
PSYCHO-SOCIAL PERSPECTIVES ON TERRORISM: A THEMATIC ANALYSIS

RICHA MALHOTRA, DR. SUSHMA SURI

Abstract: For the past two decades, 'terrorism' has spread and engulfed the entire world. It is known to cause not only physical damage but also a consequent scarring of victims. This makes it essential to address this phenomenon by exploring its dynamics. The present study attempts to examine the psycho-social perspectives on Terrorism. 50 participants divided across 5 focus groups (with age and gender balance) participated in the study. 10 focus groups were held with university students. Thereafter, In-depth interviews that lasted for one hour ensued. A brief introduction of the study was given to each group of participants, who gave their consent to be a part of the study. Two researchers were involved for leading the group and taking notes. Finally the group discussion was held in the light of interview scheduled. Thematic Analysis was employed to interpret the data. Based on this method, research findings in the form of themes were put forth.

Keywords: Group Psychology, Negative Identity, Narcissism, Terrorism

Introduction: There is no precise or widely accepted definition of terrorism. It is contended by many social scientists that in principle no definition of terrorism is possible, for the very process of definition is a part of the wider contestation of ideologies or political ideologies. It is easier to identify that which is not terror than label exactly which is terror. Like many other political terms, it is pejorative. Gabrenya (2003) explains one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. He also stated that terrorism is a poor man's warfare; war is a rich man's terrorism'. Husain (2009) explains the concept of terrorism as a form of violence which may be seen as an outburst of one's desire or intention to fight against all injustice and raising one's voice against suppression and seeking one's deserved rights. The phenomenon of violence is as old as history of human being. The world in general and India in particular have been the best example of such violence. War waged against innocent people is declared as 'war on terrorism' (Husain). According to Ahmad (2009), terrorism is broadly understood as organized violence aimed at creating panic or terror among people and eventually demoralizing state machinery with a view to achieving socio-political objectives.

Exploration of psychological profiles of terrorists has often shown to be completely different from popular perceptions. They conclude that the overwhelming majority of terrorists are not mentally ill, abnormal, psychopathic or even especially predisposed to violence. They cite a variety of reasons why a person joins a terrorist group, which often defines how effective he will be as a terrorist. *Nationalism* has been identified as the strongest motivator to take up terrorism. This is closely followed by a sense of belongingness achieved by terrorists; this need coupled with intellectual agreement with the aims of the group often lead to acceptance of violence.

Membership of a group may also be an important motive. Paul Wilkinson (1977) mentions the causes of revolution and political violence in general as causes of terrorism in particular. Crenshaw (1990) feels that an individual does not commit terrorism. Rather, she contended that "acts of terrorism are committed by groups who reach collective decisions based on commonly held beliefs, although the level of individual commitment to the group and its beliefs varies".

Ted Robert Gurr (1996), an expert on violent behaviours and movements put forth the idea of a gap between *rising expectations and need satisfaction*. Pearlstein (1991) held *narcissistic personality* responsible for terrorism. Such terrorists act for collective goals with political motivation, which deliberately sacrificed them in the act, had a narcissistic personality.

Violence, terrorism, militancy and insurgency have been viewed as the real expressions of non-containment of human aggressive behaviour unacceptable to the member of the society (Husain, 2000, Ghosh, 1994). The possible reasons which lead to terrorism lies in different psycho-social factors such as frustration in life, suppression by others, deprivation, poverty, lack of equal opportunities, religion, culture, prejudice, discrimination, feelings of insecurity, alienation, ethnic identity, etc. As a matter of fact, these are the real root causes of terrorist behaviour.

In the *Indian context*, much concern is caused by hostile neighbours creating trouble in sensitive states by providing material support, training and model help to alienate sections of the society. It is seen that the northern states of Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir show high rates of violence, terrorism and insurgency. To understand social alienation as a contributory factor in terrorism, a study was conducted by Defence Institute of Psychological

Research (Singh, 1998). It was seen that those who are frustrated because of their failure to satisfy legitimate aspirations feel the necessity to strike at a system, which is unresponsive to their needs. Powerlessness, meaninglessness, norm less-ness and social isolation were identified as contributors to alienation. Thus, it is seen that terrorism is more due to lack of understanding of the problems and issues than real problem.

Method:

Participants: The participant of the study were 50 university students (males and females both; 25 each) pursuing a Masters degree in Psychology in Delhi. The age range of the participants was 21-23.

Measures: Interview schedule was developed to raise a few broad questions concerning the research theme. On the basis of relevant review of literature, the authors identified 20 key questions. (Attached in the Annexure)

Procedure: 50 participants divided across 5 focus groups (with age and gender balance) participated in the study. 10 focus groups were held with university students. According to Madriz (2000), focus groups are a good tool not only for exploring a problem but it allows researchers to gather large amount of data. Thereafter, In-depth interviews that lasted for one hour, ensued. A brief introduction of the study was given to each group of participants, who gave their consent to be a part of the study. Two researchers were involved for leading the group and taking notes. Finally the group discussion was held in the light of interview scheduled.

Results and Interpretation: Thematic Analysis was employed to interpret the data. Thematic analysis has been defined as a method for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes the data set in rich details. However, it also often goes further than this and interprets various aspects of the research topic (Boyatzis, 1998). It moves beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focuses on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, i.e. the themes.

Based upon the results obtained from the data it can be inferred that the respondents have been very open and direct in terms of their responses and views on terrorism. A *general meaning* from the overall responses emerged that terrorism is the use of violence, when it's most important result is not the physical and mental damage of the direct victims but the psychological effect produced on someone else. Terrorism also involves, in addition to the act, the emotion and motivation of the terrorist. Violence may result in death, injury or destruction of property, or deprivation of liberty. It becomes terror when the significant aim is not to attain these ends, but

through these, to terrorize people other than those directly assaulted.

These notions and viewpoints on terrorism have been largely agreed upon by the respondents. Referring to qs.8-“what is terrorism?” a majority, i.e. 52% respondents strongly agree with the fact that terrorism is an excusable abomination. Also, high disagreement is shared on each of the following responses: terrorism is neither a crime and a holy duty (32%) nor a justified reaction to oppression (44%). Thus, majority of the subjects share a common disagreement as to what terrorism is not. Also, on being questioned about the fate of such terrorist outfits (refer qs. 2), almost half (62%) of the respondents strongly agree with the fact that terrorists should be tried and prosecuted in a democratic and a lawful manner. However, 68.3% of respondents disagree with option ‘c’ that terrorists should be ignored. Their acts of terror must be taken seriously and dealt with strictly. Most of the people (58%) also feel that terrorism is so highly prevalent due to lack of any strong action by government against terrorism (refer qs. 15). 46% of the people disagree that the policies against terrorism are inefficient.

Another significant theme that emerges from the data is the *personality of the terrorist*. It will be safe to say that terrorism on a whole is very complex. On one hand, there is the dissordance and simultaneity of the wholesale implosion/explosion of fantasies, and on the other hand, hyper-awareness and hyper-verbalization; on one hand, an internal psychological drama and on the other, the political game engaged in externally. This is why the press and the media are essential to the terrorist's existence, for this kind of personality is always torn between an internal psychological drama and the need to put up an act for society. This produces a specific type of personality: which does not correspond exactly either to the neuroses afflicting the majority of the population, or to the problems of psychotics who have been withdrawn into their own inner world. The terrorist is often a 'borderline' personality, obliged by psychological weakness constantly to rely on others (the 'anarchic' personality), in terms either of gaining their esteem or else of attacking them. Thus, on one hand, a terrorist is taken to be a dedicated person and on the other, a mercenary whose rewards may not be financial but psychological or ideological. Unfortunately, the psychological approach to a terrorist's personality has been dominated by the psychopathological orientation. It is argued that anyone who is different is not normal; the terrorist is different in opting for extra-normal use of violence for gaining his ends; hence he is pathological. This approach is counterproductive as the belief that he is

crazy, is likely to increase the general public's perceived threat and the consequent effectiveness of the terrorist act. People have a prevailing fear of the irrational and negotiations with the irrational are difficult, if not impossible. Corrado (1981) examined many theories and concluded that terrorism is more likely to be a product of frustrated but rational idealism. Also, most terrorist organizations are careful about whom they recruit and screen out those potentially dangerous to group survival. The practical rule of organizational security and maintenance excludes persons of unpredictable or uncontrolled behaviour. In a less hierarchical model, with a loose structure, where there is less control over membership, there is else obstacle to the mentally ill being inducted into the group.

Thus, the responses of qs.4 reveal the following findings, which are in line with what has been described: approximate 34% of the people from the data strongly feel that terrorists commit acts of terrorism as they are severely pathologically disturbed. However, there is maximum disagreement over terrorism being committed due to terrorists possessing a valid motive (deprivation) with almost 58% believing it.

Another important theme here is the *Beliefs, Needs and traits* common to terrorists. They look upon themselves as "sacrificial" animals in a worthy cause and look upon the conflict with the regime as "just" and righteous. They have an ambivalent attitude toward violence and aggression and are motivated by stress-seeking and the need to belong. A "belief system" is composed of dominant images, symbols and myths and contributes to perceptions/misperceptions that determine actions and expectations. The perceptions of terrorists are at variance with those of government and society. One of the aims of terrorists is to convince their audiences to see the world as they see it. An important aspect of this discrepancy in perception is the definition of the conflict between them and the adversaries. The content and origin of belief systems of terrorists affect they why and how of their strategies, their reactions to government policies and the outcome of terrorist challenges. The *sources* of terrorists' belief systems are various. The political and social environment in which the terrorist organization operates comprises one set of origins of belief systems. The set includes cultural variables (history, tradition, literature, religion) that are imparted to members of society through socialization processes and formal ideologies that are acquired in youth and are consciously borrowed. The sources of belief may also be internal. Terrorists operate under conditions of stress and uncertainty. This makes certain beliefs relevant and satisfying and also persistent and hard

to change. Both stress and ideological commitment encourage reliance on a rigid, set of beliefs not open to revision. Terrorists may be rational about convictions that the majority of society sees as irrational or delusional. Another significant element here is the *image of oneself/ self-perception*, of another actor and of the world. Images are frequently stereotypical and simplify reality. Dehumanization and deification of the enemy dominate thinking. The enemy is perceived in impersonal and abstract terms like capitalism's "bourgeoisie"- he is seen as monolithic. Most leftist terrorists do not see themselves as aggressors but as victims. The term "terrorist" is in their mind given by the enemy; actually they are freedom fighters or national liberators. Thus, two intriguing aspects of a terrorist's beliefs about the nature of conflict can be drawn here: first, they do not see themselves as murdering or killing victims but as executing victims after due trial; second is their military image and symbolism of struggle. Terrorists blame government for not conceding their "just" demands, for ignoring warnings and thereby forcing the killing the victims considered to be "innocent" by adversaries.

Referring to qs.3, "All terrorists form closely knit groups because"-majority of the respondents from the data, 62% of respondents feel this is because they all have similar ideologies. Thus, the presence of belief systems possessed by such people has been affirmed. Another instance where the importance of terrorists' belief systems is evident is qs.6 where almost 42%, i.e. the majority feels youth joins terrorist groups out of their "beliefs" that it will guarantee them the basic necessities of life.

The next theme is that of *Motives and Traits*. Terrorism's stress-producing nature has been made a mention of. Stress-seekers seem to be of two types: Individual stress-seeker and Group stress-seeker. The former is being narcissistic; he seeks self-admiration in the face of danger. The latter seeks to abandon the self in the group. He identifies himself with the group and merges himself completely in the collective personality. The distinction has implications for terrorist roles between leaders and followers, whereas leaders may possess latent dispositions and traits that make violent, stressful, oppositional behaviour attractive, followers may be attracted more to the group than to its activities. Followers exhibit strong affiliative needs.

The next theme is the *need to belong*. There is a particularly striking similarity of behaviour among terrorist despite their widely differing individual circumstances. One can attribute this similarity to the fact that the recruit to terrorism finds himself/herself feeling as if he/she belonged for the first time. For an alienated individual, i.e. the terrorist

joining a terrorist group represents the first real sense of belonging after a lifespan of rejection and the terrorist group becomes the family he never had. Upon joining a terrorist group, the individual breaks off all previous affiliations and becomes dependent on the group for emotional support. This need, thus, not only explains the similarity in behaviour of quite different terrorist groups, but also the solidarity that exists between different groups across the globe- the phenomenon of internationalism in terrorism.

Evidence for this theme is provided by responses given for qs9, which explores the reasons why a terrorist carries out or threatens to carry out acts of terror, majority of respondents, i.e. approx 52% strongly agree that various motives are responsible for such acts: intent of harming/killing others, for monetary gain and gain of personal and group principal. Thus, such an individual is led by various motives and needs to commit such acts. In qs16, 70% respondents strongly agree that terrorists commit such heinous acts as they find it the easiest way to have their demands accepted. Also, respondents don't seem to be guided by the perception highlighting the overrated importance of religion in terrorism, just as was postulated at the start. Almost 50% of subjects disagree that religion teaches them to do so. Also, in the last qs, 54% of respondents classify the acts of Maoist/Naxalites as terrorist acts-since their 'motive' of bombing trains was led to an intention of harming and killing innocent lives. In contrast, all the respondents disagree with the fact that Indian freedom struggle, classified by British as a terror act, is not so.

Narcissistic Rage is yet another theme of terrorism. Terrorism has been explained in terms of Psychology of Self developed in the works of Kohut, Kernberg, Freud, Hartmann and others. John Krayton (1983) defines terrorism as an attempt to acquire or maintain power or control by intimidation, by instilling fear of destruction or helplessness in the objects of terrorism. He also points out that terrorist operate in groups under the banner of a cause. The group or the cause is highly idealized and an air of absolute conviction is held about the truth or righteousness of the group's aims. The terrorist group grows out of a situation of deprivation. All of these characteristics of terrorism are typical of exaggerated group narcissism. Moreover, terrorists feel that they lack access to a responsive social system. Terrorist groups are led by charismatic figures who personify the plight of the group. Terrorists crave publicity which serves to enhance self-image of the group and self-esteem of individual members.

This theme is affirmed by the responses made by 48% of respondents from the data. According to these subjects, deprivation is the reason due to which they

strongly agree that terrorism is more prevalent under developed regions, thus confirming that terrorists grow out of deprivation.

The next theme is *Frustration-Aggression theory*. Much of terrorism, it is believed, is a response to frustration of various political, economic and personal needs or objectives. A terrorist act is often intended to elicit a response that will demonstrate that government will continue to frustrate the terrorists' legitimate aspirations. This response explains and normalizes terrorist activity and terrorism becomes "self-fulfilling". This provides the terrorist with responsibility, without guilt. The terrorist's motivation is strengthened because of his political objectives mesh with his personal and psychological needs. This is seen evident from responses to qs 12 where 40% respondents strongly agree that the reason for uprising among Maoists has been the frustration caused by economic deprivation. The next theme is *Negative/Confused Identity*, based on Erikson's theory of identity formation (1959). There are 8 stages delineated, and it is essential for every individual to achieve a resolution at every stage. At the stage of identity formation, individuals seek both meaning and a sense of wholeness or completeness as well as "fidelity"-a need to have faith in something or someone outside one's and trustworthy in its service. Ideologies are thus guardians of identity. Knutson (1981) used Erikson's concept of Negative Identity to account for terrorism. According to Knutson (1981), 'Negative Identity' is defined as an identity perversely based on all those identifications and roles which, at critical stages of development, had been presented as most undesirable or dangerous and yet also as most real involves a vindictive rejection of the role considered as desirable and proper by individual's family and community. It probably results from excessive normative ideals demanded by ambitious parents or actualized by superiors. Many terrorists come from homes where there was a strong pressure for achievement-if a positive identity is not possible, the individual prefers to be a "bad" person to being nobody, or potentially somebody.

Another important theme here is the *Group Psychology* theories of terrorism. One major conclusion drawn by one of these theories is that a person who is loyal to parents and loyal to regime is unlikely to become a terrorist; but a person who dissents from parents and is loyal to regime may become a terrorist and a person who is loyal to parents but dissents from regime may also become a terrorist. Kohut (1996) also describes certain features suited to become charismatic leaders. These are an unshakable confidence in themselves and voicing opinions with an air of absolute certainty; the leader's

self-esteem is high, even though maintenance of self-esteem may call for the use of manipulative techniques like establishing himself as guide, target for reverence, judging others and the like. The result is inelasticity of personality. He has no dynamically effective guilt feelings and never suffers from pangs of conscience about what he is doing. These leaders have a stunted empathetic capacity; they don't understand the wishes and frustrations of other people.

These findings can be seen clearly in the responses made to qs 17, where a little more than half of the respondents, i.e. 52% strongly feel that resorting to terrorism is attractive because it is the leader of the group who declares that terrorism is a noble action. It is the charisma of such an enigmatic leader that makes people commit such heinous acts, without feelings of guilt and is driven by leader's charisma.

Group dynamics principle is yet another theme. The centrality of the group in terrorist behaviour is highlighted by the fact that it is often through other groups that one is inducted into a terrorist organization, the recruit is indoctrinated into the norms and values of the group and contributes to the maintenance, solidarity and cohesion of the group. A terrorist organization is counter cultures, and is like a family. They are formed of like minded individuals, who share a common fate. There are several consequences of group cohesiveness; it encourages pursuit of violence, it becomes easy to depersonalize victims, individuals become more risk-taking since they are in a group; group membership helps in coping with guilt, possibility or brutalization.

For instance, the effects of a terrorist group on individual members can be assessed through responses given to qs1, where 74% respondents replied that members of terrorist groups have self concept and self esteem dependent on group membership and fear rejection from group intermittent pressures are known to exist. Also, 31% of people strongly feel that society wouldn't accept them once they go out of the group, thus fear of rejection and being outcast seem to be operating as well.

The last theme that can be drawn is the *participation of women* in terrorism. Many explanations have been offered for female involvement in terrorist activities. Some of them are: revolutionary and terrorist activity offers excitement, danger is both an attraction and repellent; terrorist violence is tied to causes which initially may appear legitimate; terrorist organizations provide an opportunity for upward mobility, in leadership and in an active role in formulating the group's policies, opportunities that are absent or extremely limited in the male dominated world of legitimate activity; terrorist

organizations offer change and a renunciation of the current male-dominated chauvinistic mores, the traditional stereotype of women as weak, supportive, silent, submissive is absent in the philosophers of many terrorist organizations; membership in a terrorist organization is the natural outgrowth of membership in extreme feminist organizations; women are rejecting stereotypic roles, etc.

The following are five propositions from the theory of women as terrorists (Hoffman, Marshall & Webb, 1984) : firstly, women, except for a few notable exceptions, have played a relatively minor role in terrorist violence in the last 30 years; secondly, one may expect female participation, both as freelance non-movement oriented terrorists as well as members of terrorist organizations, in terrorist incidents to increase dramatically in the future; thirdly, female input in terrorist acts is tied in part to feminist demands and practices; fourthly, contemporary female terrorists are likely to exhibit male personality or physical traits; and lastly, terrorist acts by females now and in the future will become more instrumental and less expensive.

Thus, when asked as to why is there more recent emphasis on involving more women in terrorist organizations, 53 out of 60 respondents, i.e. 85% of them replied that they strongly agree that since stereotypical terrorist being man, women can avoid suspicion easily as suicide bombers or on streets. 32% of them totally disagree with the fact that it is to use women as propaganda tools to appeal more than men.

Some other striking revelations have been that many respondents feel that *terrorism is growing at an immeasurable pace* (qs7), owing to the lack of proper empowerment and corruption in the legal system of the country (23% each). 68% of subjects feel that politicians are terrorists in disguise (qs13), followed by bureaucratic officials. Also, respondents feel that terrorism can be curbed (qs14) through legislation, coupled with a strategy of negotiations (38% each). However, 42% people disagreed that ruthless police power could curb terrorism.

To conclude, approx. 70%, i.e. nearly three-fourths of the total respondents feel that terrorism in any form is wrong and that any terrorist activity is inhuman.

Conclusion: For the past two decades, 'terrorism' has spread and engulfed the entire world. It is known to cause not only physical damage but also a consequent scarring of victims. It may take the victims years to cope with the trauma caused by the phenomenon and makes life difficult to deal post the aftermath. It is essential for the society at large and our nation in particular to combat this social evil. This is possible by delving deeper into the real nature of terrorism, since it has been seen that terrorism has been more

due to lack of understanding of the problems and issues than real problem.

It is important to bear in mind the above mentioned psychological and social elements and their interplay in making of a terrorist. Based on the research findings, it is suggested that further attempts must be

encouraged to understand the facets of social process of terrorism, both political and economical in level and the psychological climate generated, which constitute a cycle for germination of conflict and thereby cultivate the phenomenon of terrorism.

References:

1. Anderson, S. & Sloan, S. Historical Dictionary of Terrorism, Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow press, 1995, pp. 371-372.
2. Benson, M., M. Evans, and R. Simon 1982 "Women as political terrorists." Pp. 121-130 in S. Spitzer and R.Y. Simon, eds. Research in Law, Deviance and Social Control. Greenwich, CN: Jai Press, Inc.
3. Bernard, H. R. (2010). Analyzing qualitative data: Systematic approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Cooper, H.H.A. 1979 "Woman as terrorist." Pp. 150-157 in F. Adler and R. J. Simon, Eds. The Criminology of Deviant Women. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
4. Breakwell, Glynis M, Sean Hammond & Chris Fife-Schaw (1995): Research Methods in Psychology. London: Sage.
5. Clutterbuck, R. Guerrillas and Terrorists, London: Farberand Farber, Ltd, 1977, p. 21.
6. Freedman, L.Z., Alexander, Y. (1983) Perspectives on terrorism. Hindustan Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
7. Heitmeyer, W. & Hagan, J. (eds.) (2003) International Handbook of Violence Research p. 309-321, Kluwer Academic Publishers, The Hague.
8. Hoffman, D., Marshall, I.H., Webb, V.J. (1984) A review of explicit and implicit propositions about women as terrorists.
9. Omprakash, S. (1997) Terrorism in India. Ess Ess Publications, New Delhi.
10. Poland, J.M. Understanding Terrorism: Groups, Strategies and Responses, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1988, pp. 34-36.
11. Segaller, S. (1987) Terrorism into the 1990s. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Press
12. Wardlaw, G. (1989) Political Terrorism: Theory, tactics and Counter-measures (pp. 14-16). Cambridge University Press.

Richa Malhotra, Research Scholar, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi
Dr. Sushma Suri, Assistant Professor, Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi

APPENDIX

Interview Schedule

- 1) Members of terrorist groups have self esteem and self concept dependent on the membership of the group and fear rejection from the group because:
 - a) There are intermittent pressures.
 - b) They have only one group affiliation
 - c) It is religiously prohibited.
 - d) Once out of the group, the society would not be accepting of them.
- 2) Terrorists/ terrorist outfits should be:
 - a) Killed because they kill others
 - b) Tried and prosecuted in a democratic and lawful manner
 - c) Ignored, because we reap what we sow
 - d) None of the above
- 3) All terrorists form closely knit groups, this is because
 - a) They all follow similar ideologies.
 - b) They all are disgruntled at their present status in society.
 - c) They have a charismatic leader.
 - d) For a sense of belonging.
- 4) All terrorists commit acts of terrorism because:
 - a) They are severely psychology disturbed.
 - b) They have valid motive (ex, deprivation)
 - c) They are religious fanatics.
 - d) Due to group/peer pressure
 - 5) Terrorism is more prevalent in under-developed regions, because:
 - a) Deprivation.
 - b) People there are driven towards death and destruction
 - c) They seek the attention of the rest of the world as a potential threat to the powerful countries.
 - d) It is an expression of their suppressed thoughts and feelings.
 - 6) The youth is drawn towards Terrorist groups because:
 - a) They believe it's their social responsibility.
 - b) They like to be rebellious.
 - c) They fantasize about violence.
 - d) It guarantees them the basic necessities of life.
 - 7) Why is terrorism breeding at an un-measurable pace?
 - a) Lack of proper empowerment.

- b) Racism
- c) Imbalance of resources
- d) Corruption in the legal system of the country.
- 8) What is Terrorism?
 - a) A tactic and a strategy
 - b) Crime and a holy duty
 - c) A justified reaction to oppression
 - d) An inexcusable abomination
- 9) A terrorist is an individual who carries out or threatens to carryout acts of terror, for:
 - a) harming or killing others, who are direct enemies or innocent victims
 - b) for monetary gains
 - c) gain of group principle, gain of personal principle
 - d) All of the above
- 10) Why is their more recent emphasis on involving more women in terrorist organisations?
 - a) More effective at attracting media attention.
 - b) to use them as propaganda tools to appeal more men.
 - c) The stereotypical terrorist being a man, women can avoid suspicion easily, as suicide bombers, or on streets
 - d) Women see themselves as capable of rising against the prevalent state of deprivation.
- 11) The reason the World Trade Center was destroyed was:
 - a) Al-Qaeda
 - b) It was a deliberate hoax by the US government.
 - c) Bush was responsible.
 - d) It was to gain control over oil fields in Iraq.
- 12) What is the reason for uprising among the Maoists?
 - a) Economic Deprivation.
 - b) To make the government see the abject poverty
 - c) They want to form their own government.
 - d) They are just plain criminals.
- 13) Are there terrorists in disguise present? Select one:
 - a) Beauracratic officials
 - b) The Government
 - c) Businessmen
 - d) Politicians
- 14) Terrorism can be curbed by:
 - a) Legislation
 - b) Ruthless Police power
 - c) A strategy of negotiations.
 - d) Ban on all terrorist organizations.
- 15) Why you think terrorism is prevalent:
 - a) Strong connections with government
 - b) Intelligent plan made by terrorists
 - c) Lack of any strong action against terrorism.
 - d) Policies are inefficient
- 16) Terrorists engage in such actions because:
 - a) They are anti-human, anti-social
 - b) Their religion teaches them to do so
 - c) Politicians use them for their own personal benefits
 - d) They find it as the easiest way to, have their demands accepted.
- 17) Resorting to terrorism is attractive to some because:
 - a) The leader of their religious or political group declares that terrorism is a noble action and they are not mature enough or are afraid to question the leader's judgement.
 - b) The extreme ways in which they think and make sense of the world.
 - c) Aids in dealing with traumatic events in their own life
 - d) They find it as an easy method to rebel.
- 18) Is terrorism a necessary evil?
 - a) Yes, without it societal problems won't come on the surface.
 - b) They are trying to make a point, resorting to violence is the only option.
 - c) No, terrorism in any form is wrong.
 - d) It makes us conscious of the subjugated masses.
- 19) Are all terrorist actions worthy of being condemned?
 - a) Yes of course any terrorist activity is inhuman.
 - b) No, A terrorist in their country is a martyr in mine.
 - c) Not all terrorism is baseless and unjustified.
 - d) It a multi-dimensional problem, no fixed answers.
- 20) Which would you classify as a terrorist act?
 - a) Rebellion in Egypt to bring down Hosni Mubarak.
 - b) US forces In Iraq (before the August withdrawal)
 - c) Maoists/Naxalites bombing trains.
 - d) The Indian freedom Struggle (classified by British as secessionist and terrorist acts)
