Introduction

This introductory chapter deals with brief history of terrorism and the different types of terrorism and how its different forms and manifestations affect the peace of the world. It also presents some of the various attempted definitions of the term terrorism. This chapter also highlights the problem of defining terrorism and the reasons for not having an accepted definition.

The meaning of the term “terrorism” is dynamic and always changes with the change of circumstances. It is a controversial term that is generally applied to one’s enemies and opponents. Terrorism is not a recent phenomenon, since antiquity it was present in the world. It has been the cause of myriad violent events that occurred around the world. Terrorism encompasses violence and intimidation and is assumed as a phenomenon which can be employed for achieving political aims. As the concept of terrorism fulfills multiple functions, the better way to think of terrorism is not as a crime but different dimension of crime, a higher, more dangerous version of crime, a kind of super-crime incorporating some of the characteristics of warfare.

Terrorism is purely a subjective term, because those who use terrorism as a weapon for the attainment of their objective, they may be called as ‘freedom fighters, ‘holy warriors’ or ‘revolutionaries’ depending on the objective they wanted to achieve, as the famous saying goes, “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter”. One group engaged in some violent activity may be labeled as terrorist, while another group for the same act may be called freedom fighter or legitimate revolutionaries. The goal of terrorist is to take revenge with vengeance from those whom they regard as impediment in the achievement of their target. In pursuance of their goals they adopt varied tactics such as kidnapping, hijacking, blackmail, ruthless killings by shooting and use of bombs, suicide bombing etc. Today’s terrorists are armed with most sophisticated weapons, and are competent enough to destroy targets with high degree of success like solar energy, powered land mines, anti-aircraft guns, missiles, AK-47 and AK-56 and remote controlled explosives.
With the advancement of technology and communication the approach and reach of terrorists has become worldwide or global. Their global network provides them capacity to do violent activities in more than one country at a time. They have developed overseas network unlike traditional terrorists who generally act in some specific areas. Through their violent activities they strive to subvert a political system of the country as well as peaceful life of individuals. Terrorists often targets civilians instead of main target and try to cause as much casualties as they can through suicide bombings and other explosives.

Although terrorism has had a long history and is a serious threat to the whole world, nevertheless, it has become a focus of attention after September 11, 2001 attacks on the “World Trade Centre” in New York, U.S.A. and “Pentagon” in Washington D.C. respectively that shook not only the U.S. but the entire world. After these deadly attacks on American soil the U.S. has declared “War on Terrorism”.

The word terrorism comes from the French word ‘terrorisme’ during 18th century, based on Latin language verbs ‘terrere’ (to tremble) and ‘dettere’ (to frighten). It was actually used to describe state terror i.e. the reign of terror which prevailed in the post revolutionary France.\footnote{In 14th century the word ‘terrorism’ entered into western vocabularies through the French language. It was first used in English in 1528.}\footnote{Thus, the modern terrorism derives its origin from the epoch of French revolution (1789-1795) and the Jacobins dictatorship that used terror as an instrument for political oppression and social control. Such type of terrorism was an example of “state terrorism”.}

Brief History of Terrorism

The history of terrorism is as old as the human civilization itself, but the meaning of terrorism has undergone many changes from past to the present time. Earlier the killing of tyrant ruler was not included in the category of terrorism. In the distant past many of the great thinkers had justified the killing of tyrant rulers and considered it as the civic duty to halt the autocratic rule of the despot. The Greek thinkers, especially Aristotle, had shown several examples where he justified the
assassination of tyrant rulers and have argued that because of their tyrant behaviour they deserved their end. In his book ‘Politics’ Aristotle has said that:

There are two chief motives which induce men to attack tyrannies hatred and contempt. Hatred of tyrant is inevitable, and contempt is also frequent cause of their destruction. Thus we see that most of those who have acquired have their power, but those who have inherited have lost it, almost at once, for living in luxurious ease, they have become contemptible, and offer many opportunities to their assailants. Anger too, must be calculated under hatred, and produces the same effects. It is often times even more ready to strike the angry are more impetuous in making an attack, for they do not listen to reason. And men are very apt to give way to their passions when they are insulted.

The killing of tyrant was considered as a heroic act, for example, Brutus, the assassin of Roman emperor Julius Caesar was regarded as hero. ‘Cicero’, the Roman political thinker had also justified the killing of tyrant ruler and he wrote that:

There can be no such thing as fellowship with tyrant, nothing but better feud is possible... for, as we amputate a limb in which blood and the vital spirit have ceased to circulate, because it injures the rest of the body, so, monsters, who, under human guise, conceal the cruelty and ferocity of a wild beast should be severed from the common body of humanity.\(^3\)

These two quotations explicitly elucidates that both the political thinkers Aristotle and Cicero had excluded those people from the category of terrorist, who had killed tyrant rulers, and have argued that the assassinated tyrant rulers deserved their fate.

In the 1\(^{st}\) century the Jewish Zealots also called as the ‘Sicarii’, or dagger man was the earliest known terrorist organization. They revolted against the Roman and their motive was to prohibit their rule over Judea (now Israel). In 20 A.D, the revolt of Zealot became open, and they were finally besieged and committed mass suicide at the fortification of Masada.\(^4\)

The next group was that of ‘Assassins’ who emerged in the 11\(^{th}\) century C.E. in Persia and was an offshoot of Nizari Ismailis. This group was led by Hassan-i-sabbah, who adopted the method of ‘assassination’ to assassinate enemy leaders. Their dramatically executed assassinations of political figures terrified their contemporaries.
Eventually this group of Assassins was exterminated by Mongol invaders. Some of their practices were akin to contemporary terrorism that is, all the members of the organization maintain secrecy among themselves, and they try to disseminate their convictions among the populace. These two practices are generally followed by modern terrorist groups.⁵

There were huge lists of terrorist groups which emerged in different periods of history and used varied tactics to sponsor their acts of terrorism. Some terrorists are motivated by an idea of how religious society should be established, some groups are dissatisfied with the policies of the government and fight to set up a different form of government of their choice, while some others want to institute a separate country for their nationality or ethnic group. Therefore, the terrorist groups fall into different categories that followed different tactics and have different motives, such as state sponsored terrorism, political terrorism, national or ethnic independence movements, and religious terrorism. Although there are different categories of terrorism, the tactics of each one of them are same to achieve their objectives that are to generate fear among the masses.

Earlier the driving force behind terrorism was not only religion, there were enlightenment and other intellectual movements which contributed to the spread of terrorism which were carried out to challenge the divine rights of kings and to establish the political system which was based on equal rights for all. The 18th and 19th century terrorists revolted against the system in which few people are rich and the rest are deprived and poor. Besides targeting the hereditary rulers and representatives for assassination by terrorist, the revolutionary governments itself targeted their own citizen and commenced brutal attacks against them, which resulted in infinite number of deaths.⁶

**The Roots of Terrorism**

Terrorism is the use of violence and fear to influence others and to control their behaviour. This means has been used all through human history, by warlords, emperors, gangsters, priests, preachers, racists, financial magnates, kidnappers etc. in many cases it is a great of violence rather than the act itself that paralyzes
the victims. Terrorism is different from other form of violence such as war or guerilla operations and should not be mistaken in that way.

Many of the scholars believe that the key word to define the concept of terrorism is violence. Factually, word ‘violence’ originated in Latin word (vis). Violence is defined by the World Health Organization “as the intentional use of physical force or power threatened or actual, against a person, or against a group or community that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation.”

The modern global terrorism transcends the boundaries of violence and has taken more dangerous shape which is beyond imagination. The terrorism of global reach varies strongly from preceding terrorist attacks and other forms of violent struggles which are clearly shown in the table presented below.

Table 1: Characteristics of Terrorism, Guerilla and Conventional War as a Mode of Violent Struggle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conventional War</th>
<th>Guerilla</th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit in Size Battle</td>
<td>Large (armies, corps, divisions)</td>
<td>Medium (platoons, companies, battalions)</td>
<td>Small (usually less than ten persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>Full range of military hardware (air force, armour, artillery etc.)</td>
<td>Mostly infantry type light weapons but sometimes artillery pieces as well</td>
<td>Hand guns, hand grenades, assault rifles and specialized weapons, e.g., car bombs, remote control bombs, barometric pressure bombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactics</td>
<td>Usually joint operations involving several military branches</td>
<td>Commando type tactics</td>
<td>Specialized tactics: kidnapping, assassinations, car bombing, hijacking etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 2

#### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mostly military units, industrial and transportation infrastructure</th>
<th>Mostly military, police and administration staff, as well as political opponents</th>
<th>State symbols, political opponents and public at large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Intended Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Physical destruction</th>
<th>Mainly physical attrition of the enemy</th>
<th>Psychological coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Control of Territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Uniform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wear uniform</th>
<th>Often wear uniform</th>
<th>Do not wear uniform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Recognition of War Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>War limited to recognized geographical</th>
<th>War limited to country in strife</th>
<th>No recognized war zones. Operations carried out zones worldwide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### International Legality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes if conducted by rules</th>
<th>Yes if conducted by rules</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


The analysis shown above is general as well as limited; it has some functional points. Violence should be understood as the principal means of terrorism, and this kind of action does not necessarily take the shape of physical violence; we could certainly concede that violence can manifest differently: physically, psychologically and also symbolically. The feature that must be taken into account in our analysis is however that the phenomenon of violence linked with terrorism has varied effects over the political environment.8

About the origin of violence there are at least two contradictory standpoints. On the one hand some of the scholars stress that the origin of violence in intrinsic. For example, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), Niccollo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Ibn Khuldnun (1332-1406), and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), believe that violence among human beings is natural and innate. On the other hand, some others believe that the violence is not in human nature. Some like Eric Seligmann Fromm (1900-1980),
Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Anthony Giddens believe that violence is something which is not planned.

Hypothetically there are in numerous ways to categorize politically motivated violence. However, with the criteria of utility and stinginess in mind, a basic categorization relates to the initiator of violence and to its target, differentiating between states and citizens is presented in table below.

**Table 2: A Basic Classification of Political Violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Full scale war; belligerent; activity in peace time, e.g. cloak and dagger operations and punitive strikes</td>
<td>Law enforcement Legal and illegal oppression state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens</td>
<td>Guerilla; insurgent terrorism; coup d’état; Leninist Revolution</td>
<td>Vigilante terrorism; ethnic terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**International Terrorism**

The form of terrorism which has international features is described an international terrorism. But the problem of definition remains elusive and until now there is no internationally agreed upon definition of international terrorism. In spite of the fact that the international organization such as United Nations and other multilateral agreements have not been able to reach harmony over the nature and content of terrorism, there are scholars who have made several endeavours to define international terrorism and also attempted to distinguish it from domestic or local terrorism. The most interesting thing about terrorism is that, scholars are not disagreed about the national or international character of terrorism but over its precise meaning.⁹
The violence which is politically motivated and inside the boundaries of a particular state perpetrated by and directed against the inhabitants of the same state is generally regarded as domestic terrorism. Alternatively, terrorism engaging the citizens or territory of more than one country is viewed as international terrorism.\textsuperscript{10}

The repeated use of politically motivated violence with coercive intent by non-state actors, affect more than one state.\textsuperscript{11}

Bassiouni argues that in order to be considered international, terrorism should reflect an international component, be directed against an internationally protected target, or violate an international norm.\textsuperscript{12} He also goes on to particularly mention international elements in acts of terrorism, the targets which are protected internationally, and the international norms pertinent to terrorism.\textsuperscript{13}

According to Badey there are five important elements (repetition, motivation, intent, actors, and effect) of international terrorism to differ it from other kind of terrorism.\textsuperscript{14}

Terrorism even at national level has international implications. Sometimes, in order to get the attention terrorist target foreigners to force the national government to do or abstain from doing something. The techniques and ways adopted by the terrorist at the local level becomes international terrorism in several cases. For example, the hijackings of airline or assaulting the diplomats and persons from international organizations qualify to be regarded as international terrorism. Furthermore, terrorism at any stage cannot continue for long unless it gets moral, political and even logistic encouragement from some states. As a matter of fact terrorism has become effective and safe weapon in the hands of states to deal with their opponents. This is the main cause that many experts regarded terrorism as nothing short of war. Several nations have engaged in proxy war against their rivals by supporting terrorist groups in enemy countries. May be, this is the most significant reason that the United Nations has not been able to define terrorism in unambiguous terms.\textsuperscript{15}
State Sponsored Terrorism

Governments frequently become the targets of terrorists or the government itself promotes terrorism. The two broad definitions of ‘state sponsored terrorism’ are: one refers to “government that support or conduct terrorism against other government”. The other refers to “government that conducts terrorist acts against their own citizens.” French revolution was an example of such state sponsored terrorism in which the government sponsored terrorist acts against their own citizens. After the execution of King Louis, Maximilien Robespierre, establish the committee of public safety and the Revolutionary Tribunal which marked the beginning of his regime ‘de la terreur’ from May 1793 to July 1794. He employed violence, including the brutal methods of executions by guillotine, in order to enforce obedience to the state and to intimidate the enemies of the regime.

The growth of state terrorism is the most disturbing aspect of terrorism. When state is directly or indirectly engaged in an act of terrorism for the accomplishment of certain goals, may be a matter of policy, the act is termed as state terrorism. The state’s involvement in such acts may be in various ways and in varied degrees. For example, the authorities of state may commit this act in respect of some of its citizens living inside or outside the territory in order to intimidating them, or against colonialism, or against national liberation movement. Moreover, an act may be committed by the state by way of giving support to the latter. State sponsored terrorism has its origin in varied causes, viz. colonialism, socialism, obscurantism, political prosecution, human rights violation, economic exploitation, unemployment, alienation, communication gap and overall, moral decay of society. “Violence breeds violence and when violence shouts, reason becomes dumb and deaf.” Therefore, terrorist acts of individual or group of individuals always result in loss of life, limb and property to a certain extent, sometimes the loss is big and another times time it was less. But state sponsored terrorism result in huge loss of life and property as it was evident from the cases of invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq.

After the attacks on World Trade Centre in New York City and pentagon near Washington, D.C. on September 11, 2001, U.S. State Department presented a list of seven countries—Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan and Cuba as sponsors of
terrorism. These countries were accused by the U.S. government of being the “most active state sponsors of terrorism in 2001”. They directly involved in planning terrorist acts as well as provided support to other fundamentalist organizations, for example, Iran supported many fundamentalist Islamic organizations such as Hamas, Hezbollah and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Iraq permitted several terrorist organizations to settle their offices in Baghdad which includes ‘Abu Nidal organization’, ‘The Palestinian Liberation Front’ etc. On December 21, 1998, Pan Am Flight 103, a Pan American world Airways flight bombarded by Libyan Abdel Baset al-Megrahi over the Scottish town of Lockerbie wherein 259 people were killed in the plane and 11 on the ground. As a consequence economic sanctions were imposed by United Nations and the U.S against Libya. In the same way North Korea, Sudan and Cuba also allowed the terrorist organizations to establish their headquarters in their country, and their territories were allowed to use as a hideout for the terrorist.19

The use of terror tactics by the state is the part of foreign policy and it become legitimate if it is used by the powerful state but the same act is condemned and termed as terrorist act if it is conducted by the weaker state for example Germany’s bombing of London and U.S. atomic destruction of Hiroshima during World War II were the examples of using terror tactics by the state.

**Religious Terrorism**

Religion is one the most strong forces that can influence the behaviour of human being. Due to varied religious beliefs societies have quarreled with each other. Many people and the number of groups used the tactics of terrorism in the name of religion for achieving their violent objectives which led to innumerable deaths and murders. On religious grounds many terrorist groups justify their violence and have been killing innocent civilians since hundreds of years with the anticipation to either disseminate or coerce their religious beliefs and viewpoints.

‘Zealots’ and ‘Assasins’ were the earliest known examples of religiously motivated terrorist groups which used the tactics of terrorism to attain their violent objectives. In India a group known as ‘Thugs’ terrorized travelers and
brutally murdered them as oblation to their goddess ‘Kali’, “the Hindu goddess of destruction”.20

Gunpowder plot or papacy plot was another example of religious terrorism who’s well known member Guy Fawkes and his colleagues justified their act in the name of religion. They unsuccessfully attempted to blow up the London’s House of Parliament in 1605, but was captured and killed ruthlessly. He and his colleagues plotted such event in order to make Roman Pope supreme in England, who was earlier replaced by the king with the help of Parliament.21

Contemporary religious terrorism has been more destructive and brutal than the earlier terrorist movements. Religiously motivated terrorist sometimes used religion as the paramount goal or sometimes in amalgamation with other factors. The modern terrorism may have the following three traits:

i. The perpetrators must have used religious scriptures to justify their violent acts or to gain recruits.

ii. Clerical figures must be involved in leadership roles.

iii. Apocalyptic images of destruction are seen by the perpetrators as a necessity.

There is a big difference between the traditional terrorist groups and the modern religious terrorists. The traditional terrorist groups have not adopted the policy of mass killing, like the modern religious terrorist groups or particularly those groups who fight to set up Islamic government such as Al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, they justify their violence on Islamic groups. These groups called themselves as “holy warriors” engaged in a holy war that is Jihad—“and may believe that God wants them to kill ‘unbeliever.”22

The leader of Al-Qaeda, one of the Islamic terrorist organization, Osama Bin Laden, who was a prime accused for planning September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon, issued a fatwa on 23rd February 1988, “that announced the setting up of a world Islamic front for Jihad and declared that it is the duty of all Muslims to kill U.S citizens—civilians or military, and their allies everywhere.” The barbarous language of ‘Fatwa’ explicitly shows the callous nature of the movement. They had also perpetrated huge amount of brutal mass
killing in Kenya, Casablanca, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and the number of other countries.\(^{23}\)

The growing influence in the Muslim world, which is against Islamic practices and beliefs, may spawn religious terrorism on a massive scale. But it is wrong to say that Islam have a monopoly on religious terrorism, as evidenced by Aum Shinrikyo, a Japanese religious group which was founded by Shoko Ashara, they believed that those who were not included in their group have to die, because it is the final judgment of God, which was put into practice by them. This group made several abortive attempts of biological terrorism by using botulin toxin and anthrax spores.\(^{24}\)

**Political Terrorism**

One of the tactics employed by terrorists to gain publicity for their violent act is to politicize it and to develop fear psychosis among the masses. Through intimidation, kidnapping, bombing, killing, hijacking, and subversion they contrive to change the existing political system. They generally attack innocent civilians because they are easily accessible than their ultimate target that is, political leaders, diplomats, ministers and other dignitaries, but their act become political when their objective is to kill political leaders and to devastate the political institutions in order to defame the government concerned.\(^{25}\)

Political terrorism can be thought of as the use of violence by group acting either on behalf of, or in opposition to, an established authority by causing panic, destruction, distrust and demoralization among the people at large. Thus, the range of such activities covers cases of hijacking of buses and planes, taking of any person as hostage, abduction of the leaders or their family members, assassination of heads of states or governments or of important political personalities, explosion of bombs to destroy public buildings and kill innocent people living or assembled therein and the like.\(^{26}\)

Anarchism was considered as one of the ways of organizing society after the social changes brought about by Industrial revolution. Anarchism in the second half of the 19\(^{th}\) century was associated with bombings and political assassination in Europe.\(^{27}\) Anarchist generally target hereditary rulers and their representative,
in order to end their rule. Some of the anarchists’ propagated their cause through publishing newspapers and by giving speeches while some others become terrorist. One of the anarchist ‘Karl Heinzan’ published ‘Der Mond’(murder), in which he vindicate political murder, ‘Farenheit’ was a newspaper published by ‘John Most’ which comprises his “Advice for terrorist,” in which he asked, “What is the purpose of anarchist threat an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth— if they are not followed up by action.” An Italian anarchist, Carlo Pisacane, has coined the concept of “Propaganda by deed.” His idea was that instead of writing articles and essays, terrorists should perform through actions that masses would read about in the newspapers that would captivate the attention of people, for example, the murder of high dignitaries. Russian Narodnaya Volya was one of the political terrorist groups which existed from 1878 to 1881 and was the first terrorist group who followed Pisacane’s “Propaganda by deed.” Their target of attack was only high level officials.

The following are some of the leading political figures who were assassinated by anarchists:

- An Italian anarchist Jeronimo Santo Caserio assassinated President Marie-Francois Sadi Carnot (1837-1894) of France on June 24, 1894.
- Spanish Prime Minister Antonio Canovas de Castillo was assassinated on August 8, 1897 by anarchist Miguel Angiolillo at Santa Angueda, Spain.
- President William Mc. Kinley of the United States was assassinated by anarchist Leon Czolgosz in Buffalo, New York, in 1901.

In the later period such type of anarchist attacks ended, because the terrorists realized that the government did not disintegrate, if the head of state was assassinated. Some of the other political terrorist groups were also emerged in other countries such as in United States: ‘The Weather Underground,’ which was held responsible for attacks on U.S. Capitol building in 1971 and the Pentagon in 1972 near Washington, D.C. Although weather underground claims responsibility for the number of other attacks also, but it failed to attract large number of followers. This group lost most of its social support and the public also turned strongly against it.
The Red Brigades, Italian Red Brigades which was formed in 1969, targeted members of the Italian “establishment,” government officials, businessman, and labour union leaders. A former Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro was kidnapped by Red Brigades in 1978 and held hostage for fifty five days and was later assassinated by them. By the mid 1980s this group disappeared from the scene due to loss of its leaders.\(^{31}\)

The BaaderMeinhof gang similar to that of Weather Underground was another group emerged in 1970s which was the group of political radicals in Germany who called themselves as Red Army Faction, but it was more famous as Baader-Meinhof Gang.\(^{32}\)

Baader-Meinhof Gang was known for 1977s “German Autumn.” They carried out kidnappings, bank robberies, assassinations, bombings, and attacks on U.S air bases.\(^{33}\) They also took part in the hijacking of ‘Lufthansa Flight 181’ with the help of Palestinian group Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP).

**Ethno-Nationalist Terrorism**

Many people around the world who are the nationals of one country would like to establish an independent country which might be based on following the same religion, speaking the same language, or affiliated to same ethnic group. In many countries terrorism has been used as a manoeuvre to attain national liberation. Independence and the desire for nationalism and self determination were at the heart of large number of people who are contending for their emancipation.

Independence movement of Indians against the British colonialism is an example; as the Indians organized themselves as resistance force and also indulged in violence and terrorist activities to achieve freedom. Other example of independence movement include the struggle of Muslim Algerians, The National Liberation Front (FLN) in 1954 started their struggle for independence against France. Algeria was liberated from France in1962, after which Ahmed Ben Bella, the leader of FLN became Algeria’s first President.\(^{34}\)

The colonial and imperialist countries called these freedom fighters as terrorists because the terrorism has been used widely as a tactic to attain independence but
at the same time it is wrong to call freedom fighters as terrorists. Both terrorism and freedom fighting has distinct identities as Henry Jackson has argued that “it is disgrace that democracies should allow the treasured word ‘freedom’ to be associated with acts of terrorism.”

Ethnic terrorists have been active since years and they are not confined to any particular territory. Ethnic terrorism can be defined as violence deliberately conducted by a sub national ethnic group to advance its cause. Such violence generally focuses either on creation of a separate state or on the elevation of the status of one communal group over others as well as to advance political goals. It is frequently directed against symbolic targets. It bears much resemblance to guerilla conflict. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka, the Irgun in Palestine, the Kurdish Workers Party (PKK) in Turkey, the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA) in Northern Ireland, and the Basque separatist group Euskadi ta Askatasuna (ETA) in Spain are all examples of ethnic terrorist groups. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam (LTTE) was headed by its founder Vellupillai Prabhakaran. It is a militant nationalist political paramilitary organization based in Northern Sri Lanka. Since its formation in 1976, it has started a secessionist resistance campaign that strives to create an independent Tamil state in North and East regions. This campaign has evolved into the Sri Lankan civil war, one of the longest running armed conflicts in Asia. Between 1976–this group has carried out a number of bombings and other destructions.

Other examples of ethnic terrorism include Arabs residing in Palestine which largely has been occupied by the Jewish nation of Israel since 1948; the Basque people of Northern Spain, who want to break away to form their own country; and Kurdish people who want to create an independent state from parts of Turkey, Iran, Iraq. In Northern Ireland some residents want to become part of Republic of Ireland while others want to remain part of Great Britain.

Cyber Terrorism

The act of internet terrorism in terrorist activities is called cyber-terrorism. Cyber terrorism can be defined as the use of information technology by individuals and terrorist groups in order to foster their programme. This can include large scale
deliberate disruption of computer networks, particularly of personal computers connected to the internet, through the means of computer viruses.

**Figure 1: Motivation behind Any Cyber Crime**
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**Nuclear Terrorism**

Nuclear terrorism is direct challenge to the whole world. Nuclear terrorism signifies the detonation of a yield-producing nuclear bomb containing fissile material by terrorists. Legally, nuclear terrorism is considered as an offence if committed by any person unlawfully and deliberately “uses in any way radioactive material…with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury; or with the intent to cause substantial damage to property or to the environment; or with intent to compel a natural or legal person, an international organization or state to do or refrain from doing an act,” according to 2005 United Nations International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.\(^\text{40}\)

**TERRORISM: DEFINITIONAL PROBLEM**

Terrorism has become global menace in today’s world which affects the society and disturbs the peaceful life of common masses. It is used to elucidate different things by different people and is perceived variably by varied countries, as the famous saying goes “one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” The meaning of terrorism is perpetually fluctuating from the period of 18\(^\text{th}\) century
French Revolution, which marked the origin of modern terrorism (August 30, 1793-July 27, 1794) to the present era of 21st century.

Since definition is a precise statement of meaning, maybe there is no other term in our times that requires to be defined more precisely and clearly than terrorism. Nevertheless, this fact cannot be ignored that the most difficult aspect of dealing with terrorism is defining it. It is a true fact that the absence of explicit definition of terrorism becomes hurdle in the way of effectively countering it. This major obstacle has prevented the United Nations and other multilateral agreements to adopt a comprehensive policy and agree on means and methods to deal with terrorism. Consequently, terrorism is rapidly presuming the status of worldwide threat. Mahan and Griset stressed the need of defining terrorism as they observe:

Yet, no, matter how difficult the task, defining terrorism is crucial. In other areas of contemporary life, definition and conceptualization may be purely theoretical and of interest primarily to academics. The definition of terrorism in contrast, has very real consequences.

The main problem with the issue of terrorism is not that it has no definition at all but it has numerous definitions. However, there is no harmony or consensus on any single definition of terrorism, Mahan and Griset argue:

Terrorism is an ideological and political concept. Politics by its nature is adversarial, and thus any definition evokes adversarial agreement. The meaning given to terrorism is part of a persons or nations philosophy. Thus the determination of the “right” definition of terrorism is subjective and not likely to be reached by consensus.

Thus, there is an extensive agreement that the absence of definition of terrorism is a problem. The Director of the International Policy Institute for Counter-Terrorism, Boaz Ganor, has stressed that a definition of terrorism is essential to any serious endeavour to fight against terrorism. In the same way, former Lebanese President Emile Lahoud has noted: “it is not enough to declare war on what one deems terrorism without giving precise and exact definition.” On the contrary Sir Jeremy Greenstock held different view about the problem of precise definition of terrorism. In a post 9/11 speech he said: “increasingly, questions are being raised about the problem of the definition of a terrorist. Let us be wise and focused about this: terrorism is terrorism...What looks, amells and kills like terrorism is terrorism.”
Despite the fact that it is difficult to achieve consensus while defining terrorism, the national governments according to their own national interest and circumstances have attempted to formulate and develop some particular definitions of the term. These definitions suffer from numerous lacunas and reflect the value laden approach of the scholars and government. Yet they help in understanding the phenomenon of political violence termed as terrorism. They also help in distinguishing terrorism from other forms of violence.

The meanings of words terror and terrorism have transformed only to some degree since the late nineteenth century, but the change is significant. “In the 1890 edition of Webster’s International dictionary, the word terror is defined as “extreme fear, fear that agitates body and mind, violent dread; fight.” As second meaning Webster’s lists, “that which excites dread; a cause of extreme fear.” Today, Webster’s new Twentieth century Dictionary covers essentially the same meanings, listing: “1. intense fear; 2. a person or thing that causes intense fear;” but has the important additions: “3. a period characterized by political executions, as during the French Revolution; 4. a programme of terrorism or a party, group, etc. resorting to this.” For terrorism, the Webster’s dictionary offers the following: “1. a terrorizing; use of terror and violence to intimidate, subjugate, etc. especially as political weapon or policy; 2. Intimidation and subjugation so produced.” There is a clash between scholars over the clear and detailed meaning of adding the suffix-ism to the word terror to generate the word terrorism. The use of suffix becomes more practical where it mentions to a manner of acting or an attitude. Some of the experts assign a doctrinal quality to terrorism while others define it as a manner of acting or as a method of action. 

In spite of numerous attempts of study, the word terrorism has neither precise definition nor one which is widely acceptable to all. Due to this reason it has become a complex phenomenon. It has almost as many views as there are scholars of the subject. It is a value laden term, therefore the person defining it inadvertently inject his value judgment into the definition. The pejorative nature of the subject is one of the major contributing factors to the complexity of the concept of terrorism.
There have been a multitude of definitions on terrorism as there are scholars, but some of the definitions are more complicated which includes too many elements while some others neglect the exact problem of definition and they only focus on what is legitimate and illegitimate uses of force. There are numerous other definitions also which are provided by the government but that too serve their self interests to some extent. Generally governments called their opponents as terrorist excluding their allies. Many years ago United States (U.S.) has had presented a list of seven countries that sponsored state terrorism. Although Cuba had stopped using terror tactics in Latin America long ago but despite that it remains on the list of the United States. Some of the other countries supporting terrorist groups for example, South Africa granted aid to groups in Angola and Mozambique, who engaged in terror activities was never incorporated in the list of U.S. either because of their alliance with U.S. or their action does not have much effect on it.\(^48\) One of the critics argues in the case of U.S anti terrorist policy “the condemnatory label is being deployed to the enemies of U.S interests while being withheld from U.S friends and clients no matter how opprobrious their conduct might otherwise be.”\(^49\) Diaz-Paniagua has noted that, in order to "create an effective legal regime against terrorism, it would be necessary to formulate a comprehensive definition of that crime that, on the one hand, provides the strongest moral condemnation to terrorist activities while, on the other hand, has enough precision to permit the prosecution of criminal activities without condemning acts that should be deemed to be legitimate. Nonetheless, due to major divergences at the international level on the question of the legitimacy of the use of violence for political purposes, either by states or by self-determination and revolutionary groups, this has not yet been possible.\(^50\) In this sense, Bassiouni notes:

To define "terrorism" in a way that is both all-inclusive and unambiguous is very difficult, if not impossible. One of the principal difficulties lies in the fundamental values at stake in the acceptance or rejection of terror-inspiring violence as means of accomplishing a given goal. The obvious and well known range of views on these issues are what makes an internationally accepted specific definition of what is loosely called "terrorism," a largely impossible undertaking. That is why the search for an internationally agreed upon definition may well be a futile and unnecessary effort.\(^51\)
Definitions of terrorism are not invariable; they change with passage of time for example, John Brown, who attacked Federal Arsenal at Harpers Ferry in West Virginia spawned regional hatred which became one of the reasons for civil war. At one time, he was reprehended as terrorist, in a still different period, he was referred as a madman. There are hundreds of definitions on terrorism presented by government officials, different scholars, the media and the terrorists themselves, but there always exist a difficulty in reaching a consensual definition of terrorism. The intricacy of definition is not recent however; Cooper notes that “there has never been, since the topic began to command serious attention, some golden age in which terrorism was easy to define.” One more complexity lies in defining terrorism is that “there is not one but many different terrorisms.” It is difficult to exclude terror from other violent activities. Terrorism, guerilla warfare, civil strife, criminal activity and riots are some of the violent activities which are perceived indistinctly and the tactics of terror are common to all these activities.52

Thus the war against terrorism is as dangerous as the struggle against terrorism itself, because all violence is not terrorism but all terrorism is violence. The association of all violent acts under the rubric of terrorism makes it complicated to understand the phenomenon of terrorism. Due to these complexities vague generalizations set in, it is therefore imperative to delimit the boundaries of terrorism for its understanding.

Diversity among terrorist groups also complicates the understanding of terrorism. It is difficult to give a single explanation for the varied terror groups such as IRA (Irish Republican Army), Al Qaeda, and Aum Shinrikyo due to their varied motives and nature. As Walter Laqueur tells us, “the problem of terrorism is complicated. What can be said without fear of contradiction about a terrorist group in one country is by no true for other group at other times in other countries.” Thus this diversity transformed the so called “war on terrorism” into a “war on terrorisms.”53 Eqbal Ahmad, candid and highly acclaimed Indian anti colonialism scholar, noted that the “terrorist of yesterday is the hero of today, and the hero of yesterday becomes the terrorist of today.” He has given five categories of terrorism such as state terrorism, religious terrorism, criminal terrorism, political terrorism, and oppositional terrorism. All of these categories accord with
his definition of terrorism as “the use of terrorizing methods of governing or resisting a government.” Eqbal Ahmad has given many instances where he has shown the changing nature of terrorism, for example Menacham Begin, who in the later period became an Israeli Prime Minister, was an erstwhile commander in chief of the Irgun Tsval Leumi, a Zionist terrorist organization. Another example was that of Ronald Reagon who was the former U.S President in 1985 supported the Afghan Mujahidin because they were fighting against the Soviet Union and spread of communism in Afghanistan, and Saudi born Osama Bin Laden was one of their leading supporter. But the scenario was changed in 1998 when then President Bill Clinton launched a futile missile attack in order to kill Bin Laden in Afghanistan. Therefore the alteration in the political and ideological atmosphere at varied times have an effect on the definition of terrorism because; it is a value laden and volatile concept. Walter Laqueur defines terrorism as “the use of covert violence by a group for political ends.” Although he has written widely on the problem of definition of terrorism but he argued that “it is difficult at any period of time that a precise definition of terrorism which covers all its aspects may ever exist because, some of the definitions comprises religious, political, and economic motivations, others includes violence or threat of violence, several others definitions refer to group terrorism, while individual actors are part of some definitions.54

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences defines terrorism as:

a term used to describe the method or the theory behind the method where by an organized group or party seeks to achieve its avowed aims, chiefly through the systematic use of violence. Terrorist acts are directed against persons who have individuals, agents, or representative of authority interference with the consumption of the Objective of such a group. The terrorist do not threaten, death or destruction is part of his programme of action and if he is caught, his behavior during trial is generally directed primarily not towards winning his freedom but towards speeding knowledge of his doctrines.55

The Rand Corporation defines terrorism by the nature of the act, not by the identity of the perpetrators or the nature of their cause. All terrorists’ acts involve violence or threat of violence, often coupled with specific demands. The violence is directed against civilian targets, the motives are political. The actions are carried out in a way that will achieve maximum publicity. The perpetrators are
usually members of an organized group and unlike other criminals, they often claim credit for the act. And finally the act is intended to produce effects beyond the immediate physical damage.\textsuperscript{56}

Scholars around the world are entangled in the labyrinth of terminology and have expressed different views. Amongst them all, the most widely acceptable definition is the one given by Yonah Alexander. He defines terrorism as “the use or threat of violence against random or civilian targets in order to intimidate or to create generalized pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals”.\textsuperscript{57}

Somewhat similar is the elaborate definition given by Alex P. Schimid who analyzed innumerable definitions before concluding that:

Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method or repeated violent action, employed by clandestine individual group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby in contrast to assassination—the direct targets of violence are not main targets. The immediate human targets of violence are generally chosen randomly or selectively from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat and violence based communication processes between terrorists’ victims and main target are used to manipulate the main target turning it into a targeting of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion or propaganda is primarily sought.\textsuperscript{58}

This definition gives the details of the phenomenon of terrorism, but it remains more focused on target and objectives rather than its basic nature.

Similarly, Brian Jenkins writes that “the threat of violence or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear is terrorism.”\textsuperscript{59} This definition is very close to the idea of terrorism, but lacks two significant aspects, for example training and international support. These two aspects are highlighted in the definition given by Christopher Dobson and Martha Crenshaw. The necessity of training is expressed by Dobson who writes that “use of explosive device used by terrorists needs appropriate training” the need for international support is expressed in the definition given by Martha Crenshaw, who explains that “terrorism is a means to accomplish certain political objectives with international support.”\textsuperscript{60}

The consequent academic definition of terrorism was finalized in 1988,
Terrorism is an anxiety inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual groups, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby in contrast to assassination—the direct targets of violence are not main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat and violence based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (imperiled), victims, and main target (audience) (s), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought.

Although this definition is rather lengthy and clumsy, the main elements are now generally accepted. One of the first attempts to provide legal definition that differentiate a criminal act from a terrorist act was made by the British government. In 1974, the United Kingdom government concluded that: “for the purposes of the legislation, terrorism is the use of violence for political ends, and any use of violence for the purpose of putting the public, or any section of public, in fear”. It is a broad definition and could be interpreted to comprise conventional war as well as limited nuclear strikes. The government of United States has certainly not given out any formal definition of terrorism, but its government agencies have put forward unofficial definitions. In 1976, the Central Intelligence Agency was one of the first to give the definition of international terrorism:

The threat or use of violence for political purposes when (1) such action is intended to influence the attitudes and behaviour of target groups wider than its immediate victims, and (2) its ramifications transcend national boundaries (as a result, for example of the nationality or foreign ties of its perpetrators, its locale, the identity of its institutional or human victims, its declared objectives or mechanics of its resolution).

The wordings of various definitions given by CIA keep on fluctuating over the years.61

In 1984, the U.S. Department of State defines terrorism as “premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non combatant targets by sub national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience.” It is regarded as one of the most influential American definitions but it does not include regulations issued by executive branch agencies, decisions of the federal court, treaties or laws enacted by the state or local government. The regulations of executive branch agencies are incorporated in code of Federal Regulations, which
defines terrorism as “the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.” These two definitions issued by varied branches of the United States are distinct with each other and have some of the lacking points which is the contributing factor to problem of defining terrorism such as, the U.S department’s definition comprises the notion of political motivations, but it does not state, as does the code of Federal Regulations that is, the aim of the violent act.\(^62\)

Various departments or agencies of even the same government with themselves often have very different definition for it. The U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) defines terrorism as:

> the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a Government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.\(^63\)

while the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) states that terrorism is

any activity that involve an act that:

- is dangerous to human life or potentially destructive or critical infrastructure or key resources; and... must also appear to be intended

a) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; b) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or c) to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping.\(^64\)

And the U.S. Department of Defense defines it as:

The calculated use of unlawful violence or threat of unlawful violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological objectives.\(^65\)

It is noteworthy fact that all of the above definitions show the priorities and specific interest of the particular agencies involved. The definition given by FBI highlights the psychological aspect of the terrorist acts and also lays emphasis on terrorism’s intimidatory and coercive dimensions. Though the definition given by FBI acknowledge both social and political objectives as basic goals of terrorist, but it gives no lucid explanation of the differences between them to explicate this distinction. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) definition clearly
shows its mission: focusing on attacks to critical infrastructure and essential national resource that might have serious societal consequences. In this regard the DHS cites specifically in its definition the threat of “mass destruction,” the better to distinguish and differentiate its responsibilities from those of other agencies. The Department of Defense definition of terrorism is arguably the most comprehensive in comparison to the definition given by other agencies. It emphasizes the terrorist threat as much as the actual act of violence and concentrates on terrorism’s targeting of entire societies as well as governments. The Defense Department definition, considerably, also refers to the religious and ideological aims of terrorism together with its fundamental political goals, but skip the social elements found in FBI’s definition.66

The Organization of Islamic Conference has proposed a definition which needs our attention as it is generally but erroneously believed that all Muslims may not be terrorist but all terrorist are Muslims. The OIC stated:

Terrorism mean any act of violence or threat thereof not withstanding its motives or intention perpetrated to carry out an individual or collective criminal plan with the aim of terrorizing people or threatening to harm them or imperiling their lives, honour, freedoms, security or rights or exposing the environment or any facility or public or private property to hazards or occupying or seizing them, or endangering a national resource or international facilities or threatening the stability, territorial integrity, political unity or sovereignty of independent states.67

The definition given by the OIC reverberate the feelings of several developing and under developed nations facing the danger of imperialist intervention. Therefore, it contains an individual or collective criminal plan of terrorizing people or threatening to harm them or their lives, honour, freedoms, security or rights as terrorism. Article 2 of the OIC (Organization of Islamic Conference) Declaration has unambiguously declared that a people’s struggle, including armed struggle against foreign occupation, aggression, colonialism and hegemony, intended at liberation and self determination is not terrorism in any case. Along with some other classification this definition deserves to be taken into consideration by the relevant international organization including the United Nations as it does not create definitional vagueness. This definition makes it explicit that liberation struggle against foreign occupation or colonialism is not terrorism. Therefore, this definition can be agreeable to majority of the
nation—states conscious of their territorial integrity and national sovereignty. Nevertheless, several Western nations following imperialist policy perhaps do not accept the approach of the Organization of Islamic Conference.68

Thus, there are hundreds of definitions on terrorism and it is difficult to cite them, but the question that arises here is that, where to draw the line between the quest for identity and act of terrorism, between legitimate political demands within a country and suppression of those who make these demands. Once a terrorist is always a terrorist. Are Palestinians terrorists? Are Irish terrorists? Are the Hezbollah terrorists? Are the Taliban terrorists? The focus is not or should not be whether a group is a terrorist group, but rather what activities or actions constitute terrorism. A group labeled as terrorist at one time may eventually become a viable partner in international peace and security. Therefore terrorism remain a nebulous concept mainly because it has no widely acceptable definition, there is a free and open tendency for the persons using the term, whether states, organized groups or scholars, to define it as suits their purposes at the moment.

The United Nations came into effect at a time when the seeds for the dissolution of imperial and colonial possessions had been sown. In the early years of United Nations numerous terrorist acts were occurred in the name of national liberation, armed conflict and de-colonization. All these acts were called by the colonialist as terrorist acts, but when they became increasingly recognized at international level they were called as self determination. In this background it becomes difficult for United Nations to define terrorism in such a way that is globally acceptable to all.

Thus, despite numerous attempts there is no globally accepted definition of terrorism at international level. One judge of International Court of justice has observed, “Terrorism is a term without any legal significance. It is merely a convenient way of alluding to activities, whether of states or individuals, widely disapproved of and in which either the methods used are unlawful, or the targets protected, or both.”69 The International community has never succeeded in developing an accepted comprehensive definition of terrorism. During the 1970’s and 1980’s the United Nations effort to define the term foundered mainly due to differences of opinion among various members about the use of violence in the context of conflicts over national liberation and self determination. These
discrepancies have made it unattainable to reach a comprehensive convention on international terrorism that includes a specific, legally binding, criminal law definition of terrorism.

The definitional deadlock has restrained the adoption of extensive convention on international terrorism. The dearth of agreement on a definition of terrorism has been a main impediment to the meaningful international countermeasures. Terrorism therefore, could be problematized through different shades of its definition and combat strategies thereof. Although to fight against the various aspects of terrorism United Nations and its agencies have adopted thirteen global conventions, nevertheless there is no globally agreed upon definition of terrorism by the United Nations.

A first effort to adopt the convention on the Prevention and Punishment of terrorism was made in the League of Nations, but the convention which was drafted in 1937 never came into force. The main objective of that convention was the suppression of terrorism at the international level and it laid upon the duty on all the signatories neither to support nor allow to exist any terrorist activity with political motivations and to all in its power to avert and suppress it.⁷⁰

The proposed definition of League of Nations convention (1937) describe terrorism as “All criminal acts directed against a state and intended or calculated to create a state of the terror in the minds of particular person or a group of persons or the general public.”⁷¹

The international community has been gathering to define the word terrorism with the aims and objectives of the U.N. Charter since 1970. The first attempt was made on October 24, 1970, when the General Assembly adopted the following declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States: “Every state has the duty to refrain from organizing, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts state or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts, when the acts referred to in the present paragraph involve a threat of use of force.” But the “principle of equal rights and self determination of peoples,” inherent in the objectives of the U.N. created an ambivalence.⁷²
The international politics was so much dominated by the spectre of terrorism that in 1972 at the Olympic games in Munich the U.N General Assembly adopted a resolution to establish an Adhoc committee titled “Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or take innocent human lives or jeopardizes fundamental freedoms, and study of underlining causes of those forms of terrorism and acts of violence which lie in misery, frustration, grievance and despair, and which cause some people to sacrifice human lives, including their own, in an attempt to effect radical change.”

In the year 1970s and 1980s the U.N. strive to define the word terrorism was unsuccessful, chiefly because of divergence of opinions among different members regarding the use of violence in the conditions of conflicts over national liberation and self determination. Despite of its lack of success to define terrorism, in 1985 the U.N General Assembly adopted Resolution 40/61 “unequivocally condemn [ing], as criminal, all acts, methods and practices of terrorism wherever and whomsoever committed… call [ing] upon all states to fulfill their obligations under international law to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in other states or acquiescing in activities within their territory directed towards the commission of such acts.”

In 1992, a recommendation was made to the U.N. Crime Branch that terrorism simply be defined as the “peacetime equivalent of war crimes”. This was also emerged as extremely contentious. Even though it might be very simpler to use, today this definition is not followed by the U.N. body.

Since the period of Cold War United Nations has been striving unsuccessfully to attain a common consent on the controversial issue of the definition of terrorism at the international level, which becomes complicated because of its association with other violent acts. The examples of “operative definitions are innumerable however. In Article 5 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (1997) terrorists acts are referred to as “criminal acts…, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons …”. It is furthermore stated in the same article, that such acts “are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or
other similar nature.” In another attempt towards an operative definition of the word terrorism, the General Assembly resolution 54/110 of 2 February 2000, in its operative paragraph 2, describe terrorism in the sense of “criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular person for political reasons.” To some extent, this explanation can be similar to the language of the League of Nations draft convention of 1937. The very perplexity was also emphasized in the Secretary General’s address to the General Assembly on 1 October 2001 and to the Security Council on 12 November 2001. Mr. Kofi Annan admitted that defining terrorism as one of the most complicated task before the world organization and said that he understands and accepts “the need for legal precision.”

International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999) adopted by the General Assembly (set out in its resolution 54/109) defines terrorism by reference to a list of treaties; or “any other act intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian, or to any other person not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict, when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act.”

In 2004, the Security Council referred terrorism as “criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose of provoking a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act.”

It is needed to mention here that the definitions mentioned above were given by the United Nations in its different sectoral anti-terrorism conventions as it was not able to adopt any comprehensive convention against terrorism. It is important to mention here that the General Assembly is recently working for adopting such a convention. The draft article 2 of the proposed comprehensive convention deals with the definitional aspect of terrorism. The proposed definition is almost same as given by the United Nations in its previous sectoral anti-terrorism conventions.
The draft article has broadened the application of anti-terrorism convention to “unlawful and intentional” act of causing damage to property, places, facilities or systems, resulting or likely to result in major economic loss or the environment. Although Member States have concurred on many of the provisions of the draft convention still consensus is not likely to be reached as several nations have disagreed to include national liberation movements in the category of terrorism.\textsuperscript{79}

UN Global Counter-terrorism Strategy of (2006) reiterates the criminality of all terrorism “in all its forms and committed by whomever, wherever and for whatever reasons.” This strategy requires extradition or prosecution of “any person, who supports, facilitates, participates or attempts to participate in the financing, planning, preparation or perpetration of terrorist acts or havens”. It reaffirms consistency with international law.\textsuperscript{80}

\textbf{Concluding Observations}

Terrorism has developed into a form of specialized crime today. What differentiates terrorism from ordinary crime is that crime stems mostly from need, greed, or passion. Moreover, conventional criminals do not seek to terrorize the masses in order to blackmail governments. Terrorism, however is neither compelled by passion or need, it is sometimes defended for political reasons, and is sometimes supported by governments. Its motivations and underpinnings are selfishness, intolerance, lack of dialogue and inhumanity, greed, and unaccountability.

For the betterment of security at the international level and for the suppression of terrorism, there must be a need of broad and universally accepted definition of terrorism which unifies the efforts of all in this direction. Terrorism like ‘beauty’ is in the eye of beholder as one man’s terrorist is another man’s patriot. The United Nations as the legitimate and the prominent guardian of international peace and security should be at the forefront of international efforts to deal with terrorism, because the menace of terrorism is not only a threat to international peace and security but also to multilateral cooperation.
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