

The Struggle with Terrorists – Recent developments (March 2006)

Immediately after the September 11th attacks there was an increased sense of trans-Atlantic unity and cooperation. Today, despite the last few years' difficulties, overall cooperation in the struggle against terrorism has improved (see [Cooperation in the Fight on Terror: Documents, Initiatives, and Programs](#)). However, it is not enough. Bi-lateral and multi-lateral changes are required, including at the institutional level.

In the first place, a common trans-Atlantic strategy needs to be agreed upon. “Effective international cooperation begins with a common intellectual infrastructure based on shared assumptions and compatible conceptual tools. An intellectual infrastructure shapes choices, prompts a set of priorities, and identifies new policy options or promotes existing tools in novel ways.” ([Michael L. Moddie](#))

The guidelines put forward by the OECD in its report [DAC Guidelines and Reference Series: A Development Co-operation Lens on Terrorism Prevention](#) could be a starting point.

Of course a global multi-national strategy to combat terrorism is also required, but the trans-Atlantic world needs to take the lead. Given the nature of the threat, time is of the essence.

Some trans-Atlantic organizations and the EU have already taken action:

- **NATO** – For NATO reforms and activities related to fighting terrorism, see [NATO and Terrorism](#)
- **The OECD and G8** have instituted a [Financial Action Task Force](#) to track the funding of terrorist groups; see also [Fighting Terrorist Financing: Transatlantic Cooperation and International Institutions, 2006](#) by Anne Richards (non-resident fellow of the Center for Transatlantic Relations).
- **European Union** - Recent developments in the EU laws, policies, and initiatives for fighting terrorism are diverse and far reaching. The EU is of course designed to coordinate the foreign and security policies of its Member States. A new body of laws and programs has been adopted and implemented towards that end (see for example [Hague Programme](#)); new agencies have been created; and new or expanded functions have been assigned to existing institutions. In the [Action Plan on Fighting Terrorism](#) (which is renewed every 6 months) the EU countries have agreed on over 150 measures in diverse areas, e.g. the EU Arrest Warrant expedites extradition procedures among the states. However, as Hugo Brady and Daniel Koehane argue “the EU needs a strategy, not a shopping list” ([Fighting Terrorism: The EU needs a Strategy not a Shopping List, Centre for European Reform, Briefing Note, October 11, 2005](#)). [EU's Patchwork of Policies Leaves it](#)

[Vulnerable to 9/11-Style Attack](#), *Craig Whitlock* argued in the Washington Post on Jan. 18, 2006. A strong notion of sovereignty still permeates the EU's decision-making, but closer EU-NATO cooperation and coordination could offer a way around some of the EU gaps in dealing with terrorism. Common trans-Atlantic measures may also be available; duplication of effort and ineffectiveness are the price too often paid for lack of international measures. The EU's programs and actions are not yet "federal" but rather coordinative (see EU Counter-Terrorism Co-ordinator Gijs de Vries speech [The European Union and the fight against terrorism](#), January 19, 2006).

Recent Conferences dealing with cooperation of the democracies in fighting terrorism (to name a few):

[International Summit on Democracy, Terrorism and Security](#), United States Security and Peace Institute, March 8-11, 2005;

[Democracies Confronting Terrorism](#), Security and Peace Institute, May 18, 2005;

[Terrorism, Security and America's Purpose: Towards a More Comprehensive Strategy](#), New America Foundation, September 6-8, 2005;

[Beyond Bullets: Economic Strategies in the Fight Against Terrorism](#), New America Foundation, September 21, 2005.

Recommendations on Prevention of Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Weapons (**CBRNW**)

by the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation to the U.S. Congress (These recommendations could be adopted by other states too, with appropriate modification). Cooperation and coordination are needed in relation to the possible acquisition and use of nuclear or other WMD by terrorist organizations because – depending on the intensity of the attacks – the results could affect vast areas or even the entire world. Experts agree that, while a biological terrorist attack might not be as lethal as a nuclear one, it could impose devastating short- and long-term consequences on humans and the environment. The implementation of policies to respond to such attacks will require resources that not all states can afford or have access to. Therefore, successful prevention and preparedness policies need to be cooperative. But international institutional mechanisms remain inadequate to promote cooperation; they “either attend to narrow aspects of such problems or lack the follow-through to match rhetoric” (see [A Long-term Response to Biological Terrorism: Homeland Security Leaders Need Shared Intellectual](#)

Preparedness

Countries not only have to work to prevent terrorism, but also must prepare their communities and agencies in case attack occurs. Simulations can help on identifying loopholes and other weaknesses, and in analyzing how they can be eliminated. In recent years various simulations have tested the level of preparedness and response:

▮ Atlantic Storm

A ministerial table-top exercise convened in Washington, DC, in January 2005. It was created and presented by the Center for Bio-Security of the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, the Center for Transatlantic Relations of Johns Hopkins University, and the Transatlantic Bio-Security Network, and was funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the German Marshall Fund of the United States, and the Nuclear Threat Initiative. The exercise was held in real-time, using the world's current geopolitical context as a backdrop, and used a fictitious scenario designed to mimic a summit of trans-Atlantic leaders forced to respond to a bio-terrorist attack. [More](#)

▮ Homeland Security Initiative

The Center for the Study of the Presidency (CSP) hosted off the record roundtables with senior leadership from the White House, the National Laboratories, and the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Homeland Security. Drawing on the results of these meetings, CSP formed a Nuclear Defense Steering Committee, chaired by Norman Augustine, which recommended the creation of a "Mini Manhattan Project " to marshal the nation's efforts for defending against smuggled nuclear weapons. [More](#)

▮ Catastrophic Terrorism and First Responders: Threats and Mitigation

The NATO advanced research workshop held in Neuhausen-Stuttgart, Germany, in May 2004, aimed to identify what should be done to upgrade the security of first responders, such as police, paramedics, fire fighters, and others. It dealt with the level of protection required, search and rescue missions, damage control, and balanced risk-assessment. [More](#)

▮ NATO Exercises

Periodic exercises help to analyze the readiness of individual states and their neighbors and other allies. [More](#)