Chapter One
GENESIS OF TERRORISM

Terrorism has been a part of human history since the beginning of time. Though its objectives have always been the same, to use terror in pursuing political or social agendas, but its power has never been as frighteningly high as it is now.

Certain characteristics - like freedom of intention, divergence of opinions, varying aspirations, antagonistic thinking, manifestation of conflictual behaviours and diversity in mutual interactions - are ingrained in human nature. And human life is also full of endless chain of events, contingencies and incidences. So the stress situations of human beings serve a decisive factor when such feelings burst into violent forms due to prolong tolerance of unfavourable situation, explaining the phenomenon of terrorism. As the later manifests, it infringes on different sets of human rights – social, ideological, intellectual, educational and financial.

History itself provides vivid evidences that anti-social acts perpetrated by the destructionists had invariably created a situation of alarm, under such situations, human rights were encroached. Acts of terrorism can be carried out by individuals, groups, or states. Clandestine or semi-clandestine state actors may also carry out terrorist acts outside the framework of a state of war. However, the most common image of terrorism is that it is carried out by small and secretive cells, highly motivated to serve a particular cause, planned and carried out by a close clique, comprised of close friends, family members and other strong social networks. These groups benefited from the free flow of information and efficient Telecommunications to succeed.¹

In bringing these tools to bear on terrorism it is necessary, not only to understand its motivations and methods, but also the relationship between terrorism and other forms of violence and political change. This quest for understanding begins with an attempt to define just what one means by terrorism.

THE PROBLEMS OF DEFINING TERRORISM:

Terrorism is used to describe different things by different peoples. As a label for acts of violence, it reflects negatively on those who are labelled as terrorists. In this sense, the term terrorist is comparable to other insulting terms in the political vocabulary, such as racist, fascist or imperialist. If one side in a dispute can characterize the enemy in a negative way, and so win public opinion
over to their point of view, they will not hesitate to do so, hence the saying: "one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter". This is exemplified when a group that uses irregular military methods is an ally of a State against a mutual enemy, but later falls out with the State and starts to use the same methods against its former ally. During World War II the Malayan People’s Anti-Japanese Army was allied with the British, but during the Malayan Emergency, members of its successor, the Malayan Races Liberation Army, were branded terrorists by the British. More recently, Ronald Reagan and others in the American administration frequently called the Afghan Mujahideen freedom fighters during their war against the Soviet Union, yet twenty years later when a new generation of Afghan men are fighting against what they perceive to be a regime installed by foreign powers, their attacks are labelled terrorism by George W. Bush. Groups accused of terrorism usually prefer terms that reflect legitimate military or ideological action. Leading terrorism researcher Professor Martin Rudner, director of the Canadian Centre of Intelligence and Security Studies at Ottawa’s Carleton University, defines "terrorist acts" as attacks against civilians for political or other ideological goals, and goes on to say:

There is the famous statement: 'One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter.' But that is grossly misleading. It assesses the validity of the cause when terrorism is an act. One can have a perfectly logical cause and yet if one commits terrorist acts, it is terrorism regardless.

Some groups, when involved in a "liberation" struggle, have been called terrorists by the Western governments or media. Later, these same persons, as leaders of the liberated nations, are called statesmen by similar organizations. Two examples of this phenomenon are the Nobel Peace Prize laureates Menachem Begin and Nelson Mandela.

While the use of word like terrorism, as a means of political insult is now widespread practice, it is highly unsatisfactory from both a moral and legal point of view. It is important to arrive at a clear definition of terrorism, only then it could be certain of what is meant by the word, and then design laws to punish the terrorists.

The modern definition of the terrorism is inherently controversial. The use of violence for the achievement of political ends is common to state and non-state groups. The difficulty is in agreeing on a basis for determining when and where
the use of violence (directed at whom, by whom, for what ends) is legitimate. The majority of definitions in use have been written by agencies directly associated with a government and are systematically based to exclude governments from the definition.  

**REASON FOR CONTROVERSY:**

The contemporary label of "Terrorist" is highly pejorative. It is a badge which denotes a lack of legitimacy and morality. The application "Terrorist" is therefore always deliberately disputed. Attempts at defining the concept invariably arouse debate because rival definitions may be employed with a view to including the action of certain parties and excluding others thus each party might still subjectively claim legitimate bases for employing violence in pursuit of their own political causes or aim.

In his book *Inside Terrorism* Bruce Hoffman wrote in Chapter One: "Defining Terrorism that 'on one point, at least, everyone agrees: terrorism is a pejorative term. It is a word with intrinsically negative connotations that is generally applied to one's enemies and opponents, or to those with whom one disagrees and would otherwise prefer to ignore'. Hence the decision to call someone or label some organization 'terrorist' becomes almost unavoidably subjective, depending largely on whether one sympathizes with or opposes the person/group/cause concerned. If one identifies with the victim of the violence, for example, then the act is terrorism. If, however, one identifies with the perpetrator, the violent act is regarded in a more sympathetic, if not positive (or, at the worst, an ambivalent) light and it is not terrorism.

**THE CONTEXT OF TERRORISM:**

When a plane is destroyed by a bomb, it is frequently called terrorism, but when military forces short down a civilian aircraft, it can be deemed as an unfortunate mistake. The United States may launch missiles at a suspected terrorist base and claim it is defending national interests yet it may condemn another country for doing the same thing in another part of the world. Dual standards and contradictions lead to confusions anytime the term terrorism is employed.

The term terrorism has spawned heated debate. Instead of agreeing on the definition of terrorism, social scientists, policy makers, lawyers and security
specialists often disagrees about the meaning of the term. H. H. A. Cooper (1978, 2001) a renowned terrorism expert from the University of Texas at Dallas, aptly summarizes the problems. There is Cooper says, “A problem in the problem definition” we can agree that terrorism is a problem, but we cannot agree on what terrorism is? 17

There are several reasons for confusion. First, terrorism is difficult to define because it has a pejorative connotation. (Pejorative means that it is emotionally charged). A person is politically and socially degraded when labelled as terrorist and the same thing happens when an organization is called a terrorist group. Routine crimes assume greater social importance when they are described as terrorism, and political movements can be hampered when their followers are believed to be terrorists.

Further confusion arises when people interline the terms terror and terrorism. The object of military force, for e.g., is to strike terror into the heart of enemy, and systematic terror has been a basic weapon in conflicts throughout history. 18 Some argue that there is no difference between military force and terrorism. Many members of the antinuclear movement extended this agreement by claiming that maintaining ready to use nuclear weapons is extension of terrorism. Others use the same logic when claiming that street gangs and criminals terrorize neighbourhoods.

One of the primary reasons terrorism is difficult to define is that the meaning changes within social and historical context. 19 This is not to suggest that “one person’s terrorist is another person’s freedom fighter” but it does suggest that the meaning fluctuates. Change in the meaning occurs because terrorism is not a solid entity like crime, it is socially defined, and the meaning changes with social change. So it needs to understand the context of the definition before applying the term. The definition of terrorism always changes with social and historical circumstances.

SOME COMMON CONTEXT OF TERRORISM:

Before reviewing definitions of terrorism, it is helpful to examine the meaning of terrorism within specific framework.
HISTORY:
The meaning of terrorism has changed with time and situation. It is almost impossible to talk about terrorism without discussing the historical context of the terrorist campaign.

Modern terrorism originated from the French Revolution (1793-1794). It was used as a term to describe the action of the Jacobin club in their rule of post-Revolutionary France, the so called “Reign of terror”. By 1848, the meaning of the term changed. It was employed to describe violent revolutionaries who revolted against governments. By the end of the 1800s and early 1900s, terrorism was used to describe the violent activities of a number of groups including: labour organizations, anarchists, nationalist groups revolting against foreign power, and ultranationalist political organizations. After World–War II (1939-1945), the meaning of terrorism changed again. As people revolted from European domination of the world, nationalistic groups were deemed to be terrorist groups. From about 1964 to the early 1980s, the term terrorism was also applied to violent left-wing groups, as well as nationalists. In the mid – 1980s, the meaning changed again. In the United States, some of the violent activities of the hate movement were defined as terrorism. Internationally terrorism was viewed as subnational warfare.

As the millennium changed, the definitions of terrorism also changed. Today terrorism also refers to large groups who are independent from a state, violent religious fanatics, and violent groups who terrorize for a particular cause.

CONFLICT:
The meaning of terrorism fluctuates around various types of Wars. In times of conventional wars, armies use commando tactics that look very much like terrorism. In the American civil war, the Federal Army unleashed Major John Anderson to destroy confederate railroads. The confederates captured Anderson and accused him of being a spy but he remained a hero in the North. He did not wear a uniform, and he did not fight by the accepted norms. Armies routinely use such tactics in times of war and never define their actions as terrorism.

In guerrilla war, guerrillas use terrorist tactics against their enemies and may terrorize their supporters into submission. In war, air forces may destroy
entire cities with fire. The German Air Force (Luftwaffe) did so at Stalingrad in 1942,\textsuperscript{24} and the British and American air Forces did the same at Dresden in 1945.\textsuperscript{25} Neither side believed it was practicing terrorism. While it is possible to cite many other examples and endless contradictions, it should be realized that the definition of terrorism changes with the nature of the conflict. The term terrorism is more likely to be employed to describe violent activities that explode during a peaceful period.\textsuperscript{26}

**POLITICAL POWER:**

The definitions of terrorism can be influenced by political power. Government can increase their power when they label opponents as “terrorists”. Citizens seem willing to accept more abuses of governmental power when a counterterrorist campaign is in progress. “Terrorists” do not enjoy the same humanitarian privileges as “people”. In the public mind, illegal arrests and sometimes even tortures and murders are acceptable methods for dealing with terrorists. Labelling can have deadly results.

**REPRESSION:**

Closely related to the issue of power is the concept of repression. Such governments routinely use terrorism to keep their citizens in line. Such repression can sometimes be seen in the political structure of the country as leaders use secret police forces to maintain power. Joseph Stain (1879-1953) ruled the Soviet Union from 1924 to 1953 through terror\textsuperscript{27}, and Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq by similar methods.\textsuperscript{28} Latin America has witnessed several rulers who maintain power through repression; many times with the help from the United States. Repression can also develop outside formal political structures this is called extra juridical repression. It refers to repressive groups who terrorize others into certain forms of behaviour. Political repression is a form of terrorism, but people seldom refer to this form of violence when defining terrorism.

**MEDIA:**

Journalists and television reporters frequently use the term terrorism to define political violence. However, there is no consistent standard guiding them in the application of the definition. Many times they employ the term to attract attention to a story. James F. Paster explains the significant relationship between
terrorism and the media, and the underlying benefit each receives from the other. The Italian revolutionary Carlo Pisacane's theory of the 'propaganda by the deed'—which recognized the utility of terrorism to deliver a message to an audience other than the target—and draw attention and support to a cause.

**CRIME:**

One might say that criminals and terrorists represent two different types of violent behaviour. Some analysts would agree but confusion remains. When a crime is politically motivated, the report says it is terrorism. The problem with this approach is that crime is a crime no matter what motivation lies behind the action. Except in terms of conflict or government repression, all terrorism involves criminal activity. Criminals tend to hide after they commit a crime, but terrorists often like to take credit and bask in the media's propaganda. Another factor to consider is the span of attacks of regular criminals and terrorists. Most criminals operate within the proximity of their hide out, while most terrorists operate within entire countries, and many of them, operate internationally; with hideouts and safe houses in many geographic regions.

**RELIGION:**

In recent years religion has played a more significant role in the process of terrorism; extreme religious beliefs provide a context for defining terrorism. Religious violence centres around three sources. First, some religious groups feel they must purify the world for a new epoch. This can be defined as violent eschatology. Second some groups feel they are chosen and may destroy other people in the cause of righteousness. These types of attitude can lead to violent intolerance and religious war. Finally, other people may become so consumed with a particular cause, that they create a surrogate religion and take violent action to advance their beliefs. David Rapoport puts it; "before the 19th century, religion provided the only acceptable justification for terror".

**SPECIFIC FORMS:**

Sometimes the term terrorism is defined within a specific context. Like weapons of mass destruction, computer attacks, viruses, or destruction of an information infrastructure. Finally, drug organizations frequently use terrorist tactics, and some terrorist organization sell drugs to support their political
activities. Retired FBI counterterrorist specialist William Dyson argues that these issues are not separate form of terrorism. Rather, they are modes of attack used by political terrorists.\(^3^4\)

**THE ORIGIN OF THE TERM:**

The word terror is of Latin origin (from *terrere*-'to frighten*'). It entered modern western vocabularies only in 14th century through the French language. The first English usage was recorded in 1528. The basic mechanism of terror was captured in an ancient Chinese proverb. *“Kill one, frighten ten thousand”*.\(^3^5\)

**THE MEANING OF TERROR AND TERRORISM:**

In the 1890 edition of Webster’s international dictionary, the word terror is defined as ‘Extreme fear that agitates body and mind, violent dread, fright’. Today Webster’s new 20\(^{th}\) century dictionary covers essentially the same meanings, listing. “1- Intense fear, 2- 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 program of terrorism or a party, group, etc. resulting to this”.

For terrorism the modern Webster’s dictionary offers the following: “1- a terrorizing; use of terror and violence to intimidate, subjugate etc especially as a political weapon or policy 2- intimidations and subjugation so produced”.

There is some dispute among scholars of the precise meaning of adding the suffix-ism to the word terror to produce the word terrorism. The ism suffix is sometimes added to word terror to the theoretical level of a political doctrine. However the historical roots of the ‘ism’ suffice in terrorism adopted into medieval English from Latin via medieval French and in its basic meaning it refers to intense fear.\(^3^6\)

**DEFINITION OF TERRORISM:**

There is no universally accepted definition of terrorism and even when people agree on a definition of terrorism, they sometimes disagree about whether or not the definition fits a particular incident. In order to understand terrorism, one must assess the different views of what exactly constitutes terrorism. Reaching a general conclusion on the definition of terrorism has generated much debate in the social sciences and internationally. No single definition seems to satisfy the wide
interpretation of what specifically is terrorism. Since September 11th a large coalition has been formed to combat Terrorism. In order for this coalition to work there will have to be a universally excepted definition in order for the coalition to form plans and act.

Terrorism expert Walter Laqueur has counted over 100 definitions and concluded that "Terrorism constitutes the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted." 37

UNITED NATION:

On October 8, 2004 a UN panel described terrorism as any act "intend to cause death or serious bodily harm, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke 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 to abstain from doing any act." 38

EUROPEAN UNION:

The terrorist offences are certain criminal offences set out in a list comprising largely of service offences against persons and property that; "given their nature or context, may seriously damage a country or an international organization where committed with the aim of seriously intimidating a population; on duly compelling a government or international organization where committed with the aim to perform or seriously abstain from performing any act or seriously destabilizing or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization". 39

UNITED STATES:

The United States has defined terrorism under the federal criminal code. Activities that involve violent or life threatening acts that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any state and appear to be intended
i) To intimidate or coerce a civilian population
ii) To influence the policy of a government by intimidation in coercion or.
iii) To affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination or kidnapping; and occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States or occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. 40
UNITED KINGDOM:

The United Kingdom defines acts of terrorism in the terrorism act 2000 as the use or threat of action where:
1) The use or threat is designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public and
2) The use or threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause.
3) Involves serious violence against a person
4) Involves serious damage to property.
5) Endangers a person's life other than that of the person committing the action.
6) Creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or a section of the public or
7) Is designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system.\footnote{41}

LAWS AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:

The Supreme Court of India: Schmidt's definition of Terrorism was adopted in a 2003 ruling (Madan Singh vs. State of Bihar) defining acts of Terrorism veritably as "peacetime equivalents of war crime".\footnote{42}

U.S. code of federal Regulation: "The unlawful use of force and violent against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population or any segment thereof in furtherance of political or social objectives".\footnote{43}

The U.S. National Counterterrorism centre: (NCTC) described a terrorist act as one which was: "Premeditated; Perpetrated by a sub national or clandestine agent; politically motivated potentially including religious philosophical or culturally symbolic motivations; violent and perpetrated against a non-combatant target".\footnote{44}

U.S. National Security Strategy: "Premeditated politically motivated violence against innocents".\footnote{45}

United States department of defence: "the unlawful use of violence or threat of violence to instil fear and coerce governments or societies. Terrorism is often motivated by religious, political, or other ideological beliefs and committed in the pursuit of goals that are usually political."\footnote{46}
INDIVIDUALS:
Robespierre: "Terror is nothing other than justice prompts severe, inflexible; it is therefore an emanation of virtue; it is not so much a special principle as it is a consequence of the general principle of democracy applied to our country’s most urgent needs." 47

David Rodin (Oxford Philosopher) Terrorism is the deliberate, negligent or reckless use of force against non-combatants by state or non-state actors for ideological ends and in the absence of a substantively just legal process. 48

Yasir Arafat: (Chairman of the PLO): “The difference between the revolutionist and terrorist lies in the reason for which each fight. Whoever stands by a just cause and fights for liberation from invaders and colonialists cannot be probably called terrorist. Otherwise the American people in their struggle for liberation from the British colonialists would have been terrorist; the European resistance against the Nazis would be terrorism, the struggle of the Asian, African and Latin American people would also be terrorism, and many of you who are in this Assembly hall were considered terrorist." 49

OTHERS:
League of National Convention (1937): “all criminal acts directed against a state and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public”. 50

Darul Uloom Deoband: Anti-terrorism conference (2008): Any action that targets innocents by an individual or by any government and its agencies or by a private organization anywhere in the world constitutes according to Islam, an act of terrorism. 51

HISTORY OF TERRORISM:
Terrorism is not a modern invention. It has been a securing theme in the story of humankind. History of terrorism is as much European as Middle Eastern, and as much secular as religious.

Historical sources as old as the Bible recorded many instances of terror being used to achieve an objective. The book of Joshua 52 states that the Israelites "utterly destroyed all that was in the city [Jericho] both men and women, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword. This massacre of a city after it had fallen to an army after a long siege was typical of warfare of that
time, and for centuries to come. If a besieged town continued to resist attempts to capture it, the attackers after successfully overcoming it would put its entire inhabitant to the sword. This slaughter served specifically to frighten neighbouring people into early submission when their turn came to be under attack. 53

Another theme that stands out strongly in looking at the history of terrorism is the extent to which terror became easier to use when the group is being attacked, was something separate—either in terms of race, ideology or religion.

The development of technology in the recent years undoubtedly has made the implementation of terror on a massive scale more achievable. Those perpetrators of terror often hold the general principle that “the greater the number of victims the greater the degree of terror created”. As long as individuals had to execute victims personally with sword or gun then the extent of the slaughter was limited. Of course the numbers of people a plundering army could kill in a few days was still considerable.

During World War II the Nazis became frustrated with the slowness with which the ‘Einsatzagruppen’ 54 the murder squads slaughtering Jews in the Soviet Union were accomplishing their murderous task. The development of the gas chambers at extermination camps was huge leaps forward for the heinous process of mass slaughter. Some 2,000 holocaust victims could be killed in the gas chambers in just 15 minutes using the poison Zyklon –B. Potentially tens of thousands of victims could be killed each day. Demonization and dehumanization of enemies reached new levels during the Nazis “Final solution” – their slaughter of over six million Jews and other allegedly “asocial” groups. 55, 56

RECORDED HISTORY OF ANCIENT WORLD:
Sicarii Zealots: (66-72 A.D)

From the earliest of times man has engaged in acts of terrorism and rebellion. Josephus the famous Roman historian 57 tells in his writing that among the earliest such examples were the Sicarii and the Zealots, Jewish groups active during the Roman occupation of the first century Middle East. The favoured weapon of the Sicarii was the sica (the short dagger which gave them their name, which literally means ‘dagger men’), which they used these to murder those (mainly Jews) they deemed apostate and thus selected for execution. The Zealots, who generally targeted Romans and Greeks, give us the modern term Zealot, one
translation of which is “a fanatical partisan.” Such killings usually took place in daylight and in front of witnesses, with the perpetrators using such acts to send a message to the Roman authorities and those Jews who collaborated with them – a tactic that would also be used by subsequent generations of what would become known as terrorists.  

ELEVENTH CENTURY:
Al Assassins: (1090-1275)

The Hashashin whose name gave us the English “The assassins” were an offshoot of the Ismaili sect of Shiite Muslims. After a quarrel about the succession of leadership in the ruling Fatimid dynasty in Cairo around the year 1090, the losing Nizariyya faction were driven from Egypt. They established a number of fortified settlements in present day Iran, Iraq, Syria and Lebanon under the charismatic leader Hassan Sabah (died 1124 C.E) persecuted as infidels by the dominant Sunni sect in the Muslims world, they sent dedicated suicide murderers to eliminate prominent Sunni leaders whom, they considered “Impious usurper”. The sect was decimated by the invading Mongols, their last stronghold being flattened by Halaku khan in the year 1272.

Seventeenth Century:
Gunpowder Plot (1605)

On November 5, 1605 a group of conspirators, led by Guy Fawkes, attempted to destroy the English Parliament on the State Opening, by detonating a large quantity of gunpowder secretly placed beneath the building. The design was to kill King James I and the members of both houses of Parliament. The plotter’s aims were nothing short of a total revolution in the government of England, which would have killed the King along with leading noblemen and led to the installation of a Catholic monarch.

EIGHTEEN CENTURY:
Reign of Terror: (origin of modern terrorism)

The reign of Terror or simply the terror (French: la Terreur) led by Maximilien Robespierre from (September 1793-july 1794) a period of about eleven months during when struggles between rival factions led to mutual radicalization which took on a violent character with mass executions by guillotine. These 12
men (Jacobins) ran the government in a period now known as the "Reign of Terror". During French revolution the government, carried out terrorism in the name of democratic equality. They believe that the monarchy and the aristocracy had to be destroyed to create a truly equal society and the violence may be required to make society reflect that equality.\textsuperscript{66,67}

**NINETEENTH CENTURY:**

**Anarchism: (1890-1910)**

Anarchists were the most prolific terrorists of the 19th century, this movement arose because of social change which brought about by the industrial revolution causes tens of thousands of workers to move off small farms and work for long hours with lower pay. The anarchists believe that people can govern themselves without any formal government, laws, police or other authority but free association of all its members. Their goal was to improve the condition of workers, they urged workers to form association and take control of government and new factories. The disjointed attacks of various anarchist groups lead to the assassination of Russian Tsars and American Presidents.\textsuperscript{68,69}

**Ku Klux Klan (1865):**

The original Ku Klux Klan (KKK) was created after the end of the American Civil War on December 24, 1865, by six educated, middle-class Confederate. It soon spread into nearly every southern state of the United States. The Klan has advocated what is generally perceived as white supremacy, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholicism, homophobia, and nativism. They have often used terrorism, violence and acts of intimidation such as cross burning to oppress African Americans and other groups.\textsuperscript{70}

**Irish Republican Brotherhood : (1919-1921)**

The Irish Republican Brotherhood, a revolutionary group with support from Irish – Americans, carried out attacks in England. These were the first acts of "republican terrorism", which became a recurrent feature of British history, and they were the precursor of the Irish Republican army. Some members of the catholic population, frustrated by the lack of rights and economic opportunity, turned to terrorism and the Irish republican Army. The goal of the war was to gain Irish independence from England, terrorism was applied to the representatives of
England in an effort to make the cost of continued occupation too high to maintain.  

TWENTIETH CENTURY:

Irgun: (1936-1948)

Irgun was a clandestine militant Zionist group that operated in Palestine from 1931 to 1848. In addition to smuggling Jews into Palestine, the Irgun began in 1936 a policy of committing terrorist attacks against random Arabs as retribution for attacks and threats against Jews. These attacks were intended to instil fear in the Arab side, in order to cause the Arabs to wish for peace and quiet. These “retaliation and revenge” acts continued until the formation of the state of Israel in 1948.

In addition to the terrorist acts against Arabs, the Irgun also was involved in fighting against the British rule of Palestine. Their goal was to respond against British policies they disagreed with, and ultimately, to force the British to grant Jews the right to form their own nation in Palestine. Their most famous attacks were the bombing of the King David Hotel in 1946 which was the centre of the British administration in Palestine, and the massacre of Arab village Den Yassin in 1948. In same year, the group was formally dissolved and its members integrated into the newly formed Israeli defence forces. Irgun leader Menachem Begin later became prime minister of Israel.

World War II: (1939-1945)

Some of the most successful terrorist groups were the vast array of guerrilla, partisan, and resistance movements that were organized and supplied by the Allies. During World War II, the German military occupied many countries in Europe. Often, the German troops were attacked by people who described themselves as “Freedom fighter” or guerrillas. The Germans, on the other hand, labelled the attacks' as Terrorism and respondent by executing uninvolved civilians in the area. The British Special Operations Executive (SOE) conducted in every theatre of the war, and provided an invaluable contribution to allied victory. On the eve of D-Day it organized with French resistance the complete destruction of the rail and communication infrastructure of western France. Perhaps the largest coordinate terrorist attack in history. The SOE effectively
invented modern terrorism, pioneering most of the tactics, techniques and technologies that are the mainstays of terrorism we know today.\textsuperscript{76}

**Cold War Proxies: (1970s)**

Throughout the Cold War both sides (United States and the western democracies on one side and the Soviet Union and the communist bloc on other) made extensive use of terrorist organizations to carry on a war by proxy.\textsuperscript{77} For example many of the Afghani of were trained by the US and UK to fight the USSR in Afghanistan.\textsuperscript{78} Similar groups such as the ‘Viet Cong’ received training from Soviet and Chinese military “advisers”.\textsuperscript{79} NATO ran a Europe-wide network called ‘Operation Gladio’ which committed both false flag terrorism and would have committed insurgent attacks in the event of a Soviet invasion.\textsuperscript{80}

**Tamil tigers (liberation tigers of Tamil Eelam or LTTE):**

The Tamil tigers are a Sri Lankan separatist guerrilla organization founded in 1972. The island nation of Sri Lanka (Ceylon) has seen bitter conflict between Hindu Tamil minority and the Buddhist Sinhalese majority. The tigers seek an independent Tamil state in the northern and eastern parts of the island. Despite receiving antiterrorist aid and troops from India in the late 1980s, the Sri Lankan government has been unable to defeat the Tigers, who have proven able to mount substantial attacks.\textsuperscript{81}

**Aum Shinri-kyu (1984-1995)**

Contrary to popular belief, terrorism motivated by religion is not restricted to Islamic groups in the Middle East. The Aum Shinri-kyu, now known as Aleph, is a Japanese religious group founded by Shoko Asahara. Between 1990 and 1995, the group committed various terror attacks including the Matsumoto incident and the Sarin gas attack on Tokyo subway using the method of biological warfare using botulin toxin and anthrax spores,\textsuperscript{82} to revenge on the government rather than have any real political goal. He stated, “What the U.S government did at Waco and ruby ridge was dirty.”\textsuperscript{83}

**TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY:**

**9/11/ (2001):**

Arguably, the most widely known act of non-political terrorism was when nineteen terrorist hijacked four commercial passenger jet airliners and crashed two of them into the World Trade Centre, one into the Pentagon and another was
crashed. As a result of the attacks, both of the world Trade Centre’s Twin tower completely collapsed. Nearly 3,000 people died during the attacks, and the attacks prompted drastic changes in United States foreign and domestic policy and security protocol, The so called ‘war on terrorism’ is on-going US military response to attack, which now the focus of American security and foreign policy.84

TERRORISM CLASSIFIED BY ISSUE:

During the past five centuries, the world has seen hundreds of terrorist attacks in Europe, the United States, the Middle East, South America, and Asia. Most share similar characteristics i.e. unexpected and violent attacks on non-military targets. But the motivations behind these terrorist attacks have varied greatly.

In general, terrorist groups fall into six main categories;

1. National or ethnic independence movements
2. Political-economic warfare
3. State-sponsored terrorism
4. Social causes
5. Individuals with grievances
6. Religion

NATIONAL OR ETHNIC INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS

Around the world, many different people who are citizens of one nation would prefer to found a separate, independent country. These new countries might be based on speaking the same language, practicing the same religion, or belonging to the same ethnic group.

Examples of such independence movements include:

• Muslims, who lived in Algeria during the first half of the twentieth century, when it was governed by France;85
• Arabs living in Palestine, which largely has been occupied by the Jewish nation of Israel since 1948;86
• the Basque people of Northern Spain, who want to break away to form their own country;87
• Kurdish people who want to create an independent state from parts of Turkey, Iraq, and Iran.88
• In Northern Ireland some residents want to become part of the Republic of Ireland while others want to remain part of Great Britain.  
• In Kashmir, an area in the northwest corner of India, there people have long fought to achieve independence from India.

POLITICAL ECONOMIC WARFARE:

People have used violence to achieve a wide range of political and economic goals. On a smaller scale, workers have turned to violence to demand higher pay, while employers have used violence to keep from paying workers more. At the other end of the scale, revolutionaries have used terror to overthrow a government and completely change a political system.

Early in the nineteen century (1811), craftsmen in England who had lost their jobs as a result of new textile factories went out a night to destroy machines in the new factories or attack the homes of factory owners. In a few cases, they murdered the owners. They were called "luddites" and they were among the earliest terrorists fighting for a political economic cause.

In the 1800s some people wanted to change the economic system and to replace private ownership of factories with government ownership. In particular, a group called anarchists thought that large central governments should be replaced by smaller voluntary association's government.

STATE-SPONSORED TERRORISM:

There are two broad definitions of state sponsored terrorism, one refers to governments that support or conduct terrorism against other governments. For instance, Jessica Stern insists that in deliberately bombarding civilians as a means of attacking enemy morale, states have indeed resorted to terrorism. Per Stern, such instances include not only the Allied strategic bombing campaigns of World War II, but the American dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki that ended the Pacific phase of that conflict. The other refers to governments that conduct terrorist acts against their own citizens. Like, during the interwar years, terrorism increasingly referred to the oppressive measures imposed by various totalitarian regimes, most notably those in Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy and Stalinist Russia. More recently, other governments, such as those military dictatorships which ruled some South American countries in recent years, or the
current regime in Zimbabwe, have also been open to charges of using such methods as a tool of state. Such considerations notwithstanding, some commentators, such as Bruce Hoffman, argue that “such usages are generally termed ‘terror’ in order to distinguish that phenomenon from ‘terrorism,’ which is understood to be violence committed by non-state entities.” However not everyone agrees that terrorism should be considered a non-governmental undertaking.

INDIVIDUALS WITH GRIEVANCES:

Some individuals turn to terrorist acts to achieve their social or political goals. Assassinations (the murder of a public figure or government official) and bombings are the most frequently used tactics. Sometimes these terrorists are disturbed about a dangerous technological future. Other times they are individuals seeking revenge for an act by the government and some socially deprived groups. This was the case with Timothy McVeigh, who bombed the Oklahoma City. He was angered with the government for Waco tragedy.

RELIGION:

Religion has long been a leading source of terrorist activities. Between about 1915 and 1925 in the United States, which was predominantly protestant at the time, the ku klux klan was strongly biased against Roman Catholics. During that period, many immigrants to the U.S from Southern Europe were Catholics. Thé Klan’s hatred towards Catholics, Jews, African Americans and other groups was expressed through intimidation, beatings and lynching. According to Hoffman, the latest manifestation of religiously inspired terrorist trend began in 1979, when the revolution that transformed Iran into an Islamic republic led it to use and support terrorism as a means of propagating its ideals beyond its own border.

THE INTENT OF TERRORIST GROUPS:
A terrorist group commits acts of violence to -

- Produce widespread fear
- Obtain worldwide, national, or local recognition for their cause by attracting the attention of the media
- Harass, weaken, or embarrass government security forces so that the government overreacts and appears repressive
- Steal or extort money and equipment, especially weapons and ammunition vital to the operation of their group
- Destroy facilities or disrupt lines of communication in order to create doubt that the government can provide for and protect its citizens
- Discourage foreign investments, tourism, or assistance programs that can affect the target country's economy and support of the government in power
- Influence government decisions, legislation, or other critical decisions
- Free prisoners
- Satisfy vengeance
- Turn the tide in a guerrilla war by forcing government security forces to concentrate their efforts in urban areas. This allows the terrorist group to establish itself among the local populace in rural areas. 98

**TYPES OF MODERN TERRORISM:**

Terrorism has become such an inescapable fact of life that it now spread itself into every corner of life. With the help of modern technologies it appeared in diverse forms. As the latter manifests it infringes on different sets of human rights - social, ideological, intellectual, educational and financial.

**BIOTERRORISM:**

Bioterrorism refers to the international release of toxic biological agents to harm and terrorize civilians, in the name of a political or other cause. The U.S. centre for disease control has classified the viruses, bacteria and toxins that could be used in an attack. Biological diseases are those most likely to do the most damage. 99

**CYBER TERRORISM:**

Cyber terrorism uses information technology to attack civilians and draw attention to their cause this may mean that they use information technology such as computer system or telecommunications as a tool to orchestrate a traditional attack. More often cyber terrorism refers to attack on information technology itself in a way that would radically disrupt networked services. 100
ECOTERRORISM:

Eco terrorism is a recently coined term describing violence in the interest of environment. Extremists sabotage property to inflict economic damage on industries or factories they see as harming animals or the nature environment. These have included fur companies, logging companies and animal research laboratories. 101

NUCLEAR TERRORISM:

Nuclear terrorism refers to a number of different ways nuclear materials might be exploited as a terrorist tactic. These include attacking nuclear facilities, purchasing nuclear weapons or building nuclear weapons or otherwise finding ways to disperse radioactive materials. 102

NARCOTERRORISM:

It has had several meanings since it coining in 1983 by Former President Belaunde Terry of Peru. It once denoted violence used by drug traffickers to influence governments or prevent government efforts to stop the drug trade and terrorist type attacks against nation's anti-narcotics police. In the last several years, narco-terrorism has been used to indicate situation in which terrorism group use drug trafficking to fund their other operations. 103

REASON OF TERRORISM:

When a bomb explodes and hundred die, people start asking why some group turn to terrorism and how it become so widespread that it affects everyone's lives. Research literature on causational factors and diverse goals that drives people to resort to carry out terrorist acts is inconclusive. Multiple reasons are listed by Dr. C. Maria Keet. 104

ETHNICITY, NATIONALISM/SEPARATISM:

Probably the most contested cause of terrorism is an aggrieved group resorting to violence for nationalist or separatist reasons; depending on one's point of view, this can be considered as resistance against an (external) oppressor. Whereas in most other (previously) colonized states "nationalism movements commonly turned to terrorism", it being "the resort of an extremist faction of this broader movement" within an ethnic minority. 105 To generalize it further, Williams
pointed that, ethnic conflict arises from a "complex combination" of class, inequality, political opportunity, mobilization resources and "ethnic strength". Fearon and Laitin (1996) assessed the ratio of actual versus potential communal violence in Africa from independence through 1979, ranging from 0.0005 for actual ethnic violence to 0.0028 (or 0.28%) for ethnic civil war, thereby claiming that incidence of ethnic conflict is hugely overestimated due to research bias. Worded more positively: most ethnic groups live in peace with each other.

**POVERTY AND ECONOMIC DISADVANTAGE, GLOBALIZATION:**

A more important factor may be the social stratification Williams is referring to and inequalities in the distribution of scarce resources. Extensive contemporary media and literature simplify this to the poverty argument that when a group is absolutely or relatively deprived they rebel. Problems Lichbach identified were notions on the lack of exactly defined economic factors influencing the decision to resort to political conflict and the "tolerance for inequality". Guelke explores globalization, inequality and the Third World from another direction and explores the possible links between economic affluence and a stable liberal democracy, thereby assuming that it would reduce incidence of terrorism. However, at the same time he asserts that a liberal democracy "has proved little more successful than other forms of political systems in overcoming the relative weakness of the state in many Third World societies" and that economic development is a more important factor to maintain law and order. He is more concerned with intra-Third World conflicts than worldwide international terrorism as "there has been relatively little spill-over from political violence within Third World states into the international arena" and in addition to economic development, the possible effects a "debilitated" liberal democracy in Third World countries may induce and facilitate, but without formulating a sound conclusion on the matter either.

**NON-DEMOCRACY:**

According to Wilkinson, a democratic government is supposed to represent the people and provide political means to voice grievances, hence essentially providing a sphere where terrorism has no place. For this reason, in theory, there 'cannot' be an aggrieved group that is not adequately represented; otherwise, it is a
"violation of the doctrines of democracy and constitutionalism".¹¹³ Such a situation would fit Wilkinson's assertion that political violence is morally justifiable in a democracy in two occasions: "Firstly, there is the case of the minority whose basic rights and liberties are denied or taken away by arbitrary action of the government or its agencies. ... Second, when one minority is attacked by another minority and does not receive adequate protection from the state and its forces of law and order."¹¹⁴ and "Those who are the subjects of a liberal state, but who are not admitted to its rights of citizenship cannot be morally bound to obedience to the state. They are not bound by political obligation for they have not been accorded any rights by the state."¹¹⁵

Arguably, based on these claims, one can say it is exactly absence of a 'correct' implementation of democratic ideals and not democracy sic. What might be a cause, according to Maria Keet is the so-called 'terror of the majority': the minority is represented and allowed to voice their grievances, but this is consistently not translated into desired policies because there are not sufficient votes to pass desired legislation.

**DISAFFECTED INTELLIGENTSIA:**

Rubenstein elaborates another interesting aspect occurring in Western liberal democratic states in his book *Alchemists of Revolution* (1987), though not necessarily because of a hiatus in democratic governance. There are two points to bring under attention. First, Rubenstein's thesis that the main cause of terrorism are disgruntled, disaffected, intelligentsia who are in a social and moral crisis unable to mobilize the masses. This is "a primary internal cause of terrorism, dictating to a degree its philosophy, tactics and consequences".¹¹⁶ Intellectuals, of the type of ambitious idealist, do not have a rebellious lower class to lead due to shifts from primary and manual work to the services sector, nor do they receive guidance from a creative upper class that they can follow. When rigid social stratification shatter hopes for social transformation, then the ingredients are present for a start or rise in terrorist activities in an attempt to reconnect with the masses, whom they claim to represent and aspire to lead.
DEHUMANIZATION:

Opposite the concept of disaffected intelligentsia is the assertion that it is not intelligentsia, but simpleminded people who are easy to indoctrinate that are perceived to be 'the cause'.\textsuperscript{117} prevalent in more recent popular literature. Government and others are essentially trying to dehumanize terrorists, thereby confirming terrorist's core reasons they are fighting for: being heard, recognized and treated as equal human beings. In this context, Midgley has put forward an interesting explanation for the increased levels of dehumanization: "a continuation of the frozen, abstract hatreds made possible by the cold war... this suspending of normal human relations is supposed to be just a temporary expedient. ... The corrupt thing about the Cold War idea was that it legitimized acceptance of this evil as a normal, permanent condition of life. It domesticated tribal hatred.\textsuperscript{118} Thus terrorism and the violent responses on terrorism, made possible by disregarding the idea that an opponent is a human being too. However, a closer examination of this argument reveals that the implied cause of the violence is within us, having internalized dehumanization, not the 'illiterate stupid other'.

RELIGION:

When Religious Freedoms are violated groups often resort to the use of terror tactics to try and address the issue. One example is the Uyghur freedom Movement who responded to the suppression of their religion by the Chinese authorities by launching a bombing campaign.\textsuperscript{119}

According to Hayes, Nations that differ in religion are more likely to fight than those that share the same religion. Moreover, some sects seem generally to be more bellicose (Christian nations participated in a disproportionate number of conflicts). But these effects are not large.\textsuperscript{120} Notwithstanding the above, all religions emphasize that one should treat others as we wish to be treated, and that one should not kill another human being (the latter with a few exceptions, e.g. Just War Theory). From an Islamic perspective, there are scholars who consider Western society, which is based on Christian theology, as the main cause of terrorism, and Darwinism and materialism in particular,\textsuperscript{121} including Malthus' theory of ruthlessness,\textsuperscript{122} also known under the definition of social Darwinism. Last, New Age - as a religion - considers the perceived cause of terrorism the
"modern society", being "too stressful and uncreative" \(^{123}\), i.e. a problem within oneself.

So as passed through different phases of human history an impelling conclusion is inescapable that Violence has been a weapon used by institutions and governments as well as individual revolutionaries throughout history in every epoch and throughout the world. It has been used to subjugate populations, assert power or create an illusion of power in order to achieve political objectives and gain control of resources.

Terrorism is not a war between different segments of human being, conversely, it is a war against values—justice, and security. Nevertheless, the above-stated conclusion is both valid and operative. To restate, terrorism is a war against values that humanity so dearly cherished.
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