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ABSTRACT

Though 9/11 is becoming a distant memory for the United States, terrorism continues to erupt in many other parts of the world. Between 2004 and 2006, almost 29,000 terrorist attacks were carried out around the world. While some countries faced no attacks, other countries experienced over 1,000.

It is possible that some countries are inherently more susceptible to terrorist attacks. Region, government structure, gross domestic product, and a wealth of natural resources are a few of the factors that may affect a nation’s chances of suffering terrorist attacks. This thesis aims to shed light on which characteristics have the highest impact on level of terrorism.

Using data from the National Counterterrorism Center and the Central Intelligence Agency, multiple regression analysis was used to assess the impact of several factors on the number of terrorist attacks suffered by a country. While most variables did not prove significant, the model did show that South Asian and Middle Eastern countries, democracies, and countries that spend a large portion of their GDP on military expenses are more likely to suffer from terrorism.

These results can inform future policy decisions. Though a country cannot change its region and is unlikely to change its government structure, countries aiming to reduce their threat of terrorism may realize that increasing the size and strength of their militaries may not be a sufficient protection measure as terrorists may actually find countries with strong militaries to be more attractive targets.

Given the nimble and ever-changing nature of terrorist organizations, it is very difficult to combat them. Because each country has a different level of risk, each government needs a solid understanding of its unique threat level in order to establish the best policies to protect its population.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Though the concern over terrorism in the U.S. has gradually subsided in the years since 9/11, global terrorism continues to rage. In fact, from 2004 to 2006, almost 29,000 terrorist attacks were carried out around the world. Some countries, such as Iraq, Nepal and Afghanistan, suffered from over 1,000 attacks each over the course of the three years. Other nations, such as the U.K. and Spain, had far fewer overall, but still suffered from some very notable attacks. Still another set of countries, including Norway and Costa Rica, did not endure a single attack over that time period.

What makes certain countries more susceptible to terrorism? A quick glance at the list of countries that have been hardest hit brings to mind several similarities among them. Insurgent violence runs rampant; the governments are young and unstable; and they have an abundance of important natural resources. But do these factors lead to increased terrorism or are they mere coincidences? Existing research differs as to which factors are the most significant in predicting terrorist attacks.
Chapter 2. Background And Literature Review

Though it is difficult to determine precisely the factors that influence terrorism, studies conducted throughout the past few decades have begun to shed light on the subject. If specific high-risk factors could be identified, countries could better formulate policies aimed at protecting their homelands. Terrorism not only causes casualties and property destruction, but it can lead to devastation of a country’s economy, and countries around the world are continually searching for the best way to fight terrorism (Lutz, 2006).

Regional Concerns

Many studies have focused on the impact of region on a country’s threat of terrorism. Countries that are involved in regional conflict suffer from a much higher rate of terrorist acts than countries that remain peaceful with their neighbors (Shamir and Shikaki, 2002). Interestingly, people who live in areas of conflict, such as Israelis and Palestinians, often define terrorism differently for their own country than for the rest of the world (Shamir and Shikaki, 2002).

While some regions are more susceptible to terrorism because of their dangerous conflicts, others may be attractive targets for terrorism because of their usual safety. Countries like Canada, which is not considered a hotbed for terrorism, can be used as safe havens for terrorists (The Economist, 2007). Once terrorists have established a home base, the host country’s defenses are severely crippled. Because Canada does not suffer from a high degree of terrorism, its government does not put a great emphasis on border
security. Terrorists and other undesirable people can easily gain access to the country, making it far more susceptible to terrorism in the future (The Economist, 2007).

**Battling Insurgents and Religious Tension**

Insurgency and religious tension run rampant in some countries and may also link to susceptibility to terrorism. Insurgent groups not only carry out acts of terrorism themselves, but are also often named as a scapegoat for attacks they did not carry out (Time International, 2006). Terrorist groups may choose to target countries where insurgent groups have a strong presence so as to blame their own terrorist acts on the insurgents. Turkey has long been a breeding ground of insurgent activity and has also suffered heavily from terrorism (Time International, 2006).

Similarly, terrorism typically erupts in war zones and countries riddled with religious tension. Though definitions of terrorism may differ across studies, most experts consider attacks that result from religious conflict to be no less terroristic than attacks carried out for other reasons (Hammes, 2007). U.S. military efforts in war zones must be structured differently to account for the increased threat of terrorism (Hammes, 2007). Paradoxically, military presence in such war-torn countries may even lead to an increase of terrorism.

Additionally, some research has shown that religious symbols make for attractive terrorist targets because of the potential for added meaning and emotional distress such attacks may cause. For example, Egypt experienced a series of suicide bombings that coincided with secular holidays (The Economist, 2006). Authorities believed that the
Jihadi attackers want Egypt to return to its puritan faith and were aiming to send a message through the attacks (The Economist, 2006).

In fact, some countries, such as Algeria, Egypt and Tunisia, cracked down on religion-driven terrorism by resorting to military strikes against mosques and detention and trial without due process (Grinstein, 1996). Other states, including the United States, have extensive religious freedom protections yet have experienced a surge in religion-based violence in the past decade. Some experts argue that a caveat should be added to the United States’ freedom of religion right that allows for the criminalization of religions that pose a “clear and present danger (Grinstein, 1996).” It is unclear whether stricter or more lenient religion laws are better at reducing terrorism, primarily because countries with wide religious freedoms often have many inherent differences between those with strict religion laws. Nevertheless, religious freedoms cannot be ruled out as a catalyst for or protection against terrorism.

**Government Systems as Targets**

Government systems themselves can also affect a nation’s likelihood of suffering from terrorism. The attacks of 9/11 burst the post-Cold War security bubble (Carter, 2002). Since then, the United States has reorganized the federal government in several different ways, such as creating the Department of Homeland Security, in an effort to combat future terrorist threats. While no substantial attacks have occurred in the U.S. since 9/11, many analysts consider the government restructuring efforts to be failures because no clear management structure has been established and responsibility for homeland security activities is still not housed solely within the Department of Homeland
Security. Many argue that the federal government is no more prepared for an attack today than they were prior to 9/11 (Carter, 2002).

It can be difficult to make major changes to government structures since many nations wrestle with the competing interests of national security and civil liberties. On a smaller scale, some countries opt to fight crime with stringent laws and unyielding punishments, while others believe that vast civil liberties are the key to a peaceful citizenry. The United States has gotten tougher on crime over the past 20 years, spurred in large part by sensationally heinous crimes that have made front-page news (Shaw, et al., 1998). The Patriot Act has greatly extended the government’s ability to prevent terrorism at the price of reduced privacy. Yet, debate continues about how best to structure government while maintaining the liberties and culture that the citizens desire.

Additionally, lawmakers have called for increased aid and educational assistance as a way to combat terrorism. They believe that high rates of poverty and poor educational systems contribute to the threat of terrorism. One study, however, found the causal link to be fairly weak (Krueger and Maleckova, 2003). Rather, the researchers suggest that terrorism is more likely a response to political conditions and other feelings of frustration that are not related to economic standing (Krueger and Maleckova, 2003). Still, levels of education and poverty may have a high correlation with certain political conditions thus may serve as useful proxy variables.

Policies for Combating Terror

Some research shows that the very strategies countries employ to combat terrorism may actually increase their chances of suffering from attacks. For example,
India has experienced a rise in terrorism in the past few years, and to combat the problem, the country decided to increase the size of its intelligence agencies (Chengappa, 2006). However, to obtain more intelligence analysts, the Indian government loosened some of the hiring requirements that had previously been in place, such as no longer necessitating the ability to speak multiple languages. As a result, the intelligence analysts were not as capable and outsiders – including terrorists themselves – were able to infiltrate the intelligence system, thus compromising the entire system (Chengappa, 2006).

Prior to 9/11, Europe had a reputation for being soft on terrorism. European governments were not keen to help the United States capture and obtain fugitive terrorists – perhaps due to the fact that Europeans placed a high priority on preventing terrorism in their own countries but were not eager to get involved in conflicts of other countries (Hoffman, 1999). Because of this stance, however, Europe became a safe haven for terrorists for much of the 1990s.

**Country Characteristics as Factors in Policy Decisions**

Based on the existing research, it is clear that there are a host of characteristics that may make some countries more susceptible to terrorism than others. It is unclear which factors are the most significant in predicting likelihood of terrorism in a given country. This thesis aims to determine which country characteristics are most significant in predicting likelihood of terrorist attacks.
Chapter 3. Analytical Methodology

This study examines the relationship between specific country characteristics and the number of terrorist attacks suffered. To do this analysis, the data were assessed using an OLS multiple regression model in which the dependent variable was the number of terrorist attacks. The independent variables were a series of country characteristics. The following is the model used to analyze the data:

\[
\text{# terrorist attacks} = \beta_1 \text{population} + \beta_2 \text{Catholic} + \beta_3 \text{Muslim} + \beta_4 \text{Protestant} + \beta_5 \text{number of major religions} + \beta_6 \text{English (majority spoken)} + \beta_7 \text{GDP} + \beta_8 \text{republic} + \beta_9 \text{democracy} + \beta_{10} \text{monarchy} + \beta_{11} \text{Central and South America} + \beta_{12} \text{East Asia-Pacific} + \beta_{13} \text{Eurasia} + \beta_{14} \text{Europe} + \beta_{15} \text{Middle East and Persian Gulf} + \beta_{16} \text{North America and Caribbean} + \beta_{17} \text{South Asia} + \beta_{18} \text{number of natural resources} + \beta_{19} \text{net migration rate} + \beta_{20} \text{infant mortality rate} + \beta_{21} \text{life expectancy} + \beta_{22} \text{number of major ethnic groups} + \beta_{23} \text{unemployment rate} + \beta_{24} \text{percent of GDP used for military expenditures}
\]

Regression analysis allows the ability to determine the singular effect of each variable holding all else constant. Each independent variable was included in the model because of some hypothesized relationship to number of terrorist attacks suffered by a country. For example, one would expect the coefficient on life expectancy to be negative, democracies to experience fewer attacks than other government types, and the Middle East to suffer more attacks than other regions. Further, the impact of a variable such as GDP (a proxy for economic power) is difficult to predict since economically powerful countries have high security investment power but are also the most sought-after targets. These factors may off-set resulting in low significance for that variable.
Chapter 4. Data

To investigate these relationships, data was pulled from two primary sources. The National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) kept a thorough database of all terrorist attacks worldwide from 2004 through 2006. This data forms the foundation for the analysis. Overall, the NCTC dataset is very thorough and solid; however, it is possible that the data could be biased due to reporting gaps or differing definitions of a “terrorist attack” across countries. Because of the large size of the dataset and the fact that it covers the vast majority – if not the entirety – of the population of global terrorist attacks from 2004 to 2006, the slim possibility of bias in the data is unlikely to skew the results. The size and scope of the dataset allow the analysis to be robust and generalizable.

The NCTC dataset was supplemented with additional data from the Central Intelligence Agency’s (CIA) Factbook database. The CIA maintains a catalog of several statistics and characteristics for each nation across the globe. The main drawback to this database is that all countries are not updated at the same time. Therefore, the analysis will include a mixture of current data and slightly outdated data (typically not collected earlier than 2003), which creates another potential bias in the model.

The specific variables used in the model (and the metrics used to calculate them) are:

- Dependent variable = country’s number of terrorist attacks (from 2004-2006)*
- $\beta_1 =$ population (in thousands)$^\dagger$
- $\beta_2 =$ Catholic (dummy variable) $^\dagger$
- $\beta_3 =$ Muslim (dummy variable) $^\dagger$
- $\beta_4 =$ Protestant (dummy variable) $^\dagger$

---

1. Vatican City is the only country not included in the CIA’s database, and therefore will also be left out of this study.
\(\beta_5 =\) number of major religions (representing 5% or more of population)†
\(\beta_6 =\) English language (dummy: is English the majority language?)†
\(\beta_7 =\) Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (purchasing power parity – in billions)†
\(\beta_8 =\) republic (dummy variable)†
\(\beta_9 =\) democracy (dummy variable)†
\(\beta_{10} =\) monarchy (dummy variable)†
\(\beta_{11} =\) Central and South America (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{12} =\) East Asia-Pacific (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{13} =\) Eurasia (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{14} =\) Europe (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{15} =\) Middle East and Persian Gulf (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{16} =\) North America and Caribbean (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{17} =\) South Asia (dummy variable)*
\(\beta_{18} =\) number of natural resources†
\(\beta_{19} =\) net migration rate (per 1000 population)†
\(\beta_{20} =\) infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)†
\(\beta_{21} =\) life expectancy (years)†
\(\beta_{22} =\) number of major ethnic groups (representing 5% or more of population)†
\(\beta_{23} =\) unemployment rate†
\(\beta_{24} =\) percent of GDP used for military expenditures†

* NCTC data
† CIA data

The dummy variables for Catholic, Muslim, Protestant, republic, democracy, and monarchy were created by combining relevant classifications. Before combining any variables, there were 35 religions and 26 government types, and most classifications encompassed only a small number of countries. By combining like classifications, (i.e. Lutheran, Methodist and Protestant were folded into a single “Protestant” category; and
constitutional monarchy, parliamentary monarchy, and absolute monarchy were combined into a single “monarchy” category) several categories amassed enough countries to be included in the model.

The NCTC dataset had already categorized every country into one of eight regions. All of the regional dummy variables were included in the model, except for Africa, which was used as the baseline category. Africa was chosen as the baseline because it contained the most countries.

Table 1 shows several descriptive statistical measures for each variable included in the model.
Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Variables in Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Terrorist Attacks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11039</td>
<td>140.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (in thousands)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,321,852</td>
<td>34,116</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominent Religion (35 categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Major Religions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language (dummy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP (in billions of dollars)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>13060</td>
<td>342.3</td>
<td>33.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Type (26 categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (8 categories)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Natural Resources</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Migration Rate</td>
<td>-21.02</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>184.44</td>
<td>36.51</td>
<td>22.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy (in years)</td>
<td>32.23</td>
<td>83.52</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>71.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Major Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% GDP for Military Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5. Discussion Of Results

The results from the regression analysis, including data on all terrorist attacks worldwide from 2004-2006, are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Regression of Country Statistics on Terrorist Attacks Suffered from 2004-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>(Standard Error)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1972.48494</td>
<td>(1505.25417)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>0.00136</td>
<td>(0.00082787)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>58.81899</td>
<td>(280.56547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>-104.55540</td>
<td>(265.33650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>141.66820</td>
<td>(296.92655)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of religions</td>
<td>-58.65735</td>
<td>(91.13591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English - majority spoken</td>
<td>-25.19850</td>
<td>(256.37454)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>-0.04600</td>
<td>(0.08694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>398.25459</td>
<td>(283.06529)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>890.82958 †</td>
<td>(332.13426)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monarchy</td>
<td>405.52710</td>
<td>(340.74970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and South America</td>
<td>160.96274</td>
<td>(405.51251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>145.81373</td>
<td>(356.31660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasia</td>
<td>351.37546</td>
<td>(404.69561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>95.49607</td>
<td>(401.31374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and Persian Gulf</td>
<td>912.47397 †</td>
<td>(444.91372)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### North America and Caribbean

- **Number of natural resources**: 4.38235 (472.69493)
- **South Asia**: 716.25488 * (398.35484)

### Net migration rate

- **Net migration rate**: -7.70487 (17.71685)

### Infant mortality rate

- **Infant mortality rate**: 7.89974 (5.80040)

### Life expectancy

- **Life expectancy**: 13.86933 (19.23251)

### Number of major ethnic groups

- **Number of major ethnic groups**: 28.73068 (61.94834)

### Unemployment rate

- **Unemployment rate**: 3.25971 (5.65814)

### Military expenditures

- **Military expenditures**: 93.24092 * (56.35187)

---

**Adjusted R^2**: 0.0626

* indicates 90% confidence  
† indicates 95% confidence

### Assessment of Data and Potential Issues

It is important to note that the adjusted R^2 indicates that the model only explains 6.26% of the variation in the number of terrorist attacks suffered by a country. A low R^2 is expected for this model, because it is clear that country characteristics are not the sole indicators of a country’s susceptibility to terrorist attack. It is likely that factors such as political motives, availability of weapons materials, and ability of terrorist groups to recruit new members would each have a significant effect on the likelihood of terrorist attacks; however, such factors are not easily measurable and not necessarily country-specific. Rather, this thesis aims to examine whether country attributes that generally remain stable over extended periods of time affect a country’s susceptibility to attack.
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To better assess the data, F tests were conducted. The first F test included the three religion dummy variables (Catholic, Protestant and Muslim). Since the F statistic was low (F=0.18), the null hypothesis that these three religious variables are not jointly significant cannot be rejected. Conversely, the second F test, which included the three government type dummy variables (republic, democracy and monarchy) has a high F statistic (F=2.69). Therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected in this case, indicating that the three government type variables are jointly significant.²

Missing data does not appear to be a substantial issue. There are a total of 193 observations. Earlier specifications of the model included two additional variables – HIV rate and percent of people below the poverty line. Both variables had a high degree of missing values, and therefore 82 of the 193 observations (or 42%) were lost from the analysis. To alleviate this problem (to the extent practical), those variables were dropped from the model, and in the current model, only 42 observations (or 22%) were lost.

There is no evidence of a multicollinearity problem. None of the variance inflation factor (VIF) values for any of the variables was above 10, indicating that multicollinearity is not present. Therefore, none of the variables are highly correlated with one another.

**Significant Variables**

² There is an indication of a level of heteroskedasticity present in this model. Ideally, when graphing the residuals for all of the observations in a data set, there should be no pattern to the data points. When a definitive pattern exists, heteroskedasticity is present, which likely implies that one or more key variables were left out of the model and therefore the effects of those variables are being captured in the residual values. In this case, there is a fairly clear pattern to the residuals, indicating that heteroskedasticity is an issue, indicating potentially biased standard errors. Unfortunately, due to technology constraints, the heteroskedasticity problem could not be fixed, and thus, is acknowledged here.
As in many social science models, most of the variables are not statistically significant; however, a few do have a significant impact on number of terrorist attacks suffered by a country. The democracy variable is significant, suggesting that countries that are democracies suffer 297 additional terrorist attacks per year than non-democracies, or 890 over a three-year period \(p=.008\), holding all else constant.

Similarly, countries that are in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region suffer 304 more attacks per year than Africa, the baseline region, or 912 over a three-year period \(p=.04\). South Asia also suffers more attacks on average than Africa, however not as many as the Middle East. Holding all else constant, South Asia suffers an additional 239 attacks per year, or 712 over a three-year period \(p=.07\).

Finally, military expenditures (as a percentage of GDP) were found to have a significant effect on terrorist attacks. For every additional percentage point of GDP that a country allocates to military expenditures, the country is likely to suffer an additional 93 terrorist attacks, over a three-year period \(p=.10\).
Chapter 6. Policy Implications

The results of this analysis are mixed. Most of the country characteristics included in the model do not have a significant impact on number of terrorist attacks experienced by a country; however, even a lack of significance can drive policy decisions. For example, unemployment rate is not shown to have a significant effect, therefore, based on these results, a country would be unwise to implement policies to drive down its unemployment rate in an attempt to decrease its susceptibility to terrorist attack.

Still, based on this analysis, there are a few key policy decisions that may be warranted. First, the regions of South Asia and the Middle East were found to have a significantly higher risk of terrorist attack than the baseline region Africa and the rest of the regions (none of the other regions were found to be significant, therefore no difference can be distinguished between them and the Africa baseline). Considering their higher risk of attack, countries in either of these two regions might consider implementing policies to harden key sites and protect citizens. Based upon this analysis, a higher investment in security measures in countries within South Asia and the Middle East would be justified.

Secondly, military expenditure level (as a percent of GDP) yields a potentially paradoxical result. The results of the model indicate that increasing military expenditures in a given a country actually increases that country’s risk of terrorist attack. On its face, this finding seems counterintuitive because countries would likely opt to increase their investment in their militaries in order to reduce threats and better protect their homeland.
Though it is not possible to determine the specific reason for this result, one can infer that there may be some quality about countries with strong militaries that make them more attractive to attack. It may be that such countries often have significant global power. It is possible that the sheer fact that a country opts to bolster its security (through a stronger military) emboldens terrorists to attack the country.

While this analysis is not likely to entice a country to reduce its military spending (as there are many reasons for desiring a strong military), it may discourage countries from increasing their military investment for the sole purpose of reducing the risk of terrorist attacks on their homeland. Rather, countries seeking to reduce their threat of terrorism at home might instead decide to invest in other counterterrorism measures, such as intelligence technology or law enforcement personnel.

Finally, some results are interesting to note but do little to inform policy decisions. The significance of the democracy dummy variable is one such case. The regression analysis shows that democracies suffer from significantly more terrorist attacks than non-democracies. While this is interesting to note, and several reasons for such a result may come to mind (such as the level of power that accompanies many democracies), countries are not likely to make policy decisions based on this fact. That is, democracies are not likely to change their government structures to become non-democracies in order to thwart terrorism. There are many reasons a country may choose to be a democracy, and it would not be sound policy to change to a new government type based upon one negative finding.
Still, this result is interesting, if nothing else – especially since Americans in particular have a perception that democracies are the safest, fairest, most desired form of government. Findings such as these may lead Americans to reassess that long-held notion.
Chapter 7. Conclusions

This analysis has shown that countries with certain characteristics are inherently more susceptible to terrorist attack. Middle East and South Asian countries are at higher risk, as are democracies and countries that spend more on military expenditures. While countries with these characteristics may not be willing or able to change them, it is imperative that such countries understand that they are at higher risk and take measures to protect their populations accordingly.

Given the nimble and ever-changing nature of terrorist organizations, it is very difficult to combat them. All countries must take steps to protect their people, but some countries are more susceptible to attack and would be wise to take extra precautions and increase investment in terrorism prevention.
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