by the Aznar administration. On the other hand, an Islamic / al-Qaeda rooted attack would’ve been considered a direct result of Spain's involvement in Iraq, an unpopular war that had neither been approved by the Spanish Parliament nor the Spanish public.⁶⁶ Analysts also share a dominant opinion that the Aznar administration lost the general elections as a ramification of the handling and representation of the terrorist attacks, rather than because of the attacks as such.⁶⁷ Internationally world leaders condemned the attacks whereas the US and the UK stated that the need for a toughened resolve against terrorists had clearly been demonstrated. The US government created the Visible Intermodal Prevention and Response team (VIPR) program in response to these attacks and The UN Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1530 condemning the bombings.⁶⁸ The United States was unhappy with the election outcome as it had lost an ally in the War on Terror with the former assistant secretary of state for Europe and

⁶² Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 85.

⁶³ Peter Anderson and Miguel Ángel Del Arco Blanco, *Mass Killings and Violence in Spain, 1936-1952: Grappling with the past* (New York City: Routledge, 2015), 197.

⁶⁴ Agustín Echebarria-Echabe and Emilia Fernández-Guede, "Effects of Terrorism on Attitudes and Ideological Orientation," *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no.2 (2006): 264.

⁶⁵ Cottam et al., *Introduction to Political Psychology*, 279.

⁶⁶ *El País*, "El 92% De Los Españoles Se Oponen a La Guerra Contra Irak," Clarín. March 29, 2003. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edant.clarin.com/diario/2003/03/29/um/m-537495.htm>

⁶⁷ Philip H. Gordon, "Testimony: Madrid Bombings and U.S. Policy," The Brookings Institution. March 31, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2004/03/31europe-gordon>.

⁶⁸ The United Nations, "Security Council Condemns Madrid Terrorist Bombings, Urges All States to Join Search for Perpetrators. Resolution 1530 (2004) Adopted Unanimously," Press Release, UN News Center. March 11, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. <http://www.un.org/press/en/2004/sc8022.doc.htm>

Eurasian affairs, Philip Gordon stating that “the wrong policy reactions in both Washington and Madrid could end up giving the terrorists the result they wanted by undermining transatlantic cooperation not only in the war on terrorism but across a range of important issues.”⁶⁹

5.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath

The public blamed their government, and if people can blame their feelings of fear directly on a government they cannot be expected to abide by the policies of that same government.⁷⁰ Survey research indicates that despite having rejected an obvious manipulation of threat, people’s levels of prejudice, intolerance, and (to a lesser degree) conservatism did increase in the wake of the attacks.⁷¹ During the protests following the attacks, the two million people who flooded the streets of Madrid demanded to know who was behind the atrocities and criticized the lack of information provided by the government. In spite of being extremely well equipped with internal security structure, set up in the aftermath of 9/11 in order to combat terrorism, there were obvious inter-coordination problems among the police forces in Spain.⁷²

An Emotional Climate is described as primary collective emotions perceived as shared by members of social groups.⁷³ In order to measure the complex mix of emotions experienced by Spaniards after the attacks, Conejero and Etxebarria compiled three questionnaires that were administered one week, three weeks and two months after the event. According to their results, the prevailing emotions felt at a personal level were sadness, disgust, anger, and contempt. Interestingly fear was significantly lower than expected: it did reach a certain level of intensity but was not as acute as the other emotions.⁷⁴ Thus Conejero and Etxebarria reached the conclusion that this type of tragedy leaves behind a great trace of sadness in the atmosphere, which is in alignment with the findings of emotions after 9/11.

Emotions were not the only facet studied after the 3/11 attacks. Prejudiced sentiments were a focus as well. Echebarria-Echabe and Fernández-Guede’s research on the “Effects of Terrorism on Attitudes and Ideological Orientation” discovered that the 3/11 attacks, perpetrated by Islamic

⁶⁹ Gordon, *Testimony: Madrid Bombings and U.S. Policy*.

⁷⁰ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 84-85.

⁷¹ Þórisdóttir, *The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness*, 86-87.

⁷² Blanca Cia, “Maragall Llama a Salir a La Calle,” *El País*, March 12, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. http://elpais.com/diario/2004/03/12/catalunya/1079057238_850215.html.

⁷³ Dirk Hermans et al., *Emotional Climate: How Is It Shaped, Fostered, and Changed?* (East Sussex: Psychology Press, 2013), 113.

⁷⁴ Susana Conejero and Itziar Etxebarria, “The Impact of the Madrid Bombing on Personal Emotions, Emotional Atmosphere and Emotional Climate,” *Journal of Social Issues* 63, no. 2 (2007): 273 & 277.

terrorists, increased anti-Arab prejudice, anti-Semitism, authoritarianism, and to a lesser extent political conservatism.⁷⁵

5.4 Summary

Despite blameworthy governmental practices, counter-terrorism services and the National Anti-terrorism Coordination Center (CNCA) have been strengthened which serve to assess terrorist risks and threats to Spain and provide strategic intelligence for dealing with such risks and threats in a more effective manner. However, Spain and its people have been scarred by sadness and disappointment just as the U.S.A was and yet did not succumb to being targets of a successful fear manipulation. Conservatism, authoritarianism and distrustful behavior towards out-groups are some of the unfortunate aftermaths of the 3/11 tragedy, but Madrid is an example of how using fear as a political tool can backfire despite the presence of the emotion, cognitive confusion and anxiety. Society seemed to have bounced back to normal within two months after the train bombings; thus, the public triumphed, not fear.

⁷⁵ Agustin Echebarria-Echabe and Emilia Fernández-Guede, "Effects of Terrorism on Attitudes and Ideological Orientation," *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no. 2 (2006): 259.

6. London: 2005

6.1 Event Description

On July 7th 2005, London experienced their deadliest bombings since World War II. A total of four bombs went off that morning in a coordinated suicide attack, targeting civilians on their daily commute on the busy public transportation system. Fifty-two individuals were killed and more than 700 injured. The timing of the attacks coincided with London's bid to host the 2012 Olympic games (announced the day before) and the G8 summit in Scotland (which was to be held around that time). Three of the perpetrators were British-born nationals of Pakistani immigrants while the fourth bomber was a convert born in Jamaica and raised in the United Kingdom. The attacks, later termed as the 7/7 bombings, were committed by these four individuals who had never been on the authority's radar until they carried out their attacks. Security across the UK was increased to the highest alert level and suspicious packages were destroyed in controlled explosions to insure safety.⁷⁶ Al-Qaeda later expressed its' involvement in a video-entry broadcasted by Al Jazeera on September 1st, 2005. Two of the four bombers appeared on tape and future al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri was edited in to express the terrorists' message:

Your democratically-elected governments continuously perpetrate atrocities against my people all over the world. And your support of them makes you directly responsible, just as I am directly responsible for protecting and avenging my Muslim brothers and sisters. What you have witnessed now is only the beginning of a string of attacks that will continue and become stronger until you pull your forces out of Afghanistan and Iraq. And until you stop your financial and military support to America and Israel.⁷⁷

Despite these threats and a perceived partnership between the two groups, the bombers did not have direct assistance from al-Qaeda, and time has shown that these threats were of an idle nature. Al-Qaeda has not carried out a direct terrorist attack since, although other terrorist cells internationally have claimed to receive the infamous group's support.

6.2 Government Reaction

Shadow Home Secretary David Davis stated, "it is becoming more and more clear that the story presented to the public and Parliament is at odds with the facts."⁷⁸ This insinuates that the official line given to the public was possibly not as straightforward as one might think. In 2006, the

⁷⁶ CNN, "July 7 2005 London Bombings Fast Facts," July 4, 2014. Accessed March 25, 2015.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/06/world/europe/july-7-2005-london-bombings-fast-facts/>

⁷⁷ Mark Townsend, "Leak Reveals Official Story of London Bombings," The Guardian. April 9, 2006. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/apr/09/july7.uksecurity>.

⁷⁸ Vikram Dodd, Ian Cobain and Helen Carter, "7/7 Leader: More Evidence Reveals What Police Knew," 7/7 Leader: More Evidence Reveals What Police Knew. May 3, 2007. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/may/03/july7.topstories3>.

government had refused to undertake a public inquiry as they considered it to be a foolish diversion. Tony Blair, the Prime Minister at that time was skeptical of the inquiry as well because he believed that such a report would ultimately undermine support for the M15. In contrast, David Cameron (then leader of the opposition) disagreed by claiming that a full inquiry into the attacks would serve to get to the truth.⁷⁹ A complete independent public inquest into the attacks eventually commenced in October 2010. The Coroner Lady Justice Hallett, who was in charge of hearing the inquest, was commissioned to examine how each victim died and whether MI5, if it had worked better, could have prevented the attacks.⁸⁰ After examining the evidence at hand and after deliberation and seven months on, a verdict was reached. It was ruled, that “the 52 victims had been unlawfully killed; their deaths could not have been prevented, and they would probably have died whatever time the emergency services reached and rescued them.”⁸¹ With already strong security measures in place after the domino-affected scars of 9/11, one can say in light of the report’s findings that the government could not be held accountable for these unlawful attacks. There were however, establishments that did attempt to utilize whatever fear was present following the 7/7 bombings. The British National Party distributed leaflets less than a week after the attacks that showed images of the 'No. 30 bus' after it was destroyed by one of the bombs placed by the assailants. The slogan which accompanied the picture read, “maybe now it's time to start listening to the BNP”.⁸² This unfortunate tactic was quickly condemned by the public and politicians where Home Secretary Charles Clarke described it as an attempt by the BNP to “cynically exploit the current tragic events in London to further their spread of hatred”.⁸³ Governmental criticism was not only coming from within its own but from international sources as well. Some newspaper editorials in Iran had written about whether these bombings on British or American authorities (referring also to 9/11) would be a ploy to justify the War on Terror and thus claimed in their articles that this plan so to speak, would also involve increasing harassments of Muslims in Europe.⁸⁴ These articles bear with them elements of conspiracy and thus cannot be taken too seriously but some truth does lie within them, as the harassment of Muslims in Europe did fluctuate. The British handlings of the attacks can be summed up with the words of Tony

⁷⁹ Same reference.

⁸⁰ Dominic Casciani, "7/7 Bombs Acts of 'merciless Savagery', Inquests Told," BBC News. October 10, 2010. Accessed April 16, 2015. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-11511461>.

⁸¹ Heather Hallett, *Coroner's Inquest into the London Bombings of 7 July 2005* (London: Judicial Communications Office, 2011) <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120216072438/http://7julyinquests.independent.gov.uk/docs/orders/rule43-report.pdf> Accessed March 16, 2015.

⁸² BBC News, “BNP Campaign Uses Bus Bomb Photo,” July 12, 2005. Accessed March 16, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4674675.stm.

⁸³ Same reference.

⁸⁴ Frances Harrison, "Iran Press Blames West for Blast," BBC News. July 11, 2005. Accessed March 16, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4672037.stm.

Blair, “they are trying to use the slaughter of innocent people to cow us, to frighten us out of doing our business as normal, as we are entitled to do. They should not and must not succeed.”⁸⁵

Yet these attacks did alter certain elements of legislation in the country. There was a prior anti-terrorism bill in place in the wake of 9/11 just as many other countries had implemented in response to those attacks. The legislation created after the 7/7 bombings was called “The Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001” and it rushed through Parliament, just as the Patriot Act was in its time. The act allowed individuals to be brought into detention without trial. The legislation was open to legal challenge as it only applied to foreign nationals at the time it was written. In December 2004 it was ruled that such an indefinite detention of foreign nationals as permitted in Guantanamo Bay was in fact discriminatory. In response to this, Home Secretary Charles Clarke pushed the “Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005” which was the fourth counter-terrorist measure in five years; it expanded the definition of terrorism, created new terrorist offences, and introduced control orders legislation (the monitoring of individuals with house arrest and electronic tagging in order to replace detention without trial). Now Muslims who are British were targets of these new laws as well as Muslims who are foreign nationals, showing a possible fear of Muslims was being ignited with the passing of each law.⁸⁶ Finally, the “Terrorism Act 2006” created a series of new terrorist offences which included the encouragement of terrorism, dissemination of terrorist publications, preparation of terrorist acts, terrorist training and offences concerning the making, possession and use of radioactive material and devices.⁸⁷ This act was unique among the others as it proposed a controversial ninety-day pre-charge detention period of terrorist suspects, which was later reduced to twenty-eight days after public protests.⁸⁸

6.3 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath

There were public protests against the undemocratic detention of suspects, insinuating that in-group and out-group perception had not been heightened after 7/7. However, the relationship between Muslims and non-Muslims in Britain did change. As A. Sivanandan the political activist wrote in his journal article “Race, Terror and Civil Society”, there were increasing threats to civil liberties and an increase in alienation felt by many young Muslims in the wake of the London bombings. He notes that persecution of asylum seekers or a sort of war on asylum pre-dates 9/11, but pressure increased alongside the War on Terror after both 9/11 and the 7/7 attacks. A

⁸⁵ BBC News, "In Full: Blair on Bomb Blasts," July 7, 2005. Accessed March 20, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4659953.stm.

⁸⁶ A. Sivanandan, "Race, Terror and Civil Society," *Race & Class* 47, no. 3 (2006): 5.

⁸⁷ *Terrorism Act 2006*, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/contents>

⁸⁸ Tom Keatinge, “Counter-terrorist Regulation Restricts Charity Banking Worldwide...” - *Uncharitable Behaviour*, London: Demos, 2014. 34.

byproduct of racism, which cannot distinguish a settler from an immigrant, an immigrant from an asylum seeker, an asylum seeker from a Muslim, or a Muslim from a terrorist, he argues that “We are, all of us Blacks and Asians, at first sight, terrorists or illegals. We wear our passports on our faces or, lacking them, we are faceless.”⁸⁹ With legislation permitting the detention of nationals, the public’s in-group perceptions inevitably blur and cannot detect who is a part of the out-group. In the case of the four bombers responsible for the 7/7 bombings, it cannot be argued that these individuals were solely radical Islamist fueled by extreme ideological incentives. The four were well integrated into British society but despite having living a standard English lifestyle, they were prepared to take their lives and the lives of their fellow citizens in the name of Islam.⁹⁰

Despite these both evident and subtle persecutions of mostly Muslims, Londoners seem to have created a greater sense of unity (judging by public statements and the public responses in the forms of demonstrations). Londoners were extremely upset, as anybody would be following the attacks. There were continuous and uninterrupted news coverage of the attacks; in fact, it was the longest uninterrupted on-air broadcast in channel ITV1’s 50-year history.⁹¹ It can be suggested that the public’s perceptions of fear weren’t elevated but rather downplayed by the government. Tony Blair was known to have de-escalated the situation by not adding fuel to the flames of fear. He did not employ warfare terminology and rather communicated facts of the crime scene in a calm fashion and relayed United Kingdom’s quiet determination to defend its values and way of life.⁹² Ken Livingstone, the mayor of London expressed similar thoughts by pointing out that the aim of these terrorists was to turn Londoners against each other but he asserted that the city would not be divided by the tragedy. Standing by his words, he stated he would take the subway to work as he always did.⁹³ Sir Ken MacDonal, another prominent figure, downplayed the threat by proclaiming that, “terrorists aim to portray themselves as a greater threat than they are and tempt us to abandon our values. We must protect ourselves from these atrocious crimes without abandoning our traditions of freedom.”⁹⁴

⁸⁹ A. Sivanandan, "Race, Terror and Civil Society," *Race & Class* 47, no. 3 (2006): 2.

⁹⁰ Same reference, 4.

⁹¹ Anthony Wells, “NOP Poll of British Muslim,” UK Polling Report. August 8, 2006. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://ukpollingreport.co.uk/blog/archives/291>

⁹² Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 284.

⁹³ Same reference, 285.

⁹⁴ Same reference, 285.

6.5 Summary

Rubin et al. conducted a survey bombings in order to document reactions to the attacks and assess the medium-term effects on the general population in London to identify risk factors for persistent effects. The researchers contacted 1010 Londoners eleven to thirteen days after the attacks to assess stress levels, perceived threats and travel intentions. They contacted 574 respondents again seven months later and asked similar questions that concerned altered perceptions of self and the world.⁹⁵ A longer-term impact of terrorism on the perceptions and behavior of Londoners was recorded. The results were unsurprising as they are in tune with the aftermaths of Madrid and New York. For example, a more negative world-view was common, in line with aforementioned research in earlier chapters where scholars had also found that when describing a worsening condition, it actually increases the scores on authoritarianism. Correlating with this is the notion of seeing the world as a dangerous and threatening place. Without the authoritarianism data on the London bombings, we can cautiously assume that people became more conservative in the aftermaths of the attacks, but authoritarian feelings would soon decline as seen with Madrid, at least according to the public's stress levels. As the case was in this report, there seems to be a growing recognition that traumatic events can also have positive effects for some people: nearly 80% of participants who reported changes in self-perception in this study reported that these changes were at least partially positive. Moreover, 45% of those who said they now saw the world differently saw it at least somewhat more positively than before.⁹⁶ Other than the degree of exposure to the bombings, there were no consistent predictors of which people with short-term reactions would develop persistent reactions. Thus increased stress levels, decreased feelings of security and safety, heightened perceptions of threat and risks and behavioral changes have all been noted in communities following terrorist attacks.

Of course emotional reactions to terrorist incidents vary. Some people may develop recognized psychiatric disorders such as depression or posttraumatic stress disorder. Others who do not necessarily meet the criteria of a formal psychiatric diagnosis may still report higher levels of general anxiety or stress related symptoms. However it was notable in the findings that the attacks had inflicted disproportionately high levels of distress among non-white and Muslim Londoners. Many commentators believed that the attacks would actually lead to a reduced emotional impact on Londoners because of the city's history of dealing with IRA terrorism and the Blitz. It is also noted that British politicians and security officials have been known to warn

⁹⁵ Rubin et al., "Enduring Consequences Of Terrorism: 7-month Follow-up Survey Of Reactions To The Bombings In London On 7 July 2005," *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 190, no. 4 (2007): 350.

⁹⁶ Rubin et al., "Enduring Consequences Of Terrorism: 7-month Follow-up Survey Of Reactions To The Bombings In London On 7 July 2005," *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 190, no. 4 (2007): 354.

that acts of terrorism in London were probable, if not inevitable, without inciting great fear. The threats were downplayed in order to contain panic as British preparations for terrorism have extended to sending a leaflet to every household in the country in August 2004, which provided advice on what to do in the event of a major incident. Seemingly, the people of London were quite prepared, learning from previous incidents in New York City and Madrid for example. But it still remains to be concretely seen whether these experiences and preparations served to minimize the short-term psychological effects of the recent attacks.⁹⁷

As we've seen after such traumatic events, the use of fear was not very apparent (excluding the conspicuous attempts made by the BNP party to incite terror in order for people to vote for them). There were some controversial opinions stated, such as not wanting a full public inquiry report, in order to spare the M15 from undermining but an inquiry was eventually conducted and nothing was presented as askew. The long-term consequences presented indicate that stress and threat factors went back to normal levels in a rather quick fashion. There are still questions open whether in-group and out-group behaviors have heightened since the attacks, as one retort is that the public demanded that the "Terrorist Act 2006" detentions be reduced, citing it as undemocratic and unlawful. However by the same token, the relations between Muslims and non-Muslims seem to have become more strained. No vindictive, prejudiced attacks can be noted in the aftermath of the 7/7 bombings, giving weight to a less of an inter-group division whereas an almost contrasting representation happened in the wake of the Parisian terrorist attacks in 2015, which will be discussed later.

⁹⁷ Same reference, 356.

7. Later Attacks

7.1 Oslo: 2011

On July 22, 2011, Norway witnessed its own deadliest attack since World War II. A total of seventy-seven people lost their lives, most of them adolescents from a Workers' Youth League (AUF), whilst another 319 individuals were injured. Two attacks were carried out by a lone terrorist, Anders Behring Breivik, against the government of Norway in a car bomb explosion in Oslo and a series of shootings on the island of Utøya.⁹⁸ One survey claimed that one in four Norwegians knew someone who had been affected by the attacks, which gives insight into the effects of terrorism on small states.⁹⁹ On August 13th, 2012 Norway's prime minister was handed the Gjørv Report, which concluded that Norway's police force could have prevented the bombing in downtown Oslo which consequently could have lead to the swift capture of the gunman at Utøya. Norwegian officials thus called for increased security and emergency measures to prevent further attacks and that "mitigate adverse effects" should have been implemented on July 22.¹⁰⁰ On August 24th, 2012 Breivik was convicted, charged and sentenced to the maximum sentence of twenty-one years in prison, which can be repeatedly extended by five years as long as he is considered a threat to society.¹⁰¹

Breivik is no different from other terrorists that aim to hurt but not destroy, as he wanted to send a message to the public. Analysts have described Anders Breivik as holding extreme Islamophobic views. In his 1,500 page manifesto, called "2083: A European Declaration of Independence" he is openly critical of Muslim immigration and European liberalism.¹⁰² Two psychiatric experts appointed by the court pronounced Breivik sane at the time of the crimes. Breivik does not consider himself to be religious but rather identifies himself as a "cultural Christian" and stated that he does not necessarily need to have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and God. He nonetheless stressed the fact that he shares the same identity and goals with religious Christians, thus I argue that he identifies with that group as his in-group whereas he perceives Muslims as a threatening out-group.¹⁰³

⁹⁸ CNN, "Norway Terror Attacks Fast Facts," August 1, 2014. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/26/world/europe/norway-terror-attacks/>.

⁹⁹ Klassekampen, "1 Av 4 Kjenner Rammede," August 18, 2011. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.klassekampen.no/59186/article/item/null/-av--kjenner-rammede>.

¹⁰⁰ BBC News, "Norway Police 'could Have Stopped Breivik Sooner,'" August 13, 2012. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19241327>.

¹⁰¹ CNN, "Norway Terror Attacks Fast Facts," August 1, 2014. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/26/world/europe/norway-terror-attacks/>.

¹⁰² Birthe Steen Hansen, "Forsvareren: – I Hans Hode Var Det Nødvendig," TV 2. July 23, 2011. Accessed April 15, 2015. <http://www.tv2.no/a/3545122>.

¹⁰³ IBTimes Staff Reporter, "Anders Breivik Manifesto: Shooter/Bomber Downplayed Religion, Secular Influence Key," International Business Times. July 25, 2011. Accessed March 20, 2015. <http://www.ibtimes.com/anders-breivik-manifesto-shooterbomber-downplayed-religion-secular-influence-key-817273>.

7.2 Public Reaction and Immediate Aftermath

Stine Renate Håheim, a Norwegian politician that managed to escape from Utøya summed up the importance of dealing with terrorism in a non fearful and non hateful way: “If one man can show so much hate, think how much love we could show, standing together.”¹⁰⁴ This statement genuinely reflects how Norwegians handled the tragic aftermaths of these attacks. Norway, a country that greatly prides itself on its liberal values vowed to respond with, “more openness, more democracy and more humanity”.¹⁰⁵ I argue that Norway responded exactly how they promised they would by valuing and respecting Breivik’s human rights despite his own display of inhumanity and ruthlessness. Norway has significantly strict gun control laws, and there has been some debate about possible legislation changes in Norway’s legislature. The national penal system suffered brief scrutiny but the debate waned and no noteworthy legislation changes were made.¹⁰⁶ The Norwegian political infrastructure did however change; with polls indicating that the Norwegians’ faith in democracy had grown in the year following the attacks.¹⁰⁷ Although the people voted their liberal Labor Party out of office within two years after the attacks, the party had been in office for two consecutive terms, which is considered a rare feat in Norwegian politics. Thus the likelihood of winning the elections for the third time were slim and cannot be attributed only to the impact of the attacks.¹⁰⁸

Breivik sought to plunge the country into chaos but instead brought Norwegians closer together as a community. After the attacks, millions of people took to the streets, to take part in demonstrations against xenophobia, violence and racism. The media’s coverage on Islam has become less polarized as well since the attacks.¹⁰⁹ The case of Norway demonstrates that its people were determined not to live in fear and that strong Western societies are not immune to radical out-grouped perpetrators.

¹⁰⁴ VG, “Kjærlighetsbudskapet Sprer Seg I Alle Kanaler,” July 24, 2011. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/terrorangrepet-22-juli-politikk-og-samfunn/kjaerlighetsbudskapet-sprer-seg-i-alle-kanaler/a/10080708/>.

¹⁰⁵ Diana Magney, "Norwegians Value Respecting Killer's Human Rights," CNN. April 17, 2012. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/04/17/world/europe/norway-breivik-court-magnay/>.

¹⁰⁶ Daniel Tovrov, "One Year After Breivik: Norway Refuses To Live In Fear," International Business Times. July 23, 2012. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.ibtimes.com/one-year-after-breivik-norway-refuses-live-fear-729867>

¹⁰⁷ Anna Reimann, "Paradise Lost: Did The Breivik Massacre Change Norwegian Politics?" SPIEGEL ONLINE. July 20, 2012. Accessed March 17, 2015. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/norway-after-breivik-populists-gain-lost-ground-a-845586.html>.

¹⁰⁸ Richard Malmo, "Norway Poised to Reject Labour Party Just Two Years after Utoya Massacre," The Telegraph. September 8, 2013. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/10294628/Norway-poised-to-reject-Labour-party-just-two-years-after-Utoya-massacre.html>.

¹⁰⁹ Aage Borchgrevink, "Has Norway Reclaimed Utoya?" Al Jazeera English. July 22, 2014. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2014/07/utoya-massacre-201472195635499950.html>.

7.3 Paris: 2015

On January 7, 2015, two brothers native to France and of Algerian descent, Saïd and Chérif Kouachi, stormed into the offices of Charlie Hebdo, a French satirical newspaper in Paris. Their attack was retaliation for controversial cartoons of Prophet Mohammed, originally printed in the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten in 2006 and reprinted later by Charlie Hebdo. They killed eleven people, injured another eleven in the office building, and killed a French National Police officer on the street outside the office. The brothers identified themselves as members of the Islamist Terrorist group of Al-Qaeda's branch in Yemen, who subsequently took responsibility for the attack. A third gunman, French born native of Malian descent Amedy Coulibaly, orchestrated and carried out three separate shootings during a three day stint. He claimed to have synchronized his attacks with the Kouachi brothers. Five others were killed in his attacks and eleven wounded. Before he was killed by police, Coulibaly told CNN affiliate BFMTV by phone that he belonged to ISIS, the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. On January 9th, the brothers were killed in a police launched assault and police shortly afterwards overtook the kosher grocery store and killed Coulibaly whilst rescuing fifteen hostages in the process.

7.4 Public Reactions and Immediate Aftermath

After the atrocities, Charlie Hebdo released a new edition of its magazine which featured a cartoon of the Prophet Mohammed on its cover holding a sign that said "Je suis Charlie" (e. I am Charlie), a slogan which became the motto of support at rallies and in social media. Two million people, including forty world leaders came together in Paris in a rally of national unity and 3.7 million people joined across France. The movement went global and the Charlie Hebdo issue mentioned above printed roughly 8 million copies in six languages, in contrast to its usual 60,000 prints only available in French.¹¹⁰

This thesis lacks the scope and information to cover the aftermath of the Charlie Hebdo attacks in depth, and we do not yet know the long-term implications. What we can note differently in this most recent terrorist attack that has not been highlighted in the other case studies presented in this thesis, are the dozens anti-Muslim incidents of “revenge” that were reported in France.¹¹¹ These incidents included reports of shootings and grenade throwing at mosques and other Islamic centers as well as multiple cases of threats. This has been a unique reaction among the attacks listed, despite increased out-group hostility and heightened fear and

¹¹⁰ CNN, "Norway Terror Attacks Fast Facts," August 1, 2014. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/26/world/europe/norway-terror-attacks/>.

¹¹¹ Antonia Blumberg, "Mosques Attacked In Wake Of Charlie Hebdo Shooting," The Huffington Post. January 8, 2015. Accessed March 20, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/01/08/mosque-attacks-charlie-hebdo_n_6436224.html.

anxiety, people's sentiments have changed after terrorist attacks but risk perceptions and emotions of fear haven't escalated to such violence as seen with the case of Paris. With the global community coming together like never before in support of the French public, retaliation seems to be counter effective as it merely feeds into the extremists' agenda. It remains to be seen how the French government will play on public fears in the future, but as in the U.K., the large Muslim population may serve to restrict official xenophobia or targeted policing.

8. Synthesis

Only a tentative conclusion can be put forth in this thesis as a consequence of there being a variation in the ways that fear has been used as a political tool in response to terrorism. As we examine terrorist attacks in the West from 9/11 to Charlie Hebdo, it is clear that both the nature of terrorism and governments' responses to it have changed. Fear was a viable political tool for the U.S. government in the aftermath of 9/11 as a tangible enemy, Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda existed; thus a specific target offered an outlet for the government to channel voters' emotions. Operating under an expanded definition of Sederburg's war model, the Bush administration played on existing authoritarianism and heightened in-group feelings, expanding its political power and remaining in office for two terms.

The cases of Madrid and London indicate how fear manifested itself in the immediate aftermaths of each attack, but that in the longer term, governments did not exploit fear to enlarge their powers following the model of the Bush administration. It may be the result, especially in London, of enhanced security powers already existing in the aftermath of 9/11, but it seems fairly clear that neither Spain nor the U.K. have created security states along the U.S. model.

The case of Breivik, the long gunman, from a country that has often been cited as one of the best OECD countries in the world, from a very close-knit society could commit such barbaric acts of terror just goes to show that terrorists come in all shapes and sizes, from any nationality. Thus a "War on Terror" with certain targeted out-groups seems preposterous as no one can be definitely cited as a possible terrorist until a crime has been committed, sort of like the criminal analogy demonstrates. The fear people feel cannot be directed at a certain group, just as the case of Norway clearly highlights. The case of Norway underscores the fact that terrorists don't all have a religious (Islamist) dogma guiding them, they do not all come the same hemisphere, they might as well be a member of our in-group without realizing it.

Decades of substantial research on how people react to terror and behave in emergencies have consistently found that panic is actually quite rare. Even when faced with scary hypothetical situations that people consider to be a worst case probable scenario, people tend to organize themselves in order to provide a helping hand and

salvation to their in-groups, and even to complete strangers.¹¹² 9/11 was a dramatic deviation from what terrorism usually entails.¹¹³ After 9/11, Western countries' security programs have been upgraded and are extremely efficient. Thus the Paris shooting had reverberations throughout the West, even to New York City where all security precautions were taken. However in light of the anti-Muslim retaliations in Paris, it seems that populations are no longer sure who to blame for instances of violent terrorism. Anders Breivik truly exemplifies this paradox, as he has not been portrayed as the poster boy for all Christians and thus did not lead to any retaliation towards Christians. As often mentioned, terrorism has evolved into a mostly leaderless network, where it has become increasingly difficult to pinpoint individuals responsible for attacks. Now we seem to be facing fears of a transnational, leaderless resistance but that should not increase fear or anxiety. As Sophocles once said, "to him who is in fear everything rustles," thus what can really be gained by fearing an unknown, constantly?

With the insights of 9/11 and how the events paved the way for future terrorism policies world-wide, alongside the failures and successes of the manipulations of fear in the 3/11 and 7/7 attacks and with multi-faceted perpetrators as demonstrated with France and Norway. Fear can no longer be treated as a political tool in light of terrorist attacks, as all individuals who pertain to out-groups cannot logically be considered an enemy. Without a tangible enemy or a scapegoat, people cannot be persuaded to rally behind their authority figures if in-group notions fail to strengthen the opposition towards an enemy. Regardless of the effects R.W.A may have on certain groups and individuals, when dealing with a leaderless terrorist movement, fear may not be as effective in its current form. Thus fear should still be the only thing we have to fear, echoing Roosevelt. Nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror will solely paralyze us, as there is no gain in fearing an unknown that we have no control over. In this case, leaderless terrorist groups that still bear low probabilities of attacking, despite high consequences is not a reason to be living in constant fear of what might be, what hypothetical situations could evolve into probable scenarios because fear doesn't have to become anything more than a state of mind. It will be interesting to see what time will tell, as to where the factor of fear can be placed and consequently be used as a tool of manipulation. How this uncertainty will shape global policies to come is of particular interests as states now face the dilemma of

¹¹² Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 259.

¹¹³ Gardner, *The Science of Fear*, 260.

tackling terrorism as a tool accessible to any individual with an extremist ideology in need of exposure.

Bibliography

- "Scores Die in Madrid Bomb Carnage." BBC News. March 11, 2004. Accessed March 12, 2015. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/3500452.stm>.
- "Last Week Tonight with John Oliver: Government Surveillance (HBO)." Youtube video, 18:00. Posted by "Last Week Tonight with John Oliver," April 5th, 2015. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XEVlyP4_11M.
- "Sophocles Quotes". BrainyQuote. Accessed March 14, 2015. <http://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/authors/s/sophocles.html>
- Anderson, Peter, and Miguel Ángel Del Arco Blanco, eds. *Mass Killings and Violence in Spain, 1936-1952: Grappling with the past*. New York City, NY: Routledge, 2015. 197.
- Barrett, Jane. "Court Finds 21 Guilty of Madrid Train Bombings." Reuters. October 31, 2007. Accessed March 12, 2015. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2007/10/31/us-spain-trial-idUSL308491320071031>.
- BBC News. "BNP Campaign Uses Bus Bomb Photo." July 12, 2005. Accessed March 16, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4674675.stm.
- BBC News. "In Full: Blair on Bomb Blasts." July 7, 2005. Accessed March 20, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4659953.stm.
- BBC News. "Norway Police 'could Have Stopped Breivik Sooner.'" August 13, 2012. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-19241327>.
- BBC News. "The 9/11 Terrorist Attacks." Accessed April 4, 2015. http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/events/the_september_11th_terrorist_attacks.
- Blumberg, Antonia. "Mosques Attacked In Wake Of Charlie Hebdo Shooting." The Huffington Post. January 8, 2015. Accessed March 20, 2015. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/01/08/mosque-attacks-charlie-hebdo_n_6436224.html.
- Borchgrevink, Aage. "Has Norway Reclaimed Utoya?" Al Jazeera English. July 22, 2014. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2014/07/utoya-massacre-201472195635499950.html>.
- Casciani, Dominic. "7/7 Bombs Acts of 'merciless Savagery', Inquests Told." BBC News. October 10, 2010. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-11511461>.
- Cia, Blanca. "Maragall Llama a Salir a La Calle." *El País*. March 12, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. http://elpais.com/diario/2004/03/12/catalunya/1079057238_850215.html.
- CNN. "Norway Terror Attacks Fast Facts." August 1, 2014. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/26/world/europe/norway-terror-attacks/>.
- CNN. "2015 Paris Terror Attacks Fast Facts." January 21, 2015. Accessed March 18, 2015.
- CNN. "July 7 2005 London Bombings Fast Facts." July 4, 2014. Accessed March 25, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/06/world/europe/july-7-2005-london-bombings-fast-facts/>
- CNN. "September 11th Fast Facts." March 27, 2015. Accessed April 2, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/07/27/us/september-11-anniversary-fast-facts/>
- CNN. "Spain Train Bombings Fast Facts." March 11, 2015. Accessed March 22, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2013/11/04/world/europe/spain-train-bombings-fast-facts/>.
- Collins, Alan, Brenda Lutz, and James Lutz. "Terrorism." In *Contemporary Security Studies*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 273-286.
- Conejero, Susana, and Itziar Etxebarria. "The Impact of the Madrid Bombing on Personal Emotions, Emotional Atmosphere and Emotional Climate." *Journal of Social Issues* 63, no. 2 (2007): 273-87.
- Cottam, Martha L., Beth Dietz-Uhler, Elena Mastors, and Thomas Preston. *Introduction to Political Psychology*. 2nd ed. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2010. 22-333.
- Crenshaw, Martha. "The Psychology Of Terrorism: An Agenda For The 21st Century." *Political Psychology* 21, no. 2 (2000): 405-20.
- Crowson, H. Michael, Teresa K. Debacker, and Stephen J. Thoma. "Does Authoritarianism Predict Post-9/11 Attitudes?" *Personality and Individual Differences* 39, no. 7 (2005): 1273-283.

- Dodd, Vikram, Ian Cobain, and Helen Carter. "7/7 Leader: More Evidence Reveals What Police Knew." *7/7 Leader: More Evidence Reveals What Police Knew*. May 3, 2007. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2007/may/03/july7.topstories3>.
- Echebarria-Echabe, Agustin, and Emilia Fernández-Guede. "Effects of Terrorism on Attitudes and Ideological Orientation." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36, no. 2 (2006): 259-265.
- El País*. "El 92% De Los Españoles Se Oponen a La Guerra Contra Irak." *Clarín*. March 29, 2003. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://edant.clarin.com/diario/2003/03/29/um/m-537495.htm>.
- Engelhardt, Tom. "Let's Forget 9/11." *Al Jazeera English*. September 11, 2011. Accessed March 5, 2015. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/09/2011910125513799497.html>.
- Gallup. "Presidential Approval Ratings - George W. Bush." *Presidential Approval Ratings*. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx>.
- Gallup. "Terrorism in the United States". *National Defense*. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/4909/terrorism-united-states.aspx>
- Gardner, Dan. *The Science of Fear: How the Culture of Fear Manipulates Your Brain*. New York City, NY: Plume, 2009. 6-272.
- Gordon, Philip H. "Testimony: Madrid Bombings and U.S. Policy." *The Brookings Institution*. March 31, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2004/03/31europe-gordon>.
- Hallett, Heather. *Coroner's Inquest into the London Bombings of 7 July 2005*. London: Judicial Communications Office, 2011. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120216072438/http://7julyinquests.independent.gov.uk/docs/orders/rule43-report.pdf> Accessed March 16, 2015.
- Hansen, Birthe Steen. "Forsvareren: – I Hans Hode Var Det Nødvendig." *TV 2*. July 23, 2011. Accessed April 15, 2015. <http://www.tv2.no/a/3545122>.
- Harrison, Frances. "Iran Press Blames West for Blast." *BBC News*. July 11, 2005. Accessed March 16, 2015. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4672037.stm.
- Hermans, Dirk, Dario Páez, Agustin Espinosa, Magdalena Bobowik, and Batja Mesquita. "Emotional Climate: How Is It Shaped, Fostered, and Changed?" In *Changing Emotions*, edited by Bernard Rimé. East Sussex: Psychology Press, 2013. 113-119. <http://edition.cnn.com/2015/01/21/europe/2015-paris-terror-attacks-fast-facts/>
- Hulda Þórisdóttir. "The Effects of Perceived Threat on Political Attitudes: Uncertainty, Lack of Control, and Closed-Mindedness." Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 2008. 13-87.
- IBTimes Staff Reporter. "Anders Breivik Manifesto: Shooter/Bomber Downplayed Religion, Secular Influence Key." *International Business Times*. July 25, 2011. Accessed March 20, 2015. <http://www.ibtimes.com/anders-breivik-manifesto-shooterbomber-downplayed-religion-secular-influence-key-817273>.
- Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies. "Swearing-In Ceremony for President Franklin D. Roosevelt." *Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933*. Accessed March 3, 2015. <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/swearing-in/event/franklin-d-roosevelt-1933>.
- Keatinge, Tom. "Counter-terrorist Regulation Restricts Charity Banking Worldwide..." - *Uncharitable Behaviour*. London: Demos, 2014.
- Klassekampen. "1 Av 4 Kjenner Rammede." August 18, 2011. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.klassekampen.no/59186/article/item/null/-av--kjenner-rammede>.
- Kluger, Jeffrey. "Charting the Emotions of 9/11 — Minute by Minute." *Time*. September 3, 2010. Accessed April 5, 2015. <http://content.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2015528,00.html>.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, and W. K. Marriott. *The Prince*. Waiheke Island: Floating Press, 2008. 60.
- Magney Diana. "Norwegians Value Respecting Killer's Human Rights." *CNN*. April 17, 2012. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/04/17/world/europe/norway-breivik-court-magnay/>.
- Malmö, Richard. "Norway Poised to Reject Labour Party Just Two Years after Utøya Massacre." *The Telegraph*. September 8, 2013. Accessed March 16, 2015.

- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/10294628/Norway-poised-to-reject-Labour-party-just-two-years-after-Utoya-massacre.html>.
- Merriam Webster. "Anxiety." <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/anxiety> Accessed March 12, 2015.
- Pomeroy, Ross. "Driving Is Much Deadlier Than Terrorism—Why Isn't It Scariest." Pacific Standard. April 16, 2013. Accessed March 10, 2015. <http://www.psmag.com/books-and-culture/driving-terrorism-deadly-dangerous-availability-heuristic-55361>.
- Anna Reimann, "Paradise Lost: Did The Breivik Massacre Change Norwegian Politics?" SPIEGEL ONLINE. July 20, 2012. Accessed March 17, 2015. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/norway-after-breivik-populists-gain-lost-ground-a-845586.html>.
- Rouse, Margaret. "What Is Pager? - Definition from WhatIs.com." SearchMobileComputing. Accessed April 7, 2015. <http://searchmobilecomputing.techtarget.com/definition/pager>.
- Rubin, G. J., C. R. Brewin, N. Greenberg, J. H. Hughes, J. Simpson, and S. Wessely. "Enduring Consequences Of Terrorism: 7-month Follow-up Survey Of Reactions To The Bombings In London On 7 July 2005." *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 190, no. 4 (2007): 350-56.
- Schuster, Mark A., Bradley D. Stein, Lisa H. Jaycox, Rebecca L. Collins, Grant N. Marshall, Marc N. Elliott, Annie J. Zhou, David E. Kanouse, Janina L. Morrison, and Sandra H. Berry. "A National Survey of Stress Reactions after the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks." *New England Journal of Medicine*, 2001, 1507-512.
- Sederberg, P. C. "Global Terrorism: Problems of Challenge and Response." In *The New Global Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, edited by Charles W. Kegley Jr., 267-84. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2003, **quoted in** Collins, Alan, Brenda Lutz, and James Lutz. "Terrorism." In *Contemporary Security Studies*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 273-286.
- Sivanandan, A. "Race, Terror and Civil Society." *Race & Class* 47, no. 3 (2006): 1-8.
- Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. "Social Identity and Intergroup Behaviour." In *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge, Cambridgeshire: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 7-24.
- Terrorism Act 2006*. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/11/contents>
- The United Nations. "Security Council Condemns Madrid Terrorist Bombings, Urges All States to Join Search for Perpetrators. Resolution 1530 (2004) Adopted Unanimously." Press Release, UN News Center. March 11, 2004. Accessed March 9, 2015. <http://www.un.org/press/en/2004/sc8022.doc.htm>
- Tim Dunne, Tim, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. "Constructivism." In *International Relations Theories*, 200. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Tovrov, Daniel. "One Year After Breivik: Norway Refuses To Live In Fear." International Business Times. July 23, 2012. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.ibtimes.com/one-year-after-breivik-norway-refuses-live-fear-729867>
- Townsend, Mark. "Leak Reveals Official Story of London Bombings." The Guardian. April 9, 2006. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/apr/09/july7.uksecurity>.
- VG. "Kjærlighetsbudskapet Sprer Seg I Alle Kanaler." July 24, 2011. Accessed March 15, 2015. <http://www.vg.no/nyheter/innenriks/terrorangrepet-22-juli-politikk-og-samfunn/kjaerlighetsbudskapet-sprer-seg-i-alle-kanaler/a/10080708/>.
- Wells, Anthony. "NOP Poll of British Muslim." UK Polling Report. August 8, 2006. Accessed March 16, 2015. <http://ukpollingreport.co.uk/blog/archives/291>
- White House Archives. "Selected Speeches of President George W. Bush 2001 – 2008." Accessed April 4, 2015. http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf.
- Wilkinson, Paul. "Law-enforcement, Criminal Justice and the Liberal State." In *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*. 3rd ed. Taylor & Francis, 2011. 75-76.