

or individual level.¹⁴ In some cases, groups may choose to participate in politics following a peace settlement with the government. This could be because structural conditions have changed, such as a transition from authoritarianism to democracy. In addition, nonviolent groups may temporarily use terrorism in response to a specific event or events and then return to nonviolence. In France, for example, left-wing groups, such as the Totally Anti-War Group (Association Totalement Anti-Guerre, or ATAG), briefly resorted to terrorism to protest the U.S. war in Afghanistan in 2001 but then returned to nonviolence. Some argue that a wide range of variables can affect a group's willingness to turn to nonviolent means, such as the group's organizational structure (hierarchical organizations may be more likely to negotiate than networked groups) and the nature of public support for the cause (groups with more-ambivalent support networks may be more likely to compromise).¹⁵

Finally, some groups end once they attain *victory*.¹⁶ That is, terrorist groups may abandon terrorism because their objectives have been achieved. There are several historical examples: the Irgun Zvai Leumi in Israel, the Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston (EOKA) in Cyprus, and National Liberation Front (Front de Libération Nationale, or FLN) in Algeria. As Bruce Hoffman argued,

Although governments throughout history and all over the world always claim that terrorism is ineffective as an instrument of political change, the examples of Israel, Cyprus, and Algeria . . . provide convincing evidence to the contrary.¹⁷

Some terrorist groups, such as the Irgun, EOKA, and FLN, may play a direct role in achieving victory, though terrorism alone is rarely suf-

¹⁴ Crenshaw (1996, pp. 266–268); USIP (1999).

¹⁵ Cronin (2006, pp. 25–27).

¹⁶ Ross and Gurr (1989, p. 408); Dershowitz (2002); Pape (2005); Lake (2002); Kydd and Walter (2006); USIP (1999).

¹⁷ Hoffman (2006, p. 61).