Chapter One

MILITANCY AND TERRORISM: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
With the end of the World War II, there emerged a completely new world order. Prior to that, in the post - World War I period, the world was divided into ideological camps with the emergence of America as a capitalist superpower on the one hand and Russia as a Communist country on the other. But the end of World War II brought along with it the independence for several small countries in Asia and Africa. With the independence of these small countries, the race between the two superpower camps began, adding further woes to their fragile political, economic and social set-up. This was the period which is also known as ‘Cold War’ period because of the rivalry between the two big powers that permeated horizontally and vertically into the world political and strategic arenas. They tried to bring as many countries as possible under their fold by fomenting the various forces on ethnic, religious and cultural grounds. Thus, America got engaged in Asia and Africa, and Russia in Gulf and Europe. This encouraged the groups on the lines of different affiliations to struggle for a greater share for themselves of the limited resources of the world. In this competition and race for resources, some obviously got more while the others, less. Sometimes, the group which could not get its share in the new political set-up waged armed struggle against the state, often violent ones, aided and abetted by co-interest groups from outside. Apart from this struggle for resources, groups based on ethnic and religious identity tried to assert themselves and in order to satisfy their political objectives i.e. to get political power, resorted to violent actions time and again. In this case, special mention may be made of the growth of radical and militant Islam after the Second World War. This phenomenon has resulted in the perpetration of terrorism as an instrument for achieving the goals, mostly political.
Thus, terrorism as an instrument for achieving political goals has been widely adopted resulting in a grave worldwide concern to combat this phenomenon. Today, there is no country in the world whether in Europe, Africa or Asia, which is not witnessing the menace of terrorism and is not concerned about this. Of late, it has become a potential threat to the entire mankind.

The phenomenon of terrorism has been a complex one as a result of which it requires an in-depth study to arrive at a common and widely acceptable definition. But till now a commonly accepted definition is yet to evolve for the formation of a generally accepted policy towards it. In spite of these constraints, there have been several seminal and pioneering endeavours in this direction.

**Defining Terrorism, Insurgency and Militancy**

The word, ‘terrorism’ is interpreted by scholars in different perspectives. There are innumerable definitions which have come out of the involvement of a cross-section of academicians in this field of study. Every definition that has been forwarded by them appears correct in its own perspective. It is because of the multiplicity of definitions that the meaning of terrorism has not been understood in its correct perspective. Scholars all over the world are entangled in the labyrinth of terminology and have expressed different views. Here, some of the important definitions given by renowned scholars may be cited for a deeper, proper and logical perception on terrorism and its different connotations.

Martha Crenshaw gave a detailed account of terrorism and its approaches. She writes, “Two views are expressed to understand terrorism and its implications. The first explanation is based on the assumption that the act of terrorism is a deliberate choice by a potential actor. The organisation as a unit, acts to achieve collective values which involves radical changes of practical and social conditions. Terrorism is interpreted as a response to the external stimuli, particularly
government actions. An increase in the cost or a decrease in the reward will make it less likely." She also explains the organisational motives and objectives of terrorists and writes, "Terrorism is explained as an organisation's struggle for survival, usually in a competitive environment. Leaders ensure organisational maintenance by offering varied incentives to followers not all of which involves the pursuit of the group's stated political purposes. Leaders seek to prevent both defection and dissent by developing intense loyalties by group members. The organisation responds to the pressure from outside by the incentives offered, members or through innovation. Terrorist actions do not necessarily or directly reflect ideological values".

Thomas C. Shelling, another authority on the subject suggests, "Terrorism is one form of violent coercion, a bargaining process based on power to hurt and intimidate as a substitute for the use of overt military force". As such, it is similar to other strategies based on the 'power to hurt' rather than conventional military strength. Terrorism is meant to produce a change in government's political position, not the destruction of military potential, he opines.

Bard E O'Neill in his book has given a small but lucid definition. He mentions "Terrorism is a form of warfare in which violence is primarily directed against non-combatants (usually unarmed civilians) rather than operational, military and police forces or economic assets (public or private)."

Another scholar on the subject, Alex P. Schmid, while defining terrorism gave a lengthy but partially appropriate definition. He writes "Terrorism is a method of combat in
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2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
which random or symbolic victims share group or class characteristics which form the basis of their selection for victimisation. Through previous use of violence or the credible use of violence, other members of that group or class are put in a state of chronic fear (terror). The purpose of this indirect method of combat is either to immobilise the target of terror in order to produce disorientation and/or compliance, or to mobilise secondary targets of demands (e.g. government) or targets of attention to changes of attitude or behaviour favouring the short or the long-term interest of the users of this method.  

Schmid’s definition gives a considerable attention to the target dimension of terrorism distinguishing victims of violence not only from the actual targets of terror but also from targets of demand and attention. It further focuses on the dimensions of purposes and context and to a lesser extent on the acts that differentiate terrorism from other violent activities. Schmid’s approach, however, consciously avoids dealing with motive - a dimension that is often used to separate crusaders from criminals or “crazies”, and, as such, one that is closely related to the second ranked citation in his frequency chart i.e. political intent. The definitional effort also says little about the perpetrators of terrorism, thereby implying that there is no unique attribute of the phenomenon linked to those who carry it out. In this sense, it sidesteps the extremely contentious debate over whether direct or indirect terror used as state policy is indistinguishable from insurgency or challenge terrorism that has captured international headlines and attention.

7 Alex P. Schmid’s book Political Terrorism, pp. 79-96, offers a detailed examination of such distinctions.
Essentially, terror is a tactic that can be utilised in many contexts, for a broad range of purposes, generated by a wide spectrum of motives. Thus, terror is a component in many activities. The question then is how much within a given activity is occupied by this component. In terrorism, unlike its neighbouring reference categories (from state terror to guerilla warfare), the terror component is the pre-eminent and preponderant component of the whole of which it is a part.

 Whatever else is said about terrorism, its almost total concentration on targets of opportunity (i.e. the defenceless) provides it with its distasteful flavour whether or not one seeks to justify its occurrence.

 The group or class, whose member's sense of security is purposefully undermined, is the target of terror. The victimisation of the target of violence is considered extra-normal by most observers from the witnessing audience on the basis of its atrocity, the time (e.g. peacetime) or place (not a battlefield) of victimisation, or the disregard for rules of combat accepted in conventional warfare. The norm violation creates an attentive audience beyond the target of terror; sectors of this audience might, in turn, form the main object of manipulation. The purpose of this indirect method of combat is either to immobilise the target of terror in order to produce disorientation and/or compliance, or to mobilise secondary targets of demands (e.g. a government) or targets of attention (e.g. public opinion) to change of attitude or behaviour, favouring the short or long term interests of the users of this method of combat.10

 R. P. Hoffman defines the concept more or less on similar lines. "Terrorism is a purposeful human political activity which is directly designed to influence in ways designed by the protagonists, other human beings and, through them, same course of events".11
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11 R. P. Hoffman, as cited in Political Terrorism, op. cit., p. 91.
This definition is criticized for a certain vagueness or question whether the climate of fear had to be general. All acts of violence produce fear and alarm as a by-product - it is the objective. Being confronted by a mugger who demands your wallet may be a terrifying experience, but a mugger is not a terrorist; he is interested in your wallet. A terrorist on the other hand, is interested in the psychological effects of his violence on the people watching the event. There is, therefore, an awareness of a difference between the victims of terrorist violence and the target audience of that violence. This distinction between the victims of terrorist violence and the target of that violence sometimes manifests itself in extraordinary ways.

This problem of definition is particularly evident in international terrorism, that is, terrorist actions in which foreign targets are attacked, borders are crossed, or airlines or other international lines of commerce are attacked. The lack of a generally accepted form of terrorism has been a barrier to international cooperation against this form of terrorism. Slowly, however, a rough consensus on the meaning of terrorism is emerging without any international agreement on the precise definition.

Former US Senator Jeremiah Denton, while introducing the Anti-Terrorism Act 1984, provides an example of the type of definition some Americans believe in. He says, "Terrorism means knowing use of force or violence against any person or property in violation of the criminal laws of the US or any state, territory, possessions or district, with the intent to intimidate, coerce, or influence a government or person in furtherance of any political or ideological objective".12

Contrary to the former Senator's definition, Noam Chomsky and Edward Herman condemn it with their strong opinions on the subject. They say, "the words 'terror' and 'terrorism' have become semantic tools of the powerful in the Western world. In their dictionary meaning, these words refer to 'intimidation' by the 'systematic use of violence' as a means of both governing and opposing the existing governments. But current Western usage has restructured the sense, on purely ideological grounds, to the retail violence of those who oppose the established order".  

Ihekwoaba D. Onwudieche outlined the impact of globalisation on terrorism in his book *The Globalisation of Terrorism*. He has compiled a number of definitions of terrorism which have been suggested by different quarters across the world.  

a) An organised pattern of violent behaviour designed to influence government policy or intimidate the government population for the purpose of influencing government policy.  

b) Terror: violence committed by groups in order to intimidate a population or government into granting their demands. 

c) Terror is a symbolic action designed to influence political behaviour by extra-normal means entailing the use or threat of violence.  
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16 Webster’s Dictionary, 1983, cited in Ibid.  
d) Terrorism is a non-governmental public violence or its threat performed by an individual and small group and aimed at achieving social or political goals. That may be sub-national, national or international.\(^{18}\)

e) Terrorism is the rise of force, violence, or threat of violence to attain goals through fear, intimidation or coercion.\(^{19}\)

f) In general, the word terrorism is used today to define at least all illegal acts of violence committed for political purposes by clandestine groups.\(^{20}\)

One of the definitions which is widely acceptable in the academic circles is by Yonah Alexander. He defines terrorism as “the rise or threat of violence against random or civilian targets in order to create generalised pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals.”\(^{21}\)

Apart from these scholarly works basically academic in nature, there are also a few official definitions available. Though most of the official definitions are subjective in nature, hence, can not be taken or accepted as final ones, still they are important because they provide an insight into the understanding of this thorny problem. According to the US Department of State, there is no single universally accepted definition of terrorism. Even in US, several law enforcement agencies define terrorism in a different light and different context. The Federal Bureau of Investigation defines terrorism as “the unlawful use of force or violence against the persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.”\(^{22}\)


\(^{22}\) Cited in Christopher Kozlow, *Jane's Counter Terrorism,* USA, Jane's Information Group, 2000, p. 18.
The US Department of State provides the following definitions under Title-22 of the United States Code, Section 265(f)d: "the term terrorism means pre-mediated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience; the term international terrorism means terrorism involving citizens of the territory of more than one country; and the term terrorist group means any group practising or that has significant sub-groups that practice, international terrorism."23

The US Department of Defence defines terrorism as:

"The unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence against individuals or property to coerce or intimidate governments or societies, often used to achieve political, religious or ideological objectives."24

Being influenced by the international character of terrorism, the UN has been trying for decades to find out a suitable definition of terrorism, so that a uniform policy can be adopted against it internationally. In 1972, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to establish an Ad-hoc Committee titled, "Measures to prevent international terrorism which endangers or takes innocent human lives or jeopardises fundamental freedoms and study of the underlying 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 changes".25 Recalling this resolution, the Ad-hoc Committee created three sub-committees. The first of these was dedicated to

23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
examine the definition of terrorism. Seven draft proposals were submitted by member nations. While the Non-Aligned group defined terrorism as acts of violence committed by a group of individuals, which endanger human lives and jeopardise fundamental freedoms, the effects of which are not confined to one state. The NAM draft proposal, however, excluded the inalienable right to self-determination under colonial and racist regimes from this definition. After examining numerous proposals, the member nations agreed to define all acts of terrorism as “criminal”. This is again objectionable on the ground that the link between terrorism and crime could be established, but to identify the two as one would be misgiving. However, if it is analysed for administrative purpose, the UN definition perhaps is the simplest way to counter international terrorism. Further, as the CIS countries were facing the brunt of terrorism in the post-independence period, they adopted a declaration on the agreement on the cooperation of CIS countries in fighting terrorism. According to the CIS resolution, terrorism is “an illegal and criminally punishable action committed to break public security, influence decision-making by state authorities, and intimidate citizens”. This is a definition which is much in line with one forwarded by the UN. This definition narrows terrorism to ordinary crimes such as robbery, blackmail, extortion, and taking hostages. 26

Despite definitional discrepancies, some common features can be obtained from the above definitions. They can be presented in the form of a model, based on David Easton’s Systems theory.

Definitional Model of Terrorism (Based on David Easton's System's Theory):  

**Terrorism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Perspective (P)</th>
<th>Means Perspective (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this model, definition of terrorism is described in two broader perspectives- Politics (P), i.e. terrorism as a political phenomenon and Means (M), i.e. to study terrorism as a means to achieve certain political objectives and not as an end in itself. In the subsequent phase, the model explains that (P) helps actors to form a cohesive whole, which subsequently results into Group Action (GA), and GA heads to International Linkages (IL).

From the point of political perspective, terrorism is defined as a political rather than criminal or psychological phenomenon, as it aims to achieve political

---

power and not accumulation of wealth or personal gain. In the Means (M) perspective, terrorism is defined as a means to achieve political objectives rather than an end. The model goes further to explain that the means employed are that of Violence (V) and the violence employed is also of specific type i.e. tactical which needs professional training. A layman cannot operate sophisticated weapons used by terrorists. This aspect also has to be incorporated in the definition of terrorism. A detailed explanation of both the perspectives is given in Model-II.

**Reasons behind the Definitional Discrepancy on Terrorism and Its Fallout**

To this rider, Michael Jenkins explains that “it is possible to define terrorism objectively as long as we define it in terms of the quality of the act and not in terms of the identity of the perpetrator or the nature of the cause. This removes us from the dilemma of one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.” Of course, choosing to define terrorism in this way is itself a value judgement. It is a backhanded way of saying that ends do not justify means.28

Grant Wardlaw also holds similar opinion on this issue. He writes, “a major stumbling block to the serious study of terrorism is that, at base, terrorism is a moral problem.”29

The Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat in his 1974 United Nations speech said, “he who fights for a just cause, he who fights for the liberation of his country, he who fights against invasion and exploitation or single-mindedly against colonialism, can never be defined as a terrorist”.30

This view, however, mistakes the moral dimensions of the subject. It may be that under a given set of circumstances, an individual or group is entitled to violently break some eggs in order to make a just omelette. But what eggs are
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30 Alex P. Schmid, Albert J. Jangman et al., op. cit., p. 100.
chosen and the method in which they are broken are never outside the realm of proper and moral judgements. Just cause or not, he who performs acts of terrorism is a terrorist. And because terrorism violates the norms associated with discriminating and proportional use of violence, it leaves itself open to moral condemnation regardless of its results and its political orientations.\textsuperscript{31}

The Philosophy of Terrorism

There are several intellectual postulates that have given respectability to terrorism in the discipline of political science. And these postulates may be construed as the “philosophy of terrorism.”\textsuperscript{32}

Sanctified Goals

Almost all terrorism is committed in the name of some popular revolutionary ideology or religious legitimacy. Even the most barbarian group of terror found it necessary to rest their wanton means on some sanctified goals. The first group systematically employing murder for a “cause” it believed to be righteous was probably the famous Muslim sect: ‘the Assassins’, from whose name the modern word “assassination” is derived. The term is really derived from the Arabic hashishi (the consumers of hashish, the well known drug) who represented a sect of fanatics in Palestine in the 13\textsuperscript{th} century, whose chief object was to create a sense of terror by stabbing and murdering the Christian crusaders. The Assassins developed an explicit religious justification for killing the unrighteous and the servants of the unrighteous.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{32} The literary and philosophical history of terrorism dates back to ancient Greece, if one includes the myth of Electra who helped to avenge her father’s murder by her mother or trace Plotonis who seventeen centuries ago said, “Terror in compound is the dread of dissolution”.
The development of political ideological basis in order to provide a secular justification for revolution, however, originated during the French Revolution period. In the opinion of the ideologues of French Revolution, terror became a legitimate weapon of revolutionary justice and revenge against the absolutist, aristocratic and ecclesiastical systems of the “ancient regime”. Their revolutionary theory of popular rights to liberty and justice provided the first ideological justification for revolutionary terrorism.

Intellectual writing on terrorism as an ideology began in the nineteenth century. One of the earliest authors of terrorist thought was Wilhelm Weilting (1808-1871). He was a German Socialist who wrote about the mobilisation of the criminal underworld in a revolutionary struggle. But the concept of systematic terrorism and its use in revolutionary strategy appeared for the first time in the writings of Russian revolutionaries Mikhail Bakunin and Sergey Nechayev. Their writings, with an emphasis upon violence as a method for achieving social change, were the inspiration if not the actual source of the doctrine of anarchism and nihilism. They authored rules for revolutionary which often called catechism in view of its doctrine character, is regarded as the greatest text of terrorist literature. It is veritably acknowledged as a treatise on anti-morality and also a programme of action which epitomises the philosophy of personal terror.

Revolutionary catechism has been instrumental in the emergence of philosophy based terrorism. Its predominant theme was the destruction of the existing order. The social world, according to it, has become impotent and sterile. The socialist atmosphere corrupts the people’s instincts and wills, contracts their hearts and intelligence. Hence, it is imperative to overthrow the society and purify
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completely the milieu in which people lived. From such an understanding emanate Mikhail Bakunin’s rationalisations of terror. He maintains that the power to think and the desire to rebel represent the essential factor, the negative power in the positive development of human animality and create consequently all that constitutes humanity in man.35

He, therefore, recommends the reliance on the “eternally creative source of life.... the urge to destroy” which according to him is also a “creative urge”. He substantiates this premise by holding that every forward step in history until now has been achieved only after it has been baptised in blood. Bakunin believed in the total destruction of the legal state and the so-called bourgeois civilisation. The demolition of the state has to come about by a popular revolution, which will be led not by the vanguards of the workers party as Karl Marx envisaged, but by a collective, imperceptible and anonymous dictatorship of the partisans. This collective, Bakunin believed, will be firmly united in a secret society, acting everywhere and always with the same goal and according to the same programme.36

The catechism prescribes the same kind of fanaticism that characterises the contemporary terrorist. It states, for instance, that the revolutionary despises all doctrines, rejects the mundane sciences and leaves them to future generations. The revolutionary only knows one science - the science of destruction. “To this end and to this end alone, he will study day and night the living science, people, their character and circumstances. His role and constant object is the immediate destruction of the vile order.”37

36 Ibid. p. 7.
Propaganda by Deed

A cardinal principle in the strategy of the anarchists is a concept called "propaganda by deed". A leading French anti-parliamentarian, Paul Brousse coined the phrase "propaganda by deed".\(^{38}\) He argued that practical demonstrations are necessary to awaken the consciousness of the masses.

"Propaganda by deed" was also based on several ideological convictions (a) all revolt against oppression was itself progressive; (b) the transformation from blind and spontaneous responses against injustice into conscious and calculated revolt represented significant advances; (c) that decisions to commit specific acts of revolt had to rest with the people.\(^{39}\) In sum, anarchism attempted to make believe that all those acts which can be considered as terrorism or simply criminal were, in fact, revolutionary deeds heralding the coming socialism.

According to Bakunin, propaganda by deed should be conducted by revolutionary and secret organisations made up of secret cells composed of individuals ready to sacrifice themselves for revolution. He advocated the infiltration of all institutions of the state to undermine them and the stirring up of discontent among the peasantry in order to provoke mass insurrection. Similar ideas were advocated even before Bakunin by Weitling, who contested that the social order had to be deliberately exacerbated through organised theft with the urban lumpen proletariat. The poor he claimed should be given a chance to enjoy the growing disorder just as the soldier enjoyed war.

Anarchism helped to integrate terrorism in the revolutionary strategy to overthrow the established order during the late 19th century. The anarchists' theory
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\(^{38}\) Laqueur, op. cit., p. 229.

\(^{39}\) Flemming, op. cit., pp. 13-14.
came to represent a highly conscious effort to intellectualise, even to rationalise certain social occurrences during that era. The acts of anarchists indicate some of the major contradictions within terrorism. Prominent among them is the lack of any distinction between political violence and ordinary criminal acts. Often, terrorism has degenerated into pure robbery and criminal violence. Besides, the anarchists, while vehemently advocating the complete destruction of the bourgeois society, failed to offer concrete ideas for future society.

**Philosophisation of Violence**

Although there were many influential apologists for terrorism during the last century, the most elaborate and systematic to create a philosophy or more precisely an ideology of terror can be seen in the works of the Twentieth Century’s prominent thinker, Jean Paul Sartre. His works have succeeded in celebrating violence and amplified the concept of purifying creative crime. Sartre strove to accord a philosophical respectability to the notion that terror, far from being cancer in the body politic, is indeed its very life blood.

Terror is a fraternity and mover of history and hence terrorism should be eternal. In Sartre’s perception, man is seen not only as craving and fighting for power and greater power, but as a destroyer impelled to murder his fellow men. Human relations are devoid of any altruism and men only share the “negative reciprocity of mutual and deadly antagonism”. In his introduction to Franz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth*, Sartre claims that man recreates himself with
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40 Terrorist thought also appears in some pamphlets which surfaced in Geneva in 1880. They were authored by two most prominent advocates of terrorist action, Nikolai Maroza and G. Tavnaski who were also members of *Navodnaya Valya* which plotted and killed the Czar in 1881.
42 Ibid, p. 73.
violence against the oppressor. In essence, terror becomes a condition of freedom and to realise the brotherhood of man it is a dialectical necessity to regard all human life as expenditure.

Another seminal contribution to the philosophy of terrorism came from a neo-Marxist intellectual of Africa, Franz Fanon, who authored *The Wretched of the Earth* which inflamed the radicals of not only Africa but the entire Western World. Fanon was consumed with hatred for colonialism and racial oppression. Violence, as he saw it, was a cleansing force, liberating the native from his inferiority complex, his despair and inaction. Indulging in brutal forms of violence against the oppressor made the native fearless and restarted his self-respect. He declared that violence alone, violence committed by the people, violence organised and taught by its leaders makes it possible for the masses to understand social truths and gives the key to them. And people who have taken part in the violent struggle for national liberation will be jealous of the results of their action and will refuse to allow their destiny to be placed in the hands of so-called liberators. 43 He further claims that at the level of the community, violence raises national consciousness and mobilises oppressed people and binds them together into a new nation.

Western political analysts believe that Fanon helped to set the stage for international terrorism by justifying the resort to it as a legitimate way of attacking injustice. 44 He instilled among the Western radical movements a sense of guilt and a feeling that the Third World of the ex-colonies had “right” on its side and whatever violence unleashed by them or for them was “just”.

Another influential writer was Carlos Mrighella, a Brazilian Communist.\textsuperscript{45} He shot into prominence during the 1960s after his \textit{Mini-Manual of the Urban Guerrilla} was banned in many countries. The book is regarded as the bible of the contemporary terrorist and has greatly influenced the operational art of terrorism. Mrighella's approach is essentially one of provocation, compelling the enemy to “transform the political situation into a military one”. He assumed that in the process the government would alienate large sections of the population. Therefore, the people would blame the government for disruption of their lives and would swing its support to the terrorists as against the police and the army.\textsuperscript{46}

Mrighella’s manual provides strategy as well as movements for the terrorists. The struggle according to him, should proceed on three fronts - the urban guerrilla front, the mass front (meaning a combat front, not agitation) and support network. Mrighella undoubtedly distinguishes himself with his fanatical dedication to revolution.

Ever since the dawn of history, there always existed a spectrum of political thinkers who have glorified the role of violence and terrorism in human society and amplified its indispensability in restructuring the political systems. There is, however, a compelling continuity of irony underlying their intellectual postulates. It relates to their utterly degenerate and vulgar characterisation of human nature. Such a depiction is devoid of historical, sociological or even psychological basis. The fictional understanding of human nature is the cornerstone on which the entire edifice of “terror” philosophy has been erected. And philosophy, ironically, is

\textsuperscript{45} It would be far too flattering to regard Mrighella as a thinker given the ideological inconsistencies in his writings and his application. In 1966, he regarded terrorism merely as one form of mass resistance and did not expect that it would be a signal for popular uprising. He felt that the centre of gravity should be the countryside. His own activities, however, concentrated on the 'complimentary' front and he would frequently refer to the strategic importance of the urban cities.

\textsuperscript{46} Carlos Mrighella, \textit{For the Liberation of Brazil}, London, Hurmundowarth, 1971, p. 47.
meant to investigate the most general facts and principles of reality and human nature and conduct. Men, according to the “terror” school of thought, are not capable of experiencing emotions of love, obedience, altruism and compassion but are merely entities impelled to destroy one another. A logical extension of this perception is its utter disregard and disrespect for human life. All or any individual is expendable and can be submerged for the cause of “revolution”. There is also among the thinkers, a corresponding scorn for all human institutions and total distrust and cynicism of all existing mechanisms for the achievement of justice and change. It is this intellectual repudiation of human lives and institutions that have instilled in the present day radicals apathy to the life of the individual. Perhaps there is an explanation here for the indifference of the terrorists to the gruesome killing of innocent bystanders who chanced to fall in the way of the revolutionary march.

Invisible Utopia

There is yet another irony in the philosophy of terrorism. There is no dearth of the vocabulary of the philosophers who rationalise violence unlimited for the realisation of revolutionary ends. But none of them could offer any tangible idea of a utopian state which they intend to erect over the debris of death and destruction. Their compulsive obsession with terror as having a cathartic effect on the society led them into a blind alley of “pure nihilism” and prevaricate with the exposition of any viable socio-political and economic theory. Thus, the writings of the thinkers only appealed to the emotions of the masses and not to their rational faculties which could have translated the thesis into positive action. Owing to this factor, the intellectual influence of terrorism has been a contemporary phenomenon and till date, no terrorist movement has been able to bring about a change in the configuration of power.
Finally, there is a particularly disquieting irony in the attitudes of the protagonists of terror among the Western intelligentsia. They have dedicated their links and talents to the repudiation and institutions which have provided the atmosphere of intellectual freedom in which they can espouse their ideas. It is a paradox that the disciples of the terrorist acts and thoughts are not allowed to survive, let alone profess under totalitarian systems and can only thrive in liberal democracies, which they so vehemently denounce. Sartre, for instance, remained conspicuously silent during the Nazi dictatorship in Europe while he conveniently surfaced to provide intellectual support to the terrorist movements during the 1960s and 1970s. History does not record the existence of any philosophers who professed terrorism during Stalin’s repression in Soviet Union. May be. philosophers can romanticise and celebrate death, violence and terrorism, but only in a society that accords paramount status to human dignity and not under systems which have come into existence and sustain themselves by celebrating and romanticising violence and terrorism. Herein lies the irony and the philosophy of terror.

Aims and Objectives of Terrorism

Terrorist acts are committed primarily by those, who are not able to fulfil their needs in the existing socio-political structure. The acts are committed deliberately with definite aims in view and cannot be viewed as aberrations. Terrorism is aimed at bringing about “revolutionary changes” in the political system. The most common terrorist objectives include recognition (through publicity), provocation, coercion, insurgency support and intimidation.47

Intimidation

By inflicting overwhelming fear on a target audience, a terrorist is able to cripple the movement of its targets, and even society at large. According to David Rappoport, “It is most effective when directed against specific critical groups. In the 20th century, for example, successful terrorist movements following the example of Michael Collins (IRA leader after World War I) paralysed the police early usually by systematic assassination policies”. The mere threat of terrorist retaliation can foment fear and cause individuals to completely alter daily routines and habits.

Recognition

This is a critical component of terrorism because it satisfies one of the principles of terrorism. Some associated reasons for seeking recognition include the procurement of funds from outside sources and the recruitment of new members into an organisation. The act could also simply be a demonstration of strength to the world that the group exists and it is able to attack anywhere. Groups that are attempting to gain recognition generally execute spectacular attacks that attract a significant amount of media attention. Other methods to gain recognition include the use of names or labels implying strength or mass of numbers.

Coercion and Provocation

Coercion is an attempt to induce a desired behaviour or action from individuals, groups or governments. This objective calls for a strategy of selective targeting that may cause massive destruction but seldom much loss of life.
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48 David C. Rappoport, op. cit., p. 4.
Examples of this might include the bombing of a corporate headquarters involved in environmental operations or the bombing of abortion clinics.

Provocation is designed to elicit an over-reaction on the part of particular government agency or the military. This strategy normally calls for a terrorist to attack targets symbolic of the government to demonstrate a particular government’s vulnerability. The objective is two fold. On the one hand, the terrorist hopes that an attack of this nature will create a sense of uncertainty in the citizens as to their government’s ability to protect them. On the other hand, terrorists hope for a heavy-handed response to each compassion and public sympathy for the group. This is one of the cornerstones of Mrighella’s revolutionary manual. It notes that “by enraging the establishment to the point that it begins to violently attack the passive population, it is able to garner the support of horrified society, that otherwise may not have sided with the guerrilla”.\(^{50}\)

The people refuse to collaborate with the government and the general sentiment is that this government is unjust, incapable of solving problems, and that it resorts simply to the physical liquidation of its opponents.

Watching the guerrillas, the people now understand that it is a force to vote in any elections which have as their sole objectives guaranteeing the survival of the dictatorship and covering up its crimes. Attacking wholeheartedly this election farce and the so called “political solutions”, which is so appealing to the opportunists, the urban guerrillas must become even more aggressive and active, resorting without pause to sabotage, terrorism, expropriations, assault, kidnappings, executions etc.\(^{51}\)

\(^{50}\) Cited in Ibid.
\(^{51}\) Ibid
**Insurgency Support**

Terrorist action in support of insurgency is likely to include provocation, intimidation, coercion and the quest for recognition. Terrorism can cause the affected government to over-extend itself in attempting to protect all potential terrorist targets. Other users of terrorist skills and organisational relationships in support of insurgency can include the acquisition of funds, coercion of recruits, logistical support and internal group discipline.

**Principles of Terrorism**

Mao Tse Tung laid down three stages of development to achieve revolution, namely, the organisation stage, the guerrilla warfare and the mobile war stage.\(^5^2\) This model was followed by individuals such as Ho Chi Minh, and was quite effective during its time. Unfortunately, within a modern context this simple three stage approach is no longer applicable.

The fundamentals are still present, but for contemporary purposes, some adjustments must be made. In order for terrorism to progress from its inception to the ultimate goal of revolution, five general principles of terrorism become apparent. Understanding these principles allows for suitable development of counter-terrorism policies.\(^5^3\)

1. **Grassroot Support**: According to Mao, "the guerrilla is the fish and the people are the sea".\(^5^4\) Mao was quick to recognise the importance of the general public in any terrorist campaign. For terrorists to be truly effective, they must have the support of the general public for their cause and for their tactics. A terrorist group that fails to gain popular support will

---

\(^{52}\) Sean McCormack, op. cit.

\(^{53}\) Ibid, p. 31.

\(^{54}\) Ibid, p. 25.
not be able to progress to the stage of guerrilla warfare, because there will
not be enough people to fill its ranks. Such is the case of the right wing
militants in America. Likewise, a terrorist group that has popular support,
but whose actions are not supported, will most likely not achieve victory.
The Algerian Islamic extremists had huge popular support in their
campaign against the Algerian government, which they quickly lost after
pursuing a campaign of slaughtering entire village.

2. **Intelligence**: Accurate intelligence is vital for any strategic attack
and the same principles apply for terrorism. Terrorists, who accidentally
attack a hospital, rather than a military base, will quickly lose support
locally and internationally. Accurate, on-time intelligence is vital to carry
out any mission effectively.

3. **Propaganda**: Propaganda is critical for gaining support. A terrorist
organisation that does not advertise its cause will find few followers.
Propaganda, however, must be focussed both internally and externally.
Support from the local population, but condemnation from the international
community, will do little to ensure success. Perhaps this is one of the
largest failures of the PLO.

Although campaigns such as Intifada have been successful in gaining
international sympathy, on the whole, they have been ineffective in gaining
support outside of the Arab world. The Jews, in contrast, have been
extremely successful in propagating their views to the point that it
dominates the Western media.

4. **Technology**: Technology is rapidly enabling the terrorist
communities to carry out their sinister designs effectively. As countries
such as the US become more and more reliant on technology, they will be
more susceptible to terrorist attack. An inverse relationship exists between
the sophistication of technology and the amount of people required to
perform a mission. One individual, armed with a laptop or nuclear device
can achieve significant results, something that requires large armies.
Most importantly, the technology of the terrorists must be at par with the
target's technology. Bare-foot guerrilla fighters attacking a government
which is willing to use biological agents will most likely not succeed.
Terrorists armed with knives will do little in the face of automatic machine
guns. Since terrorist organisations are relatively small, they must have
advance technology to outbalance their limited numbers. 55

5. **International Support**: The final principle is international support.

In the modern world, international support can be a key for the success or
failure of a revolution or a terrorist campaign. Although the Russians, after
their invasion of Afghanistan, regarded Afghan rebels as terrorists, the
Afghans had the support of the Western community and were able to
receive arms and training.

In contrast, the Taliban had succeeded in capturing the majority of
Afghanistan, but failed to gain international recognition and were therefore,
politically and economically isolated. Failure to receive international
support and recognition ultimately led to their defeat. International support
is a critical component of success. Terrorists who gain internal victory, but
neglect to gather international support, may never truly succeed.
Strategies of Terrorism

Strategy is the considered application of means to advance one's ends.56 Terrorists far from being 'mindless' are disturbingly calculating about the means they use.57 Military analysts often describe terrorism as less than a strategy and merely as a tactic, but depending upon circumstances and terrorist's intentions, it can be either. In the post-1945 world, terrorism has been a strategic control to a score of revolutionary movements.

At least five terrorist strategies are so common around the globe that they deserve explicit enumeration. They all mould violence and propaganda in some form or other to gain public attention. Normally, these strategies include both, destruction and some forms of construction, that is, the actions yield not just damage to targets but some form of progress for the group in its strive for greater power. The five strategies are: (1) creation of societal dislocation or chaos; (2) discrediting or destroying a particular government; (3) rendering economic and property damages; (4) 'bleeding' state security forces and doing other military damages; (5) spreading fear for international effects.

(1) **Creation of Societal Dislocation or Chaos**: The first strategy is to create or further a sense of societal dislocation, fear and even anarchy. As the Chinese military thinker Sun Tzu recognised, creating 'disorder' is as useful, or more useful, than the destruction of the enemy forces. This strategy is most commonly used by revolutionaries. It can also work for pro-state terrorists: bombing and other crimes provoke public fears and thus enhance public support for further law enforcement measures, or even

---

dictatorship. Adolph Hitler is believed to have burnt the Reichstag, or the national government building, so that the act could be blamed on German Communists, legitimising a planned crackdown against his opponents.

Carlos Mrighella, the Brazilian terrorist of 1960s, in his manual has delineated the use and effect of this strategy. In that he opines, the more the disaster, the more is the government's repression and it leads to greater alienation of the population from the government, resulting in the increase in the terrorist base. 58

Of course, not all terrorists aim at such a strange sequence of anarchy, 'crackdown', and then revolution. There are groups with a more direct plan, and there are groups with more limited goals. What does seem nearly universal and yet often ignored by analysts is that the destruction of the terrorist groups is in their minds a necessary part of their own effort at construction of sorts. Terrorists look to positive dimensions of their actions. For example, violence is intended to forcefully draw the polity's attention to a 'neglected' issue. The hope, justified by terrorists' general success, is that a public shocked by a terrorist act or campaign, will give them attention. The public often does respond even if it does not fully believe the propaganda circulated at the time of the action by the terrorists.

(2) **Discrediting the Government**

The second terrorist strategy is to discredit, diminish or destroy a particular government and replace it with another. Attacks on officials, including tax collectors, judges, policemen, country or village officials, and persons responsible for elections, undermine the prestige or efficiency of

---

government. These can result in the reduction of the services, or closure of regional or local offices, or implicit acquiescence of 'no go' areas in the country where the government's want no longer counts - 'grey areas' as they are sometimes called.\textsuperscript{59}

Government is ordinarily weakened by this process, but if it strikes back with harsh force, making inroads against terrorism, it may also discredit itself among the public. During the mid-1990s, states engaged in rough counter-insurgency efforts, were consequently targeted by influential critics and human rights monitors. A few among them were Peru, Egypt, India, Guatemala, Mexico and Turkey. The 'positive' effects of the political strategies for the terror groups are many and diverse. Political work lends legitimacy to a group or doctrine of which public is suspicious because of its reliance on violence. Political strategies are internally important to the group since it engages or claims to engage in terrorism because of its urgent political programme. The terror group's prestige, size and effectiveness are often enhanced proportionally to how the government is damaged. Each terrorist action creates a platform from which to appeal to the public about its objectives. With time and effort, even an unusual ideology or foreign political conception can gain credibility.\textsuperscript{60}

In the struggle with all its sessions of planning, cooperation and physical confrontations with enemies, new leaders with considered ideas about a revolutionary government may emerge. Thus, the long period of covert and overt revolutionary activity became for such leaders as Yasser Arafat and

\textsuperscript{59} Cristopher C. Harmon, op. cit., p. 41.

Daniel Ortega, a sort of journeyman’s years, in which they exercised authority over an ever growing segment of the nation, gaining experience and credibility at the same time.61 Some contemporary terror using groups opt not just for a sense of legitimacy but also a direct role in the political power; they use respected and pacific forums of debate, compete in local elections, or consider participation in a national coalition government. Under extreme conditions, a group may abandon violence altogether and choose to fold completely into the political process, as did Cambodia’s April 19 Movement and El Salvador’s left wing guerrillas once Cuban and Soviet defeat in the Cold War became evident. 62

3. Economic and Property Damage

Presently, this strategy has been much neglected by the contemporary political science. General social effects of dislocation are dramatically enhanced by such common terrorist tactics as taking over public highways to tax commercial users; arson campaigns against large corporations; sabotage of oil pipelines, bombings and extortions which increase insurance prices and operating costs; prolonged efforts to disrupt the export of the manufactured goods or agricultural crops, bank robberies; and campaigns against tourist facilities which garner much of some nations’ ‘foreign’ incomes. Such efforts are intended to directly harm the property owner and perhaps also to harm the government, which immediately experiences losses. Economic strategies yield positive advantages to the

terrorists themselves as well. It hurts the government, creates impact, fills the coffers of the terrorists and shoes away the investors.\textsuperscript{63}

4. Military Damage

Military damage is another mechanism by which terrorists advance their overall object. Depending on the group, the rendering of damage to the state’s military forces or infrastructure is usually of secondary or tertiary interest; terrorists prefer undefended, non-military targets. In peacetime, the terrorists undermine readiness and spread fear among military ranks; terrorists may thin the ranks of national police forces, which have or can have peace and wartime roles.\textsuperscript{64} If events escalate into war, terrorists are in a prime position to act as proxy forces for an external power or an indigenous political organisation. For example, ethnic militants in the north eastern India may or may not wish to serve the interest of China, but they do so by distracting and tying down innumerable Indian national police and military personnel, who are continuously bled with classic ‘bite and flee’ guerrilla tactic.\textsuperscript{65}

The positive effects of the movement using terrorism are many. Military style operations by terrorists provide battle experiences, draw recruits, capture weaponry, develop logistical infrastructure and may lead to foreign support of various types. Depending upon ideology, today’s terrorist leaders may anticipate that terrorism can be combined with clandestine organisation and guerrilla combat experience to develop from an underground into a truly national military capability. That is, in fact, the

\textsuperscript{63} Cristopher C. Harmon, op. cit., p. 42.
\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Bite and Flee} was the slogan of the Italian Red Brigade as well as other terrorist groups.
Maoist model of the development of protracted guerrilla war from low level violence and propaganda to a second phase of mixed or 'mobile' warfare featuring formal military units, and ultimately to a third rather conventional phase of operations by regular armies. This was the model generally followed by the Vietnamese Communists.66

5. **Terrorism and its International Effects**

The act committed by terrorists in recent years is not confined to one particular country. Sometimes terrorist groups commit crime in one country and escape to other country. Due to having close relations with terrorist groups of that country, they find it easy to carry out their objectives. Most contemporary religious terror groups are 'universalistic' in their appeal; they think internationally by nature. For example, for religious extremists, it is somewhat unnatural to draw a boundary between two states and worry about preserving it when neither regime is 'legitimate'.

These above are the five major means by which contemporary terrorist groups and insurgents have pursued or are pursuing their goals. The most successful groups calibrate their use of terrorism to suit the political and social environment, and they use multiple means, altering their approach to suit changes caused by the environment, governmental interference, good or bad fortune, and the like. Enough groups and movements using the various strategies of terror do succeed so that observant leaders surely understand there may be prospects for success, not only risks. Such partial and larger successes are keeping terrorism alive long past the time when some have pronounced the waning of state sponsorship.

Freedom Fighter and the Terrorist

In recent years, there has been a wide discrepancy in defining who constitutes a terrorist and who constitutes a freedom fighter. Patrie Clauson writes, "one man’s terrorist could be other man’s freedom fighter". Calling a terrorist, freedom fighter and vice-versa, is an extreme example of dilemma. Terrorism has its own identity and so has freedom fighting. US Senator Henry Jackson dismissed the idea of identifying the two as one and the same in the following words: “It is disgrace that democracies should allow the treasured word ‘freedom’ to be associated with acts of terrorism”.

It is a fact that terrorists are misguided members of society who aim to destabilise an established system and risk their own lives. This is why scholars like Michael Aaronson believe that terrorists are the cruel members of the society, not freedom fighters.

While on one the hand, scholars play the game of terminology, rebel and frustrated groups of society continue to threaten mankind by adopting terrorism as a means to achieve political goals. It is therefore, important to draw lines between a terrorist and a freedom fighter. The differences between the two are analysed in the light of following determinants:

- Relevance of the UN
- Objectives and means to an objective
- Magnitude of violence
- Colonialism and de-colonialism
- Lack of moral justification

---

National versus International

Though scholars have interpreted terrorism from different perspectives, they have emphasised the relevance of the UN to curb terrorism.

Once a nation is recognised under the UN Charter, no individual or group of individuals of that particular country could be recognised as freedom fighters,\(^{70}\) as this would promote sub-nationalism within a country and can promote disharmony. Civil strife, and ultimately anarchy will prevail upon. Freedom fighting or right to self-determination is well recognised by the UN as an inalienable right of the people. It does not, however, mean that some of the genuine cases of freedom fighting, one like that of India prior to its independence would be allowed as the guiding force for secessionist movement in a country which is liberated from foreign yoke. It needs to be emphasised that so long as individual or a group of individuals hold the nationality of an independent sovereign nation, as recognised by UN, they have no moral or legal right to claim themselves as freedom fighters. Their acts of violence could be identified as acts of terrorism rather than freedom fighting.

The second distinction between the two is from the objective point of view. The main objective of freedom fighter is to acquire independence by any available means, be it moral or immoral, legal or illegal, where as the primary objective of terrorists is violence and intimidation. What they claim to be their political or economic objective is not ‘objective’ as such but ‘a set of demands’. An objective is a well perceived plan, while demands are simple expression of desire of an

\(^{70}\) A terrorist group normally aims to achieve autonomy or creation of a separate state, which does not come easily unless based on certain valid grounds. Their object remains far-fetched and thus they shift towards violence and intimidation as their goal, which does not draw attention of masses, an essential condition for liberation movement.
individual or group of individuals.\footnote{Kshitij Prabha, op. cit., p. 23.} The freedom fighters never deviate from their demands i.e. independence or freedom but in case of terrorists, the objective gets diluted when some of their demands are met or considered.

Demands rather than objectives motivate terrorists. This is precisely because the objectives of terrorists are deceptive and ambiguous. It is deceptive because their ulterior motive is succession, but they compromise on partial autonomy or release of their colleagues. As a matter of fact, terrorists resort to violence and terror to get these demands accepted rather than to achieve any broader objective. On the other hand, the freedom fighters are motivated by objectives and to achieve that, unlike terrorists, they sacrifice their trifle demands.

Independence is the goal of the freedom fighter. But terrorism does not have a determined objective and even though the terrorists claim to have some,\footnote{Martha Crenshaw, Theories of Terrorism, op. cit., pp. 13-15.} they are deceptive and fluctuating. They ultimately tend to become victims of self-deception and puppets of their own illusions and disillusions. It is said that terrorism as an objective is a failure,\footnote{J. Bowyere, Bell, The Secret Army: A History of IRA, Massachusetts, Cambridge, MIT, 1974, p. 13.} precisely because there is a gap in understanding amongst members of terrorist groups. There are innumerable examples of terrorists renouncing violent course of action, but there is no example of surrender in the history of freedom fighting.

The third significant difference between the two is related to the magnitude of violence. Terrorists are recognised with violence that creates fear psychosis.\footnote{Brian M. Jenkins, New Modes of Conflict, Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, 5th year, p.a. 90406.} This is such an important aspect of terrorism that scholars like Brian Jenkins define terrorism in terms of violence and intimidation. He opines that threat of violence,
individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instil fear, is terrorism.\textsuperscript{75}

Unlike this, violence is not a precondition for freedom fighting. It is only under a repressive foreign regime that freedom fighters too resort to violence. Violence is not an essential condition for freedom fighting. Freedom could be achieved through peaceful means too. For instance, the independence movement led and won non-violently by Mahatma Gandhi who never was declared a terrorist by the British government.

Violence, however, is all in all about terrorism. Philosophy and utility of violence are the very concepts of terrorism. There could be no terrorism without violence. Targeting innocent lives is typical act of terrorism whereas freedom fighters try to protect them. Thus, on the basis of uses, magnitude and nature of violence, a terrorist could be seen differently from that of a freedom fighter.

To call a freedom fighter a terrorist is the brainchild of colonialism. After the colonisation of the Afro-Asian countries in the post-Industrial Revolution period by the European powers, there emerged a strong resistance by the colonial natives against the exploitation, basically economic ones, against their colonial masters. This resistance force very often resorted to violence and terrorist activities. These people were branded terrorists by the colonial powers. The natives justified their violence as part of struggle for freedom from foreign yoke. Franz Fanon made it clear that “violence alone, violence committed by the people, violence organised and educated by its leaders make it possible for the masses to understand social truth and gives the key to them. Without that knowledge of practice of action, there is nothing but a fancy dress parade and blare of the trumpets”.\textsuperscript{76}

But to consider a terrorist as a freedom fighter in a liberated democratic country would mean political destabilisation. In every nook and corner and for any trifle cause, people would organise themselves as freedom fighters bringing about a precarious state of affairs, specifically in a pluralistic society. This would promote sub-nationalism\textsuperscript{77} and political chaos. Terrorists are not freedom fighters as such but murderers.\textsuperscript{78}

As mentioned, freedom fighters also resort to violence for independence i.e., to liberate people from exploitation. Their first and foremost objective is to secure civil and political rights for their masses by any available means. It is because of this commitment that freedom fighters are honoured as heroes and their acts of violence are morally justified,\textsuperscript{79} whereas terrorist is considered immoral, selfish and criminal because unlike freedom fighter, his objective is not liberation but intimidation and killing.

The basic principle of terrorism hinges around rejection of civilised society. In this account itself, acts of terrorism lack moral justification. Their acts create panic in the socio-political environment of the society. The same is not applicable so far as freedom fighting is concerned. Their target of violence is not crowded places like market places or railway stations where common men become victims. "Freedom fighters are bound by certain rules of behaviour which form cornerstone of our ethics; they draw a sharp distinction between the soldier and the children, between governmental agents and ordinary citizens, between repressive authorities.

and helpless women, between a military outpost and a common dwelling place. The terrorist, however, knows no such distinctions. He has no moral restraints in the choice of his objectives, as he has none in his methods of warfare. His objective is indeed the whole country on which he concentrates his attacks; his target is its entire population. In these limits, he recognises no innocents, no bystanders, not even strangers. He respects no code of law which was ever established for war or peace. He is above law indeed unto himself”, wrote Benjamin Netanyahu.80

Another significant difference between a freedom fighter and a terrorist is related to scope and area of influence. Freedom fighters limit their activities within the national boundary of their country. Their means and ends are confined to a geographical boundary. They do get moral support from foreign countries, but are not dependent on them. They always remain in touch with the people and stay among them. It is difficult for the freedom fighters to achieve their goal without cooperation of the masses, as independence movement is aimed to liberate people from bondage of slavery and without their support, independence would remain a far cry to achieve.81 Unlike this, terrorism is trans-national by its very nature. It seeks assistance from across the border and uses the international forums to get their demands accepted. They operate in an interwoven organisational structure, which is spread all over the world. Crossing international border to maintain new contacts and to acquire arms is a routine job of a terrorist organisation.

From the foregoing illustrations, it is clear that there is hardly any similarity between a terrorist and freedom fighter except for the fact that freedom fighters too

use violence at times. The same is not applicable to terrorism. Violence is all in for terrorism.

Causes of Terrorism

It is hard to find specific causes for terrorism because the factors responsible for this are too intertwined and interrelated to each other. Therefore, any analysis of causes of terrorism has to be studied from a broad macro-framework of social, political and economic causes.

Social Causes

In a society which is fragmented, incoherent and based on hierarchy, a certain section always feels ignored or laid down. They feel frustrated and the social discrimination that they face, creates a sense of revenge or a kind of determination among them to raise their status in an upwardly direction, in order to put themselves at par with others. But the already existing hierarchy and the social order never let them to move up in the social ladder, due to the fear of losing their own opportunities and privileges. This leads to a clash of interests and by getting the minimum spark, it bursts in most cases quite violently to create a wide ranging impact. It is a pure case of sociological disorder that causes this kind of terrorism. But as it rarely falls under the gambit of politics, it hardly begets the acronym of terrorism. But in the race for political space in a democratic society, issues of this nature easily take a political colour thereby, leading to greater hatred and violence, creating a fit case for the sobriquet i.e. terrorism.

In a very strange but interesting development before the onset of the new millennium, government and law enforcement agencies in many countries expressed the concern that one or several groups holding apocalyptic beliefs might
stage spectacular actions in connection with the new millennium.\textsuperscript{82} But despite the forecasts, there were actually few indications of a likeliness of spectacular events staged by religious groups. But whether something had happened or not, a fear psychosis was created in the public domain of such a possibility and a possible emergence of such a cult. So this may be taken as another social condition in which terrorism finds a space to grow. There is no doubt that apocalyptic perspectives seem to be especially conducive to the legitimisation of violent behaviour, since the “old world” is about to be turned upside down and replaced by a new order. Scholars such as David Rappoport have repeatedly emphasised how eminence, with the setting of deadlines, should be considered as crucial. But most apocalyptic groups do not turn violent.\textsuperscript{83} Apocalyptic world view in them apparently plays a role mostly in combination with a variety of other factors.

The other kind of violence and terrorism which emanates from the society is a religious one. There are several kinds of religious patronages to terrorism:\textsuperscript{84} (a) for the formation of religious doctrines and beliefs, viz. \textit{Jihad} in Islam and \textit{Holy war} in Christianity. Though definition of these concepts are no less lengthy and cumbersome, one can safely say that they all at some point of time or the other justify terrorism, thereby, providing social acceptance to them and in a way promoting them further; (b) to defend itself from state repression and aggressive reaction. There are governments and states whose policies towards a particular religion or religious cult in general encourage terrorism. “The reaction by the authorities or law enforcement agencies just reinforced fears and paranoia and led


\textsuperscript{83} As Rappoport reminds us, millennium groups have been characterized “either by an extraordinary militancy which drives some to ‘force the end’”, which may lead to terror or “by a refusal to participate in the existing political order” leading to pacifism. David Rappoport, “Some General Observations on Religion and Violence”, \textit{Terrorism and Political Violence}, 3 (3), Autumn 1991, p. 132.

\textsuperscript{84} Steve Bruce, \textit{Fundamentalism}, UK, Polity Press, 2000, p. 4.
a group to become more aggressive or to fall into violence". Third kind of terrorism which is largely an offshoot of the social structures is based on ethnic considerations. It is different from violence carried out for ideological, religious or financial motives. Ethnic terrorists often seek to influence their own constituencies more than the country as a whole. They frequently seek to foster communal identity in contrast with the identity proposed by the state. They often target potential intermediaries who might otherwise compromise on identity issues. A secondary goal of the attack is to create a climate of fear among a rival group’s population. That kind of terrorism polarises the multi-ethnic societies, increasing communal support for non-violent ethnic political movements of all types. Thus, fear helps alter a nation’s demography and politics to the advantage of ethnic radicals.

Economic Causes

Economic condition of a country also plays a significant role in the growth of terrorism. Due to growth of population, urbanisation and out-migration from rural to urban areas, there is a tremendous pressure on the economic system of the country. As resources are scarce, each group tries to obtain these scarce resources, this leads to competition among various groups. Those groups which do not get their share in the economy feel frustrated and neglected which culminates into resentment among them. Finally, the above factors lead to development and isolation of these groups who try to reassert their dominance by waging armed struggle against the authority.

85 J. F. Mayer, op. cit., p. 367.
Terrorists believe that they are rightfully entitled to have all the essentials and comforts which they are deprived of but others are enjoying. They consciously reject the fact that total economic equality has never existed in the history of mankind. However, people got swayed by the social awakening under Marx's theory of Communism and began to believe that the wide economic disparity that exists in the society is the handiwork of a few rather than the natural phenomenon that could be accepted as normal living condition. This awareness brought new awakening to overcome economic deprivation by force and violence. This intense desire is also because of the demonstration of wealth by the higher to the lower class in social hierarchy. The economic resources and infrastructure available, yet inaccessible, agitate minds of the deprived class. Besides, there is possibility that regional differences among nations might lead to political violence by people in the less privileged regions. Scholars like Willy Brandt have warned that, "often war is thought of in terms of military conflict, but there is an equal danger from mass anger as caused by economic disaster".

Political Causes

Political issues have equally contributed to the growth of terrorism. Terrorism being one of the means to acquire power is also inspired by the same psycho-dynamics of mankind. The obscure purpose of terrorism is to acquire power through secession, autonomy or revolution. Politicisation of violence is the tactic of terrorists to gain public support. Unless they make a case for a greater common cause, such as liberation, autonomy, secession, and so on, terrorism is

---

91 Paul Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 80.
unlikely to receive public attention without which the very purpose of terrorism would be defeated. The objective of terrorist group is not only to create fear psychosis but also to prove that terrorism is a viable instrument in politics.

Freedom is the key to democratic society, which is highly prone to terrorism compared to totalitarian, Communist or military government. People have direct access for redressal of their grievances in a democratic set up. However, when they or their fledging political groups fail to get their demands fulfilled, they adopt violence and terror to challenge political will, and morale of the democratic government and its citizens by using various propaganda channels.

Thus, it is clear from the foregoing illustrations that growth of terrorism is not merely because of economic and political deprivations but also because of social disparity, psychological depression, lack of creativity and misinterpretation of different religious codes.

**Terrorist Organisations and their Structures**

Most of the modern terrorist organisations are like modern corporations. They have established rules and regulations along with worldwide financial investors. The establishment of these organisational structures is an effort by terrorist groups to provide support, training, decision making and other resources that may be required when operating in hostile situation.

Yet in most terrorist organisations, group dynamics, egos and philosophical and ideological differences frequently override attempted organisational structure. Because of international differences, individual members can carry out attacks that are not consistent with group's stated objectives.93 These internal conflicts within

---

93 Christopher Kozlow, op. cit., p. 20.
larger organisations often cause smaller groups to splinter into new factions, yet maintain the support of the larger terrorist organisation.

Terrorist-organisations, especially, those with little or no government support generally need to establish clear organisational structures. A typical terrorist organisation is generally at the top of the command and control structure. Its primary role in the organisation is to define policy, set objectives and direct actions. The leadership is intensely committed to the groups' causes and often consists of charismatic individuals who have the ability to motivate others. If a group is state supported or directed, some or all of the leadership is typically trained and educated by the sponsoring state.

**Table 1**

**Typical Terrorist Organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Active Terrorists</th>
<th>Active Supporters</th>
<th>Passive Supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Terrorists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Supporters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Supporters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Christopher Kozlow, op. cit, p. 21

**Active Terrorists**

The next level within most organisations consists of active terrorists. These are generally men, women and children recruited and trained by the organisation in methods of carrying out attacks. While many terrorists are deeply committed to the group's cause, the general membership may include "professional" terrorists who are generally not ideologically motivated.

**Active Supporters**

Active supporters are people who do not actually carry out attacks for the organisation. However, they do provide terrorists with money, intelligence, safe houses, forged or stolen documents, legal assistance and/or medical care, but are
generally ambivalent regarding use of violence. Most organisations recruit their active members from within this group, since active supporters have proven their loyalty and skills to the organisation and leadership. A certain number of active supporters can be considered thrill-seekers who join predominantly for the excitement of belonging to a forbidden organisation.

**Passive Supporters**

Passive supporters are more difficult to define and identify. Most are sympathetic to the terrorist cause, but do not assume an active role within the organisation. Some passive supporters become involved in intimidation and extortion operations. Most terrorist organisations depend on passive support for financial banking and logistical operation.

**Non-State Sponsored Groups**

Non-state sponsored terrorist groups operate autonomously receiving no significant support from any government. Italy’s Red Brigades and Spain’s Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA) are examples of non-state supported group.

**State-Supported Groups**

A state-supported terrorist group generally operates independently but receives support from one or more governments. The International Hezbollah, a new group formed in June 1996, is an example of a state-supported terrorist group.

**State Directed Groups**

This category includes the terrorist groups or organisations that operate as agents of a government. The group is provided with intelligence. With increased counter-terrorism initiatives worldwide, newer forms of terrorist organisations and

---

94 Ibid. p. 21.
structures are becoming smaller or cellular in nature. These terrorist cells are relatively isolated from others within the terrorist groups thus reducing the risk of potential infiltration or capture from the authorities. In the event of a defection or capture, no member can identify more than a handful of others.\footnote{Christopher Kozlow, op. cit., p. 22.}

Another lingering confusion about terrorism lies with the similarity and differences it carries with other concepts like insurgency, militancy, fundamentalism and extremism. Though they are used interchangeably in different cases and by several scholars, there exist some differences between them which deserve mention for the study. The most frequently used word among all these, in place of terrorism is ‘insurgency’.

Insurgency is as old as war itself and has been the most prevalent type of armed conflict since the creation of organised political communities.\footnote{Bard, E.O’Neill, op. cit., p. 4.} The Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences defines insurgency as use of armed forces against an established government to achieve public purpose, which cannot in the opinion of insurgents be achieved by pacific means. It is also defined as struggle between a non-ruling and the ruling in which the former consciously employs political resources and violence to establish legitimacy for certain issues considered as illegitimate.\footnote{Andrew M. Scott & Others, Insurgency, Carolina, University of North Carolina Press, 1970, p. 8} Bard O’Neill, an expert on the study of insurgency says, insurgency may be defined as a struggle between a non-ruling group and the ruling authorities in which the non-ruling group consciously uses the political resources (i.e. organisational expertise, propaganda and demonstrations) and
violence to destroy, reformulate or sustain the basis of the legitimacy of one or more aspects of politics.  

Ved Marwah, an Indian expert on the subject holds similar but operationally different opinion. He writes “the terms terrorism and insurgency are frequently used to mean something. Undeniably, the two are very closely interconnected. Both are a form of unconventional war waged to gain political objectives. But there are important points of distinction between the two concepts. Insurgents mostly target the security forces and vital installations. They are more selective in choosing their targets than terrorists, and more discriminating in the use of violence. That’s not the ease with terrorism. Insurgents may resort to terrorist methods, but for them creating terror can never be an end in itself. Insurgency and terrorism have been used to soften restricting regimes by hostile foreign governments as well as by secessionist internal movements”.

Like the definition of terrorism, there are differences among the scholar academicians on the proper definition of insurgency. But, the common factor in their opinions is that terrorism and insurgency are means for violent revolutionary change. But there are differences between the two which could be analysed according to the following model.

---

99 The definition of insurgency is similar to that characterising civil war in J. K. Zawadny, “Civil War” in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan, 1968, p. 499 as cited in Sam C. Sarkesian (ed.) Revolutionary Guerrilla Warfare: An Introduction, Chicago, Precedent Publishing Inc., 1975, p. 4. The use of violence by the opponents of the government distinguishes insurgencies from socio-political protest movements, such as those led by Gandhi in India, Khomeini in Iran and Solidarity Movement in Poland.

Regional and International

The first dividing line between insurgency and terrorism is the fact that, while the former is regional, the latter is international in nature. Insurgency remains confined within a nation or within its neighbourhood. Andrew M. Scott went to the extent of describing the need of appropriate physical and demographic environment as an essential condition for successful application of insurgency. Insurgency needs access to territory and sanctuary which is safe from army attack and close to the border of a nation sympathetic to the rebels. But the same is not applicable to terrorism. Violence inflicted by the terrorist knows no boundary.

---

while insurgency remains confined to specific states though there are cases of insurgency funded by foreign land. It is relevant to note that their actions seldom affect international community. The same cannot be said for terrorism. It is perpetrated far and wide all over the world and the international community gets concerned by this phenomenon. Terrorism does not remain confined to one region nor do members belong to any one region, community or race. Terrorist groups recruit people from different parts of the country as their targets are worldwide, whereas insurgency involves local people. Their recruitment is based on commitment to the cause and geographical knowledge of the region, which is not the case so far as terrorism is concerned.

**Revolutionary and Reactionary**

The second important difference between the two is in their character. While terrorism is reactionary, insurgency is revolutionary in character. Terrorism is an expression of reaction. It is not a planned movement but reaction to certain situations which according to terrorists, is injustice and cannot be tolerated, whereas insurgency on the other hand is well planned and every phase of struggle is chalked out to suit their objectives. Violence perpetrated by the insurgents is not in reaction to any situation but a planned movement to achieve their goal that is revolution. In other words, insurgency is aimed at revolutionary change while the objective of terrorism remains obscure. Terrorists put forward certain demands, which if accepted by the government, they recede and if not, it could be bargained. In brief, there is always a considerable scope for compromise in terrorism but insurgency is committed to its ideology and goal.

**Dogmatic and Non-Dogmatic**

The third aspect of the distinction between insurgency and terrorism is related to ideology i.e. while insurgency is dogmatic, terrorism is non-dogmatic.
Indonesian Commander Abdul Haris Nasution rightly pointed out that ideological fight is usually the strongest motivation for insurgency and guerrilla warfare. In case of terrorism, the objectives being obscure, it is not supported by any fixed ideology. Their objectives keep changing from one to other as per the response they receive from the government and the people. This flickering tendency is because they lack ideology. This is why terrorists employ ‘hit and run tactics’ rather than a systematic method to achieve their ambiguous objectives.

**Rural and Urban**

The fourth significant difference between insurgency and terrorism is related to geographical locations. By virtue of being revolutionary in nature, insurgency depends on rural support for its struggle. Its roots are in the countryside, because it aims to liberate common men from certain bondage. Therefore, support and confidence of the masses are vital to their cause, and second, because the seat of administration is invariably located in urban area which helps the insurgents to escape from marauding eyes of the law enforcement agencies. Simultaneously, by operating in rural side, insurgents enjoy the topographical advantage in their operations against the security forces.

Terrorism, on the contrary, is based in urban society. Urban life is prone to criminal activities. Its socio-economic conditions nurture conflict and dissent. The wide gap between the rich and the poor, mental agony, sufferings, easy availability of weapons, other infrastructure, like communication in the cities make the terrorists mobile and successful in their hit-and-run tactics.

---


Paramilitary and Non-Paramilitary Type

Finally, difference between insurgency and terrorism could also be analysed in the light of organisational structure of terrorist group. Guerrilla or insurgent groups are organised on military lines.\textsuperscript{104} They believe in blind obedience to the command in the same way as regular armed forces demand. The guerrilla insurgency advances according to the command of their authority. Insurgents operate collectively and do not propagate individual heroism. Its organisation and modus operandi is more like a paramilitary organisation rather than a terrorist group.

Unlike insurgency, terrorism is unorganised, and believes in kidnapping, killing innocent masses. Insurgents do not create terror by killing innocents, whereas terrorists bank upon indiscriminate violence and killing. Command is not as important an issue in terrorism as in insurgency. Mode of operation is immaterial in terrorist operation. The goal has to be achieved whether operation is carried by an individual or a group, is not relevant. Therefore, on the basis of modus operandi too, terrorism and insurgency could be evaluated separately. The problem in identifying the two as one is mainly because both belong to the same school of political thought i.e. violence. To consider them as one would complicate conceptual aspects of terrorism.

Another terminology which is very often used in this context is militancy. Etymologically, 'militancy' according to Oxford Dictionary means 'combative' or 'aggressively supportive'. But generally, this is a term which is more journalistic in nature and application. Militancy is used by the journalists more in place of 'terrorism' and 'insurgency'. But academically, the meaning carries a lesser degree

\textsuperscript{104} Brian Cozier, op. cit., p. 15.
of violence or no violence at all; while carrying forward the cause or the objective aggressively. For example, in Indian struggle for independence, leaders like Tilak were considered militants for their aggressive posturing. But in the modern international relations' parlance, it is more similar to insurgency rather than terrorism for its basically local nature.\footnote{George Houghton, in his article "Matter of Militancy", has made some attempt to give militancy a meaningful definition. He says, "It springs from one's values, is expressed as an attitude, and results in certain behaviour. One's values are those things in which one strongly believes. They are what one believes to be fundamentally important and true. From this comes an attitude which is unwilling to tolerate any divergence from these fundamentally important truths and which seeks to defend them. It results in behaviour which speaks up when these truths are attacked or diluted and which refuses to cooperate with any activity which would minimise their importance. The term is a military one and carries the idea of defending, what one believes to be true".\footnote{George Houghton, The Matter of Militancy, http://www.faith.edu/pulpits/94_05.HTM} \footnote{Gabriel Ben-Dar, "Uniqueness of Islamic Fundamentalism", International Journal of Middle East Studies, Vol. 8, 1977, p. 43.}}

George Houghton, in his article "Matter of Militancy", has made some attempt to give militancy a meaningful definition. He says, "It springs from one's values, is expressed as an attitude, and results in certain behaviour. One's values are those things in which one strongly believes. They are what one believes to be fundamentally important and true. From this comes an attitude which is unwilling to tolerate any divergence from these fundamentally important truths and which seeks to defend them. It results in behaviour which speaks up when these truths are attacked or diluted and which refuses to cooperate with any activity which would minimise their importance. The term is a military one and carries the idea of defending, what one believes to be true".\footnote{George Houghton, The Matter of Militancy, http://www.faith.edu/pulpits/94_05.HTM}

The second frequently used term is 'fundamentalism', which has attracted a lot of literature on it without any commonly accepted definition. Still then, fundamentalism may be defined as a movement that is radical in terms of its goals, extremist in terms of its methods and literalist in terms of sticking to scripture.\footnote{Gabriel Ben-Dar, "Uniqueness of Islamic Fundamentalism", International Journal of Middle East Studies, Vol. 8, 1977, p. 43.}

Similarly, while analysing other terms like "extremism" and "radicalism", they normally refer to degrees of intensity in commitment to ideologies and willingness to make sacrifices and stick consistently to that which appears to be worth believing in.\footnote{Ibid, p. 241.} Some have even argued that extremism, as Barry Goldwater
put it in 1964, in the service of liberty is no vice while moderation in the defence of liberty is no merit. By radicalism Karl Marx meant those who would change society by the root, or from the root. But a common understanding of extremism means the commitment and willingness to use a calculus that gives tremendous value to the achievement of the goals and objectives in question, at the expense of other values. Hence, this is a rational movement.\footnote{Gabriel A. Almond, ‘Rational Choice Theory and the ‘Social Sciences’’ in Gabriel A. Almond (ed.), A discipline Divided, New Berry Park, California, Sage Publishers, 1990, pp. 87-97.}

Defining extremism, Peter H. Merki at European Centre for Securities elaborated detailed aspects of extremism and its subjectivity and the radicalism that causes extremism. In his lecture, he opined that, “extremism simply means identifying far more intensely with a given cause or group than most of its other members or adherents.”\footnote{Peter H. Merki, Elements of Extremism, presented at the Conference on “Enhancing Security of States in a Multi-Polar World: Focus on Extremism”, George C. Marshall European Centre for Securities Studies, Garmisch-Partenkirchen Germany, 18-22 September 2000.} Such strong identification with the group’s interest may lead extremists to plot or take violent action against its presumable antagonists and, not infrequently, moderate leaders of their own group. However, strong belief and violent action do not always go together. There may be many more strong believers than those who take extremist action and at the same time, some violent extremists have long stopped believing in their cause or nihilists to begin with.\footnote{Peter H. Merki, The Making of a Storm Trooper, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1980, pp. 226-228, 231.}

The definitions and nature of the concepts like terrorism, insurgency, militancy, fundamentalism, extremism and radicalism, as mentioned earlier, are few of the endeavours by different sections i.e. academicians and international organisations. Most of these phenomena today are of grave concern for the world powers. But one area which is suffering heavily out of these deep malaises is that of Central Asia - the five newly born republics of the erstwhile Soviet Union.
Here, the weak political stability coupled with the growing menace of religious fundamentalism has created havoc and put the countries in a deep trouble. The region being traditionally a seat of Islamic scholarship has found today numerous sponsors from outside who are trying their best to spread their supremacy over the region in the pretext of religious affinity. Though they still have not been able to establish any political supremacy there, they have been able to mobilise forces in the name of religion i.e. Islam. But why is it that after 70 years of strictly imposed secularism, these countries are falling pray to religious terrorism? The roots perhaps lie in the pre-Soviet and Soviet dealing with religion in this part of the world.