

The Sources of Pakistani Attitudes toward Religiously-motivated Terrorism

Karl Kaltenthaler

Center for Policy Studies
University of Akron
Political Science
Case Western Reserve University

William J. Miller

Political Science
Ohio University

Stephen Ceccoli

Department of International Studies
Rhodes College

Ron Gelleny

Center for Policy Studies
University of Akron

All author correspondence should be addressed to: Karl Kaltenthaler, Center for Policy Studies, 520 Polsky Building, University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, 44325-1915. E-mail: kck@uakron.edu

The Sources of Pakistani Attitudes toward Religiously-motivated Terrorism

This study is interested in understanding public opinion in Pakistan toward terror attacks. Specifically, this study explores 1) the general picture of attitudes in Pakistan toward terrorism and 2) which individuals are most likely to support terrorism in Pakistan. The study aims to give insights into how pervasive a support base exists for terrorism as a tactic in Pakistan and it seeks to isolate the individual-level traits that account for the variation we see among Pakistani Muslims regarding their level of acceptance of terrorism against Pakistani and Indian targets. We find that a large majority of Pakistanis oppose terrorism but terrorism directed at Indian targets is more tolerated than terrorism against Pakistani targets. We also find that those who are most supportive of Talibanization in Pakistan are the most supportive of terrorism.

The Sources of Pakistani Attitudes toward Religiously-motivated Terrorism

One of the biggest security threats Pakistan faces is terrorism. Terrorist attacks have killed several thousands of Pakistanis since the creation of Pakistan in 1947. Pakistan is one of the most terrorism plagued countries in the world. Now, the country regularly suffers from terrorist attacks targeting members of opposing sects of Islam, people associated with the government, foreigners, religious minorities, or relatively indiscriminate attacks aimed at creating fear in the general populace.

In Pakistan, salafi-jihadis are the most common attackers of civilians (Haqqani 2005). Prior to 2006, most salafi-jihadi groups targeted state targets such as the police and army although sectarian terrorist attacks were not infrequent (Fair 2004). The growing number of large-scale suicide terrorist attacks committed in the name of radical Islam in Pakistan committed by the Pakistani Taliban is important because it signals a growing security threat to the Pakistani populace. The Pakistani military has responded to some of the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks but the battle continues (Fair 2009).

While it is important to know why groups use terrorist attacks and who becomes a participant, it is just as important to know how well supported those attacks are by the Pakistani general public—the target political support base for the groups employing the tactics. A central concern of the Pakistani government is whether the terrorism that so plagues the country is supported by a large portion of the Pakistani population. In other words, we need to know if terrorist tactics employed in Pakistan and abroad are widely popular in Pakistan and, more importantly, why people either support or oppose those tactics. It is very important to understand the public opinion underlying the tactics to gauge how much salafi-jihadi groups can count on new recruits and logistical support from the Pakistani people. We can assume that if there is widespread support among a population for terrorist tactics and goals within Pakistan and abroad (namely India), it will be exceedingly difficult for a government to eradicate such forms of terrorism. While it may just take a few to engage in terrorism to create terrific damage to a population, if a population is

united against that terrorism, it will be very difficult for those committing such acts to continue them over time as the state will be able to count on public support for harsh counter-terrorism measures.¹

This study is interested in understanding public opinion in Pakistan toward terror attacks committed in the name of Islam. Specifically, this study explores 1) the general picture of attitudes in Pakistan toward terrorism and 2) which individuals are most likely to support terrorism in Pakistan and in India. The study aims to give insights into how pervasive a support base exists for terrorism as a tactic in Pakistan and it seeks to isolate the individual-level traits that account for the variation we see among Pakistani Muslims regarding their level of acceptance of terrorism to protect Islam. These questions are answered employing data for Pakistan from the 2005 Pew *17 Nation Global Attitudes Survey*, the 2007 World Public Opinion *Muslim Public Opinion on U.S. Policy, Attacks on Civilians, and al Qaeda Survey*, and the 2008 Terror Free Tomorrow *May-June Pakistan National Survey*. We use data from these three surveys because together they provide insights into our research questions that each alone cannot do. The paper then assesses what the empirical findings mean for our understanding of public support for terrorism in Pakistan.

The Landscape of Jihadi Terrorism in Pakistan

The creation of the state of Pakistan in 1947, in many important ways, fostered Islamist militants in the country. Two salient problems faced the new state that were to contribute to the development of Islamist militants in Pakistan: the lack of a congealed national identity because of the fractured ethnic and religious nature of Pakistani society and the security dilemma that immediately developed with India after partition. The Pakistani state has tried to foster an Islamic identity, which at times, has spurred militancy. It has also created and aided Islamist militant groups to help in its security goals. Islamist militants, many of whom have engaged in terrorism, have been developed as a foreign policy tool against Pakistan's arch-foe India since the creation of the Pakistani state in 1947 (Swami 2007).

¹ This study is not about attitudes toward militancy in Pakistan but more specifically about attitudes toward the tactic of targeting civilians for a political goal, ie, terrorism.

One way to categorize jihadi groups that have engaged in terrorism in Pakistan and India is by focusing on their primary objectives. There are three major types of jihadi militant organizations that engage in terrorism in Pakistan and in India from Pakistan. The types are what can be referred to as those that have focused principally on Kashmir, those that have been mostly sectarian in their focus, and the Pakistani Taliban. We will briefly explore each in the sections below.

Sectarian Groups

The Iranian Revolution in 1979 had an important impact on the nature of the sectarian divide in Pakistan. After the revolution, Iran began to sponsor Shia groups in Pakistan, some of which began to target Sunnis. In response, the Pakistani state began to foster Sunni groups. The state-aided sectarian jihadi groups, which were Sunni organizations, were encouraged by Zia al Haq's obvious Sunni bias in his Islamization campaign (Haqqani 2006). The Pakistani dictator was concerned about the Shia presence in Pakistan, not simply because he was Sunni himself, but also because he feared the rising power of Iran following its Islamic revolution in 1979. Al Haq, like the Saudis, viewed the Islamic government in Tehran as a threat to orthodox Islam (Nasr 2001; 2009). Thus, Al Haq encouraged the harassment and violence that the Deobandi jihadis imparted on Shias in Pakistan starting in the 1980s (Haqqani 2006).

Nearly two thousand civilians have died in Pakistan since 1980, most of them Shia, from jihadi violence targeting civilians from minority Muslim sects (Haqqani 2006, 2).² Sectarian terrorism is the most common form of religiously-motivated violence against civilians in Pakistan (International Crisis Group 2005). Sunni jihadis, which make up the overwhelming majority of jihadis in Pakistan, continue to engage in violence against Shias, sometimes on a large scale. Sunni

² Shias were not the only targets of the Sunni jihadis. Barelvi and Ahmedi Muslims, which are less orthodox and conservative than the Deobandi or Wahhabi forms of Sunni Islam, were also targeted. In fact, the Pakistani government went so far as to declare that Ahemdis were not Muslims to placate its conservative Sunni supporters.

jihadis, such as Deobandi groups Sipah-e-Sahaba (Army of the Prophet's Companions)³ and Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (Army of Jhang) militants want to clear Pakistan of "unbelievers," chief among them the Shias. This Sunni violence has sparked the creation of Shia jihadi groups, such as Sipah-e-Mohammed (Army of Mohammed), supported by Iran, which have committed acts of sectarian violence against Sunni civilians. The Shia groups are now in marked decline but sectarian terrorism in Pakistan has no end in sight.

The Anti-Indian Groups Focused on Kashmir

In 1989, the Pakistani military and intelligence services saw another use to be made of the jihadis: fighting to eject the Indians from the part of Kashmir they controlled. When a home-grown Muslim rebellion broke out in 1989 in Kashmir against Indian rule, the Pakistani state used this as an opportunity to try to make Kashmir part of Pakistan, a goal since the creation of Pakistan. The military and intelligence services, which already had long-standing relations with the jihad groups, used the jihadi cadres to infiltrate Indian-held Kashmir to aid in the insurgency aimed at ending Indian rule in Kashmir (Abbas 2006). Jamaat-e-Islami spawned Hizbul Mujahideen (Party of Holy Warriors) in order to fight in the Kashmiri jihad against the Indians. Saudi money helped create a militant group based on Ahl-e-Hadith religious principles known as Lashkar-e-Taiba (Army of the Pure). Deobandi groups such as Harkat-ul-Ansar (Movement of Supporters of the Faith), which later became Harkat-ul-Mujaideen (Movement of Holy Warriors), Sipah-e-Sahaba (Army of Mohammed's Companions), and Jaish-e-Mohammed (Army of Mohammed) fought alongside Hizbul Mujahideen,⁴ local Kashmiri groups, and Arab volunteers who had come to aid in the Kashmiri jihad. All of these groups have targeted civilians in Kashmir and in the interior of India.

³ Sipah-e-Sahaba changed its name to Millat-e-Islami/Pakistan in 2002 because it was designated a terrorist group in Pakistan. Most people still know it by its former name.

⁴ Members of these groups have formed a new group, Jaish-e-Omar (Army of Omar) in response to the US invasion of Afghanistan. This group is thought to have this name in honor of Mullah Mohammed Omar, leader of the Taliban.

The Pakistani Taliban

Another major source of terrorism in Pakistan is the Pakistani Taliban also known as the Tehreek-e-Taliban-e-Pakistan or (TTP). The Taliban, translated in Pashto as students, were Afghan refugees who were products of the Deobandi madrasas in Pakistan. In those schools, they had been indoctrinated and trained in the ways of jihad (Andrabi et al 2005; Fair 2007). This process of creating an Afghan cadre of jihadis was supported by the Pakistani military and ISI as a way of creating a force that could go into Afghanistan and create a stable and pro-Pakistani and anti-India regime. The creation of the Taliban as a fighting force meant that the Pakistani jihadis now had a direct Afghan off-shoot. The Taliban tied the Pakistani jihadis, particularly the Deobandi variant, to the fate of Afghanistan. Thus, when the Afghan Taliban came to power in Afghanistan in 1996, it was largely a triumph for the Pakistani security apparatus and its jihadi allies.

When American forces invaded Afghanistan in 2001 to displace the Taliban government and to destroy Al Qaeda, many fighters from the Taliban and Al Qaeda crossed over into Pakistan to escape American forces. Afghan Taliban and Al Qaeda fighters found refuge among Pashtun tribes in Pakistan. Reacting to pressure from the United States, Pakistani forces entered the Pashtun belt in Pakistan in the Northwest Frontier Province (NWFP) and in the Federal Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) starting in 2002, principally to route out Al Qaeda forces. The reaction from the local Pashtuns to the military operations was quite negative and a series of militant groups were formed among Pakistani Pashtuns to repel government forces. In 2007, these disparate groups were joined together to become the Pakistani Taliban. The Pakistani Taliban seemed to have been formed as the result of Pakistani Pashtun anger with the Pakistani military's operations against foreign militants in the North and South Waziristan areas in the FATA starting in 2002 (Fair 2009a). Originally, merely a collection of disparate groups opposed to the Pakistani state's operations in the Pashtun belt, the Pakistani Taliban came to be a loose umbrella for forces wedded to the hard-core Deobandi vision of an Islamic state in Pakistan. As they pushed their agenda in the FATA and NWFP, the Pakistani state answered with a mixture of force and concessions (Fair 2009b). The result of the largely

unsuccessful Pakistani counterinsurgency campaign was that the Pakistani Taliban began to grow in size and ferocity. There is now a Punjabi variant of the Pakistani Taliban, alongside the Pashtun groups, that operates in connection with several Deobandi and Ahl-e-Hadith groups that have been focused on Kashmir in the past. These groups also loosely coordinate with Al Qaeda to carry out attacks. Pakistani state employees have borne the brunt of attacks from the Pakistani Taliban but civilians are increasingly being targeted as well. Suicide attacks have become common since 2006 (Fair 2009a). Some 2,000 civilians died in Pakistan in 2008 as the victims of terrorist attacks (Bajoria 2009). Pakistani Taliban militants were the perpetrators of most of those attacks.

Consequences of Jihadi Violence

What have been the consequences for Pakistan of this proliferation and growth in jihadi groups and networks? The most obvious and shocking consequence of the proliferation of the jihadis has been a precipitous rise in violence in Pakistan over the years, particularly since 2001. The principal target of the wrath of the Pakistani jihadis has been the Pakistani state itself, most clearly seen in attempts on the life of Pervez Musharraf, the former president of Pakistan, and the successful 2007 assassination of Benazir Bhutto, a popular candidate for the prime minister's position. Musharraf became the target of vengeance of the Pakistani jihadi community because he is viewed to have betrayed them by siding with the United States in its "war on terror." Thus, Musharraf, who had backed the Taliban, the Pakistani jihadis, and to an extent, Al Qaeda, prior to 11 September 2001, was viewed as a traitor by the Pakistani jihadis for turning against the Taliban and Al Qaeda when the US demanded the Pakistani government help in the fight against these groups. Pressure on Musharraf only increased over the years since 2001 to clamp down on Muslim militancy in Pakistan, particularly in the Northwest Frontier Province and the tribal areas, which are base regions to many jihadi groups, including remnants of Al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Benazir Bhutto was targeted by the jihadis for several reasons. First, she was a woman running to be the leader of Pakistan. Second, and most importantly, she was a vocal opponent of the

jihadi groups and their ties to the ISI. Third, she was promising more cooperation with the United States in the “war on terror.” On 27 December 2007, she was killed at a rally for her Pakistan People’s Party. A subsequent investigation showed that her assassins had links to Lashkar-i-Jhangvi and Al Qaeda.

Even those in the Pakistani state who do not share the ideological vision of the salafi-jihadis are not in a position to completely eradicate the jihadi groups. The military and ISI still depend on jihadi groups to continue the proxy war in Kashmir. Abandoning that cause would prove extremely unpopular with the Pakistani population. Also, there is the threat to domestic political stability that would result from a comprehensive crack-down on the jihadis. Forays into the Northwest Frontier Province to route out Al Qaeda and Taliban fighters finding sanctuary there among the local tribes and Pakistani jihadis have led to bloody clashes, resulting in hundreds of deaths among Pakistani troops. Attempts to stabilize the situation through truces and deals have not succeeded and the area remains a highly volatile base for jihadi operations in Pakistan and into Afghanistan.

Efforts to clamp down on the growing jihadi violence in Pakistan’s major cities also seem to be breeding more violence. A raid in the summer of 2007 on the Red Mosque in Islamabad, the base of a group of salafi-jihadis seeking to impose a strict Islamic behavioral code on Islamabad, resulted in the death of over one hundred civilians and eleven Pakistani troops. More than two hundred civilians died in reprisal attacks by supporters of the Red Mosque’s among the jihadi community in Pakistan. It is unclear what the long-term prospects of increased jihadi terrorism are as a consequence of the perception that Musharraf turned on the salafi-jihadi community in Pakistan and that he became an enemy of Islam in the eyes of the salafi-jihadi community.

But what does the average Pakistani think about the issue of jihadi terrorism in his/her country? Do Pakistanis sympathize with the tactics of the jihadis? Why would some Pakistanis support jihadi violence against civilians while others oppose it? The remainder of this study is an attempt to answer those questions for, as we stated previously in this paper, it is crucial to the future

of the Pakistani salafi-jihadis if the public will back them in their jihad or conversely seek their destruction.

A Picture of Public Support for Terrorism in Pakistan

One of the most important questions any scholar of terrorism in Pakistan would ask is how much of a problem does the public perceive there to be. **Comment here on the Pew data**

In the 2007 World Public Opinion Survey, respondents were asked: *Here is a list of things that may or may not be a problem in [your country]. Please mark to what extent you perceive the issue to be a problem in [your country].* Respondents could select a very big problem a moderate problem, a small problem, and not a problem. Table 1 below shows the breakdown of the percentage of Pakistani respondents concerning terrorism in Pakistan being a problem.

Table 1: Terrorism as a Problem in Pakistan

	Urban	Rural	All
Very big problem	83%	75%	79%
Moderate problem	10%	8%	9%
Small problem	3%	5%	4%
Not a problem	1%	1%	1%
Refused/don't know	2%	12%	7%

N= 1243

Source: 2007 World Public Opinion *Muslim Public Opinion on U.S. Policy, attacks on Civilians, and al Qaeda*

We can see from the pattern of responses that terrorism is indeed viewed as a substantial problem in Pakistan. A total of seventy-nine percent of respondents viewed it as a very big problem. Only 1% did not think it was a problem at all. It is interesting to note that there is a divergence

among urban and rural Pakistanis regarding the seriousness of the terrorism problem in the country. Urban Pakistanis view it as a greater problem than rural Pakistanis. This is probably a result of the greater prevalence of terrorist attacks in the urban centers of Pakistan. Karachi, the commercial center of the country, is particularly prone to such attacks. In any case, both urban and rural Pakistanis see terrorism as very serious problem for their country.

This would indicate that Pakistanis view terrorism as something they would like to stop and thus a public policy priority for their government. With such a large proportion of the population viewing terrorism as a problem in Pakistan, this puts substantial political pressure on the Pakistani government to quell the rising tide of terrorist attacks in the country.

The next question in the World Public Opinion survey gets at the legitimacy of terrorism, specifically from a religious standpoint. Table 2 shows how Pakistanis think about the relationship between Islam and terrorism. The question asks: *In your opinion, what is the position of Islam regarding attacks on civilians?* Respondents may reply, certainly supports, supports, opposes, certainly opposes, and refused/don't know.

Table 2: Does Islam Support Terrorism?

	Urban	Rural	All
Certainly supports	2%	1%	1%
Supports	3%	1%	2%
Opposes	16%	17%	16%
Certainly opposes	72%	63%	67%
Refused/don't know	9%	18%	13%

N= 1243

Source: 2007 World Public Opinion *Muslim Public Opinion on U.S. Policy, attacks on Civilians, and al Qaeda*

The results of this question are clear that an overwhelming majority of Pakistanis do not believe that Islam supports attacks on civilians. Only 3% of the respondents think that Islam supports attacks on civilians, whereas a full 83% of the respondents believe that Islam does not support terrorist attacks. It is telling that out of that 83%, 67% are sure that the religion is opposed to attacking civilians. While there is more uncertainty among rural Pakistanis, they too overwhelmingly oppose the idea that Islam supports targeting civilians.

When the question is posed as to whether Pakistanis would support terrorism, the resulting pattern of responses seems to support the results presented with the previous question. In Table 3 we see the breakdown to a question on the general legitimacy of terrorist attacks. The question asked: *Some people think that bombing and other types of attacks intentionally aimed at civilians are sometimes justified while others think that this kind of violence is never justified. Do you personally feel that such attacks are often justified, sometimes justified, rarely justified, or never justified?*

Table 3: Is Terrorism Justified?

Often justified	7%
Sometimes justified	8%
Rarely justified	11%
Never justified	55%
Refused/don't know	20%

N= 907

Source: 2007 World Public Opinion *Pakistani Public Opinion on Democracy, Islamic Militancy, and Relations with the US.*

We can see from the distribution of responses that there is little support for the idea that terrorism is justified. Only 7% of respondents thought that terrorist tactics were often justified and

8% believed that they were sometimes justified. A further eleven percent thinks that it is rarely justified. Fifty-five percent of all respondents think that terrorism is never justified at all. We see a fairly high don't know/refused response rate among Pakistanis of 20%, which is perhaps a reflection of ambivalence toward the question or distrust of the questioner.

Does it matter what the nationality of the targets is? In other words, are Pakistanis more willing to accept terrorism toward Indian civilians compare to terrorism directed at Pakistani civilians? The question asks: *For each of the following types of attacks, please tell me of personally feel that these are sometimes justified or never justified:*

Table 4: Targets: Are the Attacks Justified?

Attacks conducted against government institutions (like the national Parliament in Dehli and state assemblies)

Often justified	15%
Never justified	64%
Refused/don't know	21%

Attacks conducted against Indian targets like subways, stock exchanges, and tourist sites

Often justified	11%
Never justified	68%
Refused/don't know	20%

Attacks in India on families of Indian military personnel

Often justified	13%
Never justified	67%
Refused/don't know	19%

Attacks in Pakistan on Shia

Often justified	5%
Never justified	78%
Refused/don't know	17%

Attacks in Pakistan on Ahmadiyya⁵

Often justified	6%
Never justified	75%
Refused/don't know	19%

⁵ Another minority sect of Islam in Pakistan

N= 907

Source: 2007 World Public Opinion *Pakistani Public Opinion on Democracy, Islamic Militancy, and Relations with the US.*

What we can see from the results of these questions about specific targets is that there is, in general, a low level of support for attacks on civilians of any kind. But we also see that there is more support for attacks on civilians if the civilians in question are Indian and not Pakistani. There is generally three times as much support for attacking Indian civilians than there is for attacking religious minorities in Pakistan. Thus, the deep hostility held by Pakistanis toward India tempers some Pakistanis aversion to the tactic of terrorism.

What if the targets are Americans? We know from many studies that Pakistanis harbor some of the most anti-American sentiments in the Muslim world. Does this anti-Americanism provide a basis for support for attacks on American civilians? Table 5 shows the results to a question in a 2009 World Public Opinion survey that asked: *How do you feel about al Qaeda?*

Table 5: Al Qaeda Attacks on Americans

	2009	2008	2007
I support Al Qaeda's attacks on Americans and share its attitudes toward the US	25%	16%	10%
I oppose Al Qaeda's attacks on Americans and share many of its attitudes toward the US	34%	15%	6%
I oppose Al Qaeda's attacks on Americans and do not share its attitudes toward the US	28%	22%	16%
Refused/Don't know	13%	47%	68%

N= 1000

Source: 2009 World Public Opinion *Pakistani Public Opinion on the Swat Conflict, Afghanistan, and the US*

The results of this question show that there has been a hardening of attitudes toward the US over the years. This is likely due to Predator drone attacks on targets in Pakistan, which are very unpopular among the Pakistani public. We can see that support for attacks on Americans went from 10% in 2007 to 25% in 2009. But we also see opposition to attacks on the US growing over time as well, from 22% in 2007 to 62% in 2009. It seems like attitudes toward the US are less ambivalent in Pakistan than they once were and more polarized. What is most interesting, for the purposes of this study, is that there seems to be more willingness to support attacks on Americans than attacks on Indians and certainly more than on Pakistanis.

While the number of actual participants in jihadi terrorist attacks may be small and it is a minority of the general public that accepts the justification for attacks on civilians, it is critical that we understand the motivations for those who support terrorism. It is also important to understand why Pakistanis oppose terrorism. Understanding support for and opposition to terrorism is crucial if we are to comprehend the political environment in which the Pakistani state operates. The next section of the paper seeks to explain why some Pakistanis may be more willing to support/oppose terrorism than others.

Possible Answers

Studying why people become involved in jihadi terrorism, particularly suicide terrorism, is something of a growth industry (Allen 2002; Azam 2005; Grimland, Kapter, and Kerkhof 2006; Khorsokhavar 2005; Oliver and Steinberg 2006; Pedahzur 2004). There has also been a spate of recent studies on the sources of support for terrorism. Some of them build off of the Pew surveys (Fair and Shepherd 2006; Kaltenthaler 2006; Wike and Samaranayake 2006) and others use different data sources related to support for suicide attacks (Haddad and Khashan 2002; Krueger and Maleckova 2003). All of these studies seek to identify the individual-level characteristics that explain why some Muslims are supportive of terror attacks and others are not. What is interesting is that while many of the studies find the same results, others come to conflicting conclusions on what

drives support for terrorism. Also, some of the studies only focus on a small number of possible explanations, thus not controlling well for other possible contributing factors. Finally, some of the studies simply add variables as controls that are likely to be significant causal variables that deserve to be fleshed out theoretically.

We want to know if individual-level Pakistani support for and opposition to terrorism is driven by interests or ideas. It is logical that opposition to the use of terrorism will come from those who stand to lose from terrorism and the disruption that it brings to economic and political life. Conversely, it is conceivable that support for terrorism will come from those who are convinced that Islam is at war with the state terrorism is a justified means to achieve the goals of Islam, as they perceive them. This latter view is based more on ideas than any tangible interests on the part of such Muslim citizens. Also, it is logical to assume that those who are generally happy with their lot in life will not support terrorism, while those who are not content may be more willing to support the tactic.

This study seeks to test a series of theoretically derived hypotheses that are divided into two categories: ideological and utilitarian. These hypotheses will be tested using the most commonly employed data set (the Pew Global Attitudes Survey conducted in 2005) to give a more complete picture of the individual-level sources of support for terrorism than is found in the previous studies. A very important part of this study is to determine the *relative* importance of these factors in explaining the variations in Pakistani support for terrorism to defend Islam. The following section briefly sketches out a number of potentially important explanations for better understanding such variation. We divide such explanations into two groups: utilitarian and ideological.

Ideological Explanations

Ideological explanations are based on the logic that individuals may support terrorism for reasons other than the fact that they stand to gain something tangible from the act. Indeed, there is a

growing literature on how ideas are affecting the nature and incidence of terrorism in the Muslim world (see Wiktorowicz and Kaltenthaler 2006).

The Role of Religion

If one is asking about the use of suicide attacks to defend Islam, it is obvious that this is a matter related to religious belief. Thus, a Muslim's religious views will be of central importance to understanding his/her position on the use of suicide attacks to defend Islam. The Pew Global Attitudes Survey asks several questions related to Islam that can shed light on how a Muslim's belief structure can affect the way they think about suicide terrorism in the name of Islam.

In particular, the Pew survey asks the following question about a Muslim's perception of threat to their religion. The question is: *Turning to another subject, in your opinion, are there any serious threats to Islam today?* The respondent can reply with yes, no, don't know, or refuse to answer the question. This is clearly an important question for gauging whether a Muslim thinks his/her religion is under threat. Wike and Samaranayake (2006) find that there is a positive correlation between a perception of threat to Islam and support for suicide terrorism to defend Islam.

We test this hypothesis in the case of Pakistan. It may be the case that if a Pakistani perceives a threat to Islam, that person would want to defend his/her faith. It is a core element of salafi belief that the jihadis are defending Islam from attack. It is not an exaggeration to say that there is a pronounced siege mentality in this vein of Islamic thinking. Thus, the violence is justified as self-defense. As the question about suicide terrorism directly refers to the threat to Islam, it is logical that the sense of threat would be linked to the support for suicide terrorism to defend Islam.

Primary Identity

A second question of interest to us in the Pew Survey concerning Islam asks the respondent to assess which identity is most important to her/him, national or Islamic. The question asks: *Do you think of yourself first as a [Pakistani] or first as a Muslim?* We would propose that if an individual considers

his/her Muslim identity as more important than his/her national identity, that person will be more interested in defending Islam than a person who identifies more with her nation. This is *not* to say that there is anything intrinsic in Islam that would lead one to support terrorism. We posit that those who are passionate about their Islamic identity would be more supportive of defending Islam. This logic generates the hypothesis that people who think their Islamic identity trumps their national identity would be more supportive of using terrorism to defend Islam.

The Preferred Role of Islam

The third question in the Pew survey that addresses an important belief issue in Islam relates to the role that Islam should play in the world. The question specifically asks: *How important is it that Islam plays a more important and influential role in the world than it does now-very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not all important?* The respondent also had the option to answer don't know or refuse to answer. This question gets at the core belief of Islamism, or the notion that the political order should be based on Islamic principles and modes of governance. Every salafi believes this to be their central mission. The only just and correct Muslim society is ruled by Islamic law and under an Islamic ruler, not by secular or democratic principles. Thus, an Islamist such as a salafi would think that a secular political order is an affront to God and must be resisted. The more radical among them would think that the secular order is an attack on Islam and must be resisted through violence. Therefore it is logical to surmise that if one is supportive of the idea of Islam playing a large role in the world, one is more likely to be supportive of the idea of using suicide terrorism to defend Islam.

Utilitarian Explanations

Utilitarian explanations take as their starting point the notion that individuals will decide whether to support or oppose terrorism based on what terrorism will do to that individual's self-interest. Such explanations would say that a citizen, when thinking about terrorist acts, will ask him

or herself whether such an act will bring them tangible benefits, such as wealth, power, or prestige. Consequently, a person's level of education and income would be potentially important factors affecting a person's calculation of rewards and costs emanating from terrorism.

We argue that it is very important to place the utilitarian variables of education and income in the context of the societies one is studying. In other words, the role that education and income will play in conditioning how people think about terrorism will depend on what their education and income will do for them in their societies. In some societies, for example, being highly educated means one has bright prospects to achieve wealth and status. In others, what some people refer to as "blocked societies," high levels of education may simply make one frustrated because educational attainment does not translate into greater levels of wealth or prestige. Likewise, in some societies, having wealth does not mean one is likely to be happy with the status quo if the wealthy are given no political voice or are treated poorly in the economic or social spheres. Thus making generalizations across all countries about how education or income would affect support for terrorism is likely to be misguided. However, we can generalize that in societies where the wealthy enjoy power and status, they will be less supportive of terrorism. Also, in societies where higher levels of education mean ever greater opportunities for wealth and status, the less supportive the educated will be of terrorism.

Income

The income of an individual has been shown to be an important predictor of a Muslim's support for terrorism. Krueger and Maleckova (2003) and Fair and Shepherd (2006) have shown that higher income individuals are, in fact, more supportive of terrorism than lower income individuals. Fair and Shepherd offer no theoretical explanation for why this is the case, but Krueger and Maleckova think that it may be linked to propensity to engage in politics. It is important to note that most of the societies that have been examined in previous studies are Arab societies. Pakistan is only one of the countries in the data pool in the 2005 Pew Survey.

We predict that income will play a role in how Pakistani Muslims view terrorism. Unlike the studies cited above, we posit that the less wealthy in Pakistan will be more likely to support terrorism than the wealthy. We base this argument on the fact that Pakistan is still almost semi-feudal in the distribution of wealth and power. Unlike in Arab states, where the state controls such a huge portion of the economy and the higher income families are at the mercy of political elites, in Pakistan, the wealthy are the political elites. Wealthy land-owners and businessmen control much of Pakistani life. They are the winners from the way Pakistanis society is structured. Terrorism would disrupt their livelihood. Also, if the salafi-jihadis were to take power in Pakistan, the wealthy would likely lose their position of power and privilege in Pakistani society. Finally, the wealthy in Pakistan do not generally send their children to madrasas, which are largely free, but rather send them to private schools that emphasize skill attainment rather than religion and ideology the way that many madrasas do. Thus, wealthier Pakistanis are less likely to be socialized into jihadi ideology compared to poorer Pakistanis. Thus, we would predict that the wealthier one is in Pakistan, the more likely one is to oppose terrorism to defend Islam.

Education

One of the biggest controversies regarding the sources of the jihadi-salafi terrorism in today's world focuses on the education of the perpetrators. Many pundits have argued that it is the provision of poor levels of education in the Muslim world that are driving the hatred and violence directed at the West. According to this prominent argument, ignorant young men are being recruited for jihad because they have no prospects and do not know that the West is not in a war against Islam. So, the pundits say, educate the Muslim masses, giving them hope and a correct view of the world and one will significantly reduce the incidence of terror committed against Western targets.

Studies have shown this argument to be misguided. Krueger and Maleckova (2003) find that low levels of education do not drive support for terrorism. Other studies, such as Haddad and Khashan (2002) and Wike and Samaranayake (2006), have found that the level of one's education

does not predict support or opposition to terrorism. Thus, in all of these studies education does not prove to be a predictor of opposition or support for terrorism in Muslim societies.

We believe that there is no reason that Pakistan would be any different. In Pakistan, where one's attainment of wealth and status is determined by one's family origins, and that determines the level of education one is able to achieve, we posit that the role of education in predicting support for terrorism to defend Islam will wash out. Education will likely have no explanatory weight independent of income.

Moreover, there is another factor that would possibly wash out the role of education in predicting support for terrorism in the name of Islam: the madrasa system. Some madrasas provide Pakistani children with relatively well-rounded educations, whereas others, simply focus on indoctrinating children into the salafi-jihadi mind-set. Thus, simply knowing someone in Pakistan is educated does not mean you can discern what type of education they have had. Because the madrasa system covers so much of the education system now, with 14, 000 madrasas in the country, it is very difficult to generalize about how and what students are being taught in Pakistani schools. Thus, we would predict that education will not have predictive power in its own right.

Finally, we also include control variables into the model to account for age and gender. While we do not attempt to advance theoretical predictions concerning the directional impact of these two factors, it is likely that age and gender condition respondents' attitudes toward the dependent variable used in this analysis.

Hypotheses:

Utilitarian

Income: The less income one has, the more likely one is to support terrorism to defend Islam

Education: The level of education is not related to one's attitude toward the use of terrorism to defend Islam

Ideological

Perception of Threat to Islam: The more one perceives Islam to be under threat, the more likely one is to support terrorism to defend Islam

Muslim identity: The more one identifies as a Muslim rather than a Pakistani, the more likely one will support terrorism to defend Islam

Role of Islam: The more one wants Islam to play an important role in the World, the more likely one will support terrorism to defend Islam

Controls: *Age, Gender*

Findings and Discussion

In order to carry out our analysis of the impact of these ideological and utilitarian factors on the support for the use of terrorism to defend Islam, we employed ordered probit regression techniques. This form of regression analysis was utilized because our dependent variable is multinomial and ordinal in nature. We were unable to use Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression methods since the assumptions require that the prediction errors follow a normal distribution and that these errors are homoscedastic. To gain a comprehensive view of support for suicide bombing among individuals in Pakistan, we analyze responses to a series of questions asked in the *2005 Pew Global Attitudes Project*. More specifically, for our dependent variable, we utilize a question that asks individuals in Pakistan whether they support suicide bombing in Pakistan in order to defend Islam to serve as the dependent variable. Additionally, we used a variety of questions from the *Pew Global Attitudes Project* to measure views on the threat to Islam, self identification, gender, age, education and income. In our model we only considered individuals that directly responded to the question. That is, individuals that refused to answer or answered that they do not know/no opinion were excluded in the analysis. All of these questions and coding values are listed in Appendix One. A total of 616 respondents were included in the analysis.

Table 11 shows the results of our ordered probit regression of individual Pakistani support for terror attacks in Pakistan in order to defend Islam. First, we found no statistically significant relationship between the ideological variables and the dependent variable. There was no statistically

significant relationship between the Islamic threat variable, the self-identification variable, and the desired role of Islam variable and our dependent variable. This set of results indicates that the ideological variables that we employed do not predict a Pakistani's attitude toward suicide bombing to protect Islam. They cannot explain either support or opposition to the tactic.

The utilitarian explanation, on the other hand, proves to be a better means of accounting for attitudes toward religiously-motivated terrorism in Pakistan. We found income to be highly associated with support for terrorism to defend Islam. In line with our hypothesis, individuals with higher levels of income were less likely to support the action. Additionally, the education variable did not result in a statistically significant coefficient, a finding that is consistent with our theoretical expectation.

The control variables show that they are statistically significant factors in the analysis. Both age and gender prove to matter regarding how Pakistanis think about terrorism motivated by the desire to protect Islam. The results indicate that men are more supportive than women of terrorism to defend Islam. The results also indicate that younger respondents are more supportive of the use of terrorism to defend Islam than the older ones.

We also employ a first differences analysis. The first difference represents the change in the probability that of the dependent variable being at its maximum value when the independent variable of interest changes from its minimum to its maximum value while all other explanatory variables are held at their means (see King 1990). We calculate the first difference only for the income variable because it is the only statistically significant explanatory variable. The first difference of (.083) indicates that with an increase in a person's income there is an 8.3% increase in the probability that a respondent will assert that suicide bombing in Pakistan to defend Islam is never justified.

Conclusions

In this paper, we consider individual-level Pakistani attitudes toward terrorism motivated by a desire to protect Islam. Our examination of the survey data shows a set of complex attitudes

towards religiously-motivated terrorism in Pakistan. First, Pakistanis, in general, view terrorism to be a problem in their country. Second, they do, for the most part, not support the tactic or believe it is justified by Islam. Thus, overall, terrorism is not viewed favorably in Pakistan.

But we find that there is not the same degree of negativity toward groups that engage in terrorism in Pakistan. Jihadi groups such as Al Qaeda and home-grown jihadi groups, while not very popular, are not nearly as condemned as the tactic of terrorism they frequently employ. The Pakistani public seems to have disconnected the groups from the tactics in their conception of the terrorism scene in Pakistan.

What accounts for this? It is possible that many Pakistanis are not aware of the groups that are responsible for specific acts of terror. Also, people may be more favorable toward the groups than the tactic of terrorism in that they may think the motives and the aims of the groups may be laudable, but the tactics of the group may be less so. In other words, it may be that Pakistanis may view the groups as having some good traits but they sometimes revert to bad methods.

We also developed and tested a series of hypotheses about Pakistani individual-level sources of support for terrorism to defend Islam. Using the Pew Global Attitudes Project data set for Pakistan, we tested a series of hypotheses that support for suicide terrorism was related to ideological and utilitarian factors.

Our analysis of the individual-level factors that predict attitudes toward terrorism to protect Islam in Pakistan showed that utilitarian concerns trump ideology when Pakistanis think about religiously-motivated terrorism. Wealthier Pakistanis are more opposed to religious terrorism in Pakistan than their poorer compatriots. Religious views, at least as measured in the survey data that was available, did not show that religious views shape attitudes toward terrorism to protect Islam.

What does all of this mean? It means that terrorism carried out in the name of religion in Pakistan does not necessarily resonate with Pakistanis based on their religious views. People in Pakistan seem to assess this terrorism much more on the basis of how it will affect them personally. The rich have a lot to lose from the disruption caused by terrorist incidents. The poor, on the other

hand, may find an assault on the status quo not nearly as problematic, even if they do not agree with the core intent of the terrorism. This terrorism may be viewed popularly more as rebellion against an unjust society than as a divine mandate.

What does this mean for policy-makers and observers of terrorism? It means that if a society has a large pool of poor and disaffected individuals, then support for terrorism may be higher than in societies where people believe they have a stake in the stability of their social, political, and economic system because it brings them tangible benefits. For policy-makers, it means that it is imperative that Pakistan move ahead with economic and social progress in order to dry up the well of support that exists for jihadi groups that threaten the stability of the country and the region.

References

- Abbas, Hassan. 2006. "Pakistan Through the Lens of the "Triple A" Theory." *The Fletcher Forum on World Affairs*. 30, 1: 181-192.
- Allen, Lori. 2002. "There Are Many Reasons Why: Suicide Bombers and Martyrs in Palestine." *Middle East Report*. 223: 34-37.
- Azam, Jean-Paul. 2005. "Suicide Bombing as Inter-generational Investment." *Public Choice*. 122(1-2): 177-198.
- Bloom, Mia. 2005. *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror*. New York: Columbia.
- Fair, C. Christine and Bryan Shepherd. 2006. "Who Supports Terrorism? Evidence from Fourteen Muslim Countries." *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*. 29: 51-74.
- Gambetta, Diego. 2005. *Making Sense of Suicide Missions*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Grimland, Meytal, Alan Kapter, and Ad Kerkhof. 2006. "The Phenomenon of Suicide Bombing: A Review of Psychological and Non-psychological Factors." *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*. 27 (3): 107-118.
- Haddad, Simon and Hilal Khashan. 2002. "Islam and Terrorism: Lebanese Muslim Views on September 11." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 46, 6: 812-828.
- Haqqani, Husain. 2005. "The Ideologies of South Asian Jihadi Groups." *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*. 1: 12-26.
- Haqqani, Husain. 2006. "Weeding Out the Heretics: Sectarianism in Pakistan." *Current Trends in Islamist Ideology*. 4: 1-12.
- International Crisis Group. 2004. "Unfulfilled Promises: Pakistan's Failure to Tackle Extremism." *ICG Asia Report No 73*.
- International Crisis Group. 2005. "The State of Sectarianism in Pakistan." *ICG Asia Report No. 95*.
- International Crisis Group. 2006. "Pakistan's Tribal Areas: Appeasing the Militants." *ICG Asia Report No. 125*.
- International Crisis Group. 2007. "Pakistan: Karachi's Madrasas and Violent Extremism." *ICG Asia Report No. 130*.
- Kaltenthaler, Karl. 2006. "The Sources of Muslim Support for Suicide Terrorism." Working Paper, Center for Policy Studies, University of Akron.
- Khorsokhavar, Farhad. 2005. *Suicide Bombers: Allah's New Martyrs*. London: Pluto Press.
- King, Gary. 1990. *Unifying Political Methodology: The Likelihood Theory of Statistical Inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krueger, Alan B. and Jitka Maleckova. 2003. "Education, Poverty, and Terrorism: Is There a Causal Connection?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 17, 4: 119-144.

Oliver, Ann Marie and Paul F. Steinberg. 2006. *The Road to Martyr's Square: A Journey into the World of a Suicide Bomber*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pape, Robert. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review*. 97: 343-361.

Pedahzur, Ami. 2004. *Suicide Terrorism*. Cambridge: Polity.

Roy, Olivier. 2002. "Islamic Radicalism in Afghanistan and Pakistan." UNHCR, Emergency and Security Service, WRITENET Paper No. 06/2001.

Wike, Richard and Nilanthi Samaranyake. 2006. "Where Terrorism Finds Support in the Muslim World." Pew Research Center. 6 June 2006.

Wiktorowicz, Quintan and Karl Kaltenthaler. 2006. "The Rationality of Radical Islam." *Political Science Quarterly*. Vol 121, No. 2: 295-325.

2007 World Public Opinion *Muslim Public Opinion on U.S. Policy, Attacks on Civilians, and al Qaeda* Survey.

Table 11: Ordered Probit Model Estimates

Dependent Variable-Position on “Justification of Suicide Bombing” in Pakistan to defend Islam			
Dependent Variables	Coef.	S.E.	First Difference
Threat	-.066	.049	
Self-ID	-.061	.082	
Islam	.023	.054	
Income	-.211**	.091	.083
Education	-.073	.048	
Gender	.192**	.096	
Age	.006*	.003	
Cut 1	-.241	.163	
Cut 2	.231	.162	
Cut 3	.497	.162	
Cut 4	.929	.166	
N	616		
LR chi2(7)	20.81		
Prob > chi2	.0041		

Note: Figures are unstandardized coefficients shown alongside standard errors. *p<.1; **p<.05; ***P<.01.

Coding of Variables:

Dep. Variable: Suicide bombing in Pakistan in order to defend Islam from its enemies

(-2=never justified, -1=rarely justified, 0=don't know, 1=sometimes justified, 2=often justified)

Threat (-1=No, 1=Yes there are serious threats to Islam today)

Self-ID (-1=Think of self first as Pakistani, 0=both, 1=Think of self as Muslim)

Islam (-2=Role of Islam very important, 2=Role of Islam not at all important)

Age (18-90)

Income (1=Lowest income quartile; 4=Highest income quartile)

Education (1=Lowest education quartile; 4=Highest education quartile)

Gender (0=Female, 1=Male)

Appendix A: Operationalization of Variables⁶

Dependent Variable: Position on “Justification of Suicide Bombing” in Pakistan

Some think that suicide bombing and other forms of violence against civilian targets in Pakistan are justified in order to defend Islam from its enemies. Others believe that, no matter what the reason, this kind of violence is never justified. Responses and coding include: Never justified (-2), Rarely justified (-1), Don’t Know (0), Sometimes Justified (1), Often Justified (2).

Independent Variables

Threat: In your opinion are there any serious threats to Islam today? No (-1), Yes there are serious threats to Islam today (1)

Self-ID: Do you think of yourself first as Pakistani or as Muslim? Think of self first as Pakistani (-1), Both (0), Think of self as Muslim (1)

Islam: How important to you is it that Islam plays a more important and influential role in the world than it does now—very important, somewhat important, not too important or not at all important? Role of Islam very important (-2)... Role of Islam not at all important (2)

Age: Age of respondent: (18-90)

Income: Here is a scale of incomes. We would like to know in what group your household is, counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes, before taxes and other deductions. (1- Lowest quartile, 4- Highest quartile)

Education: What is the highest education you have attained? (1-Lowest quartile, 4-Highest quartile)

Gender: Sex of respondent: Male (1), Female (0)

⁶ All measures taken from the *World Values Surveys and European Values* (Inglehart, et al 2000).

Appendix B: Correlation Matrix of Dependent and Independent Variables

	Dep. Var.	Threat	Self-ID	Islam	Age	Educ	Income	Gender
Dep. Var.	1.000							
Threat	-0.051	1.000						
Self-ID	-0.034	0.003	1.000					
Islam	0.033	0.065	-0.173	1.000				
Age	0.081	0.011	0.015	-0.022	1.000			
Education	-0.081	-0.191	0.068	-0.180	-0.152	1.000		
Income	-0.126	-0.064	0.051	-0.079	0.079	0.337	1.000	
Gender	0.069	-0.104	0.049	-0.124	0.123	0.252	0.073	1.000

Appendix One: Question and Coding List

Dependent Variable

Q. Some people think that suicide bombing and other forms of violence against civilian targets IN OUR COUNTRY are justified in order to defend Islam from its enemies. Other people believe that, no matter what the reason, this kind of violence is never justified. Do you personally feel that this kind of violence is often justified to defend Islam, sometimes justified, rarely justified, or never justified?

- 0 Often justified or sometimes justified
- 1 Rarely justified or never justified

Independent Variables

Q. Here is a ladder representing the “ladder of life.” Let’s suppose the top of the ladder represents the best possible life for you; and the bottom, the worst possible life for you. On which step of the ladder do you feel you personally stand at the present time?

Choices range from 0 (bottom of ladder) to 10 (top of the ladder)

Q. In your opinion are there any serious threats to Islam today?

- 1 Yes
- 0 No

Q. Do you think of yourself first as a [name of country’s people, such as Jordanian, Moroccan or Indonesian] or first as a Muslim?

- 1 [country’s people]
- 2 Muslim
- 3 Both equally

Q. How worried are you, if at all, that the US could become a military threat to our country someday? Are you very worried, somewhat worried, not too worried, or not at all worried?

- 1 Very worried
- 2 Somewhat worried
- 3 Not too worried
- 4 Not at all worried

Q. Gender

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

Q. How old were you at your last birthday?

1 _____ years (Range 18-96)

Q. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?

- 1 No formal education
- 2 No formal education but can read and write
- 3 Less than 5 classes
- 4 5-9 classes
- 5 Matric
- 6 Intermediate
- 7 Graduate
- 8 Post-graduate

Q. Here is a list of incomes. Which of these does your household fall into counting all wages, salaries, pensions and other incomes that come in? Just give the letter of the group your household falls into, before taxes and other deductions.

- 0 Rs. 4000 or less per month
- 1 Rs. 4001 to Rs. 7000
- 2 Rs. 7001 to Rs. 10,000
- 3 Rs. 10,001 to Rs. 15,000
- 4 Rs. 15,001 to Rs. 20,000
- 5 Rs. 20,001 to Rs. 25,000
- 6 Rs. 25,001 to Rs. 30,000
- 7 More than Rs. 30,001