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Social work and terrorism
Voices of experience

Marilyn Callahan

Introduction

A bomb is detonated in a railway station. A politician is assassinated. A sniper kills shoppers in a mall. The first question on the mind of everyone: Is this a terrorist attack? If so, it is considered much more frightening and significant than if it were an individual acting alone, no matter the damage inflicted.

In the last few decades, terrorism has gripped the attention of Europe and North America (the West) accustomed to feeling relatively safe from disasters befalling other ‘less democratic’ ones. In North America, this complacency ended abruptly on 11 September 2001 shattering the notion that terrorism happened somewhere else to someone else. I was at home on a small gulf island in British Columbia, Canada when my phone rang around 10:00. It was my eldest daughter quickly assuring me that my other daughter, the one living two blocks from the World Trade Centre in Manhattan, was safe. She had slept in that morning and, rather than take the subway at the WTC station, she had taken a taxi to work. She and the taxi driver felt this enormous shudder and assumed it was an earthquake. In a way it was. It awakened many in the West to the fear of terrorism and its presence within seemingly protected places called home and country.

The terrorist attacks in Madrid (2004), London (2005, 2017), Paris (2015), Brussels (2016), and Nice (2016) reinforced this recognition among Western countries. Interestingly, terrorists committed to causes unrelated to the aims of Al-Qaida and the so-called Islamic State (Da’esh) (ISIS) have killed many more people since 1970 than these Islamic groups (Schwartz, 2016). But because they attacked Western nations, they have become the enemy to be vanquished.

Western countries have responded by expending enormous efforts and resources to combat terrorism, a unifying priority on a scale rarely seen. ‘The War on Terror’, declared by President George W. Bush in 2002, has made some advances but has also fostered many missteps and created unforeseen challenges. The mandate of a ‘War on Terror’ rather than on terrorists or terrorism is very broad, and without boundaries. It is a war against ‘both the dark forces that threaten civilisation and the fears they arouse’ (Nunberg, 2004).

In the midst of this, the efforts of social workers to combat the effects of terrorism at home and abroad remain largely unrecognised. Yet, social work has a great deal to contribute to
understanding and addressing international terrorism. This chapter aims to identify its contributions and amplify its voice.

To begin, I provide a critical analysis of the role of terrorism in shaping public policy, emphasising the central focus placed on dramatic problems compared to pervasive, yet relatively silent ones, such as poverty, a phenomenon familiar to social workers. The compromise of human rights and rise of prejudice and misinformation usually accompany such attention while more significant problems are ignored. Moreover, the collateral damage, not only to human life, the environment and ecology as featured in green social work, are rarely considered (Dominelli, 2012). Social work has a rich history with such analysis, albeit on problems of a different but related nature.

Further, social work has been at the forefront of addressing the kind of mayhem terrorist attacks create. While terrorism is viewed as a national and international issue, its immediate effects are local and it is here on the ground where social workers have made a significant contribution. However, responding to the complexities of terrorism is no simple task but fraught with contradictions, also familiar to social workers. Their rich experience in working with significant problems and their ambiguities is the focus of the remainder of the chapter.

**Terrorism: critical perspectives**

While terrorism is a slippery concept to define, there are some agreed characteristics (Hoffman, 2006). It is employed first and foremost as a political concept, the use of power to achieve political aims. It differs from war as it is not waged by nation-states against one another, nor does it follow the military or legal conventions of war. Instead, it relies upon random and covert acts of violence against symbolic targets, human or material. While random, it is not haphazard but employs carefully planned and selected sorties. It is often associated with those with less power as a way of disrupting dominant systems and avoiding capture. Like extremism it depends upon a strong bond among its adherents often forged through shared religious or ideological beliefs.

Terrorist acts feature specific strategies such as bombing, assassination, hijacking, kidnapping, extortion and the destruction of significant artefacts and lands. At its core, terrorism values actions above words. It is theatre, designed act by act, to inspire fear and disorganisation (Jenkins, 1985).

However, terrorism is a contested concept. Most recently in Europe and North America, it is used as shorthand to indicate organised fundamentalist Islamic group members insinuating themselves into societies, familiar or foreign, to carry out vicious attacks against these societies, all in the name of their mission (McCants, 2015).

However, what passes as terrorism depends on the eye of the beholder. When the Irish Republican Army bombed the Grand Brighton Hotel with the intention of killing Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher on 12 October 1984, many British citizens denounced this incident as another act of terrorism while those committed to an Irish Republic viewed it as a courageous strategy in the quest for Irish independence (English, 2013). Although this conflict was inspired in part by long-standing religious feuds (Catholic and Protestant) as well as geographical and political aims, Catholicism was not vilified in the same way that the Muslim religion has been in recent years. Defining terrorism depends upon one’s vantage point and power to control the message. Is it revolution, criminal actions, self-defence or terrorism? Are they freedom fighters, outlaws, insurgents or terrorists?

While we generally consider terrorism to be a strategy of the less powerful against powerful state forces, states themselves can use terrorism against their citizens. Famously Stalin, Hitler, Gadhafi, and other tyrannical leaders have used the tools of terrorism to gain and maintain
power. However, terrorism also occurs within states that are considered democratic or at least led by seemingly benign leaders. Miller (2013) notes how America marshalled legal and extra-legal systems in the 19th century to carry out terrorist acts against Indians including forced removal from ancestral lands, separation and murder of family members, incarceration, and the destruction of buffalo and horses, the economic base of the Cherokee and Crow. Much the same analysis has been applied to the experience of Afro Americans and other peoples colonised by democratic nations.

Another central misconception about terrorism committed by Al-Qaeda, ISIS and other similar groups is the focus upon ‘us’ versus ‘them’. According to this popular belief ‘us’ is defined as Christian Westerners, and ‘them’, as members of particular militant Muslim groups. It is Westerners in their crosshairs. Yet, the essential target for ISIS and others is not the West, but Muslims, Christians and others living in their own countries, who must join the movement through fear or admiration if the terrorists’ quest for a fundamental Islamic homeland is to be realised. The Global Terrorism Database estimates that in Iraq alone, from 2006 to 2015 there have been over 17,500 terrorist attacks resulting in over 52,000 deaths. In Western Europe during the same period, radical Islamic groups have killed less than 400 people (http://start.umd.edu/gtd/). However, by occasional attacks on the West and constantly striking within their own populations, radical Islamic groups hope to demonstrate both their power to those at home and their contempt for Western culture. Responses from the West such as civilian bombings and extra-legal incarcerations fuel terrorists’ causes.

Even though citizens have committed some terrorists’ acts against their own Western countries, this notion of the terrorists as ‘foreigners’ serves several purposes. An external enemy is important for unifying a population through fear and centralising its power structures. Once there was no longer a threat from ‘The Red Scare’, a fear of communists and their use of nuclear weapons that lasted until the fall of the Berlin wall in November 1989, military spending in Western countries fell significantly. In the US, the cutback was a bipartisan effort begun under the presidency of George H W Bush and continued by Bill Clinton (Adair, 2008). The changes in former communist controlled countries of Eastern Europe were even more profound where old oligarchies disappeared and liberal market related ideas took hold in many. However, since the ‘War on Terror’ in Western nations, military spending has ramped up, not by government alone but in partnership with for profit companies. Political parties of all stripes have to pay at least lip service to security and safety as a result of the fears that have been engendered by terrorist talk. Diminishing resources for social and environmental issues as well as less commitment to democratic processes is the end result (Dancs, 2011).

The use of terrorism to achieve political aims is certainly not a recent phenomenon in human history. The concept gained purchase with the ‘Regime de la Terreur’ of 1793–94 in France, following the French Revolution and was ironically initiated to ensure the orderly transition to a more democratic form of government (Hoffman, 2006). From this, the word ‘terror’ was adopted into the English language with its meaning of ‘fear so great as to overwhelm the mind’ (http:// etymonline.com). Many of the strategies employed by the leaders of the ‘Regime de la Terreur’ inform our ongoing definition of terrorism. Abualola (2013) provides an overview of the lengthy history of terrorism in Islamic countries, indicating its pervasive use among cultures and continents.

For social workers, a critical analysis of ‘terrorism’ has important implications. A focus on terrorism shifts the gaze away from the ongoing problems of local populations and the lack of resources to support improved conditions. Tensions within populations created by fear of terrorists introduce new problems that again distract from endemic ones. Assisting others to integrate into increasingly hostile environments is nothing new to social workers but made more daunting by unchallenged assumptions and chronic mistrust.
The response to terrorism: a multifaceted approach

In a show of international unity, the United Nations (UN) adopted a strategy to combat terrorism consisting of four pillars (United Nations Global Counter Terrorism Strategy, 2006):

- Addressing the conditions conducive to the spread of terrorism;
- Preventing and combatting terrorism;
- Building capacity and strengthening the role of the UN; and
- Ensuring human rights and the rule of law.

This framework serves as the guide for deploying efforts and measuring progress in the international struggle against all manifestations of terrorism. First, it includes broadly based strategies to change environmental factors conducive to promoting the terrorist narrative such as poverty, oppression and racial and religious intolerance. Next it focuses upon preventing terrorist activities by narrowing the gaze to those most likely to commit such acts and taking direct actions to prevent this occurrence. Third, it concentrates on ensuring that nation-states have the capacity to take independent actions. And finally, it requires that all actions take place within the framework of human rights and legal conventions.

This multifaceted strategy is a familiar approach to addressing large-scale problems such as poverty, addictions, HIV, criminal justice and others and has been widely used by many professionals including social workers. Applying theories based on ecology, oppression, systems, exclusion and others, the profession of social work has wrestled with a comprehensive approach to individual, group and social issues since its inception. Thus, from the outset, social workers have a mind-set and a knowledge and practice legacy to offer to the field of counter-terrorism (Itzhaky and York, 2005).

The ethical principles upon which social work is founded provide further support to the comprehensive strategy proposed by the UN (International Federation of Social Workers, 2012). The profession of social work condemns terrorism, given that it espouses violence, unlawful actions and intolerance among other characteristics. In their jointly owned ethical statement, the International Association of Schools of Social Work (IASSW) and International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) include an explicit clause stating, ‘Social workers should not allow their skills to be used for inhumane purposes, such as torture or terrorism’ (www.IFSW.org). This statement also includes a commitment to several international agreements including civil and political rights, human rights, economic social and cultural rights, and the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples.

However, social work has always been positioned at the crossroads of many contradictions when seemingly comprehensive and ethical actions are applied in practice. The following section identifies some of these conundrums and the experience of social workers in tackling them.

Preventing and combatting terrorism while honouring the law and human rights

The development of the Guantanamo Bay detention camp by the US administration in 2002 is an example of the complications that occur when attempts to mitigate the spread of terrorism in fact betray the principles of human rights and other international agreements. At the camp, so-called terrorists have been detained indefinitely without trial and subjected to torture (Clark, 2006). The US National Association of Social Workers Legal Defence Fund joined with others in their successful application to the US Supreme Court arguing that detainees in Guantanamo who are not American citizens nonetheless have a right to challenge the legality of their
detention in American courts of law (American National Association of Social Workers, 2004). In this case, the line between who are terrorists becomes blurred: those accused, or those on the other side who employ many of the tactics of terrorists in their fight against terrorism?

Similarly social workers have learned to struggle with their stance towards groups using terrorist methods in their fight for social justice (Ife, 2008). However, they have developed other approaches rather than transgress legal rights.

The African American Civil Rights Movement 1950–1970 provides a useful example. Social workers such as Whitney Young and Dorothy Height were prominent leaders in the movement and many other social workers, black and white, committed themselves to its goals and actions based on civil disobedience and non-violent actions. However, some within the movement argued for the use of arms for self-defence and challenged the commitment to non-violence. Malcolm X, a leader in the emerging Black Power movement, described the growing militancy: ‘There’s new strategy coming in. It’ll be Molotov cocktails this month, hand grenades next month, and something else next month. It’ll be ballots, or it’ll be bullets’ (Malcolm X, 12 April 1964). It is on this particular issue that movements often fracture. Indeed the American Civil Rights movement grappled with this tension throughout (Peniel, 2010).

The role of social work is not to abandon those advocating violence and lawlessness in their quest for social justice but to promote understanding of their position while not condoning unlawful actions. In this instance, social workers broadened the discussion, noting the use of terrorist tactics against Blacks over centuries and refocused on supporting the solutions advocated by the leaders in Black Power movement (Bell, 2014).

Those solutions focused on moving beyond the quest for equality in the ‘White’ world. Instead leaders sought recognition of the distinctive history and contributions of Black people and their capacity to provide for themselves as well as gain equal access to public programs. Advocates, including Black social workers, set up self-help measures such as school lunch programs, neighbourhood safety patrols and Black curricula (Bell, 2014). They also established the National Association of Black Social Workers with the aim of continuing Black solutions to Black issues (Reid-Merrit, 2010). Much was learned for other social movements. Militancy and non-violence can be powerful partners in creating social change.

Similarly, those seeking justice for Muslims living in the West and elsewhere have created their own ways of working alongside but separate from existing groups (Shamai, 2010). For instance the Islamic Social Services Association in Canada is similar to many other recently established groups, aiming to provide education and advocacy for those in the Muslim communities while at the same time offering social services (www.issacanada.com). Social workers working outside these groups seek to find spaces for them, provide links between them and mainstream services and work to reform mainstream services.

Standing with others while not condoning their behaviour

Social work has long played a role in promoting understanding of those who use violence against others, not only in their quest for social justice, but also for other unacceptable and unlawful reasons. Parents may murder their children and each other, a gang kills a gay person, people dealing drugs may kill one another or passers-by, a terrorist blows up a nightclub: all may be the clients of social workers.

The growth of social workers practicing as capital mitigating specialists in the US is a very dramatic example of the role that social workers play in standing for the least valued (Hughes, 2009). Hired as part of a legal team arguing for defendants who have committed often heinous crimes, social workers are charged with developing social histories to promote understanding
of the defendants’ behaviour. Their codes of ethics, focusing on social justice and the dignity and worth of the individual, as well as their perspectives on the individual within their personal, social and political context, provide social workers with particular competence (Berrigan, 2008).

Standing beside those such as murderers and terrorists who have committed highly unacceptable crimes against others without offering excuses for their behaviour remains a central task of social workers. As stated by the National Association of Social Workers in the US (2006) ‘Increasingly we are challenged to stand up for the rights and liberties of the unpopular, so that rights and protections will remain available for all, and in recognition of our common humanity’.

Preventing and combatting terrorism without exacerbating conditions fostering terrorism

An irony of no small insignificance is the fact that efforts to tackle a problem can also increase its likelihood of continuing to be a problem. Once social and economic conditions that foster the development of terrorist behaviour have been identified, the next logical step is to drill down to those populations most affected by these conditions, and then further, to those who actually commit terrorist acts. The characteristics of those individuals can be used to identify others. Some form of profiling is the usual outcome.

Social work has extensive although not illustrious history with profiling in criminal justice, child welfare and mental health (Swift and Callahan, 2009). Practitioners apply risk assessment instruments to determine whether a particular individual is likely to commit further criminal acts or to abuse or neglect their child, or be a threat to those in the community because of their behaviour. However, the reliability of these instruments has been called into question, based as they are on the very small numbers of individuals committing these actions and the uncertainty of measuring the impact of larger social forces. What has happened instead is that large numbers of individuals are captured in the profilers’ net, leading to wasted resources on needless investigations and stigmatisation of individuals with particular characteristics. Overall, these efforts can further the alienation of vulnerable groups, leading to their susceptibility to behaviour outside the law.

Most recently, this phenomenon has played out in the growth of Islamophobia, where those of the Muslim faith are stereotyped as tribal, dangerous and sexist (Lavalette and Penketh, 2014). The Prevent strategy in the UK is an example of an apparently laudable aim tied to a limited strategy with the distinct potential to harm those innocent of wrongdoing, particularly young Muslim men. Under Sections 36 to 41 of the new Counter-Terrorism and Security Act (2015) social workers among others are required to report individuals exhibiting particular characteristics first and then attempt to provide them with support. Not surprisingly this strategy places social workers in the position of quasi-police officers, making their offers of help a two-edged sword. Moreover many can be identified as ‘potential’ terrorists by virtue of their race, neighbourhood, or associations who have no such inclination. Social workers have argued that in the area of ‘pre-crime’ more effective strategies are not aimed primarily at the investigation of individuals. Instead, challenges to the discourse of terrorism based upon research and facts and community organising against hate and exclusion are more useful (Stanley, 2015).

Advocating for the human rights of terrorists while standing up for the rights and needs of their victims

One of the ongoing conundrums of crime prevention and criminal legal systems is that the resources spent on these activities vastly outweigh those directed at victims of crime. Indeed, the United Nations Global Terrorism Strategy, 2006) is silent on the victims of terrorism.
Estimates of the costs of the wars in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan and Pakistan conclude that the US has spent US$4.8 trillion (about US$300 billion annually to 2016) with costs continuing to rise as veterans services and interest on the debt are factored in over time (Crawford, 2016). These wars were mounted with the stated aim of eliminating terrorist organisations and their governments. While there are no figures for the US expenditures on resettling the victims of these wars, an OECD report compares annual expenditures on refugee resettlement in 2015 among its members, with the US totalling US$1.56 billion (.01 per cent of GDP).

Social workers experiencing this reality in other fields of practice have taken leadership in the development of victim services, including those for battered women, sexual assault victims and others. Similarly, they are on the front lines of working with those most affected by terrorism and counter-terrorist efforts. For example, the President of the International Federation of Social Workers, Ruth Stark, reports on the role of social workers in the large refugee camps in Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey where meeting the very basic needs of survival such as clean water and food and even modest shelter are ongoing priorities (Hardy, 2016). Saeed (2013) portrays the arduous conditions in Syria where, in the years before the civil war, social workers worked in schools to offer individual and community services. Now those same schools are used for shelters and hospitals and are shuttered to education. Violence and sexual assault, children without parents or schools, chronic hunger and fear prevail within and outside the shelters.

Supporting victims of terrorism and other crimes requires action beyond immediate individual needs. Social workers have consistently argued for the broader rights of victim groups including reparations for loss of families, social systems, economic activities and environmental ruin (Dominelli, 2012).

While the millions of refugees fleeing countries decimated by terrorism such as Somalia, Syria and Afghanistan face untold hazards and reluctant receptions from other nations, the toll on social workers attempting to assist them is also heavy. The overwhelming and unremitting nature of the need without adequate resources to meet even basic requirements is professionally and personally debilitating. Perhaps most difficult of all for victim-survivors and social workers alike is dealing with the profound grief of those left behind and the uncertainty of the fate of friends, family and clients (Fraidlin and Rabin, 2006). That social workers are serving on the ground in spite of these appalling situations is a tribute to the profession and its members (British Association of Social Workers, 2013)

Addressing stereotypes and exclusion while settling newcomers

Vastly more persons have been displaced by the impact of terrorism than have been killed or injured (Global Terrorism Data Base, 2016). The more than 1 million Syrian refugees who came to Europe in 2015 have presented those countries with challenges of an almost unprecedented nature. European countries have not seen this level of migration since the years after World War Two and such an influx has provoked strenuous reactions of both support and rejection from residents.

Social work has a lengthy experience in dealing with stigma by employing individual, group and community approaches to force open the boundaries that deny membership to others (Shamai, 2010). One of the historical roots of Western social work, emanating in the slums of London during the 19th century, is the Settlement House Movement and the subsequent development of community organising (Healy, 2008). As waves of immigrants entered the US and Canada in the 19th and 20th centuries, social workers were at the forefront of developing community gathering places where newcomers and locals could collaborate. Over time, these
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efforts have developed into government and not-for-profit immigrant and refugee services still largely staffed by social workers.

This legacy continues. Social workers in those Western countries accepting the influx of refugees as a result of terrorist activities are taxed daily to provide quickly a wide range of refugee services, including community acceptance strategies and changes to mainstream social services (Australian Association of Social Workers, 2016, Islamic Social Services of Canada, 2017). They face dramatic attempts to limit entry of refugees to European and North American countries, none more notorious than that of the US where a failed Executive Order, issued by the president on 27 February 2017, aimed to limit entry to the US, in particular from seven predominantly Muslim countries. The National Association of Social Workers wasted no time in condemning this action, issuing a response on 1 March 2017 (Wilson, 2017). It states:

Our national priority should be to find ways, within reasonable national security policies, to welcome refugees – not deny them sanctuary. We should also be reminded that many of the refugees from Muslim countries became displaced because of wars in which the United States has participated.

Questioning the importance of terrorism while not disregarding it: spectacular problems and chronic issues

Terrorism is one of these spectacular problems with little immediate effect within Western countries, yet with the capacity to commandeer vast resources and public attention. It speaks to a need for storytelling in the media with the narrative unfolding in daily missives and the intense desire for self-preservation among policymakers. At the root of this phenomenon is the appeal of narratives that combine a mixture of excitement and fear fed daily to the public waiting for the next instalment. As I write this on 25 February 2017, the newly appointed terrorist watchdog in Britain, Max Hill, is warning that the threat of terrorism in the UK is the highest that it has been since the IRA bombings of the 1970s and 1980s (Rily-Smith, 2017). The fact that there is a terrorist watchdog with a pulpit from which to make such pronouncements is evidence of the appeal of this narrative.

World hunger, appalling death rates from easily preventable diseases and other such calamities simply do not capture the same attention. While estimates vary, about one in nine persons worldwide do not have access to food for healthy development. Most of these people live in developing countries in Asia and Africa, with the highest percentage of hunger in Sub-Saharan Africa (one in four persons). It is estimated that about half of the children under five years who die each year (3.1 million) do so because of poor nutrition (World Hunger, 2016). Terrorism and its aftermaths simply add to the hunger of those geographical regions where agricultural lands are destroyed and farm workers are killed or have fled.

Social workers have long been aware that the most vexing problems confronting individuals are not necessarily the issues of most concern to policymakers and the general public. Child welfare illustrates visibly this anomaly. When a child is murdered or harmed at the hands of a parent or caregiver, a public uproar ensues and often blame is placed on social workers. Policymakers quickly order public inquiries and tighten child protection policies, usually resulting in yet more administrative work for social workers and precious little improvements in the safety of children (Swift and Callahan, 2009). This phenomenon is evident in other areas. A person accused of a violent crime while on parole or after release from a mental health facility sparks similar reactions.
Yet these deaths or injuries, while horrifying, are rare. Daily, social workers confront the reality of children living in grim circumstances without adequate food, shelter, healthcare or guidance yet they can muster little attention for these conditions even when they try to make them a public issue.

Social workers have learned to act immediately and think long term in such circumstances. A terrorist bomb shatters a town square. Social workers and others must provide emergency aid and recovery operations. But second, they must consider the longer-term impact of that act: damage to the water supply, the loss of key leaders, the fleeing of citizens, the divisions that will be created within the community and so forth. The meaning of the act and the motivation of the terrorists both at an individual and community level must be explored and acted upon. And third, the focus on routing out terrorism in the community, while important, cannot overshadow the crucial issues long facing the community. Thinking and acting on these three dimensions is the professional skill of social work.

Conclusion

Terrorism may seem like a fairly recent phenomenon to those in Western countries, but in fact it has a lengthy history and shares much in common with other significant international problems. Social work has a long tradition and vast experience in dealing with complex and daunting problems, similar to the ones created by terrorists and has much to contribute to the field of counter-terrorism. A fundamental skill of social work is to look beyond currently held assumptions about any particular issue to provide critical analysis and new perspectives. Terrorism is one of those concepts that requires a thorough review, since it has been used as a foil for costly political and military misadventures. Critical analysis is one contribution that social work can make.

Social work has a rich tradition of viewing responses to social problems on an individual and larger social systems level, an approach used by the UN in developing its counter-terrorism response. As with any complex problem, counter-terrorism is fraught with contradictions and social work is no stranger to carrying out its work in the midst of cross currents, using as its touchstone a commitment to social justice and legal processes.

Addressing terrorism with action is another contribution. Social workers are active in the field of counter-terrorism in their own countries in the West offering emergency services to those affected by local terrorist attacks, concrete services to those fleeing terrorism in their homelands and confronting the misperceptions and prejudices that arise and that threaten the cohesion of their communities and nations. While less is known about the social workers who work in those countries torn apart by the terrorist activities, it is clear that they are struggling against all odds and that the resources of the West have been concentrated on military rather than humanitarian responses.

This chapter has focused on terrorism as an international issue that demands an analysis not only of its political, social and economic dimensions but on its destruction of the physical environment and the connections among all of these dimensions, the founding principle of green social work. Whole nations are destroyed and their populations scattered. Cultures are decimated. Untold environmental disasters are left unattended. Moreover, while narrow conceptions of terrorism prevail, significant problems like poverty worldwide and environmental catastrophes that existed long before terrorism caught the West's attention fall even further down the priority list. It is in these contexts that the voices and actions of social workers are crucial. Swimming against the stream is nothing new. The then-prime minister of Italy summed
up succinctly the central message of this chapter: ‘To fight terrorism, we need social workers as much as soldiers’ (Renzi, 2016).
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