

From ct135@columbia.edu Mon Sep 24 13:26:05 2001
Date: Fri, 21 Sep 2001 18:26:34 -0400
From: Charles Tilly <ct135@columbia.edu>
To: "Lande, Carl H" <clande@ku.edu>
Cc: amsoc <amsoc@columbia.edu>
Subject: Re: FW: Charles Tilly's Analysis (fwd)

Here is the second posting from Carl Lande.

Chuck

"Lande, Carl H" wrote:

Chuck:

Of course you may forward my letter But I must ammend my comments of yesterday, when it appeared that the Taliban Mullahs were recommending that Bin Laden be invited to leave. The President's ultimatum of yesterday evening appears to have made that unlikely. How can they back down now? But my guess is that they will soon announce that Bin Laden, despite their refusal to expel him, has of his own volition, slipped out of Afghanistan, for parts unknown. That would make it hard for the US to attack Afghanistan without earning approbrium even from our friends.

My guess is that the Taliban leaders had no idea of how far their guest would go, and that they are not happy about how he has endangered them or their reputation among moderates in the Muslim world - and given us an incentive to aid the Northern Alliance, which should find it easy to recruit new fighters after the murder of their popular leader. It is in the Taliban's interest to seek the financial benefits of international repectability. Association with a loose cannon like Bin Laden is unhelpful in that regard.

I still think that, when forced to choose, few rich Arabs or Mid Eastern governments will continue to fund Bin Laden, or be happy to harbor his followers. Therefore I think that, on balance, Bush was right in calling on other governmens to make a clear choice. ButI cannot claim to know beans about the mindest of rulers in the region. We shall see. And thanks for your thoughtful analysis.

Carl

Carl H. Lande
Emeritus Professor
Department of Political Science
The University of Kansas

Lawrence, KS 66045
(785) 843-3201
clande@ku.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: Lande, Carl H
Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2001 11:06 AM
To: 'clande@foleylaw.com'; 'landeja@state.gov'; 'alande@juno.com';
'prex@lark.cc.ku.edu'
Subject: FW: Charles Tilly's Analysis (fwd)

An interesting analysis by a respected scholar. But I think it's dead wrong. Bush is quite right in threatening the backers of terrorists. And most of these, seeing the Afghans back down, will stop harboring and funding terrorists themselves. Just what does Tilly think the US should do?
CHL

Carl H. Lande
Emeritus Professor
Department of Political Science
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS 66045
(785) 843-3201
clande@ku.edu

Date: Thu, 20 Sep 2001 22:54:15 -0700
From: John R. Hall <jrhall@ucdavis.edu>
To: Chuck Tilly <ct135@columbia.edu>
Subject: your predictions

Dear Chuck,

Thanks very much for your predictions, which have gained a life of their own. For the most part, I agree, and I admire your sociological commitment, and your willingness to use sociology as a way of engaging people in thinking about the history that we are living.

My quibbles are with #5 and 7. I am sure that you are right: effective terrorist cell operations minimize contact between cells, and even within cells, and some people are networked, and not in cells at all.

Nevertheless, the coordination of the actions does strongly suggest that

somewhere, someone came up with the specific strategic plan. Perhaps you mean that no single group, say b.l.'s orchestrated everything in a top down way, and I would agree with that. But on the face of it, the actions were coordinated, no?

For your possible interest, I'm including a link to a prepublication downloadable pdf version of a paper of mine forthcoming the the Handbook for the Sociology of Religion, on religion and violence:
<http://chsc.ucdavis.edu/JohnRHall.html> .

Keep it up!

John

John R. Hall, Professor of Sociology
Director, Center for History, Society, and Culture
www.chsc.ucdavis.edu/
2233 Social Science/Humanities Building
University of California - Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616
Fax: 530/752-0783 Office: 530/752-1638

Date: Fri, 21 Sep 2001 22:54:26 -0400
From: ned schneier <neds@taconic.net>
To: ct135@columbia.edu
Subject: terror

Ken Sherrill, a longtime CUNY colleague, was good enough to cc me your very cogent analysis of recent events. Here in Jakarta on a Fulbright, I would add one more prediction: If the terrorists are smart enough to do what they did, they are probably smart enough to vary their strategies. Airplanes are now probably the safest form of transportation, what we need to put our resources into is the protection of water supplies, land borders, and so on. Of course the lunatics in Washington will use this not only to fight the last war, but the one before (I can't believe the Democrats are caving in on the ABM). Anyway, this is all very bizarre from this perspective. Surrounded by Muslims, we feel very safe. After a month of security advisories when we first arrived, the embassy is silent and people approach us to express condolences. But we dread the dropping of the other shoe. Strange, in an anti-Hobbesian way, that we see our government not as something that will protect us from the war of all against all, but as a force that may thros us into exactly that perspective. Well, this is late night, off the top of my head; but I did want to

tell you how much I thought your analysis was on the mark. Please put us on your e-mail list if you are going any further. Thanks.
Ned Scheier (Fulbright lecturer, Prof. of Poli. Sci., ccny)

Date: Sat, 22 Sep 2001 14:41:46 -0400
From: Behrooz Moazami <068565@newschool.edu>
To: ct135@columbia.edu
Subject: Re: In search of a third Voice

Dear Chuck,

The following is what I presented last night (September 21) to a Teach-in called "9/11/01/ Causes and Consequences" organized by Dean Kenneth Prewitt (GF, New School). It tackles some of the issues that had been brought up in the recent discussions of amsocers from a rather different perspective. Please post it, if you think it is appropriate and relevant to the on-going debate.

Thanks in advance
Behrooz

Some Reflections on the On-going Crisis: In Search of a Third Voice

"In this moment of airless shock when hot tears sting disbelieving eyes, the only thing I can find to say, the only words that seem to fit, must be addressed to the unknown author of this suffering. You monster. You beast. You unspeakable bastard. What lesson did you hope to teach us by your coward's attack on our World Trade Center, our Pentagon, us? What was it you hoped we would learn? Whatever it was, please know that you failed." These words were written by Leonard Pitts Jr. the Syndicated columnist of the Miami Herald, in the editorial pages of the Times last Thursday (September 13) in an article entitled "The Barbarians will learn what America's all about." This is his description of America: "We are fundamentally decent, though peace-loving and compassionate, and we are, the overwhelming majority of us, people of faith, believers in a just and loving god." He ends with these words: You do not know what you just started. But you are about to learn."

Now it is two days that the military might of the United States is on the move to track the "bastards" through what has been called operation "Infinite - Justice." But do we know who these "bastards" were, and do we know what their motives could have been? I doubt it. Yet, it seems that many people already have the answer. The very influential Thomas Friedman writes (NYT September 14):

"The terrorists who hit the U.S. this week are people who pray to the God of Hate. Their terrorism is not aimed at reversing any specific U.S. policy. Indeed, they made no demands. Their terrorism is driven by pure hatred, nihilism, and its targets are the institutions that under gird America's way of life, from our markets to our military."

Friedman who is more seasoned and familiar with the region proposes a more "appropriate" strategy. One that has other "sophisticated" dimensions than military action. Politically he argues for taking sides with "the good guys" in the "civil war within Islam, between the modernists and the medievalists." I am sure we have all heard the demagogues, and not surprisingly some academics, to advocate such policies.

However, I would like to argue that both advocated policies are wrong, and would have catastrophic results. The crux of the matter is not that we are dealing only with some Islamic monsters, some Islamic good guys in the Middle East, and some decent people here. This is at the best is superficial and naïve, these are demagogic views of politicians, journalists and academics. The real problem is elsewhere. It is in politics, period. It is in American foreign policy, in the existence of states basing themselves on some sort of religious identity (Israel) or religious law (sharia), or highly influenced by it (the majority of them American clients) or run by dictators such as Saddam Hossein (who had the support of America in his war with Iran). So the remedy is not what we have seen so far. We should untangle the political development that we had seen in the last 50 or 60 years of this Pandora box called the Middle East and this needs serious rethinking.

We need to take the developments of last 10 days seriously and try to formulate a third voice against the madness of terrorism and stupidity of the military reaction, in defiance of religious obscurantism and a cowboy foreign, or for that matter, internal policy. A voice based on understanding, on precision, on cherishing human beings and human life, on defending the peace and liberty. In this venue, let me share some of my observations.

First: The allegation that the terrorists were direct operatives of Osama bin-Laden has yet to be backed up with more hard evidence. The actual fact is not clear yet. There is no single published document to verify that Osama bin-Laden had actually been behind the operation. Only officials have announced as such without providing any evidence. The published newspaper reports on this allegation are also shaky. Even yesterday's NYT calls him "The chief suspect." Only this morning CNN reported that a briefing of evidence would be given to the Pakistanis government.

Second: The terrorist profiles do not fit the profile of bin Laden's typical operatives, known as Afghans-Arabs (mostly are from peasant origins). If these terrorists were indeed bin-Laden operatives, then definitely we are witnessing a new generation of the Islamic terrorists. Let me take a look at the most obvious one. Mohammad Atta, apparently the main person of the group not was only highly educated, speaking fluent English and German, and had been seen drinking alcohol (he and Marwan al-Shehhi, another high-jacker, were drinking the night before the high jacking, but he had written an excellent masters thesis. According to Dietmar Machul, Dean of the Hamburg Technical University's where Mohammad attended from 1992-1999 and supervisor of his MA thesis, "Atta had been religious, prayed five times a day, and observed Ramadan, but he was not a fanatic. To the contrary, he was very critical and made thoughtful arguments. He advocated

peaceful coexistence of religions. The quarter of the city of Aleppo (Syria) where he wrote his MA thesis about was an excellent example of how Jews, Christians, and different Muslim groups lived together." Spiegel on line September 14[I am so grateful to Christiane Wilke (GF, political science) who kindly provided me with the English translation of different related German texts.] This is hardly what stands with ben Laden, Taliban, on the Sunni version of Islam and Khamenie on the version Shi'i of the faith. If the American authorities publish the text of what they have called "his suicide note," a part of this puzzle would be solved.

Third. American foreign policy in the Middle East up to very recently has been favoring and supporting Islamic political solutions. The policy in the later stages of the cold war was called "the green belt policy" (the green is the symbolic color of Islam). Some Examples:

-The CIA mobilization of the ulama (the religious scholars) in support of 1953 coup, leading to the overthrow of 1953 Iranian elected national government. The CIA by distributing money, staging "communist" demonstrations and passing false rumor of the possible take over of Iran by the communists, rallied the highest ranking ulama of Iran to support the military coup.

-Facilitation of emergence of Khomeinie as the undisputed leader of the Iranian Revolution. It could be argued, if it was not of direct American for that matter western intervention, the outcome of the Iranian Revolution would not have been what it turned out to be.

-The activation of relation with Afghani's Mujahedeen, including bin-Laden and supporting Taliban's taking power in Afghanistan.

Fourth. The main problem of the today's Middle East, or what invokes the recent wave of Islamism at large is the Israeli's refusal in recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian of forming their state in the 1967 occupied territories. The dangerous results of Netanyahu, Barak, and Sharon policies have been the unprecedented development of Islamism in the Arab world. It is perhaps important to remind that the formation of Hamas was facilitated with the Mossade's help as an alternative to the secular PLO.

Fifth. To reduce the danger of any further forms of religious extremism is to undo the entangled knots of the Middle Easto crisis and from there to de-sacrilize the on going battles over the sacred sites. I argue that this is only possible through the internationalization of Jerusalem, and I think that this could serve as a basis of a political solution for the on going crisis.

Let me end with an optimistic note. An old Persian proverb says if you plant wind you will harvest storm, let us try at least to plant hope for peace now. Perhaps, that is more likely lead to reduction of demagogy and of a better world for all of us.

From eg577@columbia.edu Mon Sep 24 13:26:05 2001
Date: Sat, 22 Sep 2001 22:30:41 -0400
From: eg577@columbia.edu
To: amsoc@columbia.edu
Subject: Stock-trading terrorists?

Bloomberg informs about possible terrorist involvement in high-profit stock-trading prior to the bombings. The kind of carefully calculated gambling the following article talks about, in my opinion, suggests the involvement of the dirty hands of an established corporate power, rather than a radical Islamic terrorist network. I hope the public will not be misinformed when they track down the source(s) of those transactions.

Emrah Goker, PhD candidate
Department of Sociology
Columbia University

Washington, Sept. 17 (Bloomberg) -- Trading skyrocketed in options that bet on a drop in UAL Corp. and AMR Corp. stock during the days before terrorists crashed hijacked United and American airlines jets into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter & Co., which occupied 22 floors of the 110-story 2 World Trade Center, and Merrill Lynch & Co., with headquarters near the destroyed twin towers, also experienced pre- attack trading of 12 times to more than 25 times the usual volume in so-called put options that profit when stock prices fall, according to Bloomberg data. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and German regulators today said they are investigating whether terrorists raised money from insider trading on their knowledge of attacks that devastated New York's financial district and closed U.S. stock markets for four days. "They not only set out to destroy capitalism, but also to beat us at our own game," said Duke University law professor James Cox. "These are people who hate capitalism and see that you can turn capitalism against itself." On the day before the Sept. 11 attack, for example, 1,535 contracts changed hands on options that let investors profit if AMR stock falls below \$30 per share before Oct. 20. That was almost five times the total number of those options traded before that day, according to Bloomberg data. AMR shares fell \$11.70 today to \$18. The per-share price of those October \$30 put options jumped to \$10.50 today from \$2.20 last Monday. 'Terrorist Involvement' Similarly, October \$30 put options for UAL soared, with 2,000 contracts traded on Sept. 6, three trading days before the attack compared with a total of 27 contracts before that day. A contract represents 100 shares. UAL stock fell \$13.32 today to \$17.50, and the price of put options, which profit if stock in United Airlines' parent falls below \$30, soared to \$12 per share from 90 cents on Sept. 6. "We've heard those reports about terrorist involvement in our markets," SEC Chairman Harvey Pitt said in a statement. "Our enforcement division has been looking into a variety of market actions that could be linked to these terrible acts including the subjects of the rumors." Trading records may help show whether Osama bin Laden or other terrorists were behind suspicious trading in airline, brokerage, and insurance stocks or options,

and may help securities regulators trace a money trail to some of those responsible for the attacks at the World Trade Center. Evidence of Murder Plans ``It's a matter of great interest to intelligence. To the extent we find this evidence, we shouldn't just focus on it as proof of insider trading but as evidence of a desire to commit murder and terrorism," said Columbia University law professor John Coffee. Deutsche Boerse AG spokesman Frank Hartmann said that exchange and German regulators also are examining trading in stocks, options, and futures before the Sept. 11 attack. On Sept. 6 and Sept. 7, trading almost doubled the average for the past six months in shares of Munich Re, the biggest reinsurer. Initial spot checks had found nothing irregular, Hartmann said. A spokeswoman for the Chicago Board Options Exchange declined comment. Japanese securities regulators also are examining trading patterns of Topix futures at the Tokyo Stock Exchange and Nikkei futures at the Osaka Stock Exchange, the Jiji news service reported, without citing sources. The prospect of insider trading based on knowledge of the attacks suggests a good deal of sophistication on the part of far-flung terrorist networks, which may have used U.S. markets to raise money for more assaults. `Sophisticated Strategists' ``It sure presents these people on a whole different level as sophisticated strategists rather than religious zealots," Coffee said. ``I suppose from their standpoint ... they're trying to pay for future terrorist activities by profiting from their past terrorist activities." At Morgan Stanley, trading in October \$45 puts jumped to 2,157 contracts from Sept. 6 to Sept. 10, almost 27 times a previous daily average of 27 contracts. Options to sell Merrill Lynch shares for \$45 apiece before Sept. 22 had 12,215 contracts traded from Sept. 5 to Sept. 10, 12 times the earlier daily average of 252. Morgan Stanley shares fell \$6.40 today to \$42.50. Merrill Lynch shares fell \$5.37 to \$41.48. Other brokerage and insurance companies where options trading surged include:

-- Bear Stearns & Cos., where investors traded 3,979 contracts from Sept. 6 to Sept. 10 on September options that profit if shares fall below \$50. The previous average volume for those options was 22 contracts. Bear Stearns shares fell \$3.79 today to \$46.45.

-- Marsh & McLennan Cos., the biggest insurance brokerage, which had 1,700 employees working in the World Trade Center. Traders on Sept. 10 exchanged 1,209 contracts on options that profit if company shares fall below \$90 through the third week of September. Previously, 13 contracts had traded on an average day. Marsh & McLennan shares fell \$2.50 today to \$84.50.

Date: Sat, 22 Sep 2001 21:32:58 -0500
From: Neta Crawford <ncrawford@polsci.umass.edu>

To: ct135@columbia.edu

Subject: Six Predictions about the Coming War and a 10 Step Program

I read your propositions and have some for you to consider. I am sure there is more to say, but these are my preliminary thoughts.

Six Predictions about the Coming War and a 10 Step Program

Domestic Politics

1. Even with dramatically increased manpower, resources, and invasions of privacy, it will prove impossible to prevent a committed terrorist from doing enormous damage in any industrialized and urbanized economy. The urban and industrial infrastructure and people of the US are too vulnerable to attack. I won't detail our many vulnerabilities, even though terrorists have surely already done so. The US government will attempt to provide enhanced security. Would be attackers will only use more inventive and potentially more deadly means of assault.

2. In the name of unity and patriotism, the critics of US domestic and foreign policy will face increasing pressure to follow the "party" line. The effects on open and critical debate may be quite severe in the form of self-censorship. Those in the government who propose alternative responses to terrorism besides the US of military force will be pushed aside in favor of those who urge a more militant response.

3. The US economy is likely to go into a much worse recession than predicted. This is so for several reasons. Government and private spending on unproductive activities (such as public and private security measures) will grow and these activities, especially military spending, generally produce fewer jobs than other sectors. Consumer spending, except on providing security, will decline overall. Investor confidence, which fueled the boom the 1990s will likely be shaken, except when it comes to investing in (relatively unproductive) security firms and military industries. As it already has, travel tourism will decline. One of the consequences of the recession will be that there will be fewer resources available for other programs and causes - environment, health, education, and welfare.

International Politics

1. The US will act militarily, diplomatically, and economically against terrorists and the states which are seen to harbor them. While in the short term, the world seems united against terrorism, over the medium and long term, the war will likely lead to

polarization. Why: Military actions to destroy terrorist camps and to find and capture terrorists will in cases where terrorists hide in urban areas, lead to significant casualties among innocent bystanders. The US has framed its war on terrorism as a crusade where god is not neutral.

2. Military actions by the US will likely promote greater military action by terrorists whose resolve will grow in the face of increased US presence and activity in the Islamic world, who seek revenge against US retaliation, and who are driven to prove that they too can cause the Superpower to react.

3. Military spending, weapons of Mass Destruction, and conventional forces will proliferate. Pressures will grow within Iraq, Pakistan, India, China and other states to acquire more military power as moderates are overshadowed by militants who seek to counter US hegemony. As the militants in these states acquire long range nuclear, chemical and biological weapons capability, the states neighboring those countries will also feel pressure to acquire weapons of destruction. Regional instability and perhaps wars will likely increase.

What to do? A Ten Step Program.

1. Face up to the fact that a potential terrorist is born every day and there is no protection against a determined terrorist assault. The only way to stop terrorism over the long run is to decrease the likelihood that individuals will feel that they must become a terrorist. This means reducing and eliminating reasons for people to resent the US and supporting moderates and democrats in places where terrorists may find fertile ground for fomenting hate.

2. Urge military restraint. Massive retaliation and/or sustained military assaults are unlikely to be effective since they will only stiffen the resolve of terrorists and increase sympathy and support for them in the places where terrorists are attacked.

3. Urge the use of alternative ways of dealing with terrorism that are more likely to be effective. The alternatives are: financial sanctions and tracking of criminals and terrorists; law enforcement (treat these actions as a crime, not an act of war); increased contact between peoples; rethinking US foreign policy so that it is not provocative. The best short term strategy may be economic. Terrorists need money and they get there cash from the illegal trade in drugs, diamonds, endangered species and so on. Put pressure on

governments and multi-national corporations to halt their participation or acquiescence in the trade of these substances.

4. Decrease our dependency on oil through conservation and the development of alternative sources of power. The oil interests and the naturally cautious will use the fear of a jihad and long term conflict with the oil rich states of the middle east to push the development of domestic oil fields, etc. But conservation and alternatives can go a long way to decrease dependency without jeopardizing our environment. And less dependency on foreign oil will decrease the likelihood that the US will fight or form unsavory alliances to keep access to foreign oil.

5. Urge our government to participate in and support multi-lateral institutions such as the UN and the International Criminal Court. These institutions are essential as venues for international dialogue and as alternative fora for US action. Over the long run, these venues may help prevent the US versus THEM rhetoric of the US becoming the reality.

6. Resist the pressures to conformity. Support those who ask critical questions about US domestic and military policy (by giving money or lending your voice). Respond against those who want to gin up the fear and who urge extreme measures. Speak out immediately against racism and other forms of discrimination.

7. Resist futile, expensive, and politically dangerous forms of "security" such as national missile defense. In the immediate future, we are much less likely to be subject to a long range nuclear attack than we are to a terrorist assault.

8. Support the arts and alternative media. Both will be important havens of alternative discourse and new ideas. Besides, we will need a little beauty.

9. Don't let the government, and private foundations, lose sight of our other concerns in terms of health, education, the environment, and the arts.

10. Form networks of information, support, and care in order to share information, guard against the feelings and effects of isolation and discouragement, and to enable joint action if that makes sense.

Neta C. Crawford
Visiting Associate Professor (Research)

Thomas J. Watson Institute for International Studies
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912

Office phone: 401 863-3067

On Leave from 2001-2002
Department of Political Science
Thompson Hall
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003

Office phone (413) 545-6187

From dgibson@wjh.harvard.edu Mon Sep 24 13:26:05 2001
Date: Mon, 24 Sep 2001 00:10:08 -0400
From: David Gibson <dgibson@wjh.harvard.edu>
To: amsoc@columbia.edu
Subject: network/organizational questions

I'm a new subscriber to this group, but most or all of the recent postings regarding the NYC/Pentagon attacks have been forwarded to me, and I believe I have a good idea of where the discussion stands. Most of this has been about the politics of any US-led attack on bin Laden and his supporters in Afghanistan, as well as some dialog about the degree of coordination behind last week's attacks. I leave the first of these to those more knowledgeable about the Middle East than I, while in terms of the second, I concur with the majority of commentators that the attacks are not likely to have been carried out absent centralized coordination. This point has been made time and again, however, and I don't intend to belabor it further.

I am more concerned here with pursuing some further questions of an organizational/network nature. The first concerns the question of who masterminded the attacks of Sept. 11th. While we have been promised firm evidence that bin Laden was responsible, at this writing the promise is all we have. What we have heard, repeatedly, is that the government is "trying to link the terrorists on the aircraft to bin Laden." Now, in network terms, this is very problematic: while it is possible that the path distance between bin Laden and myself is infinite in all networks of consequence - excluding, for instance, the who's-passed-whom on the street network - it is likely that in the world of Middle Eastern terrorists, everyone is connected to everyone else through relatively few degrees of separation, and as Duncan Watts has shown, this would be true even without any central nodes. Thus, linking the terrorists to bin

Laden is likely an easy affair given enough information as to who knows whom (or who is likely to have met whom at the training camps, for instance), but from this fact alone it does not follow that bin Laden is the mastermind behind the events of the 11th. (Apropos of which, I was surprised to learn that he denied responsibility for the attacks, which means either (a) he didn't do it, (b) he did do it but is trying to avoid suffering the consequences out of fear, or (c) he did it but has some grand strategy that does not require that he get credit at this stage; (b) and (c) are not mutually exclusive.)

My second remark concerns a 9/23 Times article, according to which many thousands of terrorists have been trained in the camps in Afghanistan, and deployed throughout the world to wreak havoc. Obviously, what's surprising is that so few of them have done anything of much consequence - especially given that the Times also conjectures that each cell is given wide discretion to determine the timing and nature of its attacks. This means either (a) the attacks of 2 weeks ago were the tip of the iceberg, with much more to come; or (b) the vast majority of trained terrorists never do much. (Both (a) and (b) may be true, of course, though if (b) is very true, (a) may be less so.) To the extent that (b) is true, it raises important questions about the conditions under which trained terrorists fall away from their chosen calling. (I am reminded here of work within criminology indicating that one's criminality decreases with one's age, which brings with it increased attachments as well mental and physical transformations.) It also suggests that bin Laden's (assuming it's him) approach is to train a lot of people under the assumption that only a few will actually prove to be of any use. Optimistically - and this is about as optimistic as I get - it means that closure of the training camps may be the most important thing we can do in the short term, for while there may be thousands of trained terrorists lurking about, most might amount to very little.

My third question/concern relates to the applicability of sociological theories of networks, organizations, and social influence to the question of how terrorism works. I fear that the applicability is very limited, though I hope that someone will convince me otherwise: most of the research in these areas has been conducted in the comfort of US (or European or Japanese) capitalism/democracy, with the result that the findings of network analysis are largely based on the study of undergraduate friendship networks and workplace relations; organizational theory is largely based on the study of capitalist firms and government agencies; and social psychology is largely the study of what undergraduates do in the laboratory. We should be surprised, consequently, if any of these perspectives tell us much about the matter at hand. But I hope others will take up the challenge and explain how those perspectives might be informative, and my relief at finding that

sociology is relevant will overwhelm any defensiveness I might feel at being proved wrong.

As I finish these last lines, I find that my Boston-bound train commands a view of the Manhattan skyline. A fitting place to conclude.

David Gibson

Assistant Professor
Dept. of Sociology
Harvard University

Date: Mon, 24 Sep 2001 10:31:53 -0400 (EDT)
From: Robert Y. Shapiro <rys3@columbia.edu>
To: Steven L. Solnick <sls27@columbia.edu>
Cc: POLS-GRAD@CUVMC.AIS.COLUMBIA.EDU
Subject: Re: Links related to 9/11, terrorism, Afghanistan, etc.

For the benefit of my students I've put together a list of links of news, commentary, analysis, documents etc related to the recent WTC attacks and the new "war on terrorism." It occurred to me that it may be of use to other faculty (or grad students) in the department, for their own use or to direct their students to. If you think so, please feel free to circulate the link as appropriate.

The page is at <http://www.columbia.edu/~sls27/911links.html>. I'm happy to receive any and all suggestions for additions to the page, as I'll try to keep it updated as time permits.

Thanks,

Steve