The Inadvertent Effects of Democracy on Terrorist Group Emergence

Erica Chenoweth

2006-06 **November 2006**

CITATION AND REPRODUCTION

This document appears as Discussion Paper 2006-06 of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. BCSIA Discussion Papers are works in progress. Comments are welcome and may be directed to the author via email at erica_chenoweth@ksg.harvard.edu.

This paper may be cited as: Erica Chenoweth, "The Inadvertent Effects of Democracy on Terrorist Group Emergence," BCSIA Discussion Paper 2006-06, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, November 2006.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Erica Chenoweth is a Research Fellow in the International Security Program (ISP) at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a doctoral candidate in political science at the University of Colorado. She is currently completing her dissertation, which expands upon the findings reported in this paper. In other projects, Chenoweth has researched international norms and security, the local politics of homeland security, strategic nonviolent action, and the relationship between corruption and terrorism. Forthcoming book projects include an in-depth examination of the relationship between regime type and terrorism and an ongoing project that explores variation in local homeland security coalition building, suggesting strategies for local governance for homeland security (with Susan E. Clarke of the University of Colorado). She has presented her research throughout the United States and recently delivered a lecture in Tirana, Albania at the NATO Advanced Research Workshop on religious coexistence in the Balkans. Chenoweth's articles and book reviews have appeared in venues such as the Review of Policy Research, Terror and Conflict Monitor, International Criminal Justice Review, and e-Extreme. She has also contributed chapters to several book volumes edited by James Forest (United States Military Academy), including *The Making of a Terrorist: Recruitment, Training, and Root Causes* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2005); *Homeland Security: Protecting America's Targets* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2006); and *Countering Terrorism in the 21st Century* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, forthcoming).

The Inadvertent Effects of Democracy on Terrorist Group Emergence[1]

Abstract

Why are terrorist groups prevalent in democracies? I argue that the motivation for terrorist group proliferation in democracies can be explained by intergroup dynamics, with terrorist groups of various ideologies competing with one another for limited agenda space within the democracy. In order to test my hypotheses, I conduct a cross-national, longitudinal analysis of 119 countries for the period 1975–97, using participation competition and intergroup competition as the key independent variables and the number of emerging terrorist groups as the dependent variable. I find support for the hypothesis that intergroup competition, motivated by the competitiveness of the political regime, explains an increase in terrorist groups. I also find preliminary support for the notion that the relationship is curvilinear—that the most competitive and least competitive polities produce the largest number of new groups. In light of the current emphasis on terrorism and its impacts on global security, officials must take into account intergroup dynamics in order to derive effective counterterrorism policies.

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 20–23, 2006.

Introduction

Why are terrorist groups prevalent in democracies, and why do individuals and groups resort to terrorist violence rather than use legal channels to express their grievances? Two different theoretical arguments in the literature suggest different interactions between democracy and terrorism. One perspective argues that democracy will reduce terrorism as a phenomenon because democracies offer avenues for interest articulation among citizens and endorse nonviolent resolutions of conflicts. Because of the increased ability to express grievances, individuals and groups will pursue nonviolent alternatives to terrorism. The second argument, on the other hand, expects the opposite effect: that political and civil liberties are positively correlated with terrorism because of the increased opportunity and permissiveness of democratic systems. The freedoms of movement and association enjoyed within democracies provide opportunities for terrorist groups to take root in societies and act against either their own governments or foreign governments. Parceling out the effects of democratic participation and constraints on executive power, still others have argued that different elements of democracy have competing effects on terrorist incidents.

This project contributes to this debate by exploring the causal processes linking democracies to terrorist group activity. I argue that terrorist activities proliferate in democratic countries for two related reasons. First, democracies provide the permissive environment, or opportunity structure, wherein terrorist groups flourish. Second, the motivation for terrorist groups to escalate in democracies can be explained by intergroup dynamics, with terrorist groups of various ideologies competing with one another for limited agenda space. To test my hypotheses, I conduct a cross-national, longitudinal analysis of 119 countries for the period

1975–97, using agenda competition as the key independent variable and the number of new terrorist groups as the dependent variable.

This research is significant for several reasons. First, it contributes to the debate concerning the relationship between democracies and terrorism. Few studies have investigated the dynamics existing between terrorist groups or the significance of such dynamics in explaining this relationship. Therefore, this research is critical in both developing testable hypotheses regarding terrorism and creating recommendations for potential policy responses. A further goal is to contribute to the growing policy literature endorsing democracy as a way to eradicate terrorism. This project is a critique of the latter perspective, offering some considerations for scholars and policymakers who advocate democratization without taking into account all of its potential ramifications. Improved knowledge about the origins and development of terrorist groups—and the conditions that enhance them—is necessary in order for policymakers to make informed choices in foreign policy, especially in light of the current emphasis on terrorism and its potential impacts on U.S. security.

In the first section of this paper, I discuss the current literature on democracy and terrorism. I then present my argument as an alternative to existing theories, followed by a large-n statistical test of my claims. I conclude by identifying the empirical and policy implications of these findings.

Political Opportunities for Terrorist Activity

There are two primary theoretical arguments concerning the relationship between democracy and terrorism.[2] First, some have argued that the lack of opportunities for expression of political grievances motivates terrorism.[3] In democratic societies, therefore, where freedom of expression is encouraged, dissenters are less likely to resort to terrorist violence.[4] Members of any class are able to join political parties, affect public policy, cast votes, and protest through peaceful means. In essence, democracy lowers the opportunity cost of achieving one's political goals through legal means, thereby making terrorism less attractive to would-be perpetrators.[5]

Those residing within democracies may be less likely to resort to terrorism, because democratic participation through elections improves the responsiveness of the government. The presence of civil liberties may also reduce terrorist violence due to a general sense of contentment among citizens.[6] In general, then, opportunities for political expression diminish the root causes of terrorism because citizens in democratic countries are more likely to be satisfied in the first place.

The second argument expects the opposite—that democracy will encourage terrorism. First, Ted Robert Gurr argues that terrorism in democracies occurs in the context of a wider

2. To be sure, there are many important questions to answer regarding the nature of democracy and terrorism, the internal features of democracy and how they give rise to groups, and the consequences of foreign and domestic policies on terrorist groups. Due to time and resource constraints, I will not be able to analyze each of these important issues in this particular project. However, future research will investigate the impacts of "social climates" within both democracies and autocracies on terrorism as data becomes more readily available.
3. Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (July 1981), pp. 379–399.
4. Alex Schmid, "Terrorism and Democracy," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Winter 1992), pp. 14–25.
5. Quan Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (April 2005), pp. 278–297; Jeffrey Ian Ross, "Structural Causes of Oppositional Political Terrorism: Towards a Causal Model," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (August 1993), pp. 317–329; and Joe Eyerman, "Terrorism and Democratic States: Soft Targets or Accessible Systems?" *International Interactions*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1998), pp. 151–170.
6. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"

violent conflict.[7] Ostensibly democratic transitions are particularly vulnerable events, as the fragile country attempts to overcome the potential backlash of internal and external actors opposing the transition or its implications. Indeed, some scholars have found that new democracies are particularly prone to internal conflict.[8]

Furthermore, most scholars in this camp have suggested that democracy provides a permissive environment for terrorist growth because of the necessity to adhere to certain civil liberties.[9] This perspective is in line with the political opportunity literature prevalent in sociology.[10] Democratic guarantees such as freedom of assembly reduce the costs of conducting terrorist activities. Moreover, legal systems are less able to quickly pursue and prosecute potential terrorists because of the constraints placed on them by civil rights. Political leaders in the United States, for instance, have expressed frustration about the constraining effects of civil liberties in conducting the war on terrorism: "[T]he spirited defense of civil liberties is a 'tactic that aids terrorists…erodes our national unity…diminishes our resolve [and] gives ammunition to America's enemies.'"[11]

7. Ted Robert Gurr, "Terrorism in Democracies: Its Social and Political Bases," in Walter Reich, ed., *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind* (Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1990), pp. 86–102.
8. Nils Petter Gleditsch, Peter Walkensteen, Mikael Eriksson, Margareta Sollenberg, and Håvard Strand, "Armed Conflict 1946–2001: A New Dataset," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 39, No. 5 (September 2002), pp. 615–637; and Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, *Electing to Fight: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005).
9. Schmid, "Terrorism and Democracy"; William Lee Eubank and Leonard Weinberg, "Does Democracy Encourage Terrorism?" *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Winter 1994), pp. 417–463; William Lee Eubank and Leonard Weinberg, "Terrorism and Democracy: What Recent Events Disclose," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring 1998), pp. 108–118; William Lee Eubank and Leonard Weinberg, "Terrorism and Democracy: Perpetrators and Victims," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Spring 2001), pp. 155–164; Ross, "Structural Causes of Oppositional Political Terrorism"; and Eyerman, "Terrorism and Democratic States."
10. See, for instance, Anthony Oberschall, *Social Conflict and Social Movements* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1973). See also Douglas McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly, *Dynamics of Contention* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
11. Attorney General John Ashcroft in John P. Crank and Patricia E. Gregor, *Counterterrorism after 9/11: Justice, Security, and Ethics Reconsidered* (Cincinnati, Ohio: LexisNexis, 2005), p. 158.

Moreover, the specific civil liberty of press freedom may also increase terrorism through two distinct processes. First, and most bothersome to researchers, is the problem of reporting bias across different regime types. Autocracies have less incentive to report the existence of oppositional groups or oppositional violence, and therefore restrict the material printed by their media. In a democracy, however, the media has an incentive to report not only transparently, but also sensationally.[12] Furthermore, the democratic government places fewer restrictions on media content.[13] Therefore, terrorist incidents are less likely to be reported in autocratic countries than in democracies. Reporting bias, then, may lead researchers to the erroneous conclusion that civil liberties actually contribute to terrorist violence in the long run.

Press freedom may have an additional positive causal effect on terrorism. Without media coverage, terrorist groups are essentially obsolete. Widespread fear and panic are fundamental elements of terrorist strategy. In fact, Margaret Thatcher called the press the "oxygen" for terrorists.[14] Because free press exists in most democracies, terrorists have increased incentives to grow in, move to, and conduct their violence within such countries. Sensational media coverage also serves the terrorists in their recruiting, teaching, and training techniques. The press, therefore, is inadvertently complicit in fulfilling terrorists' objectives.

Quan Li suggests, however, that the positive effect of civil liberties may be epiphenomenal of a crucial aspect of democratic governance: the degree of institutional constraints on the decisionmaking power of the government. Whereas freedom of action in a nondemocracy is contingent upon support from the elite, the democratic government is held accountable by other branches of government as well as by the domestic electorate. As Li argues,

12. Brigitte L. Nacos, *Mass-Mediated Terrorism: The Central Role of the Media in Terrorism and Counterterrorism* (Boulder, Colo.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002).
13. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
14. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in R.W. Apple Jr., "Meese Suggests Press Code on Terrorism," *New York Times*, July 18, 1985.

"There are more veto players over government policy in democracy than in autocracy. Such political constraints prevent the democratic government from encroaching on civil liberties."[15] In other words, the extent of civil liberties is largely determined by the strength of these constraints.[16]

Even more important, however, is that institutional constraints weaken the government's ability to fight terrorism. Checks and balances force the democratic government to be more accountable to a broader range of domestic interests. The democratic government is unlikely to engage in counterterrorist activities that could be perceived as undermining core democratic values, due to electoral incentives as well as norms of fair play. Authoritarian regimes, on the other hand, are less constrained and more able to find and crush terrorist organizations.[17] Democratic countries, therefore, are less likely to adopt counterterrorist strategies that are as strict as those enacted by nondemocratic regimes.[18]

Some scholars have also noted a relationship between the form of democracy and terrorism. John Huber and G. Bingham Powell found differing effects of majoritarian and proportional representation on the congruence between citizen preferences and public policies. On the whole, the proportional representation system generates closer alignment of citizen self-placement and the estimated positions of governments on either majoritarian or mixed systems.[19] Unsurprisingly, then, Marta Reynal-Querol has found that proportional representation also reduces the probability that groups will rebel within a state, because the opportunity costs of

15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," pp. 379–399.
18. Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response* (London: Frank Cass, 2000).
19. John D. Huber and G. Bingham Powell Jr., "Congruence between Citizens and Policymakers in Two Visions of Liberal Democracy," *World Politics*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (April 1994), pp. 291–326; and Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?" p. 284.

engaging in conflict are higher in this type of system than any other.[20] In a recent analysis, Li discovered a negative correlation between proportional representation and terrorist incidents, following Reynal-Querol's findings.[21]

To summarize, democracy has been found to both encourage and reduce terrorist incidents, albeit through different causal mechanisms. That is, democratic participation reduces transnational incidents in ways indicated by Martha Crenshaw and Alex Schmid. It "increases satisfaction and political efficacy of citizens, reduces their grievances, thwarts terrorist recruitment, and raises public tolerance of counterterrorist policies."[22] The institutional constraints, however, actually exacerbate terrorism by imposing upon the government the "tough task of protecting the general citizenry against terrorist attacks," and by weakening the government's strategic balance vis-à-vis the terrorists—essentially providing the opportunity structure in which terrorism can thrive.[23] It seems, however, that restricting freedoms of movement, press, and association does not decrease the number of terrorist incidents. Instead, one observes a "substitution effect" in which terrorists merely replace their tactics with those that can continue in light of the government's new restrictions.[24]

Instead of focusing on purely linear correlations, Alberto Abadie suggests that perhaps political freedom, poverty, and terrorism have a curvilinear relationship: it is neither the freest nor the most repressive states, but rather the intermediate states that experience terrorism. Using data from the World Market Research Center's "Global Terrorism Risk" database for 2003 and

20. Marta Reynal-Querol, "Political Systems, Stability, and Civil Wars," *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 13, No. 6 (2002), pp. 465–483.
21. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
22. Ibid., p. 294.
23. Ibid.
24. Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, "Patterns of Transnational Terrorism, 1970–1999: Alternative Time-Series Estimates," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (June 2002), pp. 145–165.

2004, Abadie suggests that these nonmonotonic relationships show that terrorism is more likely to occur in countries undergoing a democratic transition.[25]

Despite these important findings, the literature stops short of explaining terrorist groups' seeming preference for democracies. Why would they develop within and target open societies with existing avenues of interest articulation? In other words, are terrorist groups truly attracted to the nature of democracies, or to the opportunity structure alone? If it is only the latter, then terrorist groups would be similarly attracted to states that cannot control their own territories, conventionally referred to as "weak" states.

Interestingly, a number of so-called weak states do not contain or endorse substate terrorist groups, whereas almost every democratic country in the world has confronted terrorism throughout its history. Moreover, despite Li's argument that constraints on the executive prevent democracies from adopting strict counterterrorism policies, many cases exist in which democratic executives have circumvented these constraints to adopt such strategies. Therefore, it seems that the opportunity structure alone does not suffice to explain the proliferation of terrorist groups in democracies. There must be some other intervening factor(s) that affect the growth of terrorism as well.[26]

---

25. Alberto Abadie, "Poverty, Political Freedom, and the Roots of Terrorism," National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, No. 10859 (Cambridge, Mass.: NBER, 2004).

26. Some arguments are that most terrorist groups are inherently hostile toward Western democracy, because of its secularism, its hedonism, or its market strategies. Those who subscribe to the belief that terrorism is primarily an ideological phenomenon use suicide bombing as evidence to support their claims—that the "martyr culture" of Islam, for instance, endorses the use of suicide violence against Western enemies. This argument is further substantiated by examining texts of Islamic terrorist leaders, who denounce the West—particularly America—as "the Great Satan." Osama bin Laden, "Declaration of War against the Americans Occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places," in Walter Laqueur, ed., *Voices of Terror* (New York: Reed, 2004), pp. 410–412. This evidence, unfortunately, does not explain suicide terrorism or the grievances that have arisen.; nor does it explain why some Islamic individuals become terrorists and some do not. It also forces researchers and policymakers to ignore the great abundance of non-Islamic terrorists (including, for instance, the Christian Patriots, ETA, and the IRA). Islamic terrorists are not the sole proprietors of suicide terrorism. Indeed, the Tamil Tigers, a secular group, began to use suicide terrorism as a successful tactic in the 1990s. Some Islamic groups have used the Tigers' success as a justification for using this tactic against perceived occupiers in the Middle East. Islamic terrorists have then scrambled for justification in the Koran, but many influential Islamic clerics have since denounced suicide terrorism

The Motivation for Terrorist Group Activity in Democracies

I argue that the pivotal dimension of the relationship between democracy and terrorist group emergence is that intergroup dynamics differ in democracies and nondemocracies.[27] The main difference is that in democracies, terrorist groups tend to compete against one another, whereas in nondemocracies, they are less susceptible to competitive dynamics.

In democracies interest groups compete for space on the public agenda, which is comprised of "those political controversies the polity deems worthy of attention."[28] Importantly, however, the agenda is susceptible to crowding effects, forcing different interest groups to compete to maintain their positions on the agenda to the exclusion of other issues, especially those interest groups in ideological opposition to the given issue.[29] Because the agenda-setting process is highly competitive, various political organizations or interest groups are pitted against one another, even if they have similar interests at stake. Often, these groups are in direct conflict with one another and may even be hostile at times.[30]

---

as violating religious laws within Islam. See CNN, "Bin Laden Fatwa as Spain Remembers," March 11, 2005, http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/europe/03/11/madrid.anniversary/index.html.

27. Most terrorist groups—regardless of the plausibility of their claims or the regime type in their place of origin—claim that they suffer oppression from the government. While the purpose of this study is not to examine the validity of their claims, I argue that there are nevertheless certain distinct characteristics of democracies that inadvertently encourage groups to form, regardless of the factual or realistic bases of the groups' grievances and perceptions.

28. Roy B. Flemming, B. Dan Wood, and John Bohte, "Attention to Issues in a System of Separated Powers: The Macrodynamics of American Policy Agendas," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (February 1999), p. 77. Whereas the institutional agenda includes, "The specific, concrete issues being attended to by the government," the systemic agenda refers more broadly to the general concerns of the public. Ibid., p. 77.

29. David C. Lowery and Virginia Gray, "The Population Ecology of Gucci Gulch, or the Natural Regulation of Interest Group Numbers in the American States," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (February 1995), pp. 1–29.

30. Mia Bloom has argued that the competition between terrorist groups for recruits and resources has caused them to escalate their tactics to suicide bombing. However, no one has yet examined the competitive pressures that persuade groups to choose terrorism over peaceful forms of political discourse. Mia Bloom, *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).

Like more conventional conceptions of interest groups, the main objective of a terrorist group is either to preserve the status quo, or to bring about political change. According to the logic of terrorists, adroit articulations of violence may make the public aware of their grievances and succeed in putting issues of political salience on the agenda. Roger Congleton writes:

> Both terrorist networks and ordinary political interest groups attempt to influence controversial public policies in a manner disproportionate to their votes. The probability and extent of the success of their efforts increase as the resources devoted to exerting 'influence' expand, and decline with opponent efforts to resist their aims, other things begin equal. To the extent that participants are rational, institutional arrangements that change the probability of success among alternative methods of influence affect the level and allocation of group efforts across these methods. Terror is, analytically, simply another *method* that groups may use to influence decisions reached by government. In all these respects, terrorism is simply another form of interest-group politics.[31]

Terrorist groups are distinct from normal interest groups in several ways. First, whereas conventional interest groups use inducements through positive sanctions (such as financial rewards and campaign support, among others) to influence legislative voting on the agenda, terrorist groups use negative sanctions (e.g., violence) to influence policy. Second, whereas conventional interest groups participate in the political process through generally accepted means of public discourse, terrorist violence is always perceived as illegitimate and unacceptable by democratic societies. Thus, while normal interest groups may eventually gain access to the political process, terrorist groups are perceived as perpetual outsiders unless they denounce violence and become legally recognized political parties (as Sinn Fein did).

To illustrate, let us consider a hypothetical situation between two potential terrorist groups—Group A and Group B. Group A may form as a result from a social interaction between aggrieved individuals within a democratic society. In its view, Group A has exhausted conventional means of expressing its political preferences. Perhaps Group A's members

31. Roger D. Congelton, "Terrorism, Interest-Group Politics, and Public Policy: Curtailing Criminal Modes of Political Speech," *Independent Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Summer 2002).

subscribe to an extreme ideology, but perceive themselves to be isolated from mainstream political discourse. Ultimately, given a crisis of legitimacy and confidence in their government, these individuals may resort to using violence to express their grievances.[32] The new group may be able to achieve through collective action what its members had difficulty achieving separately due to limited resources. This particular process does not differ across democracies and nondemocracies.

Other potential groups (such as Group B) may react in several ways to Group A's initial violence. First, because of the competitive nature of the agenda-setting process in democracies, Group B may find that Group A's violent expression threatens Group B's ability to add its own interests to the agenda. Second, if Group A is a right-wing terrorist group, a left-wing group has an even greater incentive to adopt violent strategies. Ideological opposition becomes especially salient in this dynamic, because the interests of the respective groups may be so incompatible that there is no possibility of satisfying one group if its opponent successfully gains space on the public agenda. In other words, paying attention to Group A necessarily diverts the audience's attention away from Group B. Beginning in 1969, for example, right-wing terrorist groups in Italy promoted the so-called strategy of tension to prevent the Italian public and government from succumbing to the Red Brigades' left-wing terrorist influences. Moreover, in the conflict in Northern Ireland, reactionary groups such as the Ulster Defense Force have arisen in response to the Irish Republican Army (IRA) as a way to abet the possible effects of Northern Irish violence on British policies in the region.

Democracies also permit terrorist groups to pay attention to both the effectiveness of certain tactics and the futility of others. Manus Midlarsky, Martha Crenshaw, and Fumihiko

32. Ehud Sprinzak, "The Pscyhopolitical Formation of Extreme Left Terrorism in a Democracy: The Case of the Weathermen," in Reich, *The Origins of Terrorism*, pp. 65–85.

Yoshida have referred to the "contagion effect" of terrorist tactics in which groups emulate each other's effective organizational and attack strategies primarily by monitoring the media.[33] Because of the existence of widespread publicity on terrorist activities in democracies, groups within democracies are aware of one another's actions, therefore motivating themselves to act. Again, this may be especially true when terrorist groups that have directly opposing viewpoints—such as radical, left-wing terrorists and neo-Nazi skinhead terrorists—coexist within the same democracy. In fact, we see this "action-reaction" relationship in many democracies. Throughout the West, the left-wing terrorists of the 1960s and 1970s had their counterparts in neofascist terrorist groups—in Italy, the Red Brigades rivaled Ordine Nero, for instance. As a further example, the IRA has its counterparts in the Ulster Freedom Fighters and Ulster Voluntary Force. Indeed, these groups have experienced such a high intensity of issue incompatibility and competition that they have frequently attacked one another.

Most research on terrorism acknowledges that through their actions, terrorists speak to media, governments, and civilians as primary audiences. I argue, however, that in addition to these conventionally explored audiences, terrorist groups are talking to each other, a claim seldom made in the existing literature. In democracies, which I have already shown to permit ideological pluralism and the freedoms of assembly and press, terrorist groups are able to monitor the existence and actions of rival groups who are competing for issue recognition.

Although I expect agenda competition to have a positive effect on terrorist group emergence, an alternative expectation may be that agenda competition actually diminishes the motivation for terrorism for two reasons. First, because the legislature represents a plurality of ideas, potential terrorist groups may actually find violence unnecessary because the likelihood of

33. Manus I. Midlarsky, Martha Crenshaw, and Fumihiko Yoshida, "Why Violence Spreads: The Contagion of International Terrorism," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (June 1980), pp. 262–298.

their viewpoint being represented will increase. Second, citizens may be more satisfied due to the openness of the agenda, therefore diminishing the underlying causes of terrorism in general.[34]

To summarize, the cherished elements of democracy—competition, freedom of association, freedom of press, freedom of speech, responsive government, and a plurality of ideas—may also have dark sides. These features of governance, while desirable, inadvertently lead to contagion effects among terrorist groups, which perceive the effectiveness of terrorist tactics in influencing the population, monitor other groups' efforts at recognition, and struggle to organize themselves to compete for agenda space.

Empirical Analysis

To test my argument, I conduct a cross-national, longitudinal study of the emergence of terrorist groups in 119 countries (both democracies and nondemocracies) for the period 1975–97. The unit of analysis is the country year, and the dependent variable is the number of new terrorist groups that emerged in that country that year. Because terrorist attacks may affect some of the independent variables (such as GDP), all independent variables are lagged one year behind the dependent variable. The data for the dependent variable is taken from the RAND-MIPT database and the *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism*, each of which includes country and group profiles that indicate the date of group formation.[35] Because the dependent variable is an event count, I use negative binomial regression analysis.

34. Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism."
35. Frank Shanty, Raymond Picquet, and John Lalla, eds., *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, 2004). Also see RAND-MIPT Terrorism Knowledge Base, http://www.tkb.org. "International Terrorism: Attributes of Terrorist Events" (ITERATE) is the most commonly used events dataset, but it records only transnational terrorist incidents and is therefore inappropriate for this study. ITERATE is based upon international newspaper headlines describing terrorist attacks.

Both RAND-MIPT and the *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism* include profiles that designate the date of group formation and, where applicable, group demise. This method includes obvious reliability concerns on several counts. First, it runs the risk of omitting terrorist groups that were in existence and active but unknown to the country and therefore unreported. This is a difficult and obvious problem that all terrorism researchers face, and I do not claim to solve it here. I am aware that this reporting bias exists, however, and try to account for it by determining whether press freedom has a positive and significant effect on terrorist group emergence independent of the other regressors.

The second caveat is that not all formation and ending dates were available or known. When these dates were unclear, I used the dates of the first attack and last attack as claimed by that group as the respective formation and ending dates. The profiles included in RAND-MIPT and the *Encyclopedia of World Terrorism* are explicit about presumptions of inactivity. That is, if a group is listed as "inactive," I simply use the date of its last attack as the ending point of its existence. This eliminates the mistake of including the group in the total number of groups active in the country during a given year when it was actually out of operation. For the purposes of this study, however, I am limiting these claims to the number of new groups.

My independent variables are "compindx" and participation competition. First, I have generated a novel index measure, compindx, which identifies the degree of ideological heterogeneity among terrorist groups within a given country during that year. For instance, many groups are described as "leftist," "communist/socialist," "nationalist/separatist," "religious," "right-wing reactionary," or "racist." Because such categories are simplistic, however, I was able to discriminate between the ideologies of these groups when they were distinct from one another. For example, the category "religious" is used to describe groups such as Japan's Aum Shinrikyo,

Christian groups such as the Covenant, Sword, and Arm of the Lord, and Islamic groups such as al-Qaida. In such cases, these groups were coded as having separate ideologies, as their ideologies are obviously distinct from one another.

Moreover, some groups possess more than one of these ideological descriptions, such as the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), which contains both a communist/socialist and a nationalist/separatist ideology. Similarly, Hamas possesses a nationalist/separatist and a religious (Islamic) ideology. In such cases, though their strategic objectives may occasionally coincide, these groups are coded as ideologically distinct.

To create the measure, I first counted the number of distinct ideologies operating among terrorist groups within the country in the year under inquiry. Therefore, the diversity within the United States yields a large number of ideologies with a broad range of interests represented: black separatist groups, right-wing militia groups, neo-Nazi groups, Islamic groups, leftist groups, environmental groups, and so on. In recent years, however, Greece has had an ostensibly large number of terrorist groups, although most of them are anarchist groups. Therefore, despite its high number of groups, Greece contains a relatively low number of competing ideologies due to the homogeneity of the groups' ideologies.

I then created the ideological heterogeneity/homogeneity index measure (compindx) by dividing the number of ideologies by the number of the groups. The result is a continuous measure on a scale of 0–1, with 0 indicating total homogeneity among groups, and 1 indicating complete heterogeneity. For instance, if there are two groups with two different or competing ideologies, then the resulting proportion is 2 ideologies / 2 groups = 1 (absolute heterogeneity). This indicates a situation in which groups should compete (or escalate); whereas a proportion of

0 would indicate that the groups are more likely to cooperate. In the latter situation, we should see fewer attacks and fewer new groups emerging.[36]

Because a score of 1 indicates total heterogeneity, I coded cases in which only one group is present (1 ideology / 1 group) with a 0 since they are actually homogenous cases. Similarly, if there are multiple groups with the same ideology (such as revisionist Islam), the value of the index likewise equals 0 (meaning that no matter how many groups exist, they all possess the same ideology).

The second independent variable is participation competition, which measures the relative degree of agenda openness to influence in each country. Taken from the Polity IV dataset, participation competition is measured on a 6-point scale, with 0 meaning nonexistent agenda openness, and 6 meaning a high degree of agenda openness.[37] This index measure demonstrates the number of avenues by which citizens can influence the government, thereby adequately capturing the sense of agenda openness for my purposes. Li suggests that this variable be centered to avoid collinearity.[38] According to the argument hypothesized above, the more competitive a polity, the more terrorist activity will take place. Thus participation competition should have a positive effect on terrorist group emergence.

Hence, the model I describe results in the following estimate:

$$Y_i \text{ (number of new groups)} = a_i + ß_1X_1(\text{compindx}) + ß_2X_2(\text{parcomp}) + ç_i + t_i + e_i,$$

where a_i = the intercept, $ç_i$ = control variables, t_i = country fixed effects and panel corrected standard errors, and e_i = the residual error.

36. One important exception to this expectation is when terrorist attacks escalate as a result of protest against a nondemocratic domestic government that all of the groups oppose. This may indicate that the terrorists are pooling their resources toward one goal. In this case, however, we should see less intergroup rivalry.
37. Missing values (coded in Polity IV as -44, -88, and so on) were dropped from the analysis.
38. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"; see also Leona Aiken and S.G. West, *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions* (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1991).

I also introduce several control variables. First, as I have mentioned, press freedom is based upon Douglas Van Belle's measure of descriptive summaries of the International Press Institute's annual reports, country reports by experts, and country-specific historical documents.[39] Van Belle codes levels of press freedom into five classifications: nonexistent press, free press, imperfectly free press (due to corruption or unofficial influence), restricted press, and government-controlled press. Press freedom is coded 1 if a country's press is clearly free and 0 if otherwise. Li finds that without confounding variables such as democratic participation and institutional constraints, press freedom has a positive, statistically significant relationship to terrorist incidents. Therefore, I expect the relationship between press freedom and terrorist group emergence to be positive as well.

I control for GDP through a measure of real GDP per capita adjusted for purchasing power parity and logged.[40] GDP per capita is expected to have a negative effect because the higher the economic development, the less likely the country is to have terrorism.[41] I also control for income inequality, which includes a Gini measure ranging from 0–100, where 0 indicates less inequality, and 100 indicates the highest level of inequality.[42] Income inequality is expected to have a positive effect on terrorist group emergence, following the relative deprivation hypothesis.

---

39. Douglas A. Van Belle, "Press Freedom and the Democratic Peace," *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (November 1997), pp. 405–414, compiled by Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
40. Alan Heston, Robert Summers, and Bettina Aten, *Penn World Table*, Version 6.1 (Philadelphia: Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania, 2002); Li "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents."
41. Quan Li and Drew Schaub, "Economic Globalization and Transnational Terrorist Incidents: A Pooled Time Series Analysis," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (April 2004), pp. 230–258.
42. Missing values were filled in by Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"; see also Yi Feng and Paul J. Zak, "The Determinants of Democratic Transitions," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (April 1999), pp. 162–177; Quan Li and Rafael Reuveny, "Economic Globalization and Democracy: An Empirical Analysis," *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (January 2003), pp. 29–54; and Klaus Deininger and Lyn Squire, "A New Dataset Measuring Income Inequality," *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 10, No. 3 (September 1996), pp. 565–591.

Next, regime durability measures the number of years since the most recent regime change.[43] Regime durability is expected to have a negative effect. I also control for size, which will measure the total population, logged, from World Bank data (poplog).[44] Size should have a positive effect on terrorist group emergence, because more populous nations have a higher probability of producing terrorist groups. Government capability is also expected to have a negative effect on terrorist group emergence, since less-able governments are more likely to experience widespread internal turmoil.[45] This measure is the logged annual composite percentage index of a state's share of the world's total population, GDP per capita, GDP per unit of energy, military manpower, and military expenditures.[46] I also include dummies for type of democracy—specifically, proportional, majority, and mixed—all of which are coded 1 if they embody that type of democratic system, and 0 if otherwise.[47]

History of attacks is the average annual number of transnational terrorist incidents that have occurred in a country since 1968. This variable was computed by Li using the ITERATE data, and it is expected to have a positive effect due to the contagion effects of terrorism.[48] I also control for conflict, which is coded 1 if a state is engaged in interstate military conflict or war, and 0 if otherwise. I expect this measure to have a positive effect.[49]

Finally, there are several additional dummy variables worth mentioning. The region dummies are Africa, Americas, Asia, and Europe, relative to the Middle East, which has the

43. Monty G. Marshall and Keith Jaggers, "Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800–2000," at http://www.bsos.umd.edu/cidcm/inscr/polity/index.htm#data/; this variable is logged; see Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
44. *The 2002 World Development Indicators CD-Rom* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank, 2002).
45. Gleditsch, Walkensteen, Eriksson, Sollenberg, and Strand, "Armed Conflict 1946–2001."
46. Li and Schaub, "Economic Globalization and Transnational Terrorist Incidents"; Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
47. This data come from Matt Golder, "Democratic Electoral Systems Around the World, 1946–2000," *Electoral Studies* (forthcoming); Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
48. Edward Mickolus, Todd Sandler, Jean Murdock, and Peter Flemming, *International Terrorism: Attributes of Terrorist Events, 1968–2001* (Dunn Loring, Va.: Vinyard Software, 2003); Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"; and Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism."
49. Gleditsch, Walkensteen, Eriksson, Sollenberg, and Strand, "Armed Conflict 1946–2001."

highest number of terrorist incidents. I also include a post–Cold War dummy—coded 1 since 1991 and 0 if otherwise—because terrorist attacks have decreased dramatically since the end of the Cold War because of the end of Soviet funding of left-wing groups.[50] This dummy is expected to have a negative effect on terrorist attacks. Together with the history of attacks variable, I thus control for intertemporal effects.

In separate models, I evaluate the utility of Li's claims about the opposing effects of democratic participation and institutional constraints for explaining new group formation (see Table 2).[51] Democratic participation combines the electoral participation variable in Tatu Vanhanen's Polyarchy dataset with a dichotomous indicator of democracy from Polity IV.[52] Vanhanen's democratic participation index measures the percentage of the population that voted in general elections. Democratic participation is either coded as equal to Vanhanen's index if the country is a democracy (a polity score of 6 or higher), or 0 if the country is not a democracy (lower than a 6). This removes the threat of including high voter turnout that may result from forced voting in autocracies. On the other hand, to mitigate the possible confounding effects of low voter turnout due to overall satisfaction with the government, real GDP is also included in the model as previously mentioned. According to Li's argument, democratic participation should have a negative effect on terrorist incidents.[53]

The final indicator of democracy is institutional constraints, which is based on the executive constraints variable in the Polity IV dataset. This variable features a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating that the executive has unlimited authority, and 7 indicating executive parity or

50. Walter Enders and Todd Sandler, "Transnational Terrorism in the Post–Cold War Era," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (March 1999), pp. 145–167.
51. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"
52. Tatu Vanhanen, "The Polyarchy Dataset: Vanhanen's Index of Democracy," at http://www.prio.no/page/Project_detail//9244/42472.html; and Marshall and Jaggers, "Polity IV Project."
53. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"

subordination. One can expect institutional constraints to have a positive effect on terrorist incidents, as an executive with a higher number of checks and balances is less likely to enforce stiff counterterrorist policies.

Following Abadie, in a separate model I use two measures called participation competition squared and compindx squared (see Table 3).[54] These independent variables follow from the hypothesis that it is neither the freest nor the most repressive regimes that contain the highest number of terrorist groups, but rather the intermediate cases. I generate these variables by simply squaring participation competition and compindx, with the anticipation that these variables will be positively correlated with the dependent variable.

Because the hypotheses are directional, one-tailed tests are applied. I also include standards errors clustered by country to produce standard errors that are robust to both heteroskedasticity and serial correlation within the cross-sectional unit.[55] The results appear in Table 1 below.

In Model 1, I conduct a negative binomial regression with robust standard errors, dispersed around the constant and clustered around country. This model tests the hypothesis that participation competition (i.e. competition for influence on the public agenda) and the intergroup competition index will have positive effects on terrorist group emergence. As anticipated, both variables have positive and significant effects on the emergence of new terrorist groups.

54. Abadie, "Poverty, Political Freedom, and the Roots of Terrorism."
55. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?" p. 286.

Table 1. The Relationship between Competition and Terrorist Group Emergence

	Model							
Independent Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Participation competition	.343*** (.081)				.280** (.117)	.368** (.154)	.317*** (.084)	.310** (.123)
Compindx	.652*** (.239)		.689*** (.222)		.683*** (.231)	.490* (.299)	.606*** (.225)	.335 (.263)
Proportional representation				.223 (.26)	.020 (.37)			
Majoritarian				.717** (.306)	.306* (.344)			
Mixed				.246 (.276)	.125 (.354)			
Press freedom		.139 (.227)						
Government capability	-.086 (.239)	.063 (.295)	-.071 (.240)	.079 (.232)	-.049 (.221)	-.372 (.405)	.078 (.227)	-.237 (.261)
Conflict	.608** (.157)	.557*** (.204)	.600*** (.168)	.601*** (.157)	.591*** (.147)	.475** (.216)	.503*** (.148)	.786*** (.279)
Gini	.0002 (.025)	.002 (.024)	-.005 (.025)	.008 (.025)	.017 (.027)	.019 (.026)	.005 (.023)	-.034 (.031)
Population (log)	.173** (.078)	.210** (.083)	.169** (.078)	.195** (.079)	.111 (.077)	2.26*** (.748)	.193*** (.074)	.188** (.088)
Post-Cold War	-.203 (.164)	-.317 (.193)	-.127 (.158)	.008 (.158)	-.162 (.161)	-.672*** (.204)	-.824* (.453)	-.408** (.199)
Africa	-.107 (.441)	-.478 (.515)	-.071 (.450)	-.407 (.483)	-.210 (.417)	8.92 (541.88)	.024 (405)	-.633* (.523)
Americas	-.305 (.240)	-.521** (.261)	-.082 (.254)	-.643** (.292)	-.339 (.239)	8.62 (277.95)	-.275 (.243)	-.555* (.293)
Asia	-.709** (.333)	-.554* (.308)	-.463 (.320)	-.798** (.317)	-.787** (.336)	5.15 (161.22)	-.625 (.318)**	-1.18*** (.450)
Europe	-.350 (.337)	-.424 (.328)	.018 (.358)	-.315 (.339)	-.200 (.333)	-5.37 (7.97)	-.250 (.319)	-.739* (.380)
Real GDP (log)	-.238 (.176)	-.128 (.176)	-.013 (.175)	-.133 (.173)	-.203 (.178)	-.193 (.572)	-.266 (.171)	-.280 (.226)
History of attacks (lagged)	.211** (.088)	.646*** (.100)	.255*** (.086)	.564*** (.100)	.191** (.097)	-.536** (.253)	.248*** (.086)	.210** (.105)
Regime durability	.009 (.086)	.025 (.117)	.028 (.089)	-.033 (.070)	-.009 (.078)	.107 (.133)	-.0001 (.084)	-.038 (.089)
Constant	-2.41 (2.47)	-5.05* (3.01)	-4.19 (2.53)	-2.65 (3.03)	-3.53 (2.40)	-29.36 (12.73)	-3.09 (2.38)	.529 (3.38)
N	1016	1897	1016	2148	1016	918	1016	771
Wald chi2	244.11	297.38	128.67	348.13	274.50	38.07	631.74	84.08
Prob > chi2	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0000	.0005	.0000	.0000

Note: *** p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1

Government capability has a negative and insignificant relationship with terrorist group emergence, meaning that governments with a declining resource base will have a more difficult time preventing terrorist groups from arising within their borders. The population log variable is positive and significant, indicating that the higher a population, the more likely terrorist groups are to emerge.

The Gini index measure of inequality has a positive but insignificant effect. This means that higher degrees of inequality within a country are associated with more terrorist events. Societies that experience more social and economic cleavages are therefore more likely to experience terrorist attacks. Real GDP per capita also has a negative but insignificant effect, suggesting that the more economically deprived nations are more likely to produce terrorist groups. Both relationships, however, are weak and require further investigation. The conflict dummy has a positive and significant effect on terrorist group emergence, meaning that states involved in international conflicts are generally more likely to experience a proliferation of terrorist groups. This may be true because international conflicts require a large degree of agenda space and create the crowding effects to which terrorists react. Finally, durability has a positive but insignificant effect, indicating that regimes that maintain power longer are more likely to inadvertently produce new terrorist groups.

As expected, some temporal effects do exist as evidenced by the negative yet insignificant effects of the Cold War dummy variable and the positive and significant effects of the history of attacks. During the Cold War fewer terrorist groups emerged; however, states with a history of terrorist attacks are more likely to see new groups develop. This finding is consistent with the explanation that terrorist violence is competitive: the more attacks perpetrated by Group A, the higher Group B's incentive to escalate its own activities. This competition results in more

new groups. Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Europe experience fewer new terrorist groups than the Middle East.

Next, I ran a series of diagnostics to test the robustness of my findings over several alternative specifications. Model 2 estimates a negative binomial regression that tests the effects of press freedom on terrorist group emergence to account for any potential reporting bias. The effect of press freedom is positive, but insignificant. I therefore proceeded without including press freedom in my analysis, as press freedom does not affect the results recorded in Model 1.

Model 3 estimates a negative binomial time-series regression assessing the independent effect of terrorist group competitiveness on the number of new groups emerging within a country. As expected, the effect is positive and significant. The more ideologies that exist in conflict with one another, the more groups will develop in that country.

In Model 4, I investigate the effects of the type of democracy on terrorist group emergence. As expected, majoritarian systems are more conducive to group emergence than either proportional representation or mixed systems. This finding is consistent with Li's and Reynal-Querol's earlier findings.[56] Model 5 estimates the effects that type of democracy will have when combined with the main regressors of participation competition and terrorist group competition. All of the variables maintain their direction and significance.

Model 6 estimates the original model with fixed effects diagnostics clustered around country code. This regression tests whether the relationship between events and participation competition holds up when I account for country dummies. As evidenced in Table 1, only the change in direction of the region dummies is significant, which likely occurred due to multicollinearity. Model 7 tests a negative binomial time-series regression accounting for time effects and displays no major changes to Model 1. Finally, Model 8 tests for auto-correlation by

56. Ibid.; and Reynal-Querol, "Political Systems, Stability, and Civil Wars," pp. 465–483.

applying panel corrected standard errors to the model. The index for terrorist group competition drops out in terms of significance, but the participation competition variable retains its significance; thus the results do not change significantly.

I also ran several zero-inflated negative binomial models to account for the presence of excessive zeros in the dependent variable. For the sake of brevity, I do not include these results here, but they are available upon request.

Table 2 provides a test of the relative explanatory power of my model vis-à-vis Quan Li's explanation. I use three models that assess the likelihood of an alternative explanation to determine whether constraints on the executive allow for terrorist groups to emerge. Model 9 uses a negative binomial regression to test whether the relationship between group emergence and democracy is better explained by the institutional constraints and degree of democratic participation, as suggested by Li.[57] While executive constraints do have a positive and significant statistical effect on terrorist group emergence, the coefficient value shows that there is little substantive effect when compared to participation competition. There is little change in the remaining control variables. Model 10 estimates the original model, accounting for the possible effects of executive constraints and democratic participation. Whereas participation competition and group competition maintain their positive and significant effects, both executive constraints and democratic participation drop out. This is most likely due to high correlation (approximately .75) between the two Polity IV variables. Model 11 tests the relationship omitting democratic participation, and the findings are similar to those in Model 10.

57. Li, "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?"

Table 2. Effects of Institutional Constraints on Terrorist Group Emergence

	Model		
Independent Variables	9	10	11
Participation competition		.385**	.362**
		(.166)	(.166)
Compindx		.634***	.645***
		(241)	(.240)
Institutional constraints	.086*	-.004	-.012
	(.051)	(.087)	(.094)
Democratic participation	-.009	-.012	
	(.006)	(.008)	
Government capability	.030	-.113	-.085
	(.241)	(.236)	(.240)
Conflict	.616***	-.604***	.609***
	(.161)	(.152)	(.156)
Gini	-.003	.002	.0006
	(.022)	(.025)	(.026)
Population (log)	.223***	.155**	.174**
	(.076)	(.079)	(.080)
Post–Cold War	-.058	-.245	-.202
	(.158)	(.175)	(.164)
Africa	-.287	-.073	-.097
	(.466)	(.445)	(.461)
Americas	-.612**	-.391	-.310
	(.279)	(.257)	(.238)
Asia	-.688**	-.677**	-.701**
	(.315)	(.340)	(.346)
Europe	-.286	-.247	-.358
	(.371)	(.331)	(.313)
Real GDP (log)	-.102	-.179	-.242
	(.178)	(.171)	(.175)
History of attacks (lagged)	.603***	.222***	.214**
	(.096)	(.095)	(.096)
Regime durability	-.010	.021	.012
	(.072)	(.079)	(.083)
Constant	-4.93*	-2.51	-2.42
	(2.99)	(2.43)	(2.48)
N	2147	1016	1016
Wald chi2	372.21	265.82	249.58
Prob > chi2	.0000	.0000	.0000

Note: *** p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1

Finally, Table 3 identifies the possibility of a nonlinear relationship between participation competition, group competition, and the number of terrorist groups that emerge within a polity.

Model 12 estimates a negative binomial regression that tests for curvilinear effects of participation competition on group emergence, with group competition having a linear effect. Whereas the participation competition value is positive and significant, the interaction variable is negative and insignificant. Next, Model 13 tests whether group competition has a curvilinear effect, while participation competition maintains its linearity. In this model, group competition is positive, and its interaction term is negative. This suggests that the situations with no competition and extremely high competition allow terrorist groups to emerge. Intermediate levels of competition are more "stable" in terms of the number of terrorist groups. This may be due to the "balancing effect" of two different terrorist groups who oppose one another—such as the Red Brigades versus Ordine Nero in Italy in the 1970s and early 1980s.

Finally, Model 14 tests whether there are joint curvilinear effects of participation competition and group competition. The results suggest that the curvilinear effects of group competition are robust to two alternative specifications, whereas the curvilinear effects of participation competition are positive but less explicit. However, the lack of statistical evidence indicating a curvilinear relationship between participation competition and terrorist group emergence may exist due to the collinearity of the interaction variable and the original regressor. Therefore, preliminary evidence suggests that it is neither the most restrictive nor the most competitive regimes that experience the largest number of terrorist incidents, but rather the intermediate cases.

Table 3. Nonlinear Effect of Competition on Terrorist Group Emergence

	Model		
Independent Variables	12	13	14
Participation competition	.350*** (.084)	.327*** (.076)	.318*** (.076)
Parcomp^2	-.019 (.075)		.027 (.072)
Compindx	.662*** (.242)	4.17*** (.817)	4.21*** (.827)
Compindx^2		-3.35*** (.798)	-3.40*** (.823)
Government capability	-.092 (.247)	-.175 (.246)	-.165 (.254)
Conflict	.606*** (.157)	.643*** (.144)	.646*** (.143)
Gini	-.002 (.027)	.002 (.023)	.005 (.024)
Population (log)	.171** (.081)	.175** (.080)	.178** (.084)
Post–Cold War	-.215 (.168)	-.305* (.169)	-.289* (.169)
Africa	-.070 (.425)	.101 (.386)	.058 (.377)
Americas	-.300 (.240)	-.023 (.246)	-.027 (.251)
Asia	-.719** (.335)	-.567 (.310)	-.551* (.319)
America	-.300 (.240)	-.023 (.246)	-.027 (.251)
Europe	-.334 (.331)	-.130 (.336)	-.151 (.336)
Real GDP (log)	-.225 (.186)	-.093 (.171)	-.111 (.179)
History of attacks (lagged)	.212** (.088)	.051 (.095)	.048 (.097)
Regime durability	-.014 (.090)	-.043 (.083)	-.051 (.089)
Constant	-2.35 (2.54)	-3.57 (2.38)	-3.65 (2.46)
N	1016	1016	1016
Wald chi2	241.50	209.72	211.87
Prob > chi2	.0000	.0000	.0000

Note: *** p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.1

Empirical Summary

These findings suggest that a theory of competition among terrorist groups has some preliminary support. In fact, on its own, it has just as much support as structural theories, which offer less explanatory power. At this point, however, it is difficult to say which theory holds up best under different cases. For further research, scholars should consider examining case studies to test whether structural or intergroup approaches contain the most explanatory power. Additionally, deriving more reliable measures of intergroup competition would benefit the field of terrorism studies as well as counterterrorism efforts. According to the analysis conducted here, intergroup competition is a fairly good predictor of whether terrorist groups will form in competitive democracies. Finally, additional consideration should be given to the proposition that the relationships between terrorist events and various independent factors may in fact be curvilinear—a notion that is both theoretically and empirically undeveloped but that receives some initial support here.

Implications

The empirical analysis in this paper provides preliminary confirmation of the argument that structural explanations of democratic terrorism are incomplete. A more complete explanation concerns the incentives that motivate terrorist groups to escalate their activities, such as competition. As violent forms of more conventional interest groups, different terrorist groups compete for space on the public agenda. Because such competition results in crowding effects, the groups then perceive a need to "outdo" one another for influence, resulting in an overall escalation of violence. Terrorists do not hate freedom, as is commonly touted in political

rhetoric; on the contrary, they seem to thrive on and exploit it. This seems to be especially true in cases of democratic transitions, during which competition for agenda primacy is fierce.

Most scholars who establish a positive relationship between terrorism and democracy find themselves in an awkward position because of the implications of their results—namely, that undermining democracy may also undermine terrorism. Some scholars are obliged to admit that their results suggest that either democracies should forego their institutional constraints in this policy arena and restrict civil liberties, or that terrorism is something that contemporary democracies must learn to live with. The implications of group-level analyses are more hopeful than structural explanations because they suggest that terrorist motivations may actually be more dynamic than structural hypotheses suggest.

Moreover, just as structural explanations of terrorism are incomplete, so are structural approaches to counterterrorism. The most obvious implication is that governments cannot eradicate terrorist groups simply by implementing democracy. Democracy is permissive to and inadvertently encourages terrorist activity. Moreover, the most vulnerable time for an emerging democracy may be its period of transition—an expectation confirmed by the experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Even if democracies attempted to reduce civil liberties and crush terrorists within their borders, the competitive nature of intergroup dynamics within democracies remains beyond control. Furthermore, the alternative to democracy may be normatively unacceptable, so governments must seek ways to disrupt the intergroup dynamics that cause terrorist groups to constantly escalate their activities. One possibility is to focus counterterrorism efforts on covert infiltration of terrorist groups in an effort to dismantle the groups from the inside out. Promoting

group schisms may contribute to the downfall of these groups.[59] Though this strategy is supported internationally by governments, intelligence agencies have not yet obtained the necessary resources for this to succeed.

Indeed, there may be no single international strategy that will effectively win the War on Terrorism. Officials must take into account local environments—including both structural and group-level conditions—in order to derive effective counterterrorism policies. The best bet, however, is for governments to increase their efforts at preventing intergroup competition while at the same time promoting innovative ways to infiltrate groups to contribute to their self-destruction.

59. Rex A. Hudson makes a similar argument in Hudson, *Who Becomes a Terrorist and Why: The 1999 Government Report on Profiling Terrorists* (Washington, D.C.: Lyons, 1999).

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The International Security Program addresses the most important challenges to U.S. national security and international security in the quarter-century ahead. As the first issue of the journal *International Security* stated in 1976, "We define international security broadly to include the full array of factors that have a direct bearing on the structure of the international system and the sovereignty of its members, with particular emphasis on the use, threat, and control of force."

Program researchers analyze security issues rigorously, draw prescriptive conclusions, and communicate their recommendations directly to makers of public policy and shapers of public opinion. The program also seeks to advance scholarship in security studies by contributing to significant academic debates through its own research activities and by publishing the leading journal in the field, *International Security*. Each year ISP develops and trains new talent in security studies by hosting a dozen pre- and postdoctoral research fellows. The program also presents its research in the BCSIA Studies in International Security book series.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

The basic mission of *International Security* is to publish articles on defense and foreign affairs that combine policy relevance with scholarly analysis and research. The journal seeks to bridge the gap between contemporary security policy issues and academic research on international security studies. We define the field of international security studies broadly, to include nonmilitary as well as military threats to the security of states. Compared to some other journals, we also interpret policy relevance broadly to include many articles that bear on general theoretical questions - such as the causes of alliances or the role of international institutions - as well as historical topics, ranging from the origins of the First World War to U.S. nuclear strategy in the 1950s. As the editors of the journal wrote in its first issue, our intended audience includes the "scholars, scientists, industrialists, military and government officials, and members of the public who bear a continuing concern" for the problems of international security.

BCSIA STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

In 1991, ISP created a new book series, the BCSIA Studies in International Security, to provide an outlet for policy-oriented research and analysis in the field of international security. The first volume in the series, *Soviet Nuclear Fission: Control of the Nuclear Arsenal in a Disintegrating Soviet Union*, attracted considerable attention and contributed directly to the passage of the original legislation (known as the Nunn-Lugar Act) authorizing the expenditure of U.S. funds to reduce the nuclear dangers in the former Soviet Union. Since that auspicious beginning, further titles have covered a diverse array of topics, including nuclear, biological and chemical weapons; other aspects of the nuclear dangers emanating from the former Soviet Union; the CFE treaty in Europe; Russian foreign and security policy; transatlantic relations; security in the Middle East; and the democratic peace. The BCSIA Studies in International Security series is published by The MIT Press.

International Security Program
Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs
Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government
79 John F. Kennedy Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/bcsia
Program phone number 617-495-4708 ~ Editorial office 617-495-1914 ~ Facsimile 617-496-4403

ISP FACULTY AND STAFF

Graham T. Allison Jr., Director, BCSIA; Douglas Dillon Professor of Government
Gretchen Bartlett, Associate Director, Preventive Defense Project
Katherine Bartel, Editorial Assistant, International Security
Ashton B. Carter, Ford Foundation Professor of Science and International Affairs
Paul Doty, Director Emeritus, BCSIA; Mallinckrodt Professor of Biochemistry, Emeritus
Robert Hermann, Visiting Scholar at the Preventive Defense Project
Arnold Howitt, Executive Director of the Taubman Center for State and Local Government
Elaine Kamarck, Lecturer in Public Policy
Juliette Kayyem, Lecturer in Public Policy
Susan Lynch, Staff Assistant
Sean Lynn-Jones, Series Editor, BCSIA Studies in International Security
Brian Mandell, Lecturer in Public Policy
Ernest May, Director of the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History
Diane McCree, Managing Editor, International Security
Steven E. Miller, Program Director
Karen Motley, Executive Editor, BCSIA Studies in International Security
Joseph Nye, Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations
John Ruggie, Evron and Jeane Kirkpatrick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Center for Business and Government
Anthony Saich, Daewoo Professor of International Affairs
F.M. Scherer, Aetna Professor of Public Management and Corporate Management
Jessica Stern, Faculty Affiliate and Lecturer in Public Policy
Monica Duffy Toft, Associate Professor of Public Policy
Stephen Walt, Robert and Renée Belfer Professor of International Affairs
John White, Faculty

ISP RESEARCH FELLOWS

Hassan Abbas
Gregory Aftandilian
Ivan Arreguin-Toft
Boaz Atzili
Emily Balic
Marie Besancon
Tom Bielefeld
Nikolaos Biziouras
Lindsey Borg
Olivier Brighenti
Seyom Brown
Erica Chenoweth
Il Hyun Cho
Patrick Cohrs
Erik Dahl
Andrea Dew
Ehud Eiran
Vanda Felbab-Brown
Chuck Freilich
Rachel Gisselquist
Joshua Gleis
Michael Glosny
Kelly Greenhill
Michael Horowitz
Jeremy Jones
Chen Kane
Paul Kane
Amanda Kempa
Paul MacDonald
Abbas Maleki
William Marshall
Omar McDoom
Jacqueline Newmyer
Philip Potter
Scott Radnitz
J. Martin Ramirez
Yu Rong
Richard Rosecrance
Stephanie Rupp
John Schuessler
Brenda Shaffer
Margaret Sloane
Tammy Ann Smith
Marcial A. Garcia Suarez
Alexander Vuving
Stephen Watts
Rebecca Ulam Weiner
Alexander Weisiger
Thomas Wright
Anne Xiaohui Wu

The Robert and Renée Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs

Graham Allison, Director
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA 02138
Tel: (617) 495-1400; Fax: (617) 495-8963; Email: bcsia_ksg@harvard.edu
www.ksg.harvard.edu/bcsia

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) is the hub of research, teaching, and training in international security affairs, environmental and resource issues, science and technology policy, and conflict studies at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government. The Center's mission is to provide leadership in advancing policy-relevant knowledge about the most important challenges of international security and other critical issues where science, technology, and international affairs intersect.

The Belfer Center's leadership begins with the recognition of science and technology as driving forces transforming international affairs. To address these challenges, the Center integrates insights of social scientists, natural scientists, technologists, and practitioners with experience in government, diplomacy, the military, and business. The Center pursues its mission in four complementary research programs:

- The **International Security Program** (ISP) addresses the most pressing threats to U.S. national interests and international security.

- The **Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program** (STPP) analyzes ways in which public policies influence S&T for security, sustainability, and economic competitiveness, how S&T policies are made, and how S&T influence and are influenced by society.

- The **Environment and Natural Resources Program** (ENRP) is the locus of Harvard's interdisciplinary research on resource and environmental problems and policy responses.

- The **Program on Intrastate Conflict and Conflict Resolution** analyzes the causes of ethnic, religious, and other conflicts, and seeks to identify practical ways to prevent and limit such conflicts.

The heart of the Center is its resident research community of more than 150 scholars including Harvard faculty, an interdisciplinary group of outside analysts and practitioners, and more than 60 research fellows drawn from governments, academia, and the private sector. The Belfer Center sponsors frequent seminars, workshops, and conferences, maintains a substantial specialized library, publishes books, monographs, and discussion papers, and actively participates in policy discussions in Washington and beyond.

The Center is supported by an endowment established with funds from Robert and Renée Belfer, the Ford Foundation and Harvard University, by foundation grants, by individual gifts, and by occasional government contracts.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2006-06	Chenoweth, Erica. "The Inadvertent Effects of Democracy on Terrorist Group Emergence."
2006-05	Olmstead, Sheila M., W. Michael Hanemann, and Robert N. Stavins. "Do Consumers React to the Shape of Supply? Water Demand Under Heterogeneous Price Structures."
2006-04	Bullock, Graham. "Engaging Voices: Stakeholders and the Development of National Environmental Indicators; Case Studies from the Sustainable Roundtables, EPA, and the Heinz Center."
2006-03	Toft, Monica Duffy. "Religion, Civil War, and International Order."
2006-02	Flynn, Jules. "Taxes and Charges to Manage Oil Demand in Australia: Policy Recommendations for the Australian Federal Government."
2006-01	Blimes, Linda. "The Economic Costs of the Iraq War: An Appraisal Three Years After the Beginning of the Conflict."
2005-10	Saradzhya, Simon and Nabi Abdullaev. "Disrupting Escalation of Terror in Russia to Prevent Catastrophic Attacks."
2005-09	Stephens, Jennie C. "Coupling CO2 Capture and Storage with Coal Gasification: Defining "Sequestration-Ready" IGCC."
2005-08	Stephens, Jennie C., and Bob van der Zwaan. "CO2 Capture and Storage (CCS): Exploring the Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment Continuum."
2005-07	Lee, Henry. "Dawning of a New Era: The LNG Story." April 2005.
2005-06	Stavins, Robert S. "The Effects of Vintage-Differentiated Environmental Regulation."
2005-05	Lubowski, Ruben, Andrew Plantinga, and Robert Stavins. "Land-Use Change and Carbon Sinks: Econometric Estimation of the Carbon Sequestration Supply Function."
2005-04	Stavins, Robert S. "Environmental Economics."
2005-03	Belloni, Roberto. "Is Humanitarianism Part of the Problem? Nine Theses."
2005-02	Ghosh, Debyani. "Assessment of Advanced Coal-Based Electricity Generation Technology Options for India."
2005-01	Rosenberg, William G., Dwight C. Alpern, and Michael R. Walker. "The National Gasification Strategy: Gasification of Coal & Biomass as a Domestic Supply Option."
2004-09	Srinivas, Smita, "Demand Policy Instruments for R&D: Procurement, Technical Standards and the Case of Indian Vaccines[12]."
2004-08	Rosenberg, William G., Dwight C. Alpern, and Michael R. Walker, "Deploying IGCC in This Decade With 3 Party Covenant Financing." Vol. II

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2004-07	Rosenberg, William G., Dwight C. Alpern, and Michael R. Walker, "Deploying IGCC in This Decade With 3 Party Covenant Financing." Vol. I
2004-06	Rapporteur's Report, "Workshop on Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle: Financing and Deploying IGCC Technology in this Decade."
2004-05	Sagar, Ambuj and Pankaj Chandra. "Technological Change in the Indian Passenger Car Industry."
2004-04	Vladimir Dvorkin. "The Russian Debate on the Nonproliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Delivery Vehicles."
2004-03	Loizides, Neophytos G., and Marcos A. Antoniades. "Settlers, Refugees, and Immigrants: Alternative Futures for Post-Settlement Cyprus."
2004-02	Pressman, Jeremy. "If Not Balancing, What? Forms of Resistance to American Hegemony."
2004 – 01	Rosenberg, William G., Dwight C Alpern, and Michael R. Walker. "Financing IGCC - 3Party Covenant."
2003-13	Garcia, Denise. "The Diffusion of Norms in International Security: The Cases of Small Arms and Landmines."
2003-12	Garcia, Denise. "Analyzing the Issue of Curbing the Unrestricted Availability and Proliferation of Small Arms and Light Weapons."
2003-11	Allison, Graham. "Implications for Public Policy of the Threat from Bioterrorism."
2003-10	Aldy, Joseph, Scott Barrett, and Robert N. Stavins, "Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures."
2003-09	Lubowski, Ruben N., Andrew J. Plantinga, and Robert N. Stavins, "Determinants of Land-Use Change in the United States, 198201997: Results from a National Level Econometric and Simulation Analysis."
2003-08	Oil and Security Executive Session Rapporteur's Report.
2003-07	Stavins, Robert N., "Market-Based Environmental Policies: What Can We Learn from U.S. Experience (and Related Research)?"
2003-06	Snyder, Lori, "The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion in the Chlorine Manufacturing Industry."
2003-05	Polsky, Colin, "Assessing Vulnerabilities to the Effects of Global Change: An Eight-Step Approach."
2003-04	Smith, Jay. "A Changing of the Guard: The U.S. National Guard and Homeland Defense."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2003-03	Lee, Henry, "Assessing the Challenges Confronting Distributive Electricity Generation."
2003-02	Saradzhyan, Simon. "Russia: Grasping Reality of Nuclear Terror."
2003-01	Kokoshin, A.A., "Nuclear Conflicts of the Twenty First Century."
2002-18	Wils, Annababett, "On Accelerating the Global Literacy Transition."
2002-17	Barrett, Scott and Robert Stavins. "Increasing Participation and Compliance in International Climate Change Agreements."
2002-16	Gabbitas, Andrea, "Prospects for U.S.-Russian Nonproliferation Cooperation Under Bush and Putin"
2002-15	Kokoshin, A.A., "Defense Leadership in Russia: The General Staff and Strategic Management in a Comparative Perspective"
2002-14	Norberg-Bohm, Vicki. "The Role of Government in Energy Technology Innovation: Lessons for the Energy Sector"
2002-13	Kasemir, Bernd and Andrea Suess. "Sustainability Information and Pension Fund Investment."
2002-12	Stavins, Robert N., Alexander F. Wagner and Gernot Wagner. "Interpreting Sustainability in Economic Terms: Dynamic Efficiency Plus Intergenerational Equity."
2002-11	Sekhpossian, Noune and Karen Filipovich. "Capitalizing on Russia's Forest Sequestration."
2002-10	Jonathan P. Caulkins, Mark A.R. Kleiman, and Peter Reuter, "Lessons of the 'War' on Drugs for the 'War' on Terrorism"
2002-09	Michael Vatis, "Cyber Attacks: Protecting America's Security Against Digital Threats"
2002-08	Plantinga, Andrew J., Ruben Lubowksi, and Robert N. Stavins. "The Effects of Potential Land Development on Agricultural Land Prices."
2002-07	Mayer-Schonberger, Viktor. "Emergency Communications: The Quest for Interoperability In the United States and Europe."
2002-06	Beering, Peter S., Paul M. Maniscalco, Hank Christen, Steve Storment, and A.D. Vickery. "Winning Plays: Essential Guidance from the Terrorism Line of Scrimmage."
2002-05	Siebenhuner, Bernd. "How do Scientific Assessments Learn? A Comparative Study of the IPCC and LRTAP."
2002-04	Pangyi, Robyn. "Consequence Management in the 1995 Sarin Attacks on the Japanese Subway System."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2002-03	Sauer, Tom. "Beyond the ABM Treaty: A Plea for a Limited NMD System."
2002-02	Orenstein, Mitchell and Martine Haas. "Globalization and the Development of Welfare States in Post-communist Europe."
2002-01	Lahsen, Myanna. "Brazilian Climate Epistemers' Multiple Epistemes: Shared Meaning, Diverse Identities and Geopolitics in Global Change Science."
2001-22	de Bruijn, Theo and Vicki Norberg-Bohm. "Voluntary, Collaborative, and Information-Based Policies: Lessons and Next Steps for Environmental and Energy Policy in the United States and Europe."
2001-21	Gallager, Kelly Sims. "U.S.-China Energy Cooperation: A Review of Joint Activities Related to Chinese Energy Development Since 1980."
2001-20	Zhao, Jimin. "Reform of China's Energy Institutions and Policies: Historical Evolution and Current Challenges."
2001-19	Alcock, Frank. Embeddedness and Influence: A Contrast of Assessment Failure in New England and Newfoundland."
2001-18	Stavins, Robert. "Lessons from the American Experiment with Market-Based Environmental Policies."
2001-17	Research and Assessment Systems for Sustainability Program. "Vulnerability and Resilience for Coupled Human-Environment Systems: Report of the Research and Assessment Systems for Sustainability Program 2001 Summer Study."
2001-16	Eckley, Noelle. "Designing Effective Assessments: The Role of Participation, Science and Governance, and Focus."
2001-15	Barbera, Joseph A., Anthony Macintyre, and Craig DeAtley. "Ambulances to Nowhere: America's Critical Shortfall in Medical Preparedness for Catastrophic Terrorism."
2001-14	Cavanagh, Sheila. "Thirsty Colonias: Determinants of Water Service Coverage in South Texas."
2001-13	Rapporteur's Report. "Workshop on the Role of Science and Economics in Setting Environmental Standards."
2001-12	Hogan, William. "Electricity Market Restructuring: Reforms of Reforms."
2001-11	Koblentz, Gregory. "A Survey of Biological Terrorism and America's Domestic Preparedness Program."
2001-10	Lee, Henry, Philip Vorobyov, and Christiane Breznik. "Entering Russia's Power Sector: Challenges in Creating a Credible Carbon Trading System."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2001-09	Pate, Jason and Gavin Cameron. "Covert Biological Weapons Attacks against Agricultural Targets: Assessing the Impact against U.S. Agriculture."
2001-08	Carment, David. "The Role of Bias in Third Party Intervention: Theory and Evidence."
2001-07	Foster, Charles H.W. Foster and James N. Levitt, "Reawakening the Beginner's Mind: Innovation in Environmental Practice."
2001-06	Donohue, Laura. "In the Name of National Security: "U.S. Counter-terrorism Measures, 1960-2000."
2001-05	Koblentz, Gregory. "Overview of Federal Programs to Enhance State and Local Preparedness for Terrorism with Weapons of Mass Destruction."
2001-04	Kayyem, Juliette. "U.S. Preparations for Biological Terrorism: Legal Limitations and the Need for Planning."
2001-03	Foster, Charles H.W. and James S. Hoyte, "Preserving the Trust: The Founding of the Massachusetts Environmental Trust."
2001-02	Coglianese, Cary. "Is Consensus an Appropriate Basis for Regulatory Policy?"
2001-01	Donahue, Laura and Juliette Kayyem. "The Rise of the Counterterrorist States,"
2000-33	Kates, Robert, William Clark, Robert Corell, J. Michael Hall, Carlo Jaeger, Ian Lowe, James McCarthy, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, et. al., "Sustainability Science."
2000-32	Guston, David H., William Clark, Terry Keating, David Cash, Susanne Moser, Clark Miller, and Charles Powers. "Report of the Workshop on Boundary Organizations in Environmental Policy and Science."
2000-31	Falkenrath, Richard. "Analytic Models and Policy Prescription: Understanding Recent Innovation in U.S. Counterterrorism."
2000-30	Merari, Ariel. "Israel's Preparedness for High Consequence Terrorism."
2000-29	Kohnen, Anne. "Responding to the Threat of Agroterrorism: Specific Recommendations for the United States Department of Agriculture."
2000-28	Falkenrath, Richard. "The Problems of Preparedness: Challenges Facing the U.S. Domestic Preparedness Program."
2000-27	Clark, William. "America's National Interests in Promoting a Transition toward Sustainability."
2000-26	Rapporteur's Report. "Emissions Trading in Russia: Opportunities and Challenges." Conference October 5, 2000.

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2000-25	Jaffe, Adam B., Richard G. Newell, and Robert N. Stavins. "Technological Change and The Environment."
2000-24	Gupta, Aarti. "Governing Biosafety in India: The Relevance of The Cartagena Protocol."
2000-23	Eckley, Noelle. "From Regional to Global Assessment: Learning from Persistent Organic Pollutants."
2000-22	Keykhah, Modjeh. "Global Hazards and Catastrophic Risk: Assessments, Practitioners and Decision Making in Reinsurance."
2000-21	Ogunseitan, Oladele. "Framing Vulnerability: Global Environmental Assessments and the African Burden of Disease."
2000-20	Betsill, Michele M. "Localizing Global Climate Change: Controlling Greenhouse Gas Emissions in U.S. Cities."
2000-19	Patt, Anthony. "Communicating Probabilistic Forecasts to Decision Makers: A Case Study Of Zimbabwe."
2000-18	Lund, David C. "Regional Abrupt Climate Change Assessment in the U.S.: Comparing the Colorado and Columbia River Basins."
2000-17	Biermann, Frank. "Science as Power in International Environmental Negotiations: Global Environmental Assessments Between North and South."
2000-16	Krueger, Jonathan. "Information in International Environmental Governance: The Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Trade in Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides."
2000-15	Stavins, Robert N. "Economic Analysis of Global Climate Change Policy: A Primer."
2000-14	Weeks, Jennifer. "Advice – and Consent? The Department of Energy's Site-Specific Advisory Boards."
2000-13	Yereskovsky, Alexander. "The Global Security Environment and U.S.-Russian Strategic Relations in the 21st Century: Partners or Rivals?"
2000-12	Clark, William et. Al. "Assessing Vulnerability to Global Environmental Risk."
2000-11	Foster, Charles, H.W. and William B. Meyer, "The Harvard Environmental Regionalism Project."
2000-10	Cash, David. "'In Order to Aid in Diffusing Useful and Practical Information': Cross-scale Boundary Organizations and Agricultural Extension."
2000-09	Foster, Charles, H.W. et al., "Colloquium on Environmental Regionalism."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

2000-08	Lee, Henry and Shashi Kant Verma, "Coal or Gas: The Cost of Cleaner Power in the Midwest."
2000-07	Fischer, Markus, "The Liberal Peace: Ethical, Historical and Philosophical Aspects."
2000-06	Cash, David, "Distributed Assessment Systems: An Emerging Paradigm of Research, Assessment and Decision-making for Environmental Change."
2000-05	Donohue, Laura K., "Civil Liberties, Terrorism, and Liberal Democracy: Lessons from the United Kingdom."
2000-04	Golub, Alexander, "Russian Forests for Climate Change Mitigation: An Economic Analysis."
2000-03	Coglianese, Cary, "Policy Implications of Environmental Management Systems."
2000-02	Meyer, William B. and Charles H.W. Foster, "New Deal Regionalism: A Critical Review."
2000-01	Newell, Richard and Robert Stavins, "Abatement-Cost Heterogeneity and Anticipated Savings from Market-Based Environmental Policies."
R-99-01	Rapporteur's Report. "Workshop on Research and Policy Directions for Carbon Management."
99-20	Rufin, Carlos, "Institutional Change in the Electricity Industry: A Comparison of Four Latin American Cases."
99-19	Rothenberg, Sandra and David Levy, "Corporate Responses to Climate Change: The Institutional Dynamics of the Automobile Industry and Climate Change."
99-18	Stavins, Robert, "Experience with Market-Based Environmental Policy Instruments."
99-17	Jaffe, Adam, Richard Newell and Robert Stavins, "Energy-Efficient Technologies and Climate Change Policies: Issues and Evidence."
99-14	Jung, Wolfgang. "Expert Advice in Global Environmental Decision Making: How Close Should Science and Policy Get?"
99-13	Levy, David L. and Sandra Rothenberg, "Corporate Strategy and Climate Change: Heterogeneity and Change in the Global Automobile Industry."
99-12	Biermann, Frank, "Big Science, Small Impacts -- in the South? The Influence of International Environmental Information Institutions on Policy-Making in India."
99-11	Eckley, Noelle, "Drawing Lessons About Science-Policy Instruments: Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) under the LRTAP Convention."
99-10	Gupta, Aarti. "Framing 'Biosafety' in an International Context: The Biosafety Protocol Negotiations."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

99-09 Seng, Jordan. "If Iraq Gets the Bomb: Zealous Rogues, Old-Fashioned Tyrants, and Nuclear Deterrence."

99-08 Konoplyov, Sergei. "Analytical Centers in Ukraine."

99-07 Foster, Charles, H.W. and David Foster. "Thinking in Forest Time: A Strategy for the Massachusetts Forest."

99-06 Pfaff, Alexander S. and Stavins, Robert N. "Readings in the Field of Natural Resource & Environmental Economics."

99-05 Johnsen, Tor Arnt, Shashi Kant Verma and Catherine Wolfram. "Zonal Pricing and Demand-Side Bidding in the Norwegian Electricity Market."

99-04 Dietrich, William F. "Guide to Research Databases of Acid Rain Assessment and Policy Literature."

99-03 Grant, Richard. "Power and Prosperity: Challenges and Opportunities for Small States."

99-02 Hahn, Robert W. and Robert N. Stavins. "What has Kyoto Wrought? The Real Architecture of International Tradeable Permit Markets."

99-01 Hahn, Robert W. "The Impact of Economics on Environmental Policy."

98-27 Parris, Thomas and Charles Zracket and William Clark. "Usable Knowledge for Managing Responses to Global Climate Change: Recommendations to promote collaborative assessments and information systems."

98-26 Fisher-Vanden, Karen. "Technological Diffusion in China's Iron and Steel Industry."

98-25 Bunn, Matthew, Neil J. Numark and Tatsujiro Suzuki. "A Japanese-Russian Agreement to Establish a Nuclear Facility for MOX Fabrication and Spent Fuel Storage in the Russian Far East."

98-24 Holdren, John P. "Getting to Zero: Is Pursuing a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World Too Difficult? Too Dangerous? Too Distracting?"

98-23 Stavins, Robert N. and Richard Newell. "Climate Change and Forest Sinks: Factors Affecting the Costs of Carbon Sequestration."

98-22 O'Neill, Kate. "(Not) Getting to 'Go': Recent Experience in International Cooperation over the Management of Spent Nuclear Reactor Fuel."

98-21 Lee, Henry. "Designing Domestic Carbon Trading Systems: Key Considerations."

98-20 Patt, Anthony. "Analytic Frameworks and Politics: The Case of Acid Rain in Europe."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

98-19	Iles, Alastair. "The Evolution of Acidification Impact Frames in Europe: Interactions Between Regional and National Assessment of Forest Conditions."
98-18	Franz, Wendy E. "Science, Skeptics and Non-State Actors in the Greenhouse."
98-17	Cash, David. "Assessing and Addressing Cross-Scale Environmental Risks: Information and Decision Systems for the Management of the High Plains Aquifer."
98-16	Moser, Susanne. "Talk Globally, Walk Locally: The Cross-Scale Influence of Global Change Information on Coastal Zone Management in Maine and Hawai'i."
98-15	Miller, Clark. "Extending Assessment Communities to Developing Countries."
98-14	Bader, Pascal. "Targets and Strategies: The Role of Economic Assessments in European Climate Policy."
98-13	Botcheva, Liliana. "Doing is Believing: Participation and Use of Economic Assessments in the Approximation of EU Environmental Legislation in Eastern Europe."
98-12	Farrell, Alex and Terry J. Keating. "Multi-Jurisdictional Air Pollution Assessment: A Comparison of the Eastern United States and Western Europe."
98-11	Keating, Terry J. and Alex Farrell. "Problem Framing and Model Formulation: The Regionality of Tropospheric Ozone in the U.S. and Europe."
98-10	Samson, Paul. "Non-State Actors and Environmental Assessment: A Look at Acid Rain and Global Climate Change."
98-09	VanDeveer, Stacy D. "European Politics with a Scientific Face: Transition Countries, International Environmental Assessment, and Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution."
98-08	Chayes, Abram. "A Suggested Model for Implementing the Clean Development Mechanism."
98-07	Lynn-Jones, Sean M. "Why the United States Should Spread Democracy."
98-06	Mitchell, Ronald and Ted Parson. "Implementing Joint Implementation: Developing a Management and Performance System for the Kyoto Protocol's 'Clean Development Mechanism.'"
98-05	Hahn, Robert. "An Analysis of the First Government Report on the Benefits and Costs of Regulation."
98-04	Stavins, Robert N. "How do Economists Really Think about the Environment?"
98-03	Coglianese, Cary. "Getting the Message Out: Regulatory Policy and the Press."
98-02	Stavins, Robert. "Market-Based Environmental Policies."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

98-01	Newell, Richard, Adam Jaffe and Robert Stavins. "The Induced Innovation Hypothesis and Energy-Saving Technological Change."
97-15	Foster, Charles, H.W. "Managing Resources as Whole Systems: A Primer for Managers."
97-14	Anderson, Steven. "U.S. Electricity Restructuring and Environmental Policy: A Survey of Opinions in the Environmental Community."
97-13	Verma, Shashi. "Getting Privatization Right: Establishing a Competitive Market for Electricity Generation in Brazil."
97-12	Hahn, Robert. "Climate Change: Economics, Politics, and Policy."
97-11	Keohane, Nathaniel, Richard Revesz and Robert Stavins. "The Positive Political Economy of Instrument Choice in Environmental Policy."
97-10	Patt, Anthony. "Assessing Extreme Outcomes: The Strategic Treatment of Low Probability Impacts of Climate Change."
97-09	Long, Marybeth and Alastair Iles. "Assessing Climate Change Impacts: Co-Evolution of Knowledge, Communities and Methodologies."
97-08	Kandlikar, Milind and Ambuj Sagar. "Climate Science and Policy in India: Learning Some Lessons."
97-07	Franz, Wendy E. "The Development of an International Agenda for Climate Change."
97-06	Fisher-Vanden, Karen. "International Policy Instrument Prominence in the Climate Change Debate: A Case Study of the United States."
97-05	Agrawala, Shardul. "Explaining the Evolution of the IPCC Structure and Process."
97-04	Wright, Jan C. "'Bright Lines' and the Value of Life: Resolving the Dispute over the Regulation of Carcinogens."
97-03	Parson, Edward A. and Karen Fisher-Vanden. "Joint Implementation and its Alternatives."
97-02	Stavins, Robert N. "Economic Incentives for Environmental Regulation."
97-01	Arbatov, Alexei G. "Military Reform in Russia: Dilemmas, Obstacles, and Prospects."
96-03	de Nevers, Renee. "Sustaining the Transition? Western Efforts to Support Democracy and Prevent Conflict in Russia."
96-02	Rogers, Elizabeth S. "Using Economic Sanctions to Prevent Deadly Conflict."
96-01	Meade, Andre and Sydney Rosen. "The Mixed-Grass Prairie Reserve: Managing the Greater Badlands Region as a Whole System."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

95-14	Schatzki, Todd. "The Effects of Uncertainty on Landowner Conversion Decisions."
95-13	Lee, Henry and Negeen Darani. "Electricity Restructuring and the Environment."
95-12	Clark, William C. and Nancy M. Dickson eds. "The Press and Global Environmental Change: An International Comparison of Elite Newspaper Reporting on the Acid Rain Issue from 1972 to 1992."
95-11	Zaborsky, Victor. "Crimea and the Black Sea Fleet in Russian-Ukrainian Relations."
95-10	Stavins, Robert, Adam Jaffe, Steve Peterson, and Paul Portney. "Environment Regulation and the Competitiveness of U.S. Manufacturing: What does the Evidence Tell Us?"
95-09	Haran, Olexity. "Disintegration of the Soviet Union and the US Position on the Independence of Ukraine."
95-08	Allison, Graham T., Owen R. Coté, Jr., Richard A. Falkenrath and Steven E. Miller. "Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy: Containing the Threat of Loose Russian Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material."
95-07	Falkenrath, Richard A. "The U.S.-Russian HEU Purchase Agreement: Achievements, Problems, Prospects."
95-06	Stavins, Robert N. "The Costs of Carbon Sequestrian: A Revealed Preference Approach."
95-05	Dietrich, William. "The Challenge of Selecting Goals: Case Studies Regarding the Use of Critical Levels."
95-04	Ferenz, Michele N. and Stephan D. Sylvan. "The Design of a Palestinian-Israeli Water Commission: A Best Practices Approach."
95-03	Stavins, Robert N. and Tomasz Zylicz. "Environmental Policy in a Transition Economy: Designing Tradable Permits for Poland."
95-02	Not available.
95-01	Perlman, Brett A. "Pricing the Internet: How to Pay the Toll for the Electronic SuperHighway."
94-10	Stavins, Robert N. "Correlated Environmental Uncertainty and Policy Instrument Choice."
94-09	Falkenrath, Richard A. "The United States and Ballistic Missile Defense after the Cold War."
94-08	Falkenrath, Richard A. "The United States, the Former Soviet Republics, and Nuclear Weapons: Problems and Policies of Denuclearization."
94-07	Stavins, Robert N. and Adam Jaffee. "Environmental Regulation and Technology Diffusion: The Effects of Alternative Policy Instruments."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

94-06	Not Available.
94-05	Zaborsky, Victor. "Nuclear Disarmament and Nonproliferation: The Evolution of the Ukrainian Case."
94-04	Lachow, Irving. "The Global Positioning System and Cruise Missile Proliferation: Assessing the Threat."
94-03	Fairman, David, and Michael Ross. "International Aid for the Environment: Lessons from Economic Development Assistance."
94-02	Hahn, Robert W. and Carol A. May. "The Behavior of the Allowance Market: Theory and Evidence."
94-01	Bender, Rodd, Wyman Briggs, and Diane DeWitt. "Toward Statewide Unit Pricing in Massachusetts: Influencing the Policy Cycle."
93-06	Hahn, Robert W. "An Economic Analysis of Scrappage."
93-05	Hancke, Bob. "Technological Change and Its Institutional Constraints."
93-04	Portney Paul R. and Robert N. Stavins. "Regulatory Review of Environmental Policy: The Potential Role of Health-Health Analysis"
93-03	Parson, Edward A. and Richard J. Zeckhauser. "Equal measures and Fair Burdens: negotiating environmental treaties in an unequal world."
93-02	Stavins, Robert N. "Transaction Costs and the Performance of Markets for Pollution Control."
93-01	Holla, Rogier A.H.G. "Cultural Attitudes and Institutional Forces: Explaining National Differences in Biotechnology Policy."
92-13	Foster, Charles H.W. "Of Vert and Vision: Ensuring the Legacy of the Northern Forest of New England and New York."
92-12	Hane, Gerald Jiro. "Research and Development Consortia in Innovation in Japan: Case Studies in Superconductivity and Engineering Ceramics."
92-11	Vernon, Raymond. "The Triad as Policymakers."
92-10	Jorgenson, Dale W. and Peter J. Wilcoxen. "Energy, the Environment and Economic Growth."
92-09	Norberg-Bohm, Vicki and William C. Clark, et al. "International Comparisons of Environmental Hazards: Development and evaluation of a method for linking environmental data with the strategic debate management priorities for risk management."
92-08	Hart, David. "Strategies of Research Policy Advocacy: Anthropogenic Climatic Change Research, 1957-1974."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

92-07	Dembinski, Matthias. "Ballistic Missile Proliferation and the New World Order: A Critical Survey of the Literature."
92-06	Shlyakhter, Alexander I. and Daniel M. Kammen. "Estimating the Range of Uncertainty in Future Development from Trends in Physical Constraints and Predictions of Global Change."
92-05	Eaton, Susan C. "Union Leadership Development in the 1990s and Beyond: A Report with Recommendations."
92-04	Hahn, Robert W. and Robert L. Axtell. "Reevaluating the Relationship between Transferable Property Rights and Command-and-Control Regulation."
92-03	Stavins, Robert N. and Bradley W. Whitehead. "The Greening of America's Taxes: Pollution Charges and Environmental Protection."
92-02	Parson, Edward A. "Protecting the Ozone Layer: The Evolution and Impact of International Institutions."
92-01	Branscomb, Lewis M. "S & T Information Policy in the Context of a Diffusion Oriented National Technology Policy."
91-15	Hahn, Robert W. and Robert N. Stavins. "Economic Incentives for Environmental Protection: Integrating Theory and Practice."
91-14	Hahn, Robert W. "Government Markets and the Theory of the *N* th Best."
91-13	Parson, Edward A. and William C. Clark. "Learning to Manage Global Environmental Change: A Review of Relevant Theory."
91-12	Branscomb, Lewis M. "America's Emerging Technology Policy."
91-11	Lynn-Jones, Sean M. "International Security Studies after the Cold War: An Agenda for the Future."
91-10	Rapporteur's Report of the Executive Session: "Negotiating a Global Climate Change Agreement." March 14-15, 1991.
91-09	Jorgenson, Dale W. and Peter J. Wilcoxen. "Reducing U.S. Carbon Dioxide Emissions: The Cost of Different Goals."
91-08	Montgomery, John D., et al. "Values in Conflict: Policy Interactions in the Pacific Basin."
91-07	Summary of Project 88/Round II Workshop Proceedings. "Incentive-Based Policies for Municipal Solid Waste Management." May 16, 1991.
91-06	Proceedings of Project 88/Round II Forum. "Market-Based Strategies for Environmental Protection: A Tribute to Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania." May 16, 1991.
91-05	Foster, Charles H.W. and Peter P. Rogers. "Rebuilding the Nation's Wetland Heritage: A Challenge for the 1990s."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

BELFER CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Paper Series
Last updated: Tuesday, 11/16/2006

91-04	Lerner, Joshua. "The Impact of Patent Scope: An Empirical Examination of New Biotechnology Firms."
91-03	Gaskins, Darius and Bruce Stram. "A Meta Plan: A Policy Response to Global Warming."
91-02	Merchant, Gery E. "Freezing CO_2 Emissions: An Offset Policy for Slowing Global Warming."
91-01	Jaffee, Adam and Robert N. Stavins. "Evaluating the Relative Effectiveness of Economic Incentives and Direct Regulation for Environmental Protection: Impacts on the Diffusion of Technology."

The Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (BCSIA) Discussion Papers, established in 1991, will be issued on an irregular basis with three programmatic subseries: International Security; Science, Technology, and Public Policy; and Environment and Natural Resources. Inquiries and orders may be directed to: Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Publications, Harvard University, 79 JFK Street, Cambridge, MA, 02138.