

Moderator's introduction to the workshop

In Europe and the US, the term “terrorism” has long had evocative layers of meaning. It is generally believed that the political application of the term began during the period of French Revolution. Since the Reagan administration, the US has launched a sustained “counter-terrorism” campaign worldwide, sparked by a series of terrorist attacks, such as bombings of overseas embassies and consulates as well as the September 11 attacks at home.

However, who is entitled to take the moral upper hand to label others as “terrorists” and start a war of justice? How should they label others? Who deserves to be labeled?

So far, academia has not been able to define “terrorism” and the United Nations has not managed to unify the lists of “terrorist organizations” designated by different countries. The main reasons behind this are differences of social history, religion, culture, and political and economic development in different regions, as well as the competition among great powers in the process of globalization.

At the same time, the rapid growth of information technology, the development of terrorist organizations' behavior and internal structure, the improving means of recruiting members, and the constantly upgrading communications among terrorist organizations have been rattling world peace and security from time to time, casting a shadow on international mutual trust and cooperation.

On the theme “The Current Situation, Problems, and Prospects in International Anti-terrorism Cooperation,” the perspectives expressed in the workshop that this paper focuses

on consider the status of international counter-terrorism cooperation since the September 11 attacks, aiming to explore effective ways of international counter-terrorism cooperation in the future.

During the seminar, experts and scholars made speeches and exchanged ideas on issues including the social causes of “terrorism,” the security situation and current situation in Pakistan and Afghanistan, Al-Qaeda and DAESH, and the counter-terrorism policy of the US, especially under the Trump administration.

Participants also shared opinions and raised questions concerning organizational forms, sources of financing, and the development trends of “terrorist organizations,” in particular related to how China should understand, judge, and cope with these issues.

Nowadays, terrorist threats are on the rise. It is better to actively seek a “Chinese solution” rather than struggle with the question of who is responsible for countering terrorist threats. China should start with closely related regions or countries to acquire a thorough understanding of local situations.

China should strengthen the positive guidance of “counter-terrorism” sentiment, and build a healthy and good development environment. It should achieve these goals through public relations efforts, developing a positive national image, helping regional growth and sincere cooperation, so as to avoid fueling “terrorist forces” with blind counter-terrorism efforts.

Academia also needs more research forces from different disciplines to join counter-terrorism efforts. Researchers can provide a broader perspective and more research methods to

prevent, evaluate and solve related problems, and to offer more comprehensive intellectual support.

Zhang Jiamei
November 24, 2018

The 15th Broadyard Workshop
The Current Situation, Problems, and Prospects in
International Anti-terrorism Cooperation
November 16, 2018

The 15th Broadyard Workshop (博雅工作坊) was led by Zhang Jiamei, an associate professor at the Department of South Asia Studies at Peking University's School of Foreign Languages. More than ten experts and scholars from several universities and research institutes in China were invited to participate in the workshop. Prof. Qian Chengdan, director of Peking University's Institute of Area Studies (PKUIAS), pointed out in an introductory speech that inviting experts and scholars at home and abroad to discuss relevant issues of regional and country-specific studies in the form of the Broadyard Workshop was done with the hope that views on these issues from different perspectives can be put forward and analyzed to inspire academic achievement through exchange. In her introductory remarks, Prof. Zhang Jiamei said that everyone living in the contemporary era will have the same feeling, that is, they are very lucky to be able to live in an era when most areas are free of war. However, even with the increasing convenience of information sharing and transportation, people cannot predict panic-causing events.

These seemingly remote facts are actually closely related to everyone's life. On a broader scale, without security as a prerequisite, mutual trust and cooperation among countries cannot be achieved. This also puts forward new requirements for development in the present era. She hopes that experts and

scholars can discuss the topic professionally, and contribute wisdom to solving related problems.

Prof. Zhang Jiadong from the Center for South Asian Studies at Fudan University made the first presentation, titled “The Evolution of American Anti-terrorism Strategy and Prospects of Anti-terrorism Strategy during the Trump Administration.”

According to past practice, a new administration of the US will adjust its anti-terror strategy or policy after taking office. Although Trump has not put forward relevant plans so far, there is still a lot of anti-terror related content in several strategic reports on national security. By reviewing the changes and developments of US anti-terror policy over the past 20 years, we can further understand the theoretical basis of its adjustment, so as to provide reference for China to formulate its anti-terror policy.

To analyze US counter-terrorism strategy, four variables need to be included: threat perception, guiding principles, strategic objectives and corresponding means. From George W. Bush to Barack Obama and then to Donald Trump, despite fluctuations in different periods, the overall US counter-terrorism strategies show a continuous contracting trend.

From the perspective of threat perception, the Bush administration defined the threat of terrorism as a national security threat directly affecting the survival of the US. At that time, the entire US national security strategy was restructured around counter-terrorism, and the US even made temporary adjustments to its alliance strategy. During the Obama

administration, the threat of terrorism was not regarded as a substantial threat to national security, and the focus of US security turned from the entire globe to areas with obvious anti-American tendencies. The Trump administration inherits many of his predecessors' ideas. President Trump does not think that terrorism can truly threaten US national security interests, and also believes that terrorism cannot be defeated, so he has removed expressions like "eradication, elimination" from the national security strategy.

From the perspective of strategic guiding principles, the Bush administration and the Obama administration both followed liberalism and internationalism. The Bush administration emphasized unilateralism and preemption, while the Obama administration focused more on strategic multilateralism and using soft power. "America First" is the most prominent policy of the Trump administration. In terms of counter-terrorism, the policy gives priority to the protection of American people's lives. Therefore, the data of this period are more prominent in the probability of civilian casualties caused by anti-terror measures. Generally speaking, Trump pursues a non-liberal hegemonic strategy.

From the perspective of strategic objectives, during the Bush administration, the US not only fought terrorists and terrorist organizations around the world, but also thoroughly cracked down on terrorism, and even used counter-terrorism to reshape the post-Cold War liberal international order. To this end, Bush put forward a number of supporting concepts, such as the Color Revolutions, the "Great Central Asia" strategy, the Greater Middle East Initiative and so on. This approach changed

during the Obama administration, focusing on the most threatening terrorist organizations to the US, with anti-terror efforts being reduced in scope, number and extent. The Trump administration has conceptually thoroughly “ended” the war on terrorism, sometimes replacing it with other concepts in terms of national security. In addition, unlike the Obama administration, which helped some countries carry out so-called “democratic reconstruction” while fighting terrorist organizations, Trump is more direct and simply wants to eliminate the “guys” who threaten the US.

In terms of corresponding means, the Bush administration launched wars against terrorism through large-scale military operations, establishing the Africa Command and the prison at the Guantanamo Bay Naval Station. The US security strategy, diplomatic strategy, intelligence system and related legislation all changed during that time, and the whole anti-terrorism system was comprehensive. The Obama administration no longer carried out worldwide wars against terrorism, but put forward the Light Footprint Strategy. Obama adjusted the US counter-terrorism strategies in every region, and even “guided behind the scenes” in later stages, doing so even under the global multilateral mechanism. This situation continues during the Trump administration, but Trump emphasizes not democracy, freedom and human rights, but the efficiency and results in counter-terrorism. In order to achieve this goal, Trump delegated the power of national military command to the Department of Defense, in order to enhance the flexibility, timeliness and efficiency of the counter-terrorism department. In addition, Trump has also adopted complementary measures such

as a travel ban, while requiring partner countries to fulfill counter-terrorism obligations more actively in order to alleviate pressure on the US.

In the future, influenced by the domestic and international situation, Trump will find it difficult to make drastic adjustments in fighting against terrorism. Previously, he repeatedly expressed his intention to withdraw troops from Afghanistan. If it happened, it would have been a fundamental adjustment toward anti-terrorism wars. But in the end, due to domestic political needs and the influence of relevant interest groups, the withdrawal did not materialize. In addition, with a deepening understanding of national security, Trump will be more cautious in adjusting his counter-terrorism strategy.

Prof. Zhu Sumei from the International Politics Department, University of International Relations, gave a speech titled “International Intelligence Cooperation against Terrorism: Current Situation and Problems.”

The professor said intelligence cooperation is undoubtedly a key issue in international cooperation against terrorism. Since the September 11 attacks, with the development of globalization and the Internet, international cooperation on counter-terrorism intelligence has achieved some results at bilateral and regional levels.

The EU established a counter-terrorism intelligence cooperation mechanism at an early stage. In recent years, as Europe was frequently struck by terrorist attacks, the EU has strengthened regional intelligence cooperation and sharing, such as the establishment of the Schengen Information System (SIS) and the Passenger Name Record (PNR) system. At the same

time, the EU has also built channels of intelligence cooperation with the US, Canada, Australia and other countries. In the Middle East, there were some exchanges among intelligence agencies within the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) in the 1990s. At the end of 2017, Saudi Arabia, hoping to become the leader of the Middle East in fighting against terrorism, held a counter-terrorism summit in hopes of confronting extremism and terrorism by integrating regional and national powers.

Prior to the September 11 attacks, as the US accused Russia of human rights violations, cooperation between the US and Russia on counter-terrorism intelligence was not smooth. After the September 11 attacks, the US and Russia have strengthened their cooperation in fighting against terrorism. Russia has also provided some information to the US. Israel does well in bilateral intelligence cooperation. In addition to strengthening cooperation with its traditional allies, it also conducts counter-terrorism intelligence cooperation with Jordan, Egypt and other countries with which it has previously been at war.

At present, the main issues in counter-terrorism intelligence cooperation are different national interests and ideologies in various countries, as well as poor cooperation caused by historical and practical problems. For example, in the Boston Marathon bombing of 2013, Russia had previously informed the US of relevant information, but out of distrust of Russia, the US did not pay much attention.

While some intelligence cooperation is hindered by issues of national sovereignty, in recent years, intelligence cooperation on anti-terror financing has been much smoother. Examples include crackdowns through intelligence cooperation on secret

financing channels of the Islamic State by crowd-funding and cultural relics smuggling. Countries and international organizations are also making efforts to cut off terrorists' financing channels on P2P loan platforms through online cooperation.

Counter-terrorism cooperation should not only focus on states, but also needs to carry out diversified intelligence cooperation through other channels, such as strengthening non-governmental and think tank cooperation channels. Others suggest that there should be competitive intelligence cooperation within the country. In addition, some believe that intelligence cooperation involves not only information acquisition, but also knowledge in the fields of history, geography, anthropology and ethnology. When countries carry out intelligence cooperation, it is helpful to master relevant knowledge to expand channels of cooperation. Non-governmental private security companies are also important channels of counter-terrorism intelligence cooperation. They are more flexible and convenient than government agencies in some cases.

The speech made by Wang Shida, associate research fellow at the Institute of South Asian Studies of China Institutes of Contemporary International Relations, was titled "The Current Security Situation and Future Trends in Afghanistan."

Wang said that so far, there have been two important milestones in Afghanistan's security situation. The first one was the Iraq War launched by the US after the overthrow of the Taliban regime in 2001. It was this war that transferred most of the resources that should have been placed in Afghanistan to Iraq, leading the Taliban, which had already been disbanded and

pushed into the Pakistan tribal area, to return to Afghanistan in 2008. The second milestone was the transfer of the responsibility for security protection from the United Nations-authorized International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to the Afghan security force at the end of 2014. This meant that the responsibilities for defending the cities and rural areas from being captured by the Taliban were borne entirely by Afghan forces, while foreign forces were only responsible for training the Afghan forces and providing so-called advisers on battlefields.

Under this background, the current security situation in Afghanistan can be analyzed from three aspects. First, the Afghan Taliban is not a terrorist organization in Afghanistan, but rather the most powerful and influential rebel organization. In 2018, by launching a spring offensive, the Taliban elevated its combat capability and sphere of influence to a new level. The major character of this was manifested by its consolidation of attacks toward the military and political centers of densely populated cities including the capital city of Afghanistan, and in particular toward the posts and military camps of the Afghan National Army and the posts of Afghan National Police. Judging from the several attacks in 2018, it appears that the Taliban's actions have undergone great qualitative change, in terms of both ground attacks and key attacks on high-value targets. According to the most recent data from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (the US-established SIGAR for the reconstruction of Afghanistan), in 2018, the area effectively controlled and influenced by the Afghan government accounted for 55.5% of Afghanistan's total area, decreasing by

nearly 17 percentage point compared with the 72% three years ago. According to a New York Times report, 55% is still overly optimistic. Based on the evaluation of statistics released by a relatively neutral institute in the US, by November 2018, the Afghanistan government controlled 143 counties of a total 407 counties in 34 provinces all over the country, or 36% of counties.

Second, even though the Khorasan branch of the Islamic State could be considered as being repeatedly suppressed, it is still capable of launching terrorist attacks. The Khorasan is a branch of the Islamic State that was established in Afghanistan, Pakistan and South Asian areas in early 2015. Its attacks and sphere of influence are mainly in Afghanistan. This organization has developed rapidly since its establishment, and it claimed to control eight counties in Nangarhar province in eastern Afghanistan. Due to its considerable influence, the US, Afghanistan, and the Afghan Taliban are all strongly against it, leading to its shrinking sphere of influence in Nangarhar province. Meanwhile, the US dispatched drones to launch air attacks against it, resulting in successful killings of the organization's top leaders four times over the past two years. In 2018, the Khorasan branch expanded its influence in northern Afghanistan with its consistent resistance in Nangarhar province, but it was heavily hit by the Afghan Taliban.

Third, the Afghan National Security Forces took on the major responsibility of Afghanistan's national defense, but were vulnerable. The force originally had 352,000 people but later disbanded 40,000 people. Under this circumstance, the US military stationed in Afghanistan recommended it withdraw

troops from the outposts and military camps in remote areas to focus on protecting central cities. This suggestion, though, will lead to a serious problem. The Taliban can recruit even more freely in rural areas, collect taxes, and use rural regions as a springboard to attack central cities with a dense population.

The future of Afghanistan's security situation depends on its peace progress. The US has been fighting in Afghanistan since 2001, the longest war since the US was established. It has turned out that the US cannot completely eradicate the Taliban, and the Taliban cannot take back Kabul on the battlefield. The two sides have been locked in a stalemate and are both looking for ways out. Besides the US, some voices inside Taliban are also appealing for peace. With this background, there has been a substantive breakthrough in the peace process of Afghanistan in 2018. The negotiations in 2018 are not mediated by Pakistan, but conducted by US officials' direct negotiations with the Taliban. This is very notable, because for a long time the biggest obstacle to Afghanistan's peace process has been that the Taliban had always requested to negotiate with the US instead of the Afghan government, but the US refused to talk directly with the Taliban but instead supported the Taliban's negotiations with the Afghan government. Since Donald Trump took office, Afghan policy in the US has undergone great changes. The US held two direct negotiations with the Taliban in July and October in 2018. No matter how much substantive significance the two negotiations had, this has opened up real engagement between the US and the Taliban, and the Taliban has also shown a positive attitude toward the impact of the talks. Another substantive breakthrough was an international conference about

Afghanistan held in Moscow, Russia, on November 9, 2018. In the past two years, Russia has resumed efforts on the Afghan issue, prompting the US to claim that Russia will return to the “great game.” The conference has been launched for two years. The most striking feature in the 2018 conference was the participation of the Taliban delegation led by Mohammad Stanekzai, who at the conference made a series of appeals, saying the withdrawal of US troops is the prerequisite for peace in Afghanistan. He called for the release of prisoners, urged a revision of the constitution, and so on.

In general, the Afghan peace process in 2018 saw a glimmer of hope, but some long-existing problems still remained unsolved, such as the issue of peace-talk leadership and the problem of whether the US will withdraw troops. In addition, concerning the revision of the Afghan constitution, the Taliban clearly demanded that it should be consistent with Islamic doctrine, respect the history of Afghanistan, and embody social justice, the definition of which is still broad and in need of more discussion about implementation. In short, some substantive changes in terms of the security situation and peace process in Afghanistan have been witnessed in 2018. China should pay more attention to the changes in the situation of Afghanistan.

Zhang Jinping, professor of the Anti-terrorism Institute of Northwest University of Political Science and Law, made a speech titled “The Three Stages and Trend of the Globalization of Terrorism in the Middle East.” The speech focused on the triggering factors, manifestations and future trends of the three phases of the globalization of terrorism from the Middle East.

Terrorism in the contemporary Middle East has a long-existing unique organizational structure and a traditionally consistent extremist ideology. The first phase of its globalization occurred in 1981 when Egyptian President Sadat was assassinated. The incident firstly showed the typical means and targets of terrorism in the Middle East. It secondly showed that the organization of terrorism had developed to be extreme, and its ideology had been formed. Thereafter, terrorism in the Middle East stepped into the phase of globalization, expanding gradually to Yemen and Afghanistan, and eventually to the whole world even though with limited influence. Since 1998, the globalization process entered the second stage. After the US Embassy bombings in East Africa, the US believed that the nature of Osama bin Laden and his power had been transferred from the prior extreme violent forces to terrorist organizations. Until May 2011 when bin Laden was killed, the core power of terrorism at this stage had been the terrorists in Egypt and the local terrorist organizations they formed in Afghanistan. The third phase started from 2011, when the disbanded forces of Al Qaeda combined with Iraqi local forces to become the Islamic State, which was again transformed into a violent extremist organization in 2014 and shifted its focus from violent activities to large-scale armed fights. In 2017, the organization was again disbanded with some of its extremist forces flowing back to their home countries all over the world. Since then, terrorists around the world reorganized under the name of Islamic State. Take the terrorist attack that happened in Russia in April 2017 for instance. The initiators of the attack were no longer only Chechens, but were mixed with Central Asians and Middle

Easterners. Throughout the three stages, the organization composition, activity range, and the form of violence of terrorism in the Middle East have all changed and gradually spread to the whole world.

The globalization of terrorism in the Middle East has two layers of meaning. One is tangible, that is, they want to establish a regime through violent means with a specific organization. The second is the ideological layer, which is the diffusion of their extremist ideology. Regarding the goal of counter-terrorism, some concepts have been brought up based on previous practices, such as judicial counter-terrorism and counter-terrorism under unusual conditions, but more importantly, the focus of countering terrorist forces should be placed on cracking down on their organizational capabilities. The convergence of terrorist forces is usually achieved through their organizational capacity to form an organization, and once the organizational capacity is eliminated, terrorist forces will lose their livelihood. The terrorist activities that started in Europe in 1968 were wiped out in the 1990s mainly because their organizational structure was disbanded. During the Cold War, terrorist activities were under control due to the curb on terrorist organizations. But after the Cold War, there was no control over terrorist organizations, thus terrorist activities increased.

The organizational capacity of terrorist forces consists of four elements. First is the organizational network and organizational structure. The second is the capability of acquiring resources, recruiting members, and fundraising. The third is the ability to spread extremist ideology, that is, how

many people would believe the extremist message. The fourth is the ability to execute violent acts.

Currently, counter-terrorism can be carried out in three ways. The first is to continue attacking the previously disbanded Al-Qaeda and Islamic State to eliminate their power of re-aggregation. To achieve this, it's necessary to impose sanctions on terrorists scattered all over the world, and eliminate the terrorists who have secretly converged into groups in certain areas. Second is to crack down on other terrorist organizations around the world to boost counter-terrorist actions in the Middle East. Third, we should enhance global governance so as to cope with terrorism through solving global problems.

Ma Yong, a professor at the School of Government of Beijing Normal University, made a speech titled "The US Designation of International Terrorist Organizations and Its Influencing Factors." He pointed out that the US designation on international terrorist organizations not only affects counter-terrorism cooperation between the US and relevant countries, but also has an inestimable impact on its foreign relations.

The identification of terrorist organizations is a prerequisite for effectively combating terrorism and carrying out international counter-terrorism cooperation. The identification of a terrorist organization is a state act which can enable the public to better understand the nature of the terrorist organization. More importantly, it will make the country's counter-terrorism struggle and cooperation more targeted, effective and legitimate.

US authorities started designating terrorist organizations early. Since 1997, the US has designated 80 foreign terrorist

organizations, 13 of which have been delisted, leaving 67 on the list. The terrorist organizations are deemed by the United States secretary of state, in accordance with the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). According to section 219 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, the secretary of state has the power to make the designation twice a year and to increase, update, and abolish the list. The US adopts a “dual-track system” in the designation of terrorism organizations. One is administrative designation, that is, the secretary of state, authorized by law, designates foreign terrorist organizations and personnel. When the court makes a criminal judgment, it must be based on the administrative designation. The other is judicial designation, which means independent judgments on terrorist organizations and personnel in the US in accordance with the procedures of the Criminal Procedure Law.

It can be seen that the US adopts different ways for the designation of terrorist organizations and personnel at home and abroad. In terms of designation procedures, the results of designation are subject to judicial review before they can take effect, and they must be discussed by the Congress when they are abolished. The US has determined that the list of terrorist organizations should be updated once every two years. If it is not updated, it will be void. The secretary of state may increase, update or abolish the list. However, Congress should be notified. Congress may also overturn the results by legislation.

The designation of a group as a terrorist organization will have several consequences. First, any American or any person under the jurisdiction of the US shall not provide funds or other material assistance to the designated foreign terrorist

organization. Second, if a representative or member of a designated foreign terrorist organization is a foreigner, his or her visa application should be refused, or that person should be deported. Third, US financial institutions must freeze the funds of the designated foreign terrorist organization and its proxies, and report to the Office of Foreign Assets Control and the Department of the Treasury. In addition, the designation will also have two social effects. One is to prevent people from donating money to the terrorist organizations, and the other is to deepen people's awareness of relevant terrorist organizations.

There are three criteria for the US to designate a terrorist organization. It must be a foreign organization. The organization must engage in terrorist activities as defined by the Immigration and Nationality Act. The organization's terrorist activities must threaten the security of the US nationals residing abroad or the national security of the US, including national defense, foreign relations or economic interests. These three criteria are derived from the US Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA). For the definition of terrorist activities covered by the second criteria, the US Immigration and Nationality Act mainly refers to international terrorism. First, the definition involves violence that violates federal or state laws or acts that are dangerous to human life. The second part of the definition involves intimidating or coercing civilians, influencing government decisions through intimidation or coercion, or influencing government actions through mass destruction, assassination or abduction. The definition also includes the practice of committing crimes outside the jurisdiction of the US or transcending national borders.

Among the 67 terrorist organizations currently designated by the US, the United Nations has designated 26 of the same ones, the European Union designated 22 and the UK 35. This means that the same organization may not be regarded as a terrorist organization in different countries. They may even win sympathy, and receive assistance and support.

There are three main factors affecting the designation of terrorist organizations in the US. The first is Western values. Neither the US Immigration and Nationality Act nor the Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act specifically addresses the issue of the relationship between values and terrorism. However, reports related to the US National Security Strategy and related leaders' speeches on counter-terrorism often mention this issue, arguing that terrorism is a challenge, violation and abuse of human rights, freedom, democracy and other values. This expression actually has the consequence that the US, under the pretext of protecting human rights, refuses to designate certain de facto terrorist organizations, and even interferes with countries taking necessary measures that are actually threatened by terrorism. To some extent, they connive and even support the development of some terrorist forces. The second factor is realism. In the case of the Taliban, the organization is fully compliant with American criteria, but it has not been designated as a terrorist organization. One direct cause is the US' judgment of its own strength and potential, and its intricate relationship with Pakistan and Russia. The US is currently trying to turn enemies into friends, find opportunities to win over the Taliban, and then use its power to achieve its strategic plan in Afghanistan and even South Asia. Third, from a

geopolitical point of view, among the foreign terrorist organizations designated by the US, there are 25 in the Middle East, 15 in South Asia, 14 in Africa, five in Southeast Asia, one in Northeast Asia, three in South America, and four in Europe. The Middle East and South Asia are the focal points of global geopolitics. On the one hand, these areas are indeed the hardest hit areas of terrorism. On the other hand, the US also took the opportunity to expand its influence in these areas through the designation list and its attacks on terrorist organizations.

Qian Xuemei, an associate professor at PKU's School of International Studies, made a speech titled "From 'Al-Qaeda' to DAESH: A Reflection on Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism Cooperation."

She first pointed out that the reason why DAESH is used instead of ISIS is because DAESH is an Arabic abbreviation of "Islamic State." Although it seems that there is no difference between the two, in fact, "Islamic State" is neither Islamic nor a state. DAESH refers to the organization itself, and ISIS contains the political ideology of the so-called DAESH.

Al-Qaeda and DAESH have the following points in common: First, the two organizations were originally composed of disbanded soldiers. The founders of the organizations have their own ideological persuasion. The establishment and development of the organizations is mainly based on political reality and opportunities as well as individual ambition and private vengeance. For example, Zarqawi and Baghdadi's dreams were to become super jihad heroes like bin Laden, and most of their followers have the same ambition.

Second, these two organizations have received more or less

support and assistance from relevant countries or other organized forces in the process of gestation and development.

The development of Al Qaeda is inseparable from the strong support of the US for the “Saint Warriors” in the 1980s. In the 1990s, bin Laden was also protected by the Taliban regime. Zarqawi was funded by Al Qaeda at the end of the last century. He worked with Al Qaeda after 2003 and has since received financial support from many countries in the Gulf area. In 2014, even though the US has begun to take action, many countries have secretly supported DAESH in different ways in order to pursue their own interests. In other words, Al Qaeda and DAESH are both proxies of organized forces, intervening in internal and inter-state struggles in different ways. This has become the biggest obstacle to international cooperation against terrorism. Therefore, the difficulty of counter-terrorism cooperation does not lie in the power or mystery of terrorism, but in the conflict of interests of various countries. Inter-state politics provides a structural opportunity for terrorist forces, which creates an endogenous obstacle to counter-terrorism cooperation and cannot be eliminated. It is only possible to look for chances for cooperation while facing these obstacles.

The third thing in common is that both organizations have foreign fighters. Al Qaeda itself is the product of foreign fighters, and DAESH is an organization established in Iraq by Zarqawi who was born in Jordan. It is worth noting that the phenomenon of foreign fighters has existed for a long time. But why was it not until the emergence of DAESH that it became a concern and was studied? Similarly, the Soviet Union’s occupation of Afghanistan led to the emergence of millions of

refugees, but the issue of refugees has only received attention in recent years. There is actually a significant correlation between the two.

The fourth common point is that both organizations have become the benchmark of terrorism due largely to the publicity and interpretation of the US. Unlike Osama bin Laden, whose influence was significantly established by the September 11 attacks, al-Zarqawi was only known by Jordanian intelligence services when the US asked the United Nations to include him on its sanctions list as a terrorist. Even the CIA lacked exact details about him at that time. The follow-up story of al-Zarqawi does not prove that the US has strategic insight. Instead, it is the US effort to make al-Zarqawi a role model that has helped him gain more and more followers. In addition, the US defined al-Zarqawi as a terrorist based on its national interests. The CIA could not find the evidence that Saddam was connected with terrorism when the war with Iraq was imminent, but the discovery of al-Zarqawi changed this situation. As a consequence, al-Zarqawi suddenly changed from a man who was anxious for survival in the desert to a “hero.” Hence, the US actually created a leading figure for terrorism to a certain extent.

The last common point is the current situation of the two organizations. After the US declared victory in the so-called war on terrorism several years ago, Iran and Iraq successively announced the defeat of DAESH last year. However, the opinion that a “Post-Islamic State era” is coming is open to discussion. Further observation is needed to analyze the current situation of the two organizations, and to judge whether their forces have been severely undermined, as outsiders have claimed.

Qian Xuemei concluded her speech by emphasizing three points. First, non-state actors play a major role in contemporary terrorism, and their acts often have significant impact and even put big powers in a passive position. While state actors are kept within bounds by international law, how best to regulate activities of non-state actors is still in question. Second, the involvement of terrorism can further complicate domestic and international politics. There is no doubt that international cooperation is necessary and important for counter-terrorism, but the nature of politics between different countries must be understood rationally. In theory, terrorism is a common enemy of mankind that requires cooperation to eradicate. In reality, nevertheless, it is essential to distinguish between terrorist organizations which are described as a common enemy by some countries and those that really declare themselves to be the common enemy of the international community. It is worth mentioning that although the US had considered counter-terrorism as its top priority after the September 11 attacks and then spearheaded international cooperation in the name of counter-terrorism, it apparently has begun to shift its primary concern, which renewed the heated debate over the relationship between counter-terrorism and human rights. Third, China should conduct in-depth research on key issues with the expansion of its overseas interests. Lessons can be drawn from previous experience, including, for instance, how the US described its own enemy as the common enemy of mankind, how to establish a united front against terrorism and why the US became the enemy of terrorism.

Wang Xu, associate professor from PKU's South Asia

studies center, analyzed related situations in his speech called “Current Characteristics and Trends of Regional Security in Pakistan and Afghanistan.”

Wang said that in general, the security situation in Pakistan has shown considerable improvement recently. This trend is unlikely to be reversed even though a series of terrorist attacks have inflicted heavy casualties. In a security situation similar to that in 2007, Pakistan saw 370 terrorist attacks in 2017. In particular, though the number of terrorist attacks in 2017 had a 16.1% drop from 2016, the number of casualties only fell 10.2%, reflecting the growing intensity of terrorism attacks. With respect to regional distribution, Pakistan has three traditional harder-hit areas: Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK), Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and Karachi. Though security situations in these three areas have improved after the Operation Zarb-e-Azb in 2014, terrorist forces have proliferated rapidly in Baluchistan, the north of Sindh and the south of Punjab.

With regard to the method of attacks, in the past two years, terrorist attacks in Pakistan became increasingly cruel and the number of civilian casualties kept growing. While the numbers of suicide attacks and targeted attacks dropped, attacks launched by simple roadside explosive devices increased rapidly. In 2017, the proportion of suicide attacks was only 6.5%, whereas targeted attacks and roadside explosives accounted for 38.1% and 43% of terrorist attacks respectively.

As for the source of terrorist threats, three major types of terrorist threats still exist. The first type comes from organizations of extreme religious terrorism, including al-Qaeda,

Taliban and their branches. Second, separatist forces that resort to violence have become increasingly rampant. In 2017, separatist forces in Baluchistan were responsible for 43.3% of the terrorist attacks in Pakistan. Third, sectarian attacks still present a daunting challenge, which include conflicts between Muslim and non-Muslim, Shiite and Sunni Muslims, and two opposing sects within Sunni Muslims.

Secondly, the interaction between security situations in Pakistan and Afghanistan has been further strengthened, and the trend of cross-border terrorist attacks by two-way proxy has become increasingly apparent. The Pakistani Taliban began to plot cross-border terrorist attacks on Pakistan in the provinces of Kunar and Nangarhar in eastern Afghanistan, and even entered Pakistan's Baluchistan province from southern Afghanistan to plot attacks on Pakistani military and government targets, which were rare in the past.

Thirdly, Pakistan's anti-terrorist military operations are not synchronized with efforts to eliminate extremism. The 20-point National Action Plan on counter-terrorism passed by Pakistan at the end of 2014 has hardly been implemented at all. The consequence of it is when military operations were intensified, the security situation would improve, but a rebound would also quickly appear. Meanwhile, a non-violent movement supporting the Islamic State has emerged.

Fourthly, a trend of the legalization and formation of political parties representing regional extreme violent terrorist organizations has become more apparent. Terrorists who had been previously defeated faked their identity and returned to North and South Waziristan in the name of charitable

organizations or trust funds, which left major hidden security risks.

Fifthly, the influence of the Islamic State in Pakistan and Afghanistan has risen, and the number of planned terrorist attacks has also increased significantly. Especially in some cities, terrorists plot to carry out attacks via the Internet. However, it should be noted that the number of returning terrorists who fought in other countries is still relatively limited. One of the important reasons is that many people are entrenched in Idlib Province. In addition, although their overall goals are the same, there are differences in ideology among terrorists in Idlib and northern Afghanistan, and their support for Al-Qaeda and the Islamic State keeps swaying.

At present, the so-called “Islamic State” in Pakistan and Afghanistan is more the re-organization and re-packaging of the regional extreme violent terrorist organizations, which carries obvious indigenous characteristics. Among them are two important branches of the Pakistani Taliban: the Al Alami, a branch of Lashkar-e-Jhangvi, and the Jamaat-ul-Ahrar, which were the major targets of attacks by the Pakistani military last year. The two organizations feature younger leaders and a rapid move toward supporting the Islamic State. The Arami branch and Jamaat-ul-Ahrar have little difference from the “Islamic State” in political ideology and religious ideology, but they can be relatively less cruel in means.

Li Qingyan, an associate research fellow at the China Institute of International Studies, gave a speech called “The deterioration of the security situation in Afghanistan and its impact on China.” She believes that since US unveiled its new

Afghanistan and South Asia strategy one year ago, the effect has been far from ideal. There is still space for the Islamic State to survive amid the chaos in Afghanistan, and the situation in Afghanistan has deepened the impact on the common security and development of China and its surrounding regions.

At present, the Afghan Taliban has established a “shadow government” in the counties it controls, which are managed by the Afghan government during the day and by the Taliban at night. When local people encounter difficulties or need to seek security protection, they may not directly ask for help from the government but choose to resort to the Afghan Taliban, which reflects that Afghan Taliban has a certain solid foundation of public support in rural areas of Afghanistan. Some analysis reports indicated that about half of the territory and population of Afghanistan are currently under the influence of the Afghan Taliban. Therefore the situation is intense.

The Islamic State is another major anti-government organization in Afghanistan. At first, the Afghan Taliban’s attitude toward the Islamic State was relatively tolerant. But as it penetrated too quickly, it directly threatened the interests of the Afghan Taliban. Since 2017, the relationship between the two sides in the northern part of Afghanistan has mostly turned into fighting. The Islamic State, under multiple attacks from the US military, the Afghan government and the Afghan Taliban, has stopped the rapid expansion it previously experienced. But there is a steady arrival of “fresh blood” to supplement its strength, especially from the Middle East. This allowed the Islamic State to gain a foothold in the border area of Pakistan and Afghanistan. China will face severe challenges from the threat

of the Islamic State if it integrates Afghanistan into relevant regional economic cooperation frameworks.

The serious drug situation in Afghanistan is also a reason why the security situation in the country is difficult to improve. Statistics showed that in 2017, the planting area for poppy in Afghanistan reached 328,000 hectares, capable of producing 550 to 900 tons of export-level heroin. It is worth about 4 to 6 billion US dollars, equivalent to 20%-30% of Afghanistan's annual GDP. Especially in remote rural areas, planting opium poppy has become a means of earning a living for average Afghan people. The huge drug revenues provided a steady stream of funding for extremist or terrorist organizations, and nearly 60% of the income of the Afghan Taliban and the Islamic State comes from drugs.

The turbulent security situation in Afghan is largely combined with the trend of the fragmentation of its domestic politics. The fragmentation of the Afghan political situation and the intensification of national separatism have a great impact on whether the peace talks on Afghanistan can be successfully achieved. In particular, the newly formed Grand National Coalition of Afghanistan (GNCA), composed of more than 30 political parties mostly coming from the former Afghan Northern Alliance, were initially inactive in the peace talks, but now are trying to reach out. However, the biggest factor influencing the process of peace talks is still the geopolitical competition between big powers. The US is undoubtedly the most critical external force currently affecting the situation in Afghanistan, and Russia is also trying to increase its influence in the region. Under this circumstance, the two extremist

organizations, Afghan Taliban and the Islamic State, have become the tools for the big countries' games. The US has accused Russia of supporting the Taliban, while Russia claimed that the US secretly helped the Islamic State to expand in Afghanistan. It can be seen that anti-terrorism has become increasingly complex due to the rivalry among big countries.

Li Jingfeng, assistant research fellow of the Sichuan Academy of Social Sciences, spoke on the security situation in Afghanistan. His speech was called "The Security Situation and Policy Choice of Baluchistan." He believes that although there are security problems in Pakistan, the situation is overall controllable. Furthermore, local attacks targeting Chinese people are very few.

The latest data showed that Pakistan has a population of approximately 207.7 million, among which 12.34 million are living in Baluchistan Province, accounting for 5.93% of the whole population in Pakistan. However, the almost 6% Pakistanis implemented 30% of terrorist attacks in Pakistan. The proportion of the urban population in Baluchistan has increased from 23.89% in 1998 to 27.55% in 2017. Quetta, its administrative center, had a population of 1 million in 2017, ranking the 10th nationwide in terms of city size. Counting the number of terrorist attacks in cities of Baluchistan, we will find that the proportion of all terrorist attacks in Baluchistan ranges between 20% and 30%, which is consistent with the percentage of its urban population.

In the past decade, the number of terrorist attacks in Pakistan has shown a continuously decreasing trend. In 2009, the number of terrorist attacks reached its peak when The

National Reconciliation Ordinance (NRO) ceased to be effective. In the last two years, with the implementation of clean-up operations, the number of terrorist attacks has gradually declined. In 2018 from January to October, there were a total of 231 terrorist attacks in Pakistan. The trend of terrorist attacks in Baluchistan is basically the same as that of Pakistan, but its security situation has not been effectively alleviated; rather, to some extent it has become more severe. In 2017, the proportion of terrorist attacks in Baluchistan for the first time broke through 40% among all terrorist attacks in Pakistan, making it the region topping the list of terrorist attacks in number. Afterwards, the year 2018 witnessed the proportion continue to rise, arriving at an average of 45.45%, and even exceeded 60% in certain months.

In terms of site distribution, the number of terrorist attacks that occurred in Quetta, DeraBugti, Kohlu and Jafarabad is similar. In 2017, Quetta's terrorist attacks accounted for 21.22%, DeraBugti about 9% and Gwadar around 7.78%. With regard to the method of attacks, Quetta was the site of a very high proportion of suicide attacks in Baluchistan in 2017, while the proportion in other regions is relatively low. There are three main factions carrying out terrorist attacks in Baluchistan. First is religious militants, such as the PakistanTaliban, the "Islamic State" and so on. The second is Baluchistan separatists demanding independent autonomy. The third is different sectarian forces. Statistics showed that religious militants mainly focused on killing living targets. While the number of attacks launched by separatist forces is much higher than that of religious militants, their death tolls are roughly the same. The

main reasons are that firstly, separatist forces are not accustomed to using suicide attacks. Secondly, their targets are mainly government forces such as outposts and border police forces, which normally led to fewer casualties. Nevertheless, generally speaking, separatist forces are still the biggest threat to the security of Baluchistan.

Considering the characteristics of the current security situation in Pakistan, Li Jingfeng proposed five policy suggestions. First, Baluchistan's counter-terrorism measures should not be limited to the security sector. It requires all aspects of society to take concrete and coordinated efforts. Meanwhile, Pakistan also needs to combine its short-term and long-term anti-terrorism goals to eliminate terrorists while strengthening social reconstruction. Second, Pakistan should replace part of its military operation with other law enforcement forces such as commandos and frontier constabularies, because the appearance of military operations in Baluchistan tends to arouse hostility. Third, it is advised that Pakistan continue to upgrade its intelligence network in Baluchistan and further enhance intelligence-based clean-up operations. Fourth, it is necessary to reinforce the instruction by religious schools. Some schools can be included in the government education system, thus providing more career opportunities for graduates. The fifth is that the central government should plan fairer financial arrangements for Baluchistan, increase its quota of fiscal transfer payments, and combat corruption at the same time.

Fu Yuhong, a lecturer from School of International and Public Affairs in Jilin University, made the final speech, entitled "The Nature and Structure of the Afghan Taliban." She believes

that there are still debates over the nature of the Afghan Taliban in the international community. Disputes mainly involve the advancement of the peace process in Afghanistan, the method of intervention of external countries and major political forces, the relationship between the Afghan Taliban and the local public, and the complex interactions between many local violent extremist organizations, and so on. The Afghan Taliban's organizational structure exerts an important influence on the strength of its rebel movement, its strategy and its relationship with different actors inside and outside the country.

Many scholars have tried to define the nature of Afghan Taliban from different angles, such as claiming it as a Pashtun nationalist movement, Islamist political movement, or extreme ideological political and military organization. However, the most widely argued issue is whether Afghan Taliban is a rebel organization or a terrorist organization. This disagreement arises firstly from many inconsistencies and contradictions of the US itself when defining it. Presidents Bush, Obama and Trump have called it a terrorist organization on some occasions before, but the US government officially calls it an armed rebel group. Secondly, the Afghan Taliban employs sophisticated terrorist tactics, and Al-Qaeda, the Pakistani Taliban and the Haqqani Network, which have connections with the Afghan Taliban, are all defined as terrorist organizations. Specifically, the Haqqani Network serves as an important part of the Afghan Taliban.

On the whole, be it academic or official, the mainstream holds the view that the Afghan Taliban is a rebel organization, with political factors being the primary consideration. The label of "terrorist organization" will restrain other parties from

contacting the Afghan Taliban, and would not be conducive to the development of political peace talks in Afghanistan. Many countries still regard the Afghan Taliban as an important domestic political force in Afghanistan, in order to assure their further access into Afghanistan in the future. Secondly, the theoretical definitions of rebel groups and terrorist organizations are different. At present, the Afghan Taliban enjoys certain local support and has some legitimacy compared with terrorist organizations. Thirdly, the scope and objectives of the Afghan Taliban have all been restricted within its national boundaries, which is different from transnational international terrorist organizations.

The decentralization of the Afghan Taliban's organizational structure has brought about significant impact. Prior to 2007, its leadership basically maintained a vertical command structure led by Mullah Omar, but after 2007, many scholars believed that the leadership began to split, marked by Miran Shah Shura and Peshawar Shura separating from Quetta Shura in 2007 and 2009 respectively. However, there are also opinions saying that during the Afghan Taliban's administration, there were already lots of divided voices and even the possibility for an outbreak of armed conflicts. At that time, it was Omar's supremacy that suppressed the internal contradictions and maintained a certain balance. Entering the rebellion period, the Afghan Taliban was still filled with factions ready to split apart. For example, leaders of different factions had different tribal bases and held different positions on issues, such as social governance, political reconciliation and international jihad. After 2010, the trend of internal division and decentralization within the Afghan Taliban

became increasingly obvious. In 2010, Baradar, the No. 2 man of the Afghan Taliban, was arrested by the authorities, and other leaders engaged in a power struggle to replace him in this position. After the announcement of Omar's death in 2015, the internal power struggle inside the Afghan Taliban was further disclosed, and some external factors, such as the Islamic State's penetration into the region and support from other countries for the Afghan Taliban's different factions, contributed to the division.

The decentralization of the Afghan Taliban first became apparent in discord among top leading organizations. From the start, there was the Quetta Shura, Miran Shah Shura and Peshawar Shura. In 2017, three new power centers – the Shura of the North, Mashhad Shura and RasoolShura– emerged. Among them, the Miran Shah Shura and Peshawar Shura still recognized the paramountcy of the Quetta Shura, although they actually were not subject to the Quetta Shura's management, while the three new power centers disclaimed the QuettaShura's supremacy. Meanwhile, the factionalism has intensified. Afghan Taliban leaders after Omar were not as powerful, and suffered competition and confrontation with factional leaders. For example, the Mansour Network mainly operates in Helmand province, controlling most of the drug trade income. The network has damaged the Quetta Shura's fiscal revenue. Among the factions, the Haqqani Network has always received a lot of attention and was regarded as the most cohesive, homogenous and independent faction of the Afghan Taliban. Although the current leader Sirajuddin swore allegiance to HaibatullahAkhundzada, the two diverged significantly on

policy choice. Haibatullah Akhundzada insisted on combating the Islamic State, attaching importance to non-military social governance activities, seeking funding support from the Quetta Shura's non-traditional supporters such as Iran and Russia, and also promoting cooperation with Shiite armed groups. However, Sirajuddin chose exactly the opposite in these respects. The emergence of factionalism has caused many middle- and lower-level members to worry that the leaders are only fighting for their personal interests rather than for the cause of the Afghan Taliban, which resulted in the members' growing dissatisfaction with the leaders' policies.

With the decentralization of the Afghan Taliban, some small mobile units carry out destructive actions in different regions with quicker tactical adjustments, freer movement, a larger scope and an increased degree of violence. This change reflects a certain divergence between leaders' strategic goals and the lower-level members' practical actions. It also demonstrates that the leadership of the Afghan Taliban has had limited control over the whole movement and that the political leaders' influence on military activities has been weakened. Moreover, the Afghan Taliban began to advance toward ethnic minority areas and increased the recruitment of non-Pashtun members. However, it should be noted that there are differences between the Pashtun Taliban and the non-Pashtun Taliban. For instance, the non-Pashtun Taliban may have a closer relationship with the Shura of the North and the Mashhad Shura, but their loyalty to the Afghan Taliban's overall movement is weaker than that of its Pashtun counterpart. Besides, they mainly act in remote and undeveloped areas. The regional armed rebel networks are

becoming more and more complex, with a complicated and ever-changing relationship between different armed forces, which adds difficulty to the process of Afghan political peace talks. Finally, external countries are also contending with each other to exert their influence on the different factions of the Afghan Taliban. Driven by these external factors, the Afghan Taliban's tendency toward decentralization will continue.

In a Q&A session, participating experts answered questions from the audience.

Question: What impact does the current development of Sino-US relations have on the security situation in Afghanistan and Pakistan and on international counter-terrorism cooperation?

Li Qingyan: Afghanistan is a promising highlight in Sino-US cooperation. Although there is friction in Sino-US relations, this highlight still exists. During the Sino-US security dialogue held not long ago, both two sides agreed that the stability of Afghanistan is in the common interests of China and the US. At present, the US still needs to rely on the power of China with regards to advancing the peace talks on Afghanistan, considering the relations between China and Pakistan. The Afghanistan-Pakistan-US-China Quadrilateral Coordination Group mechanism proposed by China has been very effective in promoting the peace process in Afghanistan. If the US expects the peace talks to make quick progress, it should restart the dialogue mechanism as soon as possible.

Wang Xu: Contradictions do exist between the US global strategy and regional policy, and South Asia is a typical example. First, after a policy adjustment, South Asia is no longer a priority direction and focus of US foreign policy. A consensus

has been reached by both parties in the US that the strategic significance of Afghanistan and Pakistan has dropped greatly. Second, the US has rolled out its Indo-Pacific strategy, and no longer regards India as a South Asian country, but as a factor in its global strategy. But this triggered a problem. India, after all, is still in South Asia. The success of a major country's South Asia policy depends on whether it can balance India and Pakistan. However, the move from the US has brought "imbalance." In addition, the US knows well that the key to solving the Afghanistan issue is in the hands of Pakistan. But due to the deterioration of US-Pakistan relations, Pakistan is reluctant to play its precious "Afghanistan card," which has thrown the US into a dilemma.

Qian Chengdan: What is the root cause of terrorism? Economic problems or something else?

Qian Xuemei: Terrorism is a means, not a fixed ideology. It can be attached to all political entities or ideologies. If we must find its root cause, I think the root cause is both social and political, and is the radicalization of both sides during their political confrontation. Terrorist organizations are always established under specific political environments, and evolve as the political environment changes.

Zhu Sumei: Seen from a macro perspective, the root causes of terrorism include both political and social factors. The emergence of every wave of terrorism is related to some incompatibility that occurred amid great changes in the international community. The incompatibility first causes contradictions, which are then intensified. Meanwhile, a corresponding ideology appears to fit with radical actions. The

latest terrorism wave is associated with the incompatibility between extreme religious ideas and the development of globalization. Micro perspectives include personal reasons. And we can even analyze from a psychological perspective about why some people would engage in terrorism.

Zhang Jiadong: Terrorism cannot be directly defined because terrorism should not be defined by its root causes or by its message, but by its characteristics. Its characteristics usually include political targets, violence and non-state actors. It is organized, and the target it directly strikes is different from its political goals. The study of terrorism is to discover which people and groups have these characteristics. We have found that groups such as religious extremists, national separatists, and those who have extreme ideologies are more likely to have these characteristics. Every wave of terrorism often has a dominant conflict that incites it. The current dominant conflict is religious-based violence. Before the religious violence, it was extreme ideology and national separatism. The dominant conflicts were often had major international consequences. Terrorism has root causes, but the root causes keep changing.

Prof. Qian said in his closing remarks that the speeches and in-depth discussions at the workshop provided very good ideas for anti-terrorism cooperation and opened up new paradigms for future research. He hopes to have more opportunities to continue exploring in this field and provide more theoretical research and practical advice on related issues.