Global Trends in Terrorism: 1970-2016

Executive Summary

Anthony H. Cordesman

acordesman@gmail.com

Burke Chair in Strategy

Working Draft
Updated August 28, 2017

Terrorism has become one of the dominating national security threats of the 21st century. It is also one of the most complex — mixing the actions of states, extremists, and other non-state actors in a wide range of threats and types of conflicts. Terrorists range from individuals carrying out scattered terrorist acts, to international terrorist networks of non-state actors, to state terrorism including the use of conventional forces and poison gas to terrorize portions of a civil population. Terrorism has also become a key aspect of civil war, insurgency/counterinsurgency, and asymmetric warfare, as well as ideological, ethnic, and religious warfare.

There is no easy way to categorize the resulting patterns of violence, to measure their rise, or to set national security priorities. For more than a decade, the U.S. has focused on the threat of terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq, but it has dealt increasingly with the expansion of the threat into North Africa, other parts of the Middle East, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the rest of the world. Key warfighting threats like the Islamic State and its affiliates, and the Taliban and Haqqani Network, are only a comparatively small part of the rising threat in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), Sub-Saharan Africa, and South Asia.

It is clear from the current trends in other regions that the threat of religious extremism may soon expand rapidly into the rest of Asia, and there are many other causes of terrorism in Africa, Europe, Latin America, the United States. Terrorism is often heavily driven by ideology, but it also is often a reaction to major shifts in population, ethnic and sectarian tensions, failed and corrupt governance, and the failure to broadly develop a given economy and offer employment and a future. No area is immune to the threat, and internal instability can drive terrorism anywhere in the world.

The Burke Chair at CSIS has prepared a graphic overview of these trends as of the end of 2016. It traces the patterns since 1970, and focuses on the period from 2011-2016 — the years since the sudden rise of massive political instability and extremism in the MENA region. It covers global, regional, and key national trends and compares different estimates and sources for 2015 and 2016. This report is entitled *Global Trends in Terrorism Through 2016*, and is now available on the CSIS web site at cs.is/2vmk0E3.

The full report presents the metrics and graphics described in this executive summary. It draws primarily on reporting in the START database, but uses other reporting from sources like EU/Europol, IHS Jane's, and the IEP to illustrate different estimates, different perspectives, and the uncertainties in the data.

The Contents of the Report

The full report does not attempt to provide the supporting narrative that is critical to fully understanding the trends presented, nor does it attempt to list all the many qualifications made by the sources used regarding the limits of their models and data. These are areas where the reader must consult the original sources directly — along with a wide range of narrative material and other sources — to fully understand the trends that are displayed.

Even so, the report is necessarily complex. The report does show that there is value in looking at global trends, but makes it clear that many key trends are largely regional, and must be examined on a regional basis. It also provides key country-by-country breaks out to show that the driving

factors shaping the nature of terrorism in any given case are usually national. International networks certainly play a key role, as do factors like religion and culture, but the forms terrorism take normally differ sharply even between neighboring countries.

The report also must be detailed to fully highlight the differences and uncertainties in much of the data. There often are sharp differences in the most basic summary data, even between two highly respected sources like START and IHS Jane's. These differences do not reflect failures in the analytic efforts of the sources shown. They reflect differences that are inevitable in their need to rely on open source material, the lack of any clear definition of terrorism, the problems in measuring and displaying uncertainty, and the need to guess and extrapolate where key data are missing.

Key Uncertainties and Problems in the Data

As a result, one key conclusion that should be drawn from the full contents of the analysis is just how difficult it is to rely on given set of data. Another is that analyses which ignore the gross levels of uncertainty and the conflicts in the information provided in the different sets of open source data now available, are likely to have little legitimacy and be more misleading than useful.

The final section of the report highlights some of these problems in more detail, but the key problems involved include:

- No agreed definition of terrorism, or how to define or measure any key metric.

- Reliance on media sources or unstated sources, cancelation of NCTC and all official U.S. public reporting on trends and data with only the EU and Europol providing detailed and credible official estimates.

- Radical differences in level of reporting by region, and a lack of credible data in Central and East Asia.

- No reporting on state terrorism, and ignoring large scale killing of civilians in countries like Syria.

- Failure to report ranges in many key areas of large-scale uncertainty – particularly in terms of how terrorist incidents are defined and counted, and data on targets, perpetrators, and casualties.

- Failure to clearly distinguish between insurgency and terrorism — a key problem in every state where there is some form of active civil conflict.

- Labeling of asymmetric threats and enemies as "terrorist" for political purposes, regardless of the real character of the fighting or actions involved and methods of attack.

- Failure to distinguish ethnicity, sect, tribe, and other key data driving the patterns of terrorism.

- Constant changes in method of analysis and reporting, and unclear historical comparability of data shown.

- Lack of clear handling of hate crimes in collecting terrorism data.

- Focus on ideology and religion rather than the full range of causes of terrorism.

- Different definitions and listing of perpetrators, and very different counts and characterization of perpetrator actions – compounded by the lack of clear definitions of terrorist versus insurgent actions. Lack of clear methods for reporting attacks and incidents where perpetrators cannot be identified.

- Serious limitations to the search and graphing functions of given databases – e.g. inability to search for perpetrators in each country or region, or get totals or a range for casualties.

The reader should also be aware that the START database and the statistical annex to the State Department *Country Reports on Terrorism* do provide a full range of caveats about the definitions used and the uncertainties in the data, and that the START data offer three levels of confidence.

These caveats are not reported in detail here to limit the length of this report and the START data presented only show the high START estimate of terrorism and perpetrator threats.

Global Trends from 1970 to 2016

This section of the report draws largely on the START database. The START database forms the core of the data used in the entire report because it is the database presented in the statistical annex to the annual U.S. State Department *Country Reports on Terrorism.* It is as close to an official data based on terrorism as is now available from the U.S. government.

This section presents three sets of statistics that display the global trends from 1970-2016, from the beginning of the upheavals in the Arab world in 2011 through the end of 2016, and finally during 2016.

There is no way to determine the uncertainty in these estimates, or how truly comparable the data are. As becomes clear from the more detailed regional and national data later in the report, however, the inputs differ strikingly in many cases from other sources of such data, and the figures and trends shown must reflect a high degree of uncertainty.

As one example, the START database estimates that there were 13,488 terrorist incidents in 2016. Another key database, developed by IHS Jane's, reports 24,202 attacks for the same year. Such differences exist in the data developed by virtually every independent source, including official sources in the United States. A review of past reports by the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) and Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) also indicates that they both used different sources and definitions from each other, and would have continued to produce different results if their reports were updated using the same methods and sources used in 2010 and 2005

As for the data presented, the figures and graphs for 1970-2016 do reflect several broad trends that are undoubtedly real and accurate. They show a major shift from a more broadly distributed pattern of global terrorism to one driven by Islamic extremism and internal instability in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, South Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa, with a sharp rise beginning in the mid-2000s and becoming a key threat in these regions after 2011. They also show, however, that some regions show only a limited increase or reflect a decline in incidents relative to the past. And, that the level of violence has not risen in some regions, and has declined in several.

The data for 1970-2016 also show that there has been very limited use of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons, but that the use of chemical weapons has grown over time in some regions. START and other sources do not attempt to track a key new aspect of terrorism: cyberattacks, and no trend data are available for any period.

The data for 2011-2016 explain the sudden rise of the terrorist threat in more detail in ways that track with other sources and again must be broadly accurate. They show that levels of terrorist incidents began to stabilize in 2013/2014, but this leveling must be kept in perspective. The level of civil conflict, insurgency, and civil war continued to rise sharply. Terrorism had become major conflict in several key states like Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and the Sudan. The nature of terrorism also shifted, with more and more bombings, and high explosive attacks on civilians.

The data for 2016 show that terrorism in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, South Asia, and Sub-Saharan Africa, clearly dominated global terrorism — again, trends that virtually all sources agree upon. The data for 2016 also shows the cumulative rise in suicide and vehicle attacks by country and perpetrator, how many attacks focused on private citizens, and how much the patterns of terrorism focused on ten key countries — all with significant Islamic populations.

At the same time, the data again illustrate the major differences in estimates by source. START reports 13,488 incidents and IHS Jane's reports 24,202 attacks, a figure some 80% higher. Equally striking differences exist in START and IHS Jane's analyses of key perpetrators.

It is critical to note that virtually all of these incidents/attacks were caused by Islamist extremist groups attacking fellow Muslims and seeking to overview moderate regimes. The struggle did spill over into the U.S., European, and other countries with relatively tiny Moslem populations — but the number of incidents and casualties were very small by comparison, and the vast majority of casualties came from a small minority of extremist Muslims killing and injuring large numbers of other far more moderate Muslims.

The U.S. and its European allies naturally focus on their own security, and the threat of terrorism is all too real. At the same time, it has often been exaggerated in recent politics and media to a point where this exaggeration of the risk feeds the very process that terrorism focuses upon, and means that policymakers, the media, and the public lose perspective as to its relative importance.

 As later charts and data show, the START database only reports 175 incidents of all kinds in the U.S. between 2001 and 2016, and 1,356 incidents in all of Western Europe, versus 60,230 incidents in heavily Islamic regions and 27,580 in the largely Islamic MENA region. The supporting chronologies in the original source material make it clear that most had nothing to do with Islamic extremism, although such movements did cause a majority of the fatalities.

Perpetrators

Far too much U.S. attention now focuses on ISIS, and primarily on the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. There is no question that ISIS and Al Qaida are major threats, although ISIS lost much of the territory in its so-called "caliphate" in Iraq and Syria, and Al Qaida's direct impact was relatively limited aside from its branch in Yemen. But there are many other terrorist organizations. For example, Boko Haram and Al Shabaab also carried out extremely violent attacks with high levels of casualties, and the data show that ISIS is only a limited part of the overall threat and source of terrorist activity. Any lasting success against terrorism requires a strategy that deals with the full range of perpetrators and causes, not one organization.

At the same time, the START database provides a key caveat as to how little is known about the perpetrator in many cases:

> *Information about perpetrators was reported in source materials for 52% of terrorist attacks in 2016.* A total of 334 groups and organizations were identified as perpetrators of terrorist attacks, compared to 288 in 2015. This includes approximately 100 groups and organizations that had not previously been identified as perpetrators in the Global Terrorism Database.

This caveat reflects a key problem in analyzing the patterns of terrorism that goes far beyond the usual problem of agreeing on definitions, and extends to virtually every other aspect of open

source reporting on terrorism. The data presented throughout this report reflect serious uncertainties in estimates of numbers of attacks, targets, methods of attack, and casualties.

The START data that do reflect identified perpetrators show that in 2016, 19% of the incidents were carried out by ISIS and 13% by the Taliban, and that these perpetrators vastly dominated the estimated number of deaths and injuries. This may reflect the fact that ISIS and Taliban attacks are much better documented, but may also reflect the fact that some terrorist groups are far more violent than others. This report consistently shows that the number of attacks often does not correlate to the reported level of violence and civilian casualties.

The START and IHS Jane's data differ sharply in key estimates and show how difficult it can be to establish databases that offer suitable comparability and confidence. START counts 1,133 incidents for ISIS in 2016, and IHS Jane's counts 4,236, a number close to four times higher. Similarly, START counts 848 incidents for ISIS in 2016, and IHS Jane's counts 533,a number nearly 40% lower. Four of the top five perpetrators in the IHS Jane's list are not on the START list of the top five perpetrators.

One key trend affecting ISIS is that START finds that,

> ...the geographic reach of attacks by ISIS and its affiliates continued to grow in 2016. The number of attacks attributed to ISIS outside of Iraq and Syria increased 80%, from 44 in 2015 to 79 in 2016. This does not include attacks attributed to other organizations that have pledged allegiance to ISIS. In addition to Boko Haram in West Africa, the most active of these ISIS affiliates were located in Afghanistan/Pakistan, Egypt, Libya, and Yemen.

It should be noted, however, that the key focus of this growth in ISIS occurred largely in Muslim countries, or with large Muslim populations. Like Al Qaida, all of ISIS's major affiliates are movements seeking to achieve power over fellow Muslims, only conduct sporadic operations against the West, and are not driven by some form of "clash of civilizations."

Terrorism in North America and the United States

This section provides summary data on terrorism in Canada, Mexico, and, the United States. The START data reflect only minor terrorist activity in Canada and Mexico, and relatively low levels of terrorist activity in the U.S. after a major peak in terrorism in the U.S. in the 1970s – driven largely by the Vietnam War, racial tensions, and right wing extremist activity. After that period, terrorism created a minor actuarial risk until 2001 with a sudden peak caused by the 9/11 attacks.

Terrorism has remained a minor cause of actuarial risk and damage in all three countries since 2001, and the number of incidents was far higher in the U.S. in the 1970st, but it has had great political impact in the U.S. and has been driven in part by Islamic extremism – although almost always by native born or immigrant U.S. citizens and not by non-citizens or the direct action of terrorist organizations.

The IHS Jane's data show much higher levels of current terrorist activity. START shows 63 incidents in North America in 2015 and IHS Jane's reports 678 attacks. START shows 72 incidents in 2015 and IHS Jane's reports 428 attacks.

The NCTC and FBI no longer provide annual public reports on terrorism in the United States. Unlike the annual reports issued by the EU and Europol, there are no data on the religious, racial,

and ethnic nature of perpetrators and targets, whether or not they are citizens or native born, the number of arrests, the number of convictions, and the number of attacks prevented.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) ceased to provide a detailed analysis of total homeland defense spending in 2017, and the last special analytic annex to the budget covering such spending was issues with the President's FY2016 budget request and does not reflect Congressional action on the FY2016 budget.

The FBI does, however, provide an excellent report on hate crimes in the U.S., which some other sources group or partially include in their totals for terrorism. The most recent such FBI report covers hate crimes in 2015, and shows that:

- There were 5,818 single-bias incidents involving 7,121 victims. Of those victims, 59.2 percent were targeted because of a race/ethnicity/ancestry bias; 19.7 percent because of a religious bias; 17.7 percent because of a sexual orientation bias; 1.7 percent because of a gender identity bias; 1.2 percent because of a disability bias; and 0.4 percent because of a gender bias.

- There were an additional 32 multiple-bias incidents that involved another 52 victims.

- Of the 4,482 hate crime offenses classified as crimes against persons, intimidation accounted for 41.3 percent of those offenses, while 37.8 percent involved simple assault, and 19.7 percent involved aggravated assault.

- There were 2,338 hate crime offenses classified as crimes against property, and the majority of those (72.6 percent) were acts of destruction/damage/vandalism.

- During 2015, most reported hate crime incidents (31.5 percent) happened in or near residences or homes.

- Of the 5,493 known offenders, 48.4 percent were white, 24.3 percent were black or African-American, and race was unknown for 16.2 percent of the offenders. The rest were of various other races.

The FBI analysis also reports that:

- 59.2 percent of the 7,123 victims were targeted because of the offenders' bias against race/ethnicity/ancestry.

- 19.7 percent were victimized because of bias against religion.

- 17.7 percent were targeted because of bias against sexual orientation.

- 1.7 percent were victims of gender-identity bias.

- 1.2 percent were targeted because of bias against disability.

- 0.4 percent (30 individuals) were victims of gender bias.

Here it is important to point out that the START database on terrorism reported a total of 38 incidents of terrorism in the U.S. in 2015. START reported that 16 of these 38 attacks had some connection to religion, but did not specify the faith involved.

In contrast, criminal acts of racism still present a major challenge in U.S. society. They make up more than 59 percent of all "single bias" hate crimes—over 3,440 incidents, and single bias crimes are the most clearly identifiable of the 5,850 criminal incidents and 6,885 related offenses that were motivated by bias against race, ethnicity, ancestry, religion, sexual orientation, disability, gender, or gender identity. These totals only involve reported incidents, and reporting on hate crimes is far less comprehensive than terrorist attacks—all of which get massive media attention.

Religion was the second greatest cause of hate crimes — 59.2 percent were targeted because of a race/ethnicity/ancestry bias; 19.7 percent because of a religious bias; and 17.7 percent because of a sexual orientation bias. These three causes alone led to the targeting of 96.6 percent of "single bias" hate crimes.

The worst terrorist attacks did have more serious human consequences in terms of fatalities than hate crimes. They killed a total of 44 persons in 2015 and injured 52 others—a total of 96 victims inside the United States. START also estimates that 16 of the 52 incidents had some form of religious motive.

Hate caused far more injuries, however, than terrorism. The FBI reports that 4,482 victims of hate crimes were victims of crimes against persons in 2015. The FBI summarizes these victims, and the crimes committed against them, as follows:

- 18 persons were murdered and 13 were raped. (Concerning rape, data for 12 rapes were submitted under the UCR Program's revised definition; 1 rape was submitted under the legacy definition).

- 41.3 percent of the victims were intimidated.

- 37.8 percent were victims of simple assault.

- 19.7 percent were victims of aggravated assault.

- 0.4 percent (20) were victims of other types of offenses, which are collected only in the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS).

If one compares the total victims from terrorism to the number of victims from hate crimes, 96 victims — including 44 murders — have to be compared to 7,121 victims of hate crimes, and 2,608 of these victims suffered from physical crimes against persons ranging from simple assault to murder. A total of 883 of this total suffered from aggravated assault, and there were 18 murders and 13 rapes.

The final part of this section attempts to put the threat of terrorism into a broader perspective. This is not fully possible with the current reporting from the NCTC and FBI, which does not attempt to list attacks prevented, describe the effectiveness of counterterrorism measures in preventing infiltration or entrance in to the U.S., or provide any indication of the cost-effectiveness of U.S. counterterrorism activity.

 Two things are clear, however. First, even major success like 9/11 can produce high casualties, although even 9/11 had a minor actuarial impact even in 2011. Second, terrorism has posed a negligible threat in actuarial terms since 2011. The high federal cost of domestic counterterrorism measures -- which are only part of the national costs involved -- does raise serious questions about the current level of spending relative to risk that need far more justification than is currently being provided. At the same time, the spread of terrorist activity outside the areas where the U.S. is fighting -- and the limited levels of success in Syria and Afghanistan -- do raise serious issues as to the effectiveness of spending well over $1.5 trillion.

Terrorism in Europe

This section provides summary data on the trends in Western and Eastern Europe. It includes the START and IHS Jane's data presented in other parts of the report, but also includes data from the

one useful current official source on terrorism in the world that presents declassified official data. This is the annual report on terrorism which is issued by Europol and the EU.

If one looks at the START data on the total for Western and Eastern Europe, which includes Russia, the impact of terrorism peaks in the 1970s. It rises again in 1991, driven by terrorist attacks in the Balkans, Palestinian violence, and terrorism in the FSU and Russia. It then peaks for a third time in 2014-2015, driven by both violent Islamist extremism and terrorist activity in the Ukraine.

A chart in this section also illustrates how limited the terrorist threat has so far been in both the U.S and Western Europe since 2011 relative to the terrorist threat elsewhere in the world, particularly in areas where Jihadists are attacking fellow Muslims.

Making regional comparisons is difficult because given sources define Europe differently and include or exclude Russia and parts of Eastern Europe. If one only examines Western Europe, the START reporting on the patterns in Western Europe shows a rise in incidents after 2010, driven largely by violent Islamist extremism and the influence and actions of ISIS, that reached new peaks in 2015-2016. Belgium, France, Germany, and the UK were key targets of such attacks. Turkey was a key center of terrorist attacks because of political unrest and Kurdish separatism in the late 1970s, late 1980s to mid-1990s, and then again from mid-2015 onwards.

Once again, the report shows that the IHS Jane's data provide a very different set of estimates.

The Europol/EU data provide key insights into the correlation between terrorism and counterterrorist activity lacking in other regions of the world. It also clearly distinguishes between Islamist extremist violence and other forms of terrorism:

- In 2016 a total of 142 failed, foiled, and completed attacks were reported by eight Member States. More than half (76) of them were by the UK2. France reported 23 attacks, Italy 17, Spain 10, Greece 6, Germany 5, Belgium 4, and Netherlands 1.

- Of the 142 attacks, less than half (47) were completed. Member States reported that 142 victims died because of terrorist attacks and 379 people were injured.

- Nearly all reported fatalities and most of the casualties were the result of jihadist terrorist attacks. The total number of 142 attacks is a continuation of a downward trend that started in 2014 when there were 226 attacks, followed by 211 in 2015.

- The largest number of attacks in which the terrorist affiliation could be identified were carried out by ethno-nationalist and separatist extremists (99). Attacks carried out by left-wing violent extremists have been on the rise since 2014; they reached a total of 27 in 2016, of which most (16) were reported by Italy.

- The number of jihadist terrorist attacks decreased from 17 in 2015 to 13 in 2016, of which 6 were linked to the so-called Islamic State (IS). However, a precise ranking amongst and within terrorist affiliations across the EU cannot be established because the UK does not provide disaggregated data on attacks.

- Explosives were used in 40% of the attacks, with similar numbers to 2015.

- The use of firearms dropped considerably from 57 in 2015 to 6 in 2016.

- Apart from jihadist, ethno-nationalist and left-wing extremist attacks, an increasing stream of violent assaults by right-wing extremist individuals and groups was noted across Europe, in particular over the past two years, targeting asylum seekers and ethnic minorities in general.

- These assaults however do not generally qualify as terrorism and are therefore not included in the numbers of terrorist attacks being reported by Member States, with only one exception in 2016, reported by the Netherlands.

- Most arrests were related to jihadist terrorism, for which the numbers rose for the third consecutive year: 395 in 2014, 687 in 2015 and 718 in 2016.

- Numbers of arrests for left-wing and separatist terrorist offences dropped to half of what they were in 2015 (from 67 and 168 in 2015 to 31 and 84 in 2016 respectively).

- Numbers of arrests for rightwing terrorism remained low at 12 in 2016, compared to 11 in 2015.

- France is the only Member State in which the overall numbers of arrests continue to increase: from 238 in 2014, to 424 in 2015, and to 456 in 2016.

- Almost one-third of arrestees (291) were 25 years old or younger. Only one in ten arrestees (9%) in 2016 was older than 40 years.

- Arrests for terrorist activities (preparing, financing, assisting, attempting, or executing attacks) decreased from 209 in 2015 to 169 in 2016.

- Arrests for travelling to conflict zones for terrorist purposes also decreased: from 141 in 2015 to 77 in 2016. This was similar to the decrease in numbers of arrests of people returning from the conflict zones in Syria and Iraq: from 41 in 2015 to 22 in 2016.

The Europol/EU report also provides a detailed summary analysis of the patterns in Islamist attacks lacking in the public reporting by all other countries and regions:

- ...The threat of jihadist terrorism is not perceived equally amongst Member States, of which the majority have not been confronted with jihadist terrorist activities at all in 2016, nor in one of the preceding years. These countries might be used for transiting of foreign terrorist fighters, (potential) jihadists or returnees, or unintentionally providing for a safe haven for them. These and other factors, however, including perceived insults to Islam, may influence potential risks. Switzerland for instance, not being an EU Member State and not being part of a coalition against IS, is aware of its vulnerability to jihadist terrorism by association with other Western countries and its international profile.

- …As military pressure on IS increased and measures to prevent potential recruits from reaching IS-controlled territory became more effective, IS adapted its recruitment tactics. It now declared that perpetrating a terrorist attack in the West was even preferable to travelling to join IS.

- The increased efforts to incite IS sympathizers in the West to perpetrate attacks were reflected in practical guidance for lone actor attacks provided in IS publications. The IS multi-language magazine *Rumiyah*18 contained a series of articles under the title "Just Terror Tactics", which suggested terrorist attacks using knives, vehicles or arson, and gave tips on how to maximize the numbers of victims and impact. Perpetrators were admonished to leave some kind of evidence stating the motivation of the attack and allegiance to IS, such as a note attached to the victim's body or a last will.

- In 2016 IS preferred to claim lone actor attacks through its *A'maq News Agency...*The increased efforts by IS to directly recruit vulnerable people via social media and incite them to perpetrate terrorist acts in their country of residence, seem to not be limited to male targets.

- …In 2012, already before the emergence of IS, al-Qaeda had redesigned its strategy to ensure its survival under the changed political circumstances following the Arab rebellions: al-Qaeda would merge with the population to the extent possible; cooperate with other Muslim groups based on common interests; and administer territories that fell under its control in a way so as not to alienate the population. The aim was to create safe havens from which al-Qaeda could plan and execute attacks on Western targets. The intransigent behavior of IS toward local populations made the implementation of this new strategy even more pressing for al-Qaeda in an effort to mark the difference to its opponent.

The data on Russia and the Ukraine show exceptionally sharp peaks and valleys in the number of incidents and attacks and their consequences. They highlight yet another area where there is no reporting on state terrorism, although Russia has clearly supported such movements in the

Ukraine. There also is no clear separation of terrorism from insurgent activity, although the data on weapon type clearly reflect the impact of warfighting.

Once again, striking differences exist between the START and IHS Jane's counts – differences illustrated in the examples in the tables for Russia and the Ukraine.

Terrorism in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)

As is shown at the start of the report, the MENA area and South Asia are currently the center of global terrorist activity, with Sub Saharan Africa next. They are also the centers of U.S. counterinsurgency warfighting and counterterrorist activity.

These patterns are clearly reflected in both the START and IHS Jane's reporting on the broader patterns in the region as well as in the detailed sections on developments in the fighting in Iraq and Syria and in Afghanistan that follow.

A glitch in the START database prevented the updating of comparative perpetrator data to include 2016, but the rise of ISIS is still all too clear in the graphs and charts shown in the report. So are the escalating levels of violence, and the spread of violence to include Yemen and Libya. The data on both type of attack and weapons use show a major rise in the use of explosives – often large vehicle-borne bombs and suicide attacks.

The trend data on Algeria show the impact of its successful war against terrorism and serve as clear example that such wars can be won. The data on Libya, in contrast, provide another warning of how revolutions can turn into endemic violence. They also reflect the problems in dealing with countries and forces where there is no clear way to separate terrorist activity from insurgency – a problem shaping the data in Afghanistan, Egypt, Iraq, Nigeria, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, Ukraine, and Yemen as well.

The bulk of the data that follow cover subregions where the U.S. is not involved in conflict: The Arab-Israeli states and the Arab Gulf states other than Iraq. Once again, a detailed review of the source material showed that the START and IHS Jane's data are very different. Discussions with national experts also indicate that official national estimates of various aspects of terrorism usually differed strikingly from both START and IHS Jane's data.

ISIS, Al Qaida, and ISIS Affiliates

This section of the report covers the joint impact of ISIS and Al Qaida, the impact of the war on the ISIS "caliphate" in Iraq and Syria, and the impact of ISIS's affiliates. It groups these data into three sets:

- Data on both Al Qaida and ISIS
- Data on ISIS
- Data on ISIS's affiliates

The START data on ISIS show its rise as a key source of terrorism, but do not reflect its broader impact on warfighting, insurgency, and the large numbers of injured and killed that result from its actions. Once again, there is no clear separation of terrorist and insurgent activity.

They show that Al Qaida Central has been much less active by comparison. Al Qaida and all of its affiliates carried out only 1,505 attacks in 2016, but its affiliates like Al Nusra and Al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula are a different story.

At the same time, it is clear from the data in these sections that defeating ISIS in its caliphate in Iraq and Syria will not begin to put an end to the terrorist threat. ISIS proper carried out 4,343 attacks during its rise in 2011-2016. This was only 6.1% of the world total and 7.2% of the MENA total, although these attacks accounted for a much higher percentage of the total deaths. In 2016, ISIS carried out 1,495 attacks out of 13,488 incidents, or 11% of the total, but these seem to include large numbers of attacks related to the fighting in Iraq and Syria.

Syria presents another key problem and weakness in the current data on terrorism: The failure to assess state and state-driven terrorism. The Assad regime's use of state terrorism in the form of chemical weapons and bombing civilians with weapons like barrel bombs, as well as the abuses of civilians and first responders by its security forces, make the Assad regime the leading single sponsor of state terrorism, but these actions are not addressed in any major database on terrorism.

Equally important, the data and maps in this section show that the ISIS "caliphate" was far more than a terrorist organization and that its primary role was seeking to create a nation under its control through counterinsurgency and asymmetric warfare. There is no clear way to separate its role in terrorism from its broader political and military role – particularly because ISIS fought with forces from Arab rebel groups in Syria, Iran, Iraq, Hezbollah, Russia, Turkey, and the U.S.-led coalition. Like the Taliban, ISIS used terrorism as a key tactic, but there is no way to clearly quantify its use of terrorism in Iraq and Syria as distinguished from its overall role in warfighting and insurgency, and the latter role presented the far more serious threat.

Two other key aspects of ISIS emerge in these data. The first is the potential role of "foreign fighters" in future conflicts and terrorism. ISIS in Iraq and Syria created a large body of local and foreign extremists that may become involved in either terrorism in other countries or future insurgencies. Most are far better trained in insurgent warfare than terrorism, but some could easily adapt to support terrorist groups or cells in other countries. The numbers involved, however, are highly uncertain, as is the future number of those who survive and escape some form of capture or internment.

The second is the strength of ISIS's affiliates, many of which only established ties to ISIS because of its major initial victories in Iraq and Syria. Most of the major affiliates will remain as terrorist and/or insurgent groups after the defeat of the ISIS "caliphate" – just as the overseas branches of Al Qaida survived its defeat in Afghanistan. Once again, the data involved are uncertain, but it is still clear that talking about "defeating" ISIS by fighting in Iraq and Syria ignores the reality of a far greater terrorist, insurgent, and extremist threat.

Finally, the future of Al Qaida Central is a key issue. Groups like Al Nusra may or may not survive in Syria, and may or may not pay close attention to Al Qaida in the future. The same applies to Al Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. The end result could be the joint splintering of both ISIS and Al Qaida or a shift towards some new broad based structure, but none of the current trends in data provide a strong indication of Al Qaida's future.

Terrorism and U.S. Wars: Syria and Iraq

This section shows the broader data affecting the role of terrorism in the MENA region and key conflict areas in the region, the relative impact on the Afghan and Iraq Wars and on the U.S.-led coalition's role in fighting a counterinsurgency campaign against ISIS, and, START and other estimates of how this fighting impacted the overall patterns of terrorism in the region, Iraq, and Syria. It also shows how the fighting with ISIS has interacted with other key ethnic and sectarian tensions and conflict, and the different national patterns of insurgency and terrorism that emerged in Syria and Iraq.

It has already been made clear that the levels of terrorism in Iraq and Syria did not dominate "terrorism," even in the MENA region, and that other centers of terrorism play a key role. While the data are once again uncertain, it seems likely that they are correct in showing that "terrorism" played a greater role in the insurgency in Iraq and Syria than in Afghanistan – although both combined from all perpetrators were only about half the level of terrorism worldwide.

It is also important to keep the data shown in this section in perspective. A military victory in Iraq and Syria will achieve important results in terms of regional stability and serving U.S. national security interests, but, by itself, will only have a marginal impact on the overall threat of terrorism. Even a total defeat of the ISIS "caliphate" will still leave many ISIS fighters to join other movements or ISIS affiliates outside Iraq and Syria.

In the case of Iraq, the START and IHS Jane's data again show just how different estimates from leading sources can be. If one focuses on the START data, its summary reporting in the 2016 analytic annex indicates that:

- Perpetrator deaths in Iraq increased 79% between 2015 and 2016, comprising 25% of total deaths in Iraq, and accounting for more than one-third of the increase in total deaths in Iraq between 2015 and 2016.

- The Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) remained the primary perpetrator of terrorist attacks in Iraq in 2016. For 66% of attacks in Iraq, source materials did not attribute responsibility to a particular perpetrator organization; however, ISIS was identified as the perpetrator in 94% of the remaining attacks for which a perpetrator organization was named.

- The total number of deaths due to terrorist attacks in Iraq increased 40% in 2016, due in large part to an increase in highly lethal attacks.

- In 2016, terrorism in Iraq continued to be marked by extremely deadly coordinated attacks. On 78 occasions during the year, there were more than 10 attacks on a single day within a particular country. Of these, more than two-thirds (71%) took place in Iraq.

- Extensive campaigns of non-lethal violence also took place in Iraq in 2016. For example, the leader of the Dawr District Council reported to the media that ISIS detonated explosives at more than 100 houses in the district over the course of a week in September. No casualties were reported, but dozens of families were forced to relocate.

- More than 2,400 attacks – the vast majority of all attacks in Iraq (86%) in 2016 – were classified as bombings/explosions. An additional 6% were armed assaults, 4% were kidnappings, 2% were facility attacks, and 2% were assassinations. Overall, 9% of all attacks were suicide attacks. These trends are generally very consistent with patterns of tactics in 2015, with the exception of declining numbers of assassinations (48 in 2016 compared to 73 in 2015), and increasing numbers of facility attacks (50 in 2016 compared to eight in 2015).

13

Once again, START's estimates differ from those of IHS Jane's (and indeed all major independent sources of data on terrorism differ in detail). START does estimate some 3,356 incidents took place in Iraq in 2016 which is close to IHS Jane's estimate of 3,350 attacks. However, START estimate some 2,744 incidents took place in Iraq in 2016, and IHS Jane's estimates 3,350 attacks

The differences are far greater for Syria. START estimates some 490 incidents took place in Iraq in 2016, and IHS Jane's estimates 5,496 attacks. START estimates some 472 incidents took place in Iraq in 2016. IHS Jane's estimates 7,997 attacks. Jane's does say it includes insurgent as well as terrorist attacks and violent protests, but it is unclear how one counts insurgency "attacks," and differences like this did not emerge in the data from Iraq.

U.S. experts privately make it clear that there are no credible estimates of the number of foreign volunteers/foreign fighters, and that public reporting tends to be the highest figure provided by given countries or from given report, analytic guesstimate, or source.

Estimates of foreign volunteers/foreign fighters also have little practical value since temporary visitors to training and indoctrination facilities, or visitors to the West and non-conflict areas from given terrorist groups, may possess at least as much of a threat, and many so-called foreign fighters become casualties or receive no practical training in terrorism.

Trained cadres, or volunteers/fighters that survive with both motivation and specialized skills almost certainly do pose a major threat but are only a small part of the real-world total which has little to do in any respect with published estimates.

There also is no clear effort to reach a consensus within the U.S. intelligence community, as is shown in the first slide in this section.

Terrorism and U.S. Wars: Afghanistan

Like Iraq and Syria, Afghanistan is a counterinsurgency war zone, not a center of terrorism. The Taliban was a government that the U.S. helped drive out of Afghanistan. It then based itself in Pakistan, and became a major insurgency from 2008 onwards. It is not, like Al Qaida or ISIS, a terrorist movement focused on spreading a regional or global of ideology in addition to seeking direct political power.

Even more than is the case with the ISIS "caliphate," treating an insurgency as terrorism may have propaganda value, but mislabels the Taliban and the nature of the fighting. The Taliban and its direct supporters form what is very close to a classic insurgent movement that seeks to infiltrate, establish influence, and take control by military means. Terrorism is a Taliban tactic (as well as one of many other insurgent groups), but there is no meaningful way to distinguish between its actions as an insurgent force or to even find reliable data to use according to any given definition.

This section does show START and IHS Jane's efforts to estimate the terrorist threat in Afghanistan, but these caveats about the actual nature of the violence in Afghanistan must be kept carefully in mind. In broad terms, calling an insurgency that is directed almost solely towards gaining power a "terrorist" group makes no real sense, and now there are real terrorist threats in Afghanistan like ISIS

The START analytic annex for 2016 reports that:

- The total number of terrorist attacks in Afghanistan decreased 22% between 2015 and 2016, while the total number of deaths decreased 14%. At the same time, perpetrator deaths declined 7%, and the percentage of total fatalities in Afghanistan that were perpetrator deaths remained especially high – 51%, compared to 26% worldwide.

- Attacks carried out by the Taliban in 2016 killed more than 3,500 people (including nearly 2,000 perpetrators) and wounded more than 3,500 additional people. The Khorasan branch of ISIS remained active in Afghanistan in 2016, carrying out 6% of attacks in which a perpetrator group was identified.

- Three of the 20 deadliest individual attacks in 2016 took place in Afghanistan – in Kunduz, Helmand, and Ghazni provinces. The Taliban claimed responsibility for all three attacks.

- Attacks against police targets, especially personnel, checkpoints, and police buildings, comprised 35% of terrorist attacks in Afghanistan in 2016. This represents a decrease from 2015, when 45% of all attacks in Afghanistan targeted police. However, police targets were still twice as prevalent in Afghanistan as worldwide (17%). Private citizens and property were targeted in one-third (33%) of the attacks in Afghanistan in 2016 (increased from 24% in 2015), followed by non-diplomatic government targets, which comprised 12% of attacks in 2016.

Pakistan is both a state sponsor of terrorism against Afghanistan and India, and suffers from serious internal threats. Its military and Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) branch have sponsored terrorist attacks and the Taliban in Afghanistan and a range of terrorist groups that have attacked India – some over its control of Kashmir. The START and IHS Jane's data do not reflect state terrorism, and the show only terrorism on targets within Pakistan.

START summarized the situation in Pakistan in 2016 as follows:

- In 2016, the total number of terrorist attacks reported in Pakistan decreased 27%, and the total number of deaths decreased 12%; however, the total number of people injured increased 29% in comparison to 2015. The number of perpetrators killed in attacks in Pakistan in 2016 decreased 25% between 2015 and 2016. Perpetrator deaths comprised 9% of all deaths in Pakistan in 2016, compared to 26% worldwide.

- Two-thirds of terrorist attacks in Pakistan in 2016 targeted the police (29%), private citizens and property (27%), and non-diplomatic government entities (11%). Although attacks on educational institutions, religious figures and institutions, and transportation targets each comprised 4-5% of all terrorist attacks in Pakistan in 2016, these types of targets were approximately twice as prevalent in Pakistan, compared to worldwide.

Again, estimates from different sources differ sharply in many respects. For example, START estimates some 1,927 incidents took place in Afghanistan in 2015; IHS Jane's estimates 1,185. START estimates some 1,615 incidents took place in Afghanistan in 2016; IHS Jane's estimates 1,004.

Terrorism in Other Parts of South Asia

The data in this section show that India is a major center of terrorist activity, although its large size and immense population must be considered in making such assessments. Unfortunately, the data do not distinguish between the religious nature of the perpetrators and targets in a country where religion is a key factor, and do not distinguish by ethnic group.

This is a critical problem throughout the sources now available. They often report on weapon and target type, and data like casualties, but ignore some of the key factors driving terrorism in given countries and on a regional and global basis.

The START analysis rather strikingly does not mention Pakistan or the role of Pakistani extremist groups in supporting terrorism in India in the country summary provided in the State Department analytic annex for 2016. It does note, however, that:

- Although India ranked highly among countries that experienced the most terrorist attacks in 2016, the lethality of these attacks remained relatively low compared to other countries that also experienced a great deal of terrorist violence. On average, terrorist attacks in India caused 0.4 total deaths per attack in 2016, compared to 2.4 deaths per attack worldwide. Nearly three-quarters of attacks (73%) in India in 2016 were non-lethal. The deadliest attack in India in 2016 took place in July, when the Communist Party of India – Maoist detonated explosives and opened fire on Central Reserve Police Force personnel in Bihar state. Sixteen people were killed in the attack, including six assailants.

- The number of perpetrators killed in terrorist attacks in India decreased 20% in 2016.

- There was a sharp increase in the number of people kidnapped or taken hostage in terrorist attacks in India in 2015. This pattern – which was largely the result of relatively few attacks involving especially large numbers of people kidnapped or taken hostage – reversed in 2016. The total number of people kidnapped or taken hostage in terrorist attacks in India, decreased 63%, from 866 in 2015, to 317 in 2016.

- A majority of terrorist attacks in India in 2016 involved either bombings/explosions (47%) or armed assaults (18%). In addition, kidnappings were particularly prevalent in India (15% of all attacks, compared to 10% worldwide), as were facility/infrastructure attacks (12% of all attacks, compared to 6% worldwide).

- More than half of the terrorist attacks in India in 2016 took place in four states: Jammu and Kashmir (19%), Chhattisgarh (18%), Manipur (12%), and Jharkhand (10%). This geographic pattern is relatively stable compared to 2015, with the exception of Jammu and Kashmir, which experienced an especially large (+93%) increase in attacks in 2016.

- Information about the perpetrator groups responsible for terrorist attacks in India was reported in source materials for 55% of all attacks. Compared to the other countries that experienced the most terrorist attacks and fatalities in 2016, the diversity of perpetrator groups was much greater in India, with 52 active groups. However, nearly two-thirds of the terrorist attacks carried out in India in 2016 (65%) were attributed to the Communist Party of India-Maoist or Maoist perpetrators not specifically identified as belonging to a particular organization.

-

The data show that Bangladesh and Nepal have also had high levels of terrorism, but that levels have recently dropped sharply. Once again, the charts show that the START incident counts and IHS Jane's attack counts often differ strikingly.

Terrorism in China

The data on China, like that on Central Asia, seem to only include major incidents. They are unusually uncertain totals and clearly lack in comparability to the data for most other regions. This may reflect START's dependence on media reporting, which is subject to higher levels of censorship in some regions than others.

It is important to note that the U.S. and China do differ over the definition of terrorism and how to characterize a number of activist groups. This is particularly true of some Uighur groups. The START chronology data shown here indicate, however, that they largely agree on characterize terrorists once they use any form of violence.

Once again, a table in this section shows significant differences between the START and IHS Jane's estimates.

A detailed breakout of the data on China is not provided for these reasons.

Terrorism in Central Asia

The data on Central Asia, like the data for China, seem to only include a small selection of major violent incidents. Like the data on China, they seem unusually uncertain and lacking in comparability to the data for most other regions. This may reflect dependence on media reporting which is subject to censorship, but China's tight internal security may keep the number of attacks low even for a country of its size and population.

Once again, there are significant differences between the START and the IHS Jane's estimates.

Only a limited breakout of the data is provided for these reasons. It is clear, however, that as in other regions, terrorism differs strikingly by county and that national causes and conditions – rather than broad regional or ideological trends and causes – drive the real-world nature of terrorism in any given case.

East Asia, Southeast Asia, and Oceania

The data on various subregions of Asia make it clear that regional summaries can disguise the true nature of terrorism and threat. The key patterns are national and plays out in strikingly different ways even in neighboring states.

The START data on East Asia and Northeast Asia, for example, show that China, Japan, North Korea, and South Korea all have low levels of terrorism, but that China and Japan still stand out – somewhat surprisingly – relative to the two Koreas.

The START data on Southeast Asia – Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Vietnam – show that Thailand is the driving center of terrorist activity in the sub-region. A country-by-country breakout shows, however, that Myanmar and Indonesia also have significant activity at a much lower level. The data again fail to show the causes and underlying patterns because they do not take account of political unrest in Thailand and problems with Muslim minorities in the South.

The data for Myanmar do not trace the extent to which they are impacted by the Rohingya minority, tribal violence, and various warlord and drug groups in the East. The data on Indonesia do not characterize the tribal, ethnic, or religious character of the targets, but seem to be driven by Islamic extremism.

The data on the Philippines show high levels of terrorism and receive special attention in the START annex to the State Department's country reports on terrorism. The summary in the START analysis for 2016 also provides some additional useful comparisons of global trends:

- Terrorist violence in the Philippines was relatively consistent between 2015 and 2016. However, due to declining frequency of terrorist attacks elsewhere, the Philippines ranked fifth among countries in terms of total attacks in 2016. The number of attacks in the Philippines declined by 2% (490 in 2015 to 482 in 2016), and the total number of deaths in the Philippines increased by 5% (260 in 2015 to 272 in 2016).

- Like India, the average lethality of terrorist attacks in the Philippines (0.6 deaths per attack) was markedly lower than the global average in 2016 (2.4 deaths per attack). Terrorist attacks in the Philippines were slightly less likely to be successful (76%), compared to worldwide trends (81%)

- Among the ten countries that experienced the most terrorist attacks in 2016, the percentage of people killed who were perpetrators was lowest in the Philippines – 7%. This figure has declined since 2014, when 21% of all deaths in the Philippines were perpetrator deaths.

- Although the number of terrorist attacks in the Philippines in which people were kidnapped or taken hostage remained stable between 2015 and 2016, the number of people kidnapped or taken hostage increased 70%, from 127 in 2015 to 216 in 2016.

- For 57% of all attacks in the Philippines in 2016, the source materials did not identify the perpetrator group responsible for the attack. Among the remaining attacks, 57% were carried out by the (CPP/NPA), 20% were carried out by the ASG, and 13% were attributed to the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Movement. An additional 6% of remaining attacks (12 events) were attributed to ISIS or the ISIS-linked Maute Group.

- Terrorist attacks in the Philippines in 2016 targeted non-diplomatic government targets more than any other type of target. In fact, these targets comprised 39% of all attacks in the Philippines, compared to 10% globally. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the attacks on government entities targeted politicians, political parties, and political rallies/meetings, rather than government employees and facilities (17%), or election-related targets (10%). An additional 21% of attacks in the Philippines in 2016 targeted private citizens and property, and 12% targeted the police.

- The primary tactics used by terrorists in the Philippines differed considerably from global trends in 2016. Although bombings were the most common tactic in the Philippines, they comprised one-third (33%) of all attacks in the Philippines, compared to more than half (57%) worldwide. In contrast, assassinations were more than four times as prevalent in the Philippines (29% of all attacks) as globally (7% of all attacks). The frequency of assassinations increased 131% between 2014 and 2016. In 2016, the vast majority of these attacks (81%) targeted politicians and political party members.

- Sixty of the Philippines' 81 provinces experienced terrorist attacks in 2016. Although the attacks were geographically dispersed, five locations experienced more than 20 attacks throughout the year: Maguindanao (62), Basilan (32), North Cotabato (27), Masbate (23), and Batangas (22).

The data on Oceania show negligible levels of terrorism.

Once again, there are significant differences between the START count of incidents and the IHS Jane's count of attacks.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Sub-Saharan Africa presents a number of complex problems in estimating terrorism. As the graphs in this section show, countries differ sharply within a given sub-region. START estimates that several countries dominate in terms of incidents – Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Sudan, and Somalia. Its estimates do, however, present problems. The graph total estimated incidents for 2011-2016 for Somalia are 2,697, which is exactly the same as the graph and total for Al Shabaab as a perpetrator. This means that every incident could assigned to one perpetrator, and ignores reported Al Shabaab activity in Kenya.

Several broad patterns do emerge. Islamist extremist groups dominate the rise of terrorism in Western and Eastern Africa, but tribal and regional differences also play a major role and the struggle is at least as much one for power as over religion per se. Stability, and conversely the level of terrorism, is highly dependent on the quality of governance and popular support and unity, which helps explain the high level of differences between neighboring states.

One key case where terrorism is largely a function of poor governance and internal tribal and regional differences is the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which has now experienced chronic instability for over half a century.

The START reporting on South Africa makes a sharp contrast to the reported levels of terrorism in other areas of Africa. The numbers of incidents are very low.

A review of the IHS Jane's data reveals a similar pattern for most countries and subregions, but not for Somalia. START reports 407 incidents for 2015, and IHS Jane's reports 278 attacks. START reports 509 incidents for 2016, and IHS Jane's reports 471 attacks. Similarly, in the case of Nigeria, START reports 637 incidents for 2015, and IHS Jane's reports 273 attacks. START reports 531 incidents in Nigeria for 2016, and IHS Jane's reports 226 attacks.

This again illustrates how difficult it is for any outside organization to estimate terrorist patterns that lacks the resources and access a government has to intelligence data, as well as the fact that reporting and definitions vary sharply by country and according to a government's political stand and control of its media.

Caribbean and Central and South America

The START and IHS Jane's reporting on South America makes a sharp contrast to many other regions in the world. The level of terrorism is very low compared to the patterns in other developing regions and shows a sharp decline since the levels of Marxist guerilla activity in the mid-1970s to early 1990s.

START does not report any significant level of terrorist activity for the Caribbean and Central America during 2011-2016.

The only major source of guerrilla activity in the northern part of South America was in Colombia, and the START data shows a sharp drop that seems likely to be prolong if Colombian peace negotiations prove to have a lasting impact.

The START data for the southern part of South America do show more terrorist activity, but the levels remain very low and no one country emerged as the center of even low level activity.

Once again, START and IHS Jane's differ, even though both sources agree that the levels of activity are very low. In the case of Colombia, START reports 135 incidents for 2015, and IHS Jane's reports 213 attacks. START reports 85 incidents for Columbia in 2016, and IHS Jane's reports 156 attacks. Similarly, in the case of Venezuela, START reports 3 incidents for 2015, and IHS Jane's reports 27 attacks. START reports 6 incidents for 2016, and IHS Jane's reports 27 attacks.

Sources, Analytic Cautions and Challenges

The final section focuses on the problems and uncertainties in the data. One key conclusion is that open source analysis cannot be accurate, or provide the transparency and coverage needed for accurate public policy analysis, unless the U.S government provides a declassified database of comparable and useful key data. The former NCTC and FBI reports made a start in this regard, but have long since been cancelled.