Chapter II

Terrorism, History and Concepts
Global Terrorism is a phenomenon of the 20th Century. Today few countries can claim immunity from attacks on non-combative targets. We people of the post-cold war era have grown up with – and almost become used to the vision of acts of terrorism as tragically being part of someone’s daily life. If it does not affect us directly, we see the outcome on other people on the television. When a bomb in a village market place, on an airplane, in a building, or on a bus wounds or kills innocent victims who have done the perpetrators no harm, the condemnation of the acts of terrorism is even louder and the sense of outrage even greater.

It is not a wrong statement if we call the present era as era of terrorism or even Ages of fear. Fear is almost affected all part of our life from the mind up to our international and global environment. International relations are now not just about power politics but also about fear politics. We live in a world where power is no longer an adequate guarantee against fear. In fact, power begets fear. The more powerful a nation is, the more fearful it becomes.

Nowadays the US is the most powerful nation on earth. However, September 11 has also made it the most fearful nation. This apparently contradictory combination, awesome power and unprecedented fear, is profoundly reshaping international security order. Above all, it has ushered in a conflict between American power politics and some

---

of the core principles of international order, including principles of just war, respect for the rule of law and collective security.

Terrorism, particularly what is now known as jihadi terrorism, has become a persistent and deadly problem for many of the world's nations and peoples. Since rising to prominence as a form of political violence in the 1970s, terrorism has mutated into a major threat to nation-states and individuals alike. Particularly after the 9/11 terror attacks in the United States, there has been a great deal of scholarly interest in generating theories of terrorism.

Like all political phenomena, terrorism is defined by the duality between professed ideas and their implementation. In addition, like all political phenomena, terrorism exists only in a cultural and historical context. For three decades, the activities of terrorist movements were closely linked to Marxist ideology; Marxist terrorist groups are in the minority today, whereas they predominated in the 1970s and 1980s. The same applies to the entire history of terrorist movements, shaped by the political context in which they are born, live, and die. While terrorism is a phenomenon that is continuously reinventing itself, the lack of continuity between each generation of terrorists often entails a signal break with the past.

These days, the importance of the cultural component is more evident in terrorist movements of religious inspiration than in those of a nationalist or strictly ideological bent. The religious movements are making them heard. Hamas and al Qaeda, in particular, combine political or pseudo-political aspirations (the destruction of Israel
and/or the United States) with a religious undertone that serves the primary purpose of recruitment and thus finds an echo in the ideology of other movements.

A terrorist organization is virtually by definition opposed to the state apparatus. The nature of that opposition often defines a movement’s character. Where the state apparatus is essentially rational, the terrorist party will tend to appeal strongly to emotion. Where the state machinery operates on the basis of “realist” policies and an understanding of the balance of power, the terrorist movement will imbue its politics with a powerful moral tone (whose code varies depending on the ideology in play) and a weak-versus-strong strategy reliant for the most part on its Psychological impact on the adversary. Raymond Aron had a felicitous way of getting to the significant part: “A violent action is deemed terrorist when its psychological effects are disproportionate to its purely physical results.”

Today’s terrorism is what specialists call group or bottom-up terrorism, but top-down (state) terrorism has been far more prevalent throughout history. It enjoyed its heyday in the twentieth century with the advent of totalitarianism. In terms of victims, top-down terrorism has taken a vastly higher toll than its bottom-up counterpart has.

In this chapter, our focus is on international terrorism. As a tool, terror espouses the same strategic principle: to bend one’s adversary’s will while affecting his capacity for resistance. Until very recently, no one spoke of “state terrorism.”

State terrorism, as it is understood today, applies above all to the support provided by some governments to terrorist groups, but it takes many other forms. It is also a tool
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employed systematically by totalitarian regimes. A state’s terrorism is also manifest in
the military doctrine of its armed forces. The doctrine of “strategic bombing,” for
example, developed in the West in the 1930s, was based entirely on the terror incited
by the mass bombing of civilian populations to compel governments to surrender. This
doctrine resulted in the bombing of Dresden and the atomic destruction of Hiroshima
and Nagasaki.

The boundaries between top-down and bottom-up terrorism are often blurred, as
exemplified by Lenin before 1917 and after he seized power. We have all seen today’s
terrorist become tomorrow’s head of state, with which governments will have to deal at
the diplomatic level. Western tradition considers violence legitimate only when it is
practiced by the state. Such a limited definition takes no account of the terror practiced
by those who have no other means of redressing a situation they deem to be
oppressive. The legitimacy of a terrorist act lies in the objectives of its agents. We need
only imagine interviews with terrorists of yore to grasp the idea that “the end justifies the
means” are the engine of most terrorist activity. It is the cause embraced by a terrorist
movement, rather than its mode of action, that is subject to moral evaluation.³

In the context of the wars of national liberation of the 1950s and 1960s, terrorist
activities are often seen in a positive light because they hastened the liberation of
oppressed peoples. Those agents of terrorism are heroes. For the most part, they
harbor no regrets. It all boils down to idea of a “just war” that legitimates violent action.
In the West and elsewhere, however, there is the tendency to label an action “terrorist”
when it is deemed illegal. This always-dangerous confusion between the moral

³ Ibid. p. 7
interpretation of a political act and the act itself clouds our understanding of the terrorist phenomenon. An act is deemed “terrorist” when it smacks of fanaticism or when the aims of its perpetrators seem neither legitimate nor coherent. The observer becomes lost in the labyrinth of terrorist movements, which have varied down the centuries and evolved in distinct historical and cultural contexts.

Confusion arises from the idea that the terrorist act is by definition one aimed at civilians. The civilian population becomes a target of the indirect strategy when its fate as a potential victim can influence the decisions taken by its leaders. The notion that the fate of civilians automatically sways the political leadership represents a contemporary, contingent understanding of politics. It is accepted that the concept of popular sovereignty—exploited, incidentally, to justify state terror—emerged only with the Enlightenment. Somewhat later, political terrorism evolved with the shift in mentality—nineteenth century Russian populists, for instance, were influenced by the romantic tradition. If modern terrorism tends in practice mainly to target civilians, the phenomenon derives in fact from the general evolution of political structures and the emergence of the mass media. In the West, political structures have evolved toward democracy since the late eighteenth century.

The modern media, a critical component of liberal democracy, emerged in tandem. Now, the political legitimacy of a democracy and its elected representatives lies by definition with its citizens, which is why terrorism is more effective against democratic countries than against dictatorships.

This is not, as is widely thought, because dictatorships are more efficient at finding and punishing terrorists -although they do have greater leeway than democracies in doing
so- but because the impact of an attack is broader in a free country than in one whose people have no voice in government and the media serve or are controlled by the state. It is therefore not inaccurate to affirm that modern terrorism is in part a consequence of democracy\(^4\).

That does not mean, however, that the phenomenon of terrorism is necessarily linked to democracy, as the exploitation of terror predates the modern democratic state. Yet—and this is where confusion tends to arise—“predemocratic” terrorism was practiced in other forms, which, at first sight, would seem to be quite distinct from the terrorism we know today.

One of the earliest manifestations of the terrorist technique is what was once called “tyrannicide”—a term long fallen into obsolescence. Traditionally, an attack on a tyrant was carried out in the name of justice. Tyrannicide was the most widespread form of terrorism of the pre-modern era. The most fearsome organization of that period, acting in the name of ideological purity, was the Assassin sect, active in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It bears some resemblance to certain contemporary terrorist organizations.

No society has a monopoly on terrorism, and over the course of history, terrorist acts have left their mark on any number of geographical and cultural spheres. The Zealots or sicarii\(^5\), and the Assassins, for instance, were active in the Middle East, which remains a haven for important terrorist organizations to this day. Following World War II, the state

\(^4\) Ibid. p. 8

\(^5\) The Sicarii are mentioned by Josephus in *Jewish Antiquities*: "When Albinus reached the city of Jerusalem, he bent every effort and made every provision to ensure peace in the land by exterminating most of the Sicarii."
of Israel forced its way onto the scene via a strategy that drew on terrorist tactics. The Palestinians draw on terrorism today against Israel. For several centuries, Central Asia and the Middle East were prey to the terror practiced by various nomad armies, including those of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane. Since the nineteenth century, Russia has been the theater of numerous acts of terrorism, including the state terror on which the entire Soviet edifice relied for seven decades. Today, terrorism in Russia is once again “bottom-up.” In Europe, the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48) demonstrated the readiness with which opposing armies resorted to terror. More recently, Europe has been swept by diverse waves of terrorism: anarchists, Irish terrorism, the activities of ideological groups such as the Red Brigades in Italy and the German Red Army Fraction, and, most recently, the Basque, Corsican movements and the Syrian rebels.

The United States experienced anarchist attacks in the late nineteenth century. Moreover, the assassination of political figures (Lincoln, McKinley) owes something to the tradition of tyrannicide and is deep rooted in American history. The activities of a semi-clandestine organization like the Ku Klux Klan are also based on terror through the practice of lynching. Organizations of the far right, to a certain degree following in the KKK’s footsteps, continue to deploy terrorist tactics (such as the Oklahoma City bombing) but by increasingly sophisticated modern means. Long spared international terrorism on its own soil, the United States was tragically struck on September 11, 2001. Sub-Saharan Africa, which had long seemed immune, has in recent years fallen victim to the terrorism of regular armies, irregulars, and armed bands. The problem is
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6 Tyrannicide is the killing or assassination of a tyrant usually for the common good. The term also denotes those who kill a tyrant.
particularly acute in the Great Lakes region, where the conflict in the Democratic
Republic of the Congo has claimed three million victims, mostly civilians.

In the context of globalization, Africa has tangentially become a terrorist target, as
evidenced by the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya. For its part,
Latin America was once the theater of myriad guerrilla conflicts, including in the cities.
The guerrillas naturally resorted to terrorist tactics, especially in the kind of guerrilla
warfare waged by the Tupamaros in Uruguay.

In 1979, the war in Afghanistan—with the help of the United States, Saudi Arabia, and
Pakistan—abetted the rise of radical Sunni Islamism. The movement was swelled by
elements from virtually all Muslim countries, other than those of sub-Saharan Africa,
and turned against the United States once the USSR had withdrawn from Afghanistan.
Its hostility to the United States was manifest in a series of attacks in the mid-1990s.
That of September 11, 2001, marked its acme and led to Washington’s punitive
expedition against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and the entity known as al Qaeda.
The Bush administration accused Iraq of harboring weapons of mass destruction,
having links to Al Qaeda, and representing a threat to world peace and to U.S. security.
Obviously part of the global struggle against terrorism, the ensuing war, unilaterally
decided on, has been a source of difficulties unforeseen by Washington’s policy.

In fact, one cannot condemn terrorism without condemning all violence of every stripe.
One must, at the very least, consider why and by whom it is being practiced. Like war,
and perhaps even more so, terrorism preys on minds and wills. At first glance, the
democracies would seem to be especially vulnerable. Yet, if the challenge is great or
even fundamental, people prove themselves surprisingly capable of enduring it and the
psychological tensions it begets. Terrorism is justified as a last resort. In the real world, the weak have no other weapon against the strong. Many movements that later became legitimate have used it. As for states, the monopolists of legal violence, they are designed and duty-bound to defend themselves.

Any movement with a certain degree of social substance practices terrorism as a pressure tactic in order to squeeze concessions and a negotiated solution from the state. In the case of militant Islamism, the characteristic that sets it apart from all other movements, past and present, is that it has nothing to negotiate. The truth is that its fight is to the death.

As an international phenomenon, terrorism is more of a galling nuisance than a truly destabilizing force, except for its psychological impact. Terrorism is the price paid by the West, and especially the United States, for its hegemony. The trick, if one has the political acumen to learn it, is to avoid fueling it while claiming to fight it.

In this chapter, the study will be concentrate on the definition of terrorism as well as the history, origin and various kinds of international terrorism in era of globalization. This chapter is divided in to four parts. In the first one the study is focusing on historical backgrounds of terrorism, second parts is dedicated to make an explanation about the routes of terror, the third part is trying to consider the most important definitions on the terrorism concept, the last part of this chapter is mainly dedicated to make an explanation on the various kinds of terrorism especially in the modern era.
Historical perspective of terrorism

Terrorism is not new, and even though it has been used since the beginning of recorded history, it can be relatively hard to define. Terrorist acts or the threats of such actions have been in existence for millennia. Despite having a history longer than the modern nation-state, the use of terror by governments and those that contest their power remains poorly understood. The history of terrorism is a history of well-known and historically significant individuals, entities, and incidents associated, whether rightly or wrongly, with terrorism. Scholars agree that terrorism is a disputed term, and very few of those labeled terrorists describe themselves as such. It is common for opponents in a violent conflict to describe the other side as terrorists. Those called terrorists can often be referred to as militants, paramilitaries, guerrillas, resistance movements or freedom fighters. However, they are united in the range of tactics they commonly employ, which involves non-systemic covert or semi-covert warfare, driven by an ideological basis often-political religious or socially based. They often seek to use propaganda of the deed to cause a psychological impact alongside the actions themselves to drive the aspired change.

Scholars dispute whether the roots of terrorism date back to the first century and the Sicarii Zealots, to the 11th century and the Al- Hashshashin, to the 19th century and
Narodnaya Volya, or to other eras.  The Sicarii and Hashshashin are described below, while the Narodnaya Volya is discussed in the 19th Century sub-section. Other pre-Reign of Terror historical events sometimes associated with terrorism are the Gunpowder Plot, an attempt to destroy the English Parliament in 1605, and the Boston Tea Party, an attack on British property by the Sons of Liberty in 1773, three years prior to the American Revolution.

**Early Origins of Terrorism**

The scope of political terrorism has expanded rapidly through history. From the time of the Assassins (late 13th century) to the 1700s, terror and barbarism were widely used in warfare and conflict, but key ingredients for terrorism were lacking. Until the rise of the modern nation state after the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the sort of central authority and cohesive society that terrorism attempts to influence barely existed. Communications were inadequate and controlled, and the causes that might inspire terrorism (religious schism, insurrection, ethnic strife) typically led to open warfare. By the time, kingdoms and principalities became nations, they had sufficient means to enforce their authority and suppress activities such as terrorism.

The French Revolution provided the first uses of the words "Terrorist" and "Terrorism". Use of the word "terrorism" began in 1795 in reference to the Reign of Terror initiated by

---


the Revolutionary government. The agents of the Committee of Public Safety and the National Convention that enforced the policies of "The Terror" were referred to as 'Terrorists'. The French Revolution provided an example to future states in oppressing their populations. It also inspired a reaction by royalists and other opponents of the Revolution who employed terrorist tactics such as assassination and intimidation in resistance to the Revolutionary agents. The Parisian mobs played a critical role at key points before, during, and after the Revolution. Such extra-legal activities as killing prominent officials and aristocrats in gruesome spectacles started long before the guillotine was first used.

During the 1st century AD, the Jewish Zealots in Judaea Province rebelled, killing prominent collaborators with Roman rule. In 6 CE, according to contemporary historian Josephus, Judas of Galilee formed a small and more extreme offshoot of the Zealots, the Sicarii ("dagger men").9 Their efforts also directed against Jewish "collaborators," including temple priests, Sadducees, Herodias, and other wealthy elites. According to Josephus, the Sicarii would hide short daggers under their cloaks, mingle with crowds at large festivals, murder their victims, and then disappear into the panicked crowds. Their most successful assassination was of the high priest Jonathan.[20]

In the late 11th century AD, the Hashshashin (a.k.a. the Assassins) arose, an offshoot of the Ismaili sect of Shia Muslims.10 Led by Hassan-i Sabbah and opposed to Fatimid

rule, the Hashshashin militia seized Alamut and other fortress strongholds across Persia (Iran). Hashshashin forces were too small to challenge enemies militarily, so they assassinated city governors and military commanders in order to create alliances with militarily powerful neighbors. For example, they killed Janah al-Dawla, ruler of Homs, to please Ridwan of Aleppo, and assassinated Mawdud, Seljuk emir of Mosul, as a favor to the regent of Damascus.\(^{11}\) The Hashshashin also carried out assassinations as retribution.

As mentioned above, Hashshashin was founded by the religious teacher Hassan Ibn Sabah (Hassan-i Sabbah). Their Arabic name Hashshasin sprang from the terrorist’s addiction to hashish (some kind of weed). Because of their activities as Killers, the word “assassin” came to mean political murder. The Assassins were a religions-political group whose power rested on the membership of Fedawi (devoted ones) who killed at the command of their religious leader, believing that killing the unrighteous guaranteed their own salvation and assisted in overthrowing a corrupt order.

The Assassins remained a powerful force in the Arab world for 200 years and pitted their new weapon of terrorism against their religious and political opponents, Sunni Islam and Turkish military forces. Ultimately, Mongol invaders destroyed them but two of their organizational practices – (1) popular agitation of their attempts to spread their beliefs among the populace (2) a strict code of secrecy among all members of the organization – have an exceptionally modern ring.\(^{12}\) Yet, under some definitions of


terrorism, such assassinations do not qualify as terrorism, since killing a political leader does not intimidate political enemies or inspire revolt.

Political Terrorism as an instrument of power came of age during the French Revolution of 1792-93. Despite some indiscriminate killings during the early phases of the Revolution, a policy of revolutionary terror evolved clearly with the Jacobins. The Jacobin dictatorship used terrorism as an instrument of political repression and social control. It was a state-directed activity, domestic in inspiration and in execution. Not until the Revolution was “exported” to the rest of Europe by means of military conquest did the twin policies of intimidation and retribution become international in scope.\footnote{Ibid, p.34}

Robespierre, Saint Just and the Committee of Public Safety played a vital role in the organization and direction of what came to be known as the Reign of Terror. The important point is that a political group, which was weak, could wield such disproportionate amount of power.

**History of terrorism in modern era**

During the late 19th century, radical political theories and improvements in weapons technology spurred the formation of small groups of revolutionaries who effectively attacked nation-states. Anarchists espousing belief in the "propaganda of the deed\footnote{For more, see: Bueno de Mesquita. Ethan, S. Dickson. Eric(2007), the Propaganda of the Deed: Terrorism, Counterterrorism, and Mobilization, *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Apr., 2007), pp. 364-381.}” produced some striking successes, assassinating heads of state from Russia, France, Spain, Italy, and the United States. However, their lack of organization and refusal to
cooperate with other social movements in political efforts rendered anarchists ineffective as a political movement. In contrast, Communism’s role as an ideological basis for political terrorism was just beginning, and would become much more significant in the 20th century.

Another trend in the late 19th century was the increasing tide of nationalism throughout the world, in which the nation (the identity of a people) and the political state were combined. As states began to emphasize national identities, peoples that had been conquered or colonized could, like the Jews at the times of the Zealots, opt for assimilation or struggle. The best-known nationalist conflict from this time is still unresolved - the multi-century struggle of Irish nationalism. Nationalism, like communism, became a much greater ideological force in the 20th century. The terrorist group from this period that serves as a model in many ways for what was to come was the Russian Narodnya Volya (People’s Will)\(^{15}\). They differed in some ways from modern terrorists, especially in that they would sometimes call off attacks that might endanger individuals other than their intended target. Other than this quirk, we see many of the traits of terrorism here for the first time; clandestine, cellular organization; impatience and inability for the task of organizing the constituents they claim to represent; and a tendency to increase the level of violence as pressures on the group mount. Despite terror’s long history of use in many countries, political terror failed to score any significant successes after the French Revolution until 1921 when the British were forced to bow to the terrorist campaign in Ireland and Ireland was granted

\(^{15}\) Encyclopaedia britanica, URL: http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/403550/Narodnaya-Volya
independence under the terms of the Irish Treaty. The period between the Irish treaty and the end of World War II saw little political terrorism, except as an adjunct to conventional warfare.

Following World War II, political terrorism re-emerged on the international scene. It became a tool in the larger arena of nationalist movements for independence – from its minimal application in India to a substantial reliance on it in Algeria, Cyprus and Kenya.\(^{16}\) The rise of guerilla tactics by non-state actors in the last half of the twentieth century was due to several factors. These included the flowering of ethnic nationalism (e.g. Irish, Basque, Zionist, and Palestinians), anti-colonial sentiments in the vast British, French and other empires, and new ideologies such as communism.

A manifestation of revolutionary Terrorism, utilized as an unofficial instrument of national foreign policy as well as a deadly weapon of political protest, was the Black Hand, the secret Serbian revolutionary organization, whose main aim was to bring about the union with Serbia of unredeemed Serbian nationals and territory. As was so often the case with revolutionary terrorist groups, the end justified the means. The Black Hand precipitated World War I. The assassination of Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand on June 28, 1914 by Gavrilo Principal, a 19 years old terrorist trained by the Black Hand, Was a shot heard around the world.

1930s saw the recurring political violence in the twin slaying in Marseilles of King Alexander of Yugoslavia and French foreign minister Louis Barthou, and the

\(^{16}\) A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava, op.cit., p33
assassination of Austrian chancellor Englebert Dollfus. The Leagues of Nations called for a conference to deal with the resurgent problem of international terrorism. The Geneva Conference of 1937 reproduced two Conventions. (1) Prevention and Repression of Terrorism, (2) Creation of an International Criminal Court.

Terrorist groups with a nationalist agenda have formed in every part of the world. For example, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) grew from the quest by Irish Catholics to form an independent republic, rather than being part of Great Britain.

Similarly, the Kurds, a distinct ethnic and linguistic group in Turkey, Syria, Iran and Iraq, have sought national autonomy since the beginning of the 20th Century. The Kurdistan Worker’s Party (PKK), formed in the 1970s, and earlier Partiya Jiyana Azad a Kurdistanê (PJAK) use terrorist tactics to announce its goal of a Kurdish state. The Sri Lankan Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam are members of the ethnic Tamil minority. They use suicide bombing and other lethal tactics to wage a battle for independence against the Sinhalese majority government.¹⁷

During the 1960s, political terrorism appears to have entered into another phase. Perhaps the two most significant qualitative changes were (1) its trans-national character, (2) its emergence as a self-sufficient strategy, terrorists attempted to operate independently of the larger political arena. Causative factors included revolution in communications (radio, travel, tourism).

International terrorism became a prominent issue in the late 1960s, when hijacking became a favored tactic. In 1968, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine hijacked an El Al Flight. Twenty years later, the bombing of a Pan Am flight over Lockerbie, Scotland, shocked the world. 9/11 terrorist attack was the most terrible hijacking and suicide attack in its kind. The era also gave us our contemporary sense of terrorism as highly theatrical, symbolic acts of violence by organized groups with specific political grievances. In that era, terrorists used spectacular tactics to bring international attention to their national cause. Terrorists also took advantage of the black market in Soviet-produced light weaponry, such as AK-47 created in the wake of the Soviet Union’s 1989 collapse. Most terrorist groups justified violence with a deep belief in the necessity and justice of their cause. Terrorism in the United States also emerged. Groups such as the Weathermen grew out of the non-violent group Students for a Democratic Society. They turned to violent tactics, from rioting to setting off bombs, to protest the Vietnam War.\(^\text{18}\)

One of the most important incidents throughout terrorism history is emerge of most well-known global terrorist group known Al-Qaeda. From two last decades of twentieth century, many Muslims particularly Arabs were trained and equipped by US and some region countries for the purpose of fighting against Soviet Union’s Red army. After Soviet Union collapse, so many fighters were released, but soon after, most of

\(^\text{18}\) Amy Zalman, The History of Terrorism, URL: http://terrorism.about.com/od/whatisterroris1/p/Terrorism.htm
them from all over Islam world gather together under the flag of Al-Qaeda leaded by Osama Bin laden.

Since the importance of this particular group and unique incident, this study is going to take the Al-Qaeda as a case study, hence in forth chapter Al-Qaeda’s history and activities will be analyzed.

Anyhow, terrorism’s emergence as a self-sufficient tool to achieve political objectives is largely due to the vulnerability of our modern urban civilization. Today’s urban guerillas view the modern city as the new battleground. The most important tactic in terrorist strategy to gain popular support and to discredit an incumbent regime may be provoking the government into adopting countermeasures, preferably repressive ones. This usually induces a breakdown in social norms and helps create conditions for public disaffection and alienation. If such an atmosphere can be sustained over a period, it can be exploited to the terrorist’s psychological and political advantage. The dramatic rise of International terrorism in the last two decades and its concomitant political and psychological impact has produced a crisis of global proportions. The terrorist phenomenon, as reflected almost daily in the news media, is worldwide, and its victims can be found among every class and nationality. Although a genuine and continuing threat to world public order exists international opinion is deeply divided as to the cause of terrorism and is distressingly uncertain as to its remedy.

It has become commonplace to assert that a precise definition of terrorism is lacking and that a working model has yet to be developed. Nevertheless, by placing
terror-violence in its historical context, a clearer and more effective perspective can be attained.

Post World War I, ideology and perpetration of terrorism has become a part of the 20th Century historical process. The cult of violence has become a substitute for the use of reason in the political arena. Despite the lessons of the past and the portents of the future, power politics and ideological militancy continue to make a mockery of the law of nations. Transnational terrorism had now been inextricably intertwined with nationalist moments.

Briefly, can be said that the global terrorist activities are now attracting quite a few people, primarily because of the feeling that resolution of internal social, economic and political problems can be achieved either by eliciting, rather easily, support (in the form of men, material and ideology) from outside or by committing some spectacular acts in some advanced countries or again some developed countries' interests. In a way, the United Nations had come to virtually accept this phenomenon when the UN General Assembly passed a resolutions on October 24, 1970, that “every State had a duty to refrain from organizing, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in any other State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards commissioning of such acts, it is, of course, a different matter that such dictums have remained more on the statute books than been observed or implemented.19
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19. A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava,p38
Terrorism has indeed become a global phenomenon with increasing and rather well identifiable links between different terrorist groups or organizations. They use each other’s areas for recruitment and training, exchange illegal weapons, engage in joint planning and ventures and also provide administrative and other logistic support. The irony in such globalization of terrorist activity lies in the fact that all this is often or has actually been facilitated not only by obvious support of states and governments inimical to each other, but also by technological advancement in the field of scientific research that human brains are capable of. Quite often the terrorist groups are one step ahead of the state machinery in the use of technological aids to their planning and commissioning of the act. Though it is not intended to quote case histories in this thematic presentation, few references may help drive home the point forcefully. One has only to look at the activities of the Libyan or Iraqi Terrorists in London, the attack on the synagogue in individual ISI officers, it was learnt, were reported to have participated in the trade and terrorists pushed into India were partly, if not wholly, funded through income earned through narcotics. That activated of narcotic gangs and clandestine arms deals through covert support from different intelligence agencies were causing international concern was also clear from a UN Report of 1987, which linked international terrorism to illegal drug production and trafficking and illegal arms trade. The vast underworld, fed by hostile intelligence agencies, links criminals involved in narcotics and money-laundering and illegal arms dealers into a sinister web. Smugglers feed terrorist violence at one end and illegal arms dealers at the other. The arms-drop case at Purulia (West Bengal, India) is only suggestive of the fact that the routes for illegal arms trade crisis-cross over
even continents. National boundaries or international borders are of no consequence to those involved in such trades.\(^{20}\)

All these are changing the faces of terrorism and that is why perhaps Walter Laqueur, Chairman of the International Council at the Centre for Strategic and international Studies, USA, has said; “In its long history, terrorism has appeared in many quizzes. Today society faces not one terrorism but many kinds of terrorism: the greatest change has been that terrorism is no longer the militants only strategy. The past few decades have witnessed dozens of aggressive movements espousing varieties of nationalism, religious fundamentalism, fascism and even apocalyptic millenarianism, from Hindu nationalists in India to neo-fascists in Europe and the developing world to the Branch Dravidian Cult of Waco, Taxes, the earlier fascists or terrorists believed in armed or military aggression and engaged in huge arms build-up. but such a strategy has become outdated. Now, mail-order catalogues tempt militants with readily available, far cheaper, unconventional as well as conventional weapons. Walter Laqueur is of the opinion that given the technical difficulties, terrorists are probably less likely to use nuclear devices than chemical weapons, and least likely to attempt to use biological weapon. However, Laqueur warns, “difficulties could be overcome, and the choice of unconventional weapons will in the end come down to the specialties of the terrorists and their access to deadly substances. Terrorists are not generally likely to engage in over – kills if their traditional weapons- the submachine gun and the conventional bomb are sufficient to continue their struggle and achieve their aims. However, despair could

\(^{20}\) Ibid, p.41
lead to giving up the usual armed assault and make a desperate attempt to beat the enemy, as if to prove the paradox that only hope lies in their despair.”

Laqueur also sounds a cautions note on possible “future shock”. In the coming days, the terrorists could be individuals or like-minded people working in very small groups. On the patterns of the technology-hating Unabomber, who apparently worked alone sending out parcel bombs over two decades or the perpetrators of the 1995 bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma City (USA). An individual may possess the technical competence to steal, buy, An individual may possess the technical competence to steal, buy, or manufacture the weapons he or she needs for a terrorist purpose and the ideology or ideologies such individuals may espouse could be more aberrant than those of usually largest groups of terrorists, A serious danger indeed.

Advanced societies are now dependent every day on electronic storage, retrieval, analysis and transmission of information, Defense, the police, banking, trade, transpiration, scientific work and a large percentage of the government’s as well as private sector’s transactions are on-line. That exposes enormous vital areas of national life to mischief or sabotage by any computer hacker, and concerted sabotage by some competent hacker could render a country very non-functional at the shortest notice. Hence the threading or emerging speculation about “info-terrorism” and cyber warfare. The overall information warfare is the most dreaded form of terrorism facing the civilized

society — a true mode of globalization of terrorism, which would respect no national boundaries or international boarder either in space or on the ground.

**The nature and root of terrorism**

Terrorism is the use of fear and violence to control others and to influence their behavior. This tool has been used throughout human history, by warlords, emperors, gangsters, priests and preachers, racists, financial magnates, kidnappers, abusive spouses and dysfunctional parents, among others. In most cases, it is the threat of violence rather than the act itself that paralyzes the victims. Terrorism is different from the war or guerilla operations and shouldn’t be mistaken in that way.

Most of the scholars believe that the key word to define the terrorism concept is violence. Literally, word violence rooted in Latin’s word (Vis). Violence is defined by the World Health Organization as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against a person, or against a group or community, that either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation.\(^\text{22}\)

---

\(^{22}\) From the French term *maldéveloppement*, introduced as a human and social development term in France in the 1990s, to replace the words *malformation* or *développement anormal*. The word is a neologism broken down as *mal* ("ill") + *development*. Maldevelopment is the state of an organism or an organization that did not develop in the "normal" way (used in medicine, e.g. "brain maldevelopment of a fetus").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Conventional War</th>
<th>Guerilla</th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Size in Battle</strong></td>
<td>Large (armies, corps, divisions)</td>
<td>Medium (platoons, companies, battalion)</td>
<td>Small (usually less than ten persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weapons</strong></td>
<td>Full range of military hardware (air force armor, artillery, etc)</td>
<td>Mostly infantry-type light weapons but sometimes artillery pieces as well</td>
<td>Hand guns, hand grenades, assault rifles &amp; specialised weapons, e.g., car bombs, remote-control bombs, barometric pressure bombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tactics</strong></td>
<td>Usually joint operations involving several military branches</td>
<td>Commando-type tactics</td>
<td>Specialized tactics: kidnapping, assassinations, carbombing, hijacking, barricade-hostage, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td>Mostly military units, industrial &amp; transportation infrastructure</td>
<td>Mostly military, police &amp; administration staff, as well as political opponents</td>
<td>State symbols, political opponents and the public at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended Impact</strong></td>
<td>Physical destruction</td>
<td>Mainly physical attrition of the enemy</td>
<td>Psychological coercion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Territory</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniform</strong></td>
<td>Wear uniform</td>
<td>Often wear uniform</td>
<td>Do not wear uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition of War Zones</strong></td>
<td>War limited to recognized geographical</td>
<td>War limited to the country in strife</td>
<td>No recognized war zones. Operations carried out zones worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Legality</strong></td>
<td>Yes if conducted by rules</td>
<td>Yes if conducted by rules</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: martin frost website

---

There are at least two inconsistent standpoints about the origins of violence. On one hand, some are emphasize that the origin of violence is inherent. Some like Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679), Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), Ibn Khaldoun (1332- 1406) and Immanuel Kant (1724- 1804) believe that the violence among humankind in natural and inherent. On the other hand, some believe that the violence is not human nature. Some like Erich Seligmann Fromm (1900 –1980), Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778), Anthony Giddens (1938) telling that the violence is adventitious.

Theoretically, there are an infinite number of ways to classify politically motivated violence. Nevertheless, with the criteria of utility and parsimony in mind, a basic classification that relates to the initiator of the violence and to its target, distinguishing between states and citizens, is presented in Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIATOR</th>
<th>TARGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| STATE     | FULL-SCALE WAR; BELLIGERENT; ACTIVITY IN PEACETIME, EG CLOAK-AND-DAGGER OPERATIONS AND PUNITIVE STRIKES | LAW ENFORCEMENT
|           | LEGAL AND ILLEGAL OPPRESSION |
| CITIZENS  | GUERRILLA; INSURGENT TERRORISM; COUP D'ETAT; LENINIST REVOLUTION | VIGILANTE TERRORISM; ETHNIC TERRORISM |

25 Merari, Ariel, Terrorism as a Strategy of Insurgency, Terrorism and Political Violence, Vol.5, No. 4 (Winter 1993), pp.213- 251, LONDON, Published By FRANK CASS.
Encompasses, in a gross manner, all forms of political violence carried out by humans against other humans, while differentiating between their main types. Each one of the four cells includes a distinct category of truculent behavior. These will be described briefly in the following paragraphs.

**States against States**

Violence initiated by states can be conceptually divided into two main types: (1) state violence directed against other states, and (2) violence that states inflict on their own citizens.

Aggressive actions of states against other states have often taken the form of conventional war: a clash of sizable regular armies. This has been undoubtedly the most consequential form of violence in history. Various aspects of conventional wars, such as military strategy and the laws of war, have been studied extensively and have become recognized academic disciplines or sub disciplines. Obviously, states have also used a plethora of lower levels of violence in their contests with other states, such as limited air force strikes, commando raids, or the assassination of enemy agents. Yet, in all cases, these acts can be characterized as organized and planned, and they reflect the capability of a large bureaucracy.

**States against Citizens**

The use of force by states against their own citizens includes two main subcategories. One is the ordinary, overt legal process by which states enforce their laws. The other is the clandestine use of illegal violence by a government, designed to intimidate and terrorize citizens with the intention of preventing them from opposing the
regime. Sometimes illegal state violence is exercised in the context of internal strife in the name of efficiency: cutting corners of due legal processes that hamper the struggle against the insurgents. Examples are abundant. The extreme instances have involved the enormous totalitarian regimes of Nazi Germany and Stalinist Soviet Union. “Death squads” in several Latin American countries, usually manned by members of the security forces, provide a less efficient, albeit quite repugnant example of a different brand.

**Citizens against Citizens**

The most mundane form of citizens’ violence against other citizens is, of course, common crime. Unlike the types of violence shown in Table 1, common crime is usually motivated by reasons that have nothing to do with political objectives. Much of it is committed for personal economic gain and another significant part is stimulated by personal animosities.

Thus, the great mass of citizens’ violence against other citizens is unrelated to the subject of this essay, namely, political violence. There are, however, also phenomena of citizens’ violence committed for political or social motivations. Some of these are related to racial or ethnic rivalries or strifes. Others are associated with right-wing or left-wing social ideologies; and still others have to do with a variety of idiosyncratic issues, such as abortion, environment conservation, or animal rights.

A special case of citizens’ violence, vigilantism, merits special mention. Vigilante violence has sometimes been associated with an unauthorized attempt to control crime, but sometimes with violence against ethnic or political minorities.

**Citizens against the State**
Citizens’ violence against states may be organized or spontaneous. Sometimes it is an impulsive expression of discontent, having neither clear political goals nor organized leadership or plan. In its organized form, citizens’ violence falls under the category of insurgency, aimed at overthrowing the government. The main forms of insurgency are distinct strategies of uprising that differ from one another in several important characteristics. Before turning to examine them in greater detail, ever, it is necessary to cope with the definition of terrorism and to distinguish between this mode of violence and other forms of conflict.\(^{26}\)

In its popular understanding the term ‘terrorism’ tends to refer to an act that is wrong, evil, illegitimate, illegal, and a crime. The term has come to be used to describe a wide range of violent, and sometimes not-so-violent, conduct (especially in the hands of the media since 11 September 2001). Acts characterized as terrorist in nature can occur both in conflict and peace-time. They may constitute crimes in domestic and international law, and they are motivated by a complex matrix of reasons and ideals. Their characterization can also depend upon the person or institution using the label and may even change over time. To give two striking examples, the list of most wanted terrorists kept by the United States featured, at one time, Yassir Arafat and Nelson Mandela, both of whom were subsequently awarded the Nobel Peace Prize: evidence

that this is a highly political and controversial issue.\textsuperscript{27} In the months prior to his death, Yassir Arafat was in again described as a terrorist by the United States Administration.\textsuperscript{28}

The nature of terrorism is the indiscriminate and indirect targeting of individuals with a specific goal and purpose. Terrorism is indiscriminate and indirect in that the people killed are not targeted specifically and the people killed, per se, are of no account to the terrorist. Who gets killed is of no consequence but the fact that people are killed is of consequence. Terrorism is not an irrational act. The targets are chosen because they will cause a desired impact (either the destruction of infrastructure, the causing of massive death, or disruption of a society). The nature of modern terrorism is that anyone can be a victim, but terrorism is not random. The apparently random target is not random, buts its appearance as random causes public anxiety and fear and change in behavior, which is exactly what the terrorist wants to accomplish. Terrorism is also a public act. The act must be such that the greater society will see it and react to the attack. The terrorist will choose targets that have symbolic value and/or economic value (WTC for example) or targets that have public value (buses, restaurants, etc.) in order to get public attention and public behavior change.\textsuperscript{29}

Terrorism should not be confused with traditional warfare. In war, the target is selected for its military value. In war groups of people are selected for attack because

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{27} This list is maintained by the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation. URL: http://www.fbi.gov/wanted/terrorists/fugitives.htm.
\end{footnotes}
the people themselves have some specific value and attacking the group will achieve a military objective. In terrorism, the group is of little account per se, but the fact that they are killed is the point. Terrorism should not be confused with war crimes. An example of a war crime is an army going into a town with the objective of purging the town of enemy forces, and while doing so they kill unarmed civilians and non-combatants. Although such action is illegal and a crime, it is not considered terrorism; the dead were killed because the army lost control of itself, not because the destruction was designed to intimidate other towns or the society as a whole. In distinguishing the difference between war and terrorism, the focus is on the reason for the attack and the impact of the attack, not the target of the attack itself.

Briefly, terrorism should be understood as a political act to achieve a desired goal through the use of violence. Terrorism is not an irrational act committed by the insane. The terrorist does not act for personal gain or gratification, thus the terrorist is not a criminal in the traditional sense. A terrorist believes in what he, and now with female suicide bombers, she is doing. The objective is worth the life of the terrorist and the lives of the people he/she will take. The intent is not to kill those who die in an attack, but to affect the larger society as a whole. An attack can be committed to destroy the buildings and operations of a society, to kill or injure people or to disrupt the peaceful existence of the society. The attack can seek to achieve all three or a combination of the three. The objective can be to force a government to negotiate or to seek revenge for a
government action. Terrorism does not seek specific victims but it does seek out specific targets for a specific outcome.  

Researchers are divided in their opinions on whether terrorism should be considered a criminal act or a political-military act. Brian Jenkins (former head of the Terrorism Project at the Rand Institute) has observed that if one looks at terrorism as a crime, there will be a need to gather evidence, arrest perpetrators and put them on trial. This approach provokes problems of international cooperation, he argues, and is not a suitable response for acts of terrorism perpetrated by a distant organization or a country involved in terrorism. Approaching terrorism as warfare, however, one can be less concerned with the aspect of individual guilt, and an approximate assessment of guilt and intelligence are sufficient. The focus is not on a single perpetrator, but rather on proper identification of the enemy. Contrary to Jenkins, Barzilai argues that terrorists are criminals, and that if terrorism-related crimes are treated differently to ordinary crimes, this will result in municipal authorities employing tougher, more stringent tools to gain illegitimate political advantages.  

Generally speaking, those perpetrating ‘normal’ criminal offences do so out of some personal, hedonistic motivation – whether that be the material rewards of a burglary, the thrill and high of challenging ‘the system’ or using drugs, or the desperation of stealing

30 Ibid.

31 Conte. Alex (2010), Human Rights in the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism: Commonwealth Approaches: The United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. New Zealand, Springer. P. 9
necessities where no alternatives appear to be available. Personal gain is the common feature of criminal conduct, setting aside crimes of passion and those of the mentally insane.32

In contrast, the primary motivation of terrorists is altruistic, motivated by a higher cause or ideology that is greater than his or her personal impulses or gains. It should be recognized that the individual terrorist may not be motivated in this way, instead acting out of a sense of revenge borne out of the individual’s personal or familial experience or perceptions of ill-treatment or humiliation, a matter recognized, for example, by the Israeli Security Agency and the Israeli Counter-Terrorism Bureau, and also implied in the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy (see Chap. 13).11 It can be generally said, however, that a terrorist (or at least the entity that recruited the individual) will act for the furtherance of an external cause (whether it be a localized secessionist movement or global jihad) and for the benefit this has to both the cause and the people of it.12 Combined with the honor derived from such conduct in this life, and the rewards in the next, the motivations of a terrorist are far beyond those of an ‘ordinary’ criminal offender. 33

Added to these distinct motivations are the standards against which terrorists measure their conduct. The fact that a terrorist act might be unlawful according to the law of the State in which the act is perpetrated, or under international law, is argued to be irrelevant to a terrorist. Terrorists measure their conduct against the codex of the ideology they are pursuing.14 If the ideology mandates the killing of Jews or Christians,

32 Ibid. p. 10
33 Ibid.
Muslims, Hindus or anyone else then that killing is not murder but, instead, a legitimate and appropriate act. The consequence of these features is significant. Standard criminology does not apply. The notion of personal deterrence is largely irrelevant, with the language of terrorists often entirely divorced from that of the ‘normal’ criminal offender.

Acts of violent behavior – characterized by a technique of perpetrating random and brutal intimidation, coercion or destruction of human lives and property and used intentionally by subnational groups, operating under varying degrees of stress to obtain realistic or illusory goals – are symptomatic of what can be called international terrorism, what nature it has and what reasons.

One major reason for this contemporary phenomenon lies in the very nature of modern civilization itself. The present complex technological society is extremely vulnerable to unsuspected and ruthless attacks of terrorism because transportation centers, communication facilities, oil fields and refineries and factories cannot always be protected against the random acts of small groups of dedicated and determined terrorists.

Second, highly sophisticated weapons, like heat seeking missiles, which can be fired from light shoulder launchers, are now relatively easy for various terrorist movements to obtain. It is also likely that in the future these groups will have access to biological, chemical and nuclear instruments of death and destruction.

Third, the availability of the most warfare capabilities to terrorist groups challenges the stability of an orderly human society. Their newly found power
transforms subnational groups, ordinarily regarded as ‘powerless’ into parties with formidable strengths. They are often capable of creating states within states thereby undermining the ability of legitimate governments to rule or ultimately to survive.

Fourth, the advances of science and technology are slowly turning all of modern society into a potential victim of terrorism with no immunity for the non-combatant segment of the world population, nor for those nations and peoples who have no direct connection to specific grievances motivating acts of violence or to particular conflicts. Because of the unrestricted and indiscriminate character of terrorism, innocent civilians are increasingly subject to daily risk anywhere in the world.

Fifth, communication and transportation opportunities have enabled an international network of terrorism to develop with a certain degree of centralized organizational structure. Collaboration among ideologically linked groups and even among those without a common philosophy of political interest has developed relationships involving financing, training, supply of combat materials, propaganda facilities, refuge bases, organizational assistance, attacks by proxy and joint attacks. This pattern of ‘comradeship’ is inevitably expanding the areas of international violence.

Sixth, as the world is shrinking through the revolution in communications, terrorists are assured extensive publicity for their acts an enunciated causes. Because terrorism is essentially violence for effect and is targeted not only against immediate victims but is directed at a wide audience as well, terrorists are making a conscious and deliberate effort to use the media for intimidation and blackmail. The immediacy and diffusion of acts of terror through the electronic media have consequently produced
great psychological effects far beyond the area of terrorism. Another major consequence of extensive media coverage of ideological and political violence is the exportation of terroristic techniques and inspiration to other terroristic groups.\(^34\)

Hence, it might be not wrong if we consider our understanding about nature of terrorism would have some obvious effect on our reaction against this particular concept.

**Definitions of Terrorism**

The term "terrorism" comes from French *terrorisme*, from Latin: 'terror', "great fear", "dread", related to the Latin verb *terrere*, "to frighten". The *terror cimbricus* was a panic and state of emergency in Rome in response to the approach of warriors of the Cimbi tribe in 105BC. The French National Convention declared in September 1793 that "terror is the order of the day". The period 1793–94 is referred to as *La Terreur* (Reign of Terror). Maximilien Robespierre, a leader in the French revolution proclaimed in 1794 that "Terror is nothing other than justice, prompt, severe, inflexible."\(^35\)

Word terrorism has different meanings for different people. Terminology is always a matter of agreement for the purpose of common understanding. There is no point in searching for logic-based definitions of terms that belong to the realm of political or

\(^{34}\) A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava, pp.30,31

social science, especially when the term in question carries a negative emotional connotation.

Absent general acceptance of the basic assumptions and semantics necessary for the definition of terrorism, there is no way on earth, for any country to prove logically that a particular event is acts of terrorism. Achieving a consensus on the meaning of the term “terrorism” is not an important end in itself, except, perhaps, for linguists. Still, for students of political violence, classification of the phenomena that fall under this general category is an essential first step of research. It is necessary to differentiate between various conditions of violence and to distinguish between diverse modes of conflict, whatever we name them, if we want to gain a better understanding of their origins, the factors that affect them, and how to cope with them. The purposes, circumstances, and methods involved in a state’s violence against its own citizens are entirely different from those that characterize violence by states against other states or by insurgent groups against governments. The application of the term “terrorism” to all three situations is obfuscating and disrupts both academic research and addressing these problems in political action. As long as the term “terrorism” simply denotes a violent behavior that is deplorable in the eyes of the user of the term, its utility is in propaganda rather than in research.

In general, the criteria for defining the term terrorism has remained subjective and based mainly on political considerations. The fact, however, remains that terrorism is promoted by a wide range of motives depending on the point in time and the prevailing political ideology. It, therefore, takes different forms, is usually equated with political subversion, employed at times by governments and is used as an instrument of
syndicated crime. As with any complex social problem there have been attempts to simplify critical issues in terrorism. The analysis of terrorism as a form of political violence is a problem because of lack of consensus about definition of the phenomenon itself and objective criteria free of any ideology.

Walter Laqueur an eminent authority on the subject is of the view that there is no definition of terrorism that could cover all its various manifestations in history. He includes under the heading of terrorism highly heterogeneous phenomena as peasant revolts, revolts in general, civil wars, wars for national liberation and resistance movements against foreign invaders. Despite differences in approach most scholars and observers tend to agree that present day terrorism is a negative political phenomenon with grave consequences for the individual society, political regimes, international community and the human race as a whole.36

Terrorism of course, is not a recent phenomenon. It has been present throughout history. It originated in the conspiracies within the royal courts for capturing power. But developments in the modern age have changed the entire concept. Systematic terrorism in its modern form received great impetus in the late 18th and 19th centuries with the propagation of secular ideologies and nationalism in the wake of French revolution. The pro imperial nationalism that led to the Meiji restoration in Japan in 1868 was accompanied by frequent terrorist attacks on Tokugawa Shogunate in the

36. A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava, op.cit, p.2

Also look at: Laqueur. W, Terrorism: a Brief History, laqueur.net, URL:

Southern United States, the Ku Klux klan was set up after the defeat of the confederacy in the American civil war to terrorize former slaves and representatives of the reconstruction administration imposed by the Federal Government. Adherents of anarchism across Europe and elsewhere carried out terrorist attacks on high officials or even ordinary citizens in the later 19th century. A glaring example of state sponsored nationalist terrorism was the assassination of Frances Ferdinand in Sarajevo in 1914, precipitating World War I. However, in the 1960s international terrorism exhibiting destructive activity across national borders came into its own.

The last decade of the twentieth century has seen that the old paradigm of predominantly state terrorism has been joined by a newly religiously motivated terrorism that neither relies on the support of sovereign states nor is constrained by the limits on violence that state sources have observed themselves or placed on their proxies. The 1993 World Trade Center bombing in New York and related conspiracies, the Tokyo Sarin gas attack in 1995, the 1996 Oklahoma City bombing, the 1998 East Africa bombing are examples of the unmistakable harbingers of a new and vastly more threatening terrorism, one that aims to produce casualties on a massive scale. Thus in the new millennium, new forms of terrorist threat and assault that are harder to distinguish from other criminal activity seem to point to a new era of indiscriminate violence more dangerous and deadly than in the past. Indeed with the increasing globalization of the world economy, terrorists have managed to expand their activities, to establish networks of alliances with transnational criminal organizations to hinder law

---

and order, particularly in a number of developing countries where criminal law enforcement may be susceptible to pressure and bribery from powerful drug barons.\textsuperscript{38} Terrorism could be problematized through various shades of its definition and combat strategies thereof. For instance, because of the divergent positions of various states with regard to terrorism and the loose wording of item no. 92 of the Agenda, neither the Twenty Seventh, nor the subsequent Twenty-Eighth session of the UN General Assembly could work out any specific measures to check acts of terrorism jeopardizing the normal course of international relations. The major problem was the inclusion of even the national liberation movements and other forms of group and class assertion of people in to the discussion of “international terrorism” by the capitalist block led by the USA. The others led by the USSR were against the inclusion of the complete transformative upraises comprising of masses as “time of surprise attacks, or revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses is past.”

In this part, present research tries to give the most relevant and most important definitions of word Terrorism. To have a better understanding, the research is dividing the definitions into two divisions. At first, the scientific definitions on word Terrorism will be discussed, and then the official definitions on the terrorism concept will be drawn.

A: scientific definitions of the word Terrorism

Terrorism is notoriously difficult to define, in part because the term has evolved and in part because it is associated with an activity that is designed to be subjective. The difficulties of defining terrorism, combined with the ease with which states apply the label, means that what we view as terrorism is largely shaped through counter measures. Exploiting popular fears of terrorism provides states with opportunities to engage in military aggression and implement repressive laws that normally would be seen as unacceptable. The targets of a terrorist episode are not the victims who are killed or maimed in the attack, but rather the governments, publics, or constituents among whom the terrorists hope to engender a reaction—such as fear, repulsion, intimidation, overreaction, or radicalization.

Based on the work of Mark Juergensmeyer, "trans-violence" is the action of killing or planning to kill others. This kind of killing is carried out outside the boundaries of war. However, executives and planners can without presence in war or scene witness horrific and brutal.39 Departing from traditional terrorism in recent terrorist attacks, including the bombing of Pan American Flight 103, bombing World Trade Center in 1993, bombing of the federal building in Oklahoma in 1995, Aum Shinrikyo’s (Japanese Cult) chemical attack on the Tokyo subway, Hamas bombing in Israel in 1996, IRA (Irish Republican Army) bombings in Britain and al-Qaeda bombing in Saudi Arabia all are indicative of a

profound rupture in terrorist attacks; so that the trans-modem terrorists are also capable of providing weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and uncontrollable.

Unlike traditional terrorists who want to take privileges (like liberating occupied lands or releasing their forces from prison) and send their message of innocence throughout the world, trans-violence terrorists are quiet and have no messages to say. In many terrorist attacks that have occurred in recent years, unlike the past no group has taken advantage from them.

Events such as the toppling of Pan American Airlines Flight 103, the overthrow of the Indian Airlines flight in the Gulf of Ireland in 1988, the bombing of the Atlanta Olympic Games in 1996 all suggest that period of traditional terrorism has came to the end and new form of terrorism which is recognized with the suffix of Postmodern, has begun.

According to recent theory of Walter Laquer\textsuperscript{40} two main reasons can cause the rise of postmodern terrorism;

One could be a wave of religious revival; because throughout history, religion has always been used to justify the most horrible assassinations. While these kinds of attitudes have been controled and limited in traditional and secular communities. For example, justifying acts of trans-violence in Sri Lanka’s Tamil separatist against Sinhalese Buddhists, Hindus and Sikhs in India and Pakistan and radical Muslims and

\textsuperscript{40} Walter Laquer, “Post Modern Terrorism,” Foreign Affairs, v 75, n, 5, (1996), 24-36.
deadly deeds in order to fulfill God’s commandments in Israel by Jewish and Palestinian radical Groups.

All agencies and departments and large multinational corporations and also smaller and local companies have been dependent on computers. While many of them are not aware of vulnerabilities of computer and disclosure of information by hackers.

Considering cyber wars, in 1996 US government formed a Commission entitled "Commission on critical infrastructure protection». This Commission came to this conclusion that it must focus on industries such as electronics, communications and computer, because most of the attacks in cyberspace will be against them.

Specialists in the area of terrorism studies have devoted hundreds of pages toward trying to develop an unassailable definition of the term, only to realize the fruitlessness of their efforts: Terrorism is intended to be a matter of perception and is thus seen differently by different observers\(^4\).

Although individuals can disagree over whether particular actions constitute terrorism, there are certain aspects of the concept that are fundamental. First, terrorism always has a political nature. It involves the commission of outrageous acts designed to precipitate political change. At its root, terrorism is about justice, or at least someone’s perception of it, whether fabricated or divine.

Second, although many other uses of violence are inherently political, including conventional war among states, terrorism is distinguished by its non-state character

\(^4\) Look at Malik. Omar (2001), Enough of the definition of Terrorism!, London, Royal institute of international affairs.
even when terrorists receive military, political, economic, and other means of support
from state sources. States obviously employ force for political ends: When state force is
used internationally, it is considered an act of war; when it is used domestically, it is
called various things, including law enforcement, state terror, oppression, or civil war.
Although states can terrorize, they cannot by definition be terrorists. Third, terrorism
deliberately targets the innocent, which also distinguishes it from state uses of force that
inadvertently kill innocent bystanders. In any given example, the latter may or may not
be seen as justified; but again, this use of force is different from terrorism.
Hence the fact that precision-guided missiles sometimes go astray and kill innocent
civilians is a tragic use of force, but it is not terrorism. Finally, state use of force is
subject to international norms and conventions that may be invoked or at least
consulted; terrorists do not abide by international laws or norms and, to maximize the
psychological effect of an attack, their activities have a deliberately unpredictable
quality.42
Thus, at a minimum, terrorism has the following characteristics: a fundamentally political
nature, the surprise use of violence against seemingly random targets, and the targeting
of the innocent by non-state actors. All of these attributes are illustrated by recent
examples of terrorism—from the April 2000 kidnapping of tourists by the Abu Sayyaf
group of the Philippines to the various incidents allegedly committed by al-Qaeda,
including the 1998 bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and the
September 11 attacks. For the purposes of this discussion, the shorthand (and

42 Cronin. Audrey Kurth, Behind the curve, Globalisation and international terrorism, International security, Winter
admittedly imperfect) definition of terrorism is the threat or use of seemingly random violence against innocents for political ends by a non-state actor.

There is innumerable kind of definitions of terrorism and every definition though it appears correct in its own perspective, lacks some important aspects of terrorism. In other words, these definitions do not represent all the components of terrorism. However, if these definitions are analyzed in totality, an acceptable definition could be evolved. Multiple interpretations not merely complicate definition of terrorism, but also encourage its perpetrator to escape in the name of economic deprivation and freedom fighting. As a matter of fact, terrorism continues to pervade the political system because there is no acceptable definition; and hence no punitive action against the perpetrator is possible either by the government or by the international organizations.

Scholars all over the world are entangled in the labyrinth of terminology and have expressed different views. Professor Yonah Alexander Director of International Center for Terrorism Studies (ICTS) defines terrorism as: ‘the use of violence against random civilian targets in order to intimidate or to create generalized pervasive fear for the purpose of achieving political goals.’ Somewhat similar is the elaborate definition given by Alex Peter Schmid professor in the Department of Political Science at Leiden University, who analyzed innumerable definitions before arriving at the following conclusion: ‘Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by clandestine individual groups or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby—in contrast to assassination—the direct targets of violence

are not the main targets. The immediate human targets of violence are generally chosen randomly or selectively from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat and violence based communication processes between terrorists’ victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target, turning it into a targeting of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion or propaganda is primarily sought.\textsuperscript{44} This definition goes into detail of the phenomenon of terrorism, but remains more focused on targets and objectives than its basic nature.

\textit{Brian Michael Jenkins} Senior Advisor to the RAND Corporation writes that the threat of violence, individual acts of violence or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear is terrorism.\textsuperscript{45} This definition of terrorism is close to the concept of terrorism, but ignores two significant aspects e.g. training and international support. These two aspects are highlighted in the definition of Christopher Dobson and Martha Crenshaw. The necessity of training is expressed by Dobson who writes that ‘use of explosive devices used by the terrorists needs appropriate training’\textsuperscript{46} the need for international assistance is expressed in the definition of Martha Crenshaw. She opines

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{44} Alex Schmid and Jongman, J. Albert (1988) Political Terrorism, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, p. 28.
\item \textsuperscript{45} Jenkins, Brian (1978), "International Terrorism: Trends and Potentialities", Journal of International Affairs, vol. 32, no. 1, Spring/Summer, pp. 115-123.
\end{itemize}
that terrorism is a means to accomplish certain political objectives with international support.\textsuperscript{47}

There is yet another group of scholars who define terrorism in historical perspective, for instance Michael Walzer professor emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study (IAS) in Princeton, believes that "random terror for political achievement emerged as strategy of revolutionary struggle after the World War II."\textsuperscript{48}

Likewise some scholars define terrorism in the light of violence and coercion by state agencies. Laqueur, for instance, defines acts of violence and repression as carried out by the government against their own people as terrorism.\textsuperscript{49} In the same vein, Neil Livingston says that the state is the main perpetrator of terrorism today.\textsuperscript{50}

Furthermore the following definitions are provided by various experts in the field:

- Terrorism is the unlawful use or threat of violence against persons or property to further political or social objectives. It is usually intended to intimidate or coerce a government, individual or groups, to modify their behavior or politics. -Vice President Task Force, 1986.


\textsuperscript{50}Livingston. Neil (1982), The War Against Terrorism, Massachusetts, D.C. Health and Co., p. 11.
• Terrorism is the premeditated, deliberate, systematic murder, mayhem, and threatening of the innocent to create fear and intimidation in order to gain a political or tactical advantage, usually to influence an audience. - James M. Poland.

• Terrorism constitutes the illegitimate use of force to achieve a political objective when innocent people are targeted. - Walter Laqueur.

• Terrorism is the use or threatened use of force designed to bring about political change. - Brian Jenkins. Paul Pillar, a former CIA deputy Chief of the Counterterrorism Center defines terrorism in the context of four elements:
  • It is premeditated and planned in advance, rather than an impulsive act of rage,
  • It is political—not criminal, like the violence that groups such as the Mafia use to get money, but designed to change the existing political order,
  • It is aimed at civilians—not military targets or combat-ready troops,
  • It is carried out by sub-national groups not by the army of country.\(^51\)

  Briefly, political terrorism can be defined as the systematic use of murder and destruction and the threat of murder and destruction. To terrorize individuals, groups communities or governments into conceding to the terrorist political aims.

  While the diversity of definitions on concept of terrorism is widespread, the characteristics of the concept, taken from majority of scholar definitions may help to understand the meaning of this particular word.

**Characteristics of Terroristic violence:**

---

To help understanding the matter of terrorism, we need to know what characteristics it has. Instances given below are some of the characteristics of Terrorism and terroristic violence.

1) It is inherently indiscriminate in its effects. Terrorists often profess to use terrorism selectively and rationally and claim to be able to predict precisely the effects to their attacks. Obviously, terrorists may choose to foist a policy of selective assassination or kidnapping aimed at key politicians or officials, or members of the security forces in preference to massacre of large numbers of the public. Yet even when terrorists claim to select individual targets, they own idiosyncratic codes. No one can be certain that they will not be the next victim.52 It is of the very nature of this kind of violence that the terrorists, in order to terrorize their audience, strike like lightning in the dark.

2) Terrorism is essentially arbitrary and unpredictable, both in the minds of its victims and audience and in its effect upon individuals and society. It is precisely because terror is a subjective experience and that people have such variable thresholds of fear that it is nonsense for terrorists to claim to predict the effects of terrorism upon behavior. Stanislaw Andrzejewski Polish-British sociologist has aptly described terrorism as a peculiar kind of tyranny, in which no observance of commands – no matter how punctilious – on the part of the prospective victims can ensure their safely.

3) Terrorism implicitly denies recognition of all rules and conventions of war. It refuses to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants and recognizes no humanitarian constraints or obligations to prisoners or to the wounded. All lives, including those of women and children, are considered expendable for the cause. No one is innocent: therefore any victims of terrorism, is claimed by the terrorists to be guilty by association with the “enemy”53.

4) The terrorist’s rejections of all moral constraints are also reflected in particularly hideous and barbarous cruelties and weapons. Even in the more rural-based and primitively armed terrorist movements of recent African and Asian history hideous barbarities such as the disembowelment or dismembering of victims have been practiced. However, although terroristic violence does not required an advance industrial or urban base there is no doubt the modern explosives, technology and firearms have enormously increased the terrorists” capacity for mass slaughter and destruction54.

5) Politically motivated terrorism is generally justified by its perpetrators on one or more of the following counts; (i) any means are justified to realize an allegedly transcendental and (in Weber’s terms, ‘value-rational grounds): (ii) closely linked to (i) is the claim that extreme violence is a intrinsically beneficial, regenerative, cathartic and ennobling deed regardless or other consequences; (iii) terrorism can be shown to have ‘worked’ in the past, and is held to be either the ‘sole

54. S. Segallar (1986), Invisible armies, Terrorism into the 1990s, London, pp.272-275
remaining’ or ‘best available’ method of achieving success (in Weber’s terms instrumental-relational’ grounds); (iv) the morality of the just vengeance or ‘an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth’; and (v) the theory of the lesser evil; greater evils wills befalls us or our nation if we do not adopt terror against our enemies.55

B: Official definitions of the word Terrorism

The question of a definition of terrorism has haunted the debate among states and international organizations for decades. A first attempt to arrive at an internationally acceptable definition was made under the League of Nations, but such a convention drafted in 1937 never came into existence. Since then, the international community has never succeeded in developing an accepted comprehensive definition of terrorism. Hence, since the first convention has failed, inability of finding an universally accepted definition on international terrorism has been remained. Nevertheless this inability to find a consensus on the precise wording of what constitutes terrorism did not deter most of the international community in the real world. Most of the countries which have faced to the terrorist attacks were trying to legally define term of terrorism. The United States of America is one of the most targeted countries by terrorist whether they are international or local. The US code has defined terrorism:

Title 22, Chapter 38 of the United States Code (regarding the Department of State) contains a definition of terrorism in its requirement that annual country reports on terrorism be submitted by the Secretary of State to Congress every year. It reads:

"Definitions ... the term 'terrorism’ means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents;"\(^5\)

Title 18 of the United States Code (regarding criminal acts and criminal procedure) defines international terrorism as:

"The term 'international terrorism’ means activities that involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or of any State; [and] appear to be intended . . . to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; . . . to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or ... to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping; and [which] occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or transcend national boundaries in terms of

\(^5\) Title 22 › Chapter 38 › § 2656f, 22 USC § 2656f - Annual country reports on terrorism, Cornell university law school, URL: http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/22/2656f .
the means by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to intimidate or coerce, or the locale in which their perpetrators operate or seek asylum.”

Furthermore, The United States Department of Defense recently changed its definition of terrorism. Per Joint Pub 3-07.2, Antiterrorism, (24 November 2010) the Department of Defense defines it as "the unlawful use of violence or threat of violence to instill fear and coerce governments or societies. Terrorism is often motivated by religious, political, or other ideological beliefs and committed in the pursuit of goals that are usually political.” the new definition distinguishes between motivations for terrorism (religion, ideology, etc.) and goals of terrorism ("usually political"). This is in contrast to the previous definition that stated that the goals could be religious in nature.

In addition, The United Kingdom’s Terrorism Act 2000 defined terrorism as follows:

(1) In this Act "terrorism" means the use or threat of action where:

   (a) The action falls within subsection,

   (b) The use or threat is designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public and

   (c) The use or threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause.

---

(2) Action falls within this subsection if it:

(a) involves serious violence against a person,
(b) involves serious damage to property,
(c) endangers a person’s life, other than that of the person committing the action,
(d) Creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or a section of the public or
(e) Is designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system\textsuperscript{59}.

Official counter-terrorism law and legal definitions of this word have taken over in some other countries like Germany, Italy, and India etc.

But yet, some scientific argument exists in the official definition on international terrorism.

Noam Chomsky in his book “Hegemony or survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance” has a remarkable explanation about problems of official definition of terrorism. He wrote: “We might ask why the concept of terror should be considered particularly obscure. There are official US government definitions that fall well within the range of clarity of other defined terrorism as “the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to attain goals that are political, religious, or ideological in nature... through intimidation, coercion, or instilling fear”. The officials US Code gave a more elaborate...

\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
definition, essentially along the same lines. The British government’s definition is similar: “Terrorism is the use, or threat, of action which is violent, damaging or disrupting, and is intended to influence the government definition or intimidate the public and is for the purpose of advancing a political, religious, or ideological cause”. These definitions seem fairly clear. They are close enough to ordinary usage, and are considered appropriate when discussing the terrorism of enemies. The officials US definitions are the ones I have been using in writing about the topic since the Reagan administration came into office in 1981, declaring that a war on terror would be a centerpiece of its foreign policy. The reliance on these definitions is particularly appropriate for our purposes because they were formulated when the first war on terror was declared. But almost no one uses them, and they have been rescinded, replaced by nothing sensible. The reasons do not seem obscure: the official definitions of terrorism are virtually the same as the definitions of counter terror (sometimes called “low-intensity conflict,” or “Counterinsurgency”). But counter terror is officials US policy, and it plainly will not do to say that the US is officially committed to terrorism.

The US is by no means alone in this practice. It is traditional for states to call their own terrorism “counterterror”, even the worst mass murderers; the Nazis, for example. In occupied Europe they claimed to be defending the population and legitimate governments from the partisans, terrorists supported from abroad. That was not entirely false; even the most egregious propaganda rarely is. The partisans were

---

60 Chamsky, Noam (2003), Hegemony or survival. American’s quest for global dominance, New York, Henry Holt and Company, p188.
undoubtedly directed from London, and they did engage in terror. The US military had some appreciation of the Nazi perspective: its counterinsurgency doctrine was modeled on Nazi manuals, which were analyzed sympathetically, with the assistance of Wehrmacht officers\textsuperscript{61}.

It is this common practice that allows for the conventional thesis that terror is a weapon of the work. That is true, by definition, if terror is a weapon of the weak. That is true, by definition, if terror is restricted to their terrorism. If the doctrinal requirements are lifted, however, we find that, like most weapons, terror is primarily a weapon of the powerful.

Another problem with the official definitions of terror is that it follows from them that the US is a leading terrorist state. That much is hardly controversial, at least among those who believe that we should pay some attention to such institutions as the International Court of Justice or the UN Security Council, or mainstream scholarship, as the examples of Nicaragua and Cuba unequivocally reveal. But that conclusion won’t do either. So we are left with not sensible definition of terrorism – unless we decide to break ranks and use of the officials definition of terrorism – unless we decided to break ranks and use the official definitions that have been abandoned because of their unacceptable consequences.

The official definitions do not answer every question precisely they do not, for example, draw a sharp boundary between international terrorism and aggression, or between

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid, also look at: Michael McClintock (1992), Instruments of statecraft, New york, Pantheous, chapter 8.
terror and resistance. These issues have arisen in interesting ways, which have direct bearing on the re-declared war on terror and on today’s headlines\textsuperscript{62}.

These words have shown us an attempt to make a double standard by major power for their own benefits. The most important cause for the double standards of the major power like USA over the international terrorism is that they have their vital strategic interests to protect which could be more relevant than countering terrorism or certain specific immediate problems that keeps on emerging now and them. Terrorism is one of the biggest issues that has surfaced in the changing global conflict scenario. This gap in attitude leads to a lack of commitment in defining the immediate goals. The US policy on internationals terrorism and on the Afghanistan issue after the September 11 terror attacks is a reflection of the same.

In addition, of official definitions of concept terrorism by several countries, also some international organizations have attempted to depict a definition on international terrorism concept.

Various legal systems agencies use different definitions of "terrorism". Moreover, the international community has been slow to formulate a universally agreed upon, legally binding definition of this crime. These difficulties arise from the fact that the term "terrorism" is politically and emotionally charged.

In 1996, the General Assembly established an Ad Hoc Committee with a mandate to draft a comprehensive international convention on terrorism and a

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. p.189.
convention on the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism. Since its establishment, the Ad Hoc Committee has successfully negotiated two Conventions: the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the Assembly in 1997, with 58 signatures; and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted in 1999 and signed by 119 nations - the highest number of actions so far. Both of these have since entered into force.\(^\text{63}\)

In 2000, the UN General Assembly began considering an Indian draft of a comprehensive convention on terrorism, which received considerable support in Europe and North America.

The UN Security Council in a resolution 1368 on 12 September 2001, recognized the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense in accordance with the UN Charter, Chapter VII, Article 51, and unequivocally condemned the attacks as "a threat to international peace and security:" It expressed a readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the attacks.\(^\text{64}\)

On 28 September 2001, Security Council resolution 1373\(^\text{65}\) also repeated the "threat to international security" designation and imposed a requirement on all states to take measures against the perpetrators and states suspected of assisting them. It also urged states to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts, prohibit their national from assisting terrorists, and should ensure terrorist acts are established as


criminal offences in domestic law with adequate penalties. Increased bilateral and multilateral cooperation should be developed on information and assistance in investigations and states should become parties to and fully implement the relevant international protocols and conventions to combat terrorism. It also invoked the close connection between terrorism and organized crime, including drug and arms trafficking and money laundering and established a counter terrorism committee to monitor and implement the resolution.

In the wake of the terrorist action, NATO also invoked for the first time in its 52-year history its Article 5 on collective security and proclaimed the attack as one on all the Alliance. And the European Union also announced an Action Plan which has been set motion on a somewhat piecemeal basis. Some of these steps originally foreseen included a common arrest warrant, central identification and banning of terrorist organization and closer cooperation between Europol and other law enforcement authorities on a number of sectors such as money-laundering and information exchanges, many of which remain also in the formative stage and many of which have been criticized from different fronts. Subsequent meetings, declarations and accords on a bilateral, regional and multilateral basis established the objective and contours of the international coalition against terrorism, which by most reckoning involves more than 100 countries to a larger or lesser degree. This number includes the members of the EU, ASEAN, APEC and ASEM, as well as others from other regional and international groupings.
C: Definitions of terrorism in international articles

As mentioned previously, in the late 1930s, the International community made a first attempt at defining terrorism. Article 1.1 of the League of Nations’ 1937 Convention for the prevention and punishment of Terrorism, which never entered into force, defined "acts of terrorism" as "criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public". Article 2 included as terrorist acts, if they were directed against another state and if they constituted acts of terrorism within the meaning of the definition contained in article 1, the following:

1. Any willful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to:
   a) Heads of State, persons exercising the prerogatives of the head of the State, their hereditary or designated successors;
   b) The wives or husbands or the above-mentioned persons;
   c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public positions when the act is directed against them in their public capacity.

2. Willful destruction of, or damage to, public property or property devoted to a public purpose belonging to or subject to the authority of another High Contracting Party.

3. Any willful act calculated to endanger the lives of members of the public.

4. Any attempt to commit an offence falling within the foregoing provisions of the present article.
5. The manufacture, obtaining, possession, or supplying of arms, ammunition, explosives or harmful substances with the view to the commission in any country whatsoever of an offence falling within the present article."

On December 17, 1996, the non-binding United Nations Declaration to Supplement the 1994 Declaration on Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism, annexed to the UN General Assembly Resolution 51/210, condemned terrorist activities in the following terms:

1. The States Members of the United Nations solemnly reaffirm their unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed, including those that jeopardize friendly relations among States and peoples and threaten the territorial integrity and security of States;

2. The States Members of the United Nations reaffirm that acts, methods and practices of terrorism are contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations; they declare that knowingly financing, planning and inciting terrorist acts are also contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations;”

3. Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance

---

unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them."\(^{67}\)

Antonio Cassese has argued that the language contained in these declarations "sets out an acceptable definition of terrorism."\(^{68}\)

In 2004, United Nations Security Council Resolution 1566 condemned terrorist acts as:
"criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act, which constitute offences within the scope of and as defined in the international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."\(^{69}\)

The European Union defines terrorism for legal/official purposes in Art. One of the Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism (2002). This provides that terrorist offences are certain criminal offences set out in a list consisting largely of serious offences against persons and property that;

\(^{67}\) Ibid.


...given their nature or context, may seriously damage a country or an international organization where committed with the aim of: seriously intimidating a population; or unduly compelling a Government or international organization to perform or abstain from performing any act; or seriously destabilizing or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organization.\textsuperscript{70}

\textbf{D: International terrorism in international law and international order}

In the international law, terrorism is treated as an activity of natural persons acting individually or in groups, and direct victims of terrorist activities are physical persona (hostages, passengers in civilian planes and other means of transport). On the other hand, states can be responsible for terrorist acts of individuals – it they actively support them or tolerate their activities by encouraging and supporting them. Some forms of participation of state in terrorism may be brought about if they accept the request of a certain terrorist group of organization for help. In the past history of international political relations no terrorist organization managed to overthrow a regime and gain power. Now they can particularly if there are some international circles behind terrorist activities, as is the case with terrorist activities in Serbia, Kosovo and Metohija, they can destabilize the state.

Since the new form of terrorism has gained an international phase, first, this study is going to analyze the concept of terrorism in its international form in order to have a better understanding nature of international law about the international terrorism.

**Terrorism in international order**

Terrorist acts, which cannot bring about any social change, may be called symbolic acts that carry a message to the (world) public on the causes and goals of a terrorist organization. In order to achieve certain goals, a terrorist organization as a sender of a terrorist “message” in the system of social communication with other participants in the communication network, sends message that encourage the like-miners. Gathers and rallies them, and intimidates the opponents, disorganizing and disuniting them. It is broadly held that terrorism as activity is aimed at creating collective fear and a sense of insecurity among people. The basis of such understanding of terrorism implies that psychological effects of terrorist activities by far exceed their physical outcome. American expert B. Jenkins claims that “terrorism is violence aimed at overseers, it has an intended effect and is not a by-product of terrorism”[71].

Previously, terrorist activities were carried out within one country for the purposes of power struggle or political change. With the emergence of anarchists, terrorists activities assumed international dimensions, Austrian Queen Elizabeth was killed by an Italian anarchist in Switzerland. As is known, anarchists are against any rule in any state in the world. International terrorism to achieve their foreign policy goals. They often do it

---

[71] For more information look at: Jenkins(1979), Terrorists at the threshold (FROM LEGAL AND OTHER ASPECTS OF TERRORISM), Practicing Law Institute, United States of America.
behind the scenes, in order to avoid responsibility and condemnation of the public. The states mostly support already existing terrorist organizations-, which for their own reasons fight against a foreign Government or even other opposition group, which suits the state supporting them. When in a certain state there are no terrorist groups to be used, the state through its agents organizes terrorist activities by presenting those activities as a domestic affair, i.e. the weakness of the system in that state or discontent of the people. This is how terrorist activities of internally motivated executors are carried out.

International terrorism does not only relate to one isolated society, which means that is necessary to know the kinds of relations among terrorist acts and international politics. In considering the manifestations of terrorism in international relations, it may be concluded that it is manifested as transnational and inter-state. International terrorism can really destabilize the system in a country or in a region. Such activities are entrusted to intelligence services. Which in the interest of security avoid publicity or even manage to avoid the control of Parliaments and government.

Of all cases recorded in history, the most spectacular are the following: the break-in of Tupak Amaru terrorists in the Embassy of Japan in 17 December 1996 in Lima, Peru, taking 71 hostages for 126 days, attack on the world Trade Center in New York in 1993, when six persons were killed and more than 1,000 wounded, with material damage in excess of $ 500 million, attacks against US Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, killing 266 persons and wending 5,000. As well as IRA terrorist attacks throughout the world. These incidents send a clear warning to the international
community, particularly the United States, that double standards encourage terrorism and affect the international system of security. The international community bears the United State responsible primarily for the creation of the organization “Islamic Mujahedin” and Taliban and the Liberation Army of Kosovo. It is assumed that there are currently 3,000 terrorist organizations, with 200,000 terrorists in all about whom the FBI has detailed information\(^72\).

The international terrorism represents a set of activities prohibited against the international law, directed against individuals, groups, state and its institutions and facilities (aircraft, ships, embassies) carried out by individuals, terrorist organization or state in order to fulfill their goals of endangering the stability of that state, its political system, that of the international community and violating the conventions on the protection of human rights and freedom.

The growth of international terrorism has been a hard and sad reality of the contemporary times. It has assumed a very dangerous proportion and is posing a danger to the international peace and security. The dangers of international terrorism can be listed as under:

I. Terrorism being a transnational enterprise is much more prone to spreading in comparison to the conventional wars.

II. It can be used by a state against the other to attain certain tactical and strategic gains over the adversaries without involving in the direct conflict with it.

\(^{72}\) A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava, op.cit. p.78
III. The closer cooperation apparent between the terrorism and organized crimes also points to the further erosion of the authority of the state with the one using force to achieve its objective and the other corrupting the state from within.

IV. Terrorist groups can use the ideologies of rights of determinism, national liberation war, freedom movement. Ethnic interest of their resort to terrorism for securing their goals from a state, which is considered by them to be as enemy state.

V. A major power can use the opportunity provided by the operations of terrorist groups against the states inform of war against the states as a Cloak to intervene in the situation in the name of preserving peace, security and stability in the regions

All these dangers have very serious and dangerous implications for international peace and security. To check this menace of transitional terrorism needs a full-hearted cooperation of the international community to tackle the problem.

International terrorism as a global international problem had not been considered in the UN before the abduction and killing of Israeli sportsmen at the Munich Olympic Games in 1972. After these events despite opposition of a number of African and Arab countries. The topic measures for the prevention of international terrorism threatening or taking away the lives of innocent people or violating fundamental freedom was placed on the agenda of the 27th GA regular session.

---

73 S. segallar, op.cit., p.267
The international Organization bears great responsibility for not dealing with the violence while it was at embryonic stage and failing to respond to it even after this dangerous violence has taken deep roots. This is because Mafia Underground uses terrorist activities to pursue political goals of some states, which also includes criminal and Mafia groups in order to offset the terrorist activities. In that way, the states finance terrorist organizations allowing the Mafia Underground to deal with narcotic drugs and other illegal activates.

The essential components of more or less a consensus definition of international terrorism may be given as follows.

1. International terrorism is the systematic and purposeful use or threat of extraordinary and intolerable violence, individual acts, or a campaign of violence, designed primary to terrorize or instill fear.

2. International terrorists use or threaten to use violence, indiscriminately or selectively, against either enemies or allies to achieve political ends.

3. International terrorism involves a consistent pattern of symbolic or representative selection of its physical victims or objects.

4. International terrorism is deliberately intended to create a psychological or physical effect on specific group of people of victims in order to change political behavior and attitude in a manner consonant with terrorists objectives and goals.

5. International terrorism is aims at the people watching more than the people being victimized.
6. International terrorism contains an international element or is directed against an international target and has international consequences.

7. International terrorists may include revolutionaries, political extremists, criminals professing political aims and even authentic lunatics.

8. International terrorists may operate alone or may be members of a larger and wolf-organize group(s) or may even be governments.

9. International terrorists motive may be personal gain e.g. money, or revenge, or the destruction of all government or self-rule for a particular ethnic group and so on.

10. The ambition of terrorists may be limited or local. E.g. the overthrow of a particular regime or may be global e.g. simultaneous worldwide revolutions.

11. International terrorism is applied to all acts of violence all ransom kidnappings. All hijackings and all thrill kings, which may not be intended by their preparations.

12. International terrorism may be a single incident or a champing of violence waged outside the accepted rules and procedures of international diplomacy and war.

13. International terrorism is offer designed to attract the worldwide attention to the existences to the existence and cause of the terrorists.

14. The actual victims or victims of terrorist attacks and the target audience may be the same, and the actual victims may be totally unrelated to the struggle.

15. International terrorism is essentially criminal, illegal, ruthless and inhuman.

16. International terrorism is politically motivated and any political group, convinced of the rightness of its cause, may resort to violent means to advance that cause.
17. International terrorism transcends national boundaries through the choice of a foreign victim or target, commission of the terrorist act in a foreign country, or effort to influence the policies of foreign government.

18. International terrorists strike abroad, or at a diplomat or other foreigner at home, because they believe they can thereby exert the greatest possible pressure on him, her, or another government or on world opinion.

19. International tourists may be may not wish to kill their victim(s) but they offer find occasions to kill their victims to enhance the credibility of their threats even through theory do not wish to kill them.

20. International terrorism is directed against a government or another group, class or party.

21. International terrorists may seek to cause political social and/or economic disruption and for this purpose, adopt all means at their disposal.74

For further clarification of international terrorism, it has to be said that international terrorism is involved when a terrorist group in one country receives financial and other resources from outside that country. An element of international terrorism comes in to the picture when the members of another group outside that nation design specific persons of one nation as targets. It is therefore, described as a “warfare without territory, waged without armies… it is warfare that is not limited territorially. Sporadic battles may take place worldwide. It is warfare without neutrals and with few or no civilian by standards.” Jenkins writes, “international terrorism
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comprises those incidents of terrorism that have clear international consequences: incidents in which terrorists go abroad to strike potentially deadly materials are the other disturbing aspects of the contemporary transactional terrorism; necessitating a closer coordination and cooperation among states in combating crimes closely connected with terrorism.” Today’s terrorist has a vast psychological advantage over his earlier counterpart; the chances of his getting away are high, thanks to remote control technology at his disposal.

Due to ready and wide coverage that global media provides to terrorist activities, the theatre of today’s terrorism is limitless. Satellite T.V. and other electronic means normally not only provide enough space for the demonic messages and histrionics of today’s terrorists, but also exposes them to the skills and expertise of other terrorists, but also exposes them to the skills and expertise of other terrorist groups. Thus, terrorism is a multidimensional problem with social, economic, political, psychological and strategic implications. At a conceptual level, it encompasses individual terrorism, state terror and State sponsored terrorism. It can be domestic or international in nature. Domestic terrorism involves the citizens and territory of one State and is directed against it by that State. On the other hand, terrorism is international when it is directed against foreigners or foreign targets: when it is concerted by the governments or factions of more than one State or when it is aimed at influencing the policies of a foreign government.

**Terrorism in context of international law**
It need not to be said that the problem of international terrorism is not solely a legal one and hence requires multi-pronged strategies to combat it. International law has an important role to play in any scheme designed to suppress acts of international terrorism. In view of transnational nature of such acts and their far-reaching consequences for international relations, the desirability and the need of strengthening international relations, the desirability and the need of strengthening international cooperation between states in order to take and adopt practical and effective measures to prevent, combat and eliminate all forms of terrorism that affect the international community is obvious. They in turn require a comprehensive international legal framework to deal with the acts of terrorism. It in turn requires the development and codification of international rules regarding the prevention and punishment of terrorism.

The 1937 Convention on the Prevention and punishment of Terrorism and an accompanying convention on the establishment of an international Criminal court were first major efforts in this direction.75

The Leagues' Terrorism Convention was directed mainly at crimes against Heads of State and other public officials though it also contained a number of far reaching obligations unrelated to such crimes. Although 24 States had signed this convention only one state ratified it and it never came into force. This convention was the victim

of the tense international atmosphere extant on the eve of world war II, its overtly – ambiguous scope and lack of agreement on the definition of terrorism.

In the period since world war II, the difficulties in reaching agreement on steps to control the problem have become even more acute. Despite this fact, The United Nations achieved a fair amount of conduct, support or encourage terrorist activity against other state. However, it should be noted that the UN General Assembly could for the first time discuss the issue of international terrorism only in September 1972. In the same year, an ad-ho committee on international Terrorism was established pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 3,034 of December 18, 1972. Since then the matter has been discussed in various fora of the UN and its specialized Agencies. The deliberations on this sensitive and very complex issue in these fora were, market and marred by ideological and political divisions in the world community on all the issues relating to international terrorism viz definition of international measures to be adopted to prevent international terrorism and the eradication of the causes of international terrorism. In particular, the controversy surrounding the legitimacy of self-determination and the national liberation struggle overshadowed the debates and discussions on terrorism. As a compromise solution, the right to self-determination and the legitimacy of the struggle for self-determination were reiterated in all the relevant General Assembly resolutions and the anti-terrorism conventions adopted during the cold war period. Moreover, those resolutions invariably urged states to take measures for the speedy and final elimination of the problem of international terrorism and also addressed the issue of the underlying causes of terrorism. Despite the change in tone of General Assembly
resolutions on the subject since 1985, the pattern of using the self-determination formula continued until recently\textsuperscript{76}.

Despite the lack of consensus among States on the issues relating to terrorism, The United Nations and the Specialized Agencies ICAO and IMO succeeded in dealing in a place meal fashion with various aspects of the problem of international terrorism and an number of international treaties have been adopted— the Convention on Offences and Certain other act Committed on Board Aircraft. Signed at Tokyo on September 14, 1963; the Convention for the suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft signed at the Hague on December 16, 1970\textsuperscript{77}, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation\textsuperscript{78}, concluded at Montreal on September 23, 1971 the convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, New York, Sept’14 1973, the international Convention against the Taking of Hostages, 1979 the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, Vienna March 03, 1980; the Montreal Protocol\textsuperscript{79}, the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of civil Aviation, (Rome, March

\textsuperscript{76} A.S. Narang, Pramila Srivastava, op.cit. pp.219-21

\textsuperscript{77} CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AIRCRAFT SIGNED AT THE HAGUE ON 16 DECEMBER 1970, URL: \url{www.icao.int/secretariat/legal/List%20of%20Parties/Hague_EN.pdf}

\textsuperscript{78} the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, URL: \url{treaties.un.org/untc//Pages//doc/.../volume-974-l-14118-English.pdf}

10,1988)\textsuperscript{80} and the Protocol thereto, and the Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives for the Purpose of Detection\textsuperscript{81}, done at Montreal on March 01, 1991. One thing common in all these conventions is that they all have adopted what is called a piecemeal object-oriented, segmented or enumerative approach to the problem, this approach, avoiding the definitional morass surrounding the concept of terrorism seeks low level agreement on the prohibition of the acts of terrorism that are to be suppressed. Although some commentators argue that a definition of terrorism is necessary and maintain that the piecemeal approach is not an appropriate way to deal with terrorism, given the current realities of international law, the United Nations and its specialized Agencies have regarded it as the only expedient way to obtain consensus on the suppression of international terrorism in addition to be existing international conventions. States have concluded many bilateral treaties and regional Conventions viz. 1979 European convention on the Suppression of Terrorism\textsuperscript{82} and the 1971 OAS Convention to Prevent and Punish the Acts of Terrorism\textsuperscript{83} taking the Form of Crimes against Persons and Related Extortion that are of international Significance.

\textsuperscript{80} CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST THE SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION (SUA CONVENTION), URL: cns.miis.edu/inventory/pdfs/aptmaritime.pdf


\textsuperscript{83} Convention to prevent and punish the acts of terrorism taking the form of crimes against persons and related extortion that are of international significance, Organization of American States, 2 February 1971, URL: http://www.refworld.org/docid/47fdffb27d.html
Following the end of the cold war, and the elimination of traditional colonialism, prospects for obtaining global consensus on the contentious issues relating to terrorism have increased more than ever. It is evident from the recent General Assembly resolutions on the subject. The Declaration on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the United Nations of October 24, 1995\(^{84}\) exhorts member States to act together to defeat the threats to states and people posed by terrorism. In all its forms and manifestations and transitional organized crime and the illicit trade in arms and the productions. Consumption and trafficking of illicit drugs. In addition to this under the Declaration on measures to Eliminate international Terrorism, annexed to General Assembly resolution 49/60 of Dec. 09, 1994\(^{85}\). The member states of the UN have solemnly reaffirmed their unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whosoever committed, including those, which jeopardize the friendly relations among states, and people and threaten the territorial integrity and security of States. The Declaration also encouraged States to review urgently the scope of the existing legal provisions on the prevention. Repression and elimination of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations with the aim of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations with the aim of insuring that there is a comprehensive legal framework covering all aspects of the matter, General Assembly


Resolutions 51/210 of Dec 17. 1996\textsuperscript{86} and the Declaration to supplement the 1994 Declaration annexed thereto also reflects the consensus obtained on the issue of terrorism. In this context mention should also be made of another instrument of far-reaching significance for the suppressions of terrorism related crimes like drug trafficking, illicit arms trade and money laundering namely international action to combat Drug Abuse and illicit Productions and Tracking 1994.

Against this background, it is interesting to have a cursory glance at the provisions of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted on December 15, 1997 (UN General Assembly Resolution 51/64)\textsuperscript{87}. As this is post Cold-war anti-terrorism Convention that has been adopted in the backdrop of the previously mentioned global consensus on terrorism, the study of the nature of obligations imposed upon States by it is important.

In recent years, the terrorist attacks by means of explosives or other lethal devices have become increasingly widespread. The bombing of the American Trade Centre at New York: blasting of the share market and Taj Mahal Palace and Tower hotel at Mumbai in India, massive bombing by the Irish Republic Army in Britain all these years, the gruesome bombing against innocent civilians in Oklahoma City (which left more than 200 dead or missing) and the recent killings in Kenya and Tanzania leading to threatening of US missiles in Afghanistan and Sudan, Al-Qaeda’s several attacks in Iraq, several bloody terrorist attacks by Jondollah group in south east Iran, are few examples of the occurrence of such acts. Such incidents are a matter of concern to the

\textsuperscript{86} Available at: http://www.un.org/law/terrorism/

international community and need to be suppressed in the most effective manner. Perpetrators of such crimes cannot and should not be treated as freedom fighters.

Thus, there is an urgent need to enhance International cooperation between States in devising and adopting effective and practical measures for the prevention of such acts of terrorism and for the prosecution and punishment of their perpetrators. However, the existing multilateral legal provisions do not adequately address these attacks. The Terrorist Bombings Convention seeks to provide a legal framework for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

Till the 11/9 incident, the international community were trying to make lows through the international conventions on international terrorism.

Table 3: International Conventions on Terrorism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convention</th>
<th>Year of Adoption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages (Hostages Convention)</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

Two weeks after the attacks of 9/11, the Security Council unanimously adopted anti-terrorism resolution 1373 (2001) on 28 September 2001, which reaffirmed the Council’s unequivocal condemnation of the terrorist acts of 11 September and obligated all Member States to criminalize the willful provision or collection of funds for terrorist acts and to freeze any financial assets and economic resources of those who commit or attempt to commit terrorist acts or participate in or facilitate the commission of terrorist acts and of persons and entities acting on behalf of terrorists. Moreover, all States must refrain from providing any form of support to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts and prevent terrorism by denying safe haven to those who finance, plan, support, commit terrorist acts and provide safe havens as well. They must prosecute anyone who has participated in the financing, planning, preparation or perpetration of terrorist acts or in supporting terrorist acts and should also ensure that terrorist acts are established as serious criminal offences in domestic law and seriously punished. They also must intensify and accelerate the exchange of information regarding terrorist actions or movements, forged or falsified documents, traffic in arms and sensitive material, use of communications and technologies by terrorist groups, and the threat posed by the possession of weapons of mass destruction. Before granting refugee status, all States should take appropriate measures to ensure that the asylum seekers have not planned, facilitated or participated in terrorist acts.

The Security Council also established a 15-member Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC)\(^9\) to monitor the resolution’s implementation, revitalized in 2004 to provide expert

\(^9\) For more information look at: About the Counter-Terrorism Committee, URL: http://www.un.org/en/sc/ctc/aboutus.html
advice on all areas covered by resolution 1373, to facilitate technical assistance, and to promote closer cooperation and coordination with regional and intergovernmental bodies.90

Mandatory anti-terrorism measures between 2001 and 2004 suffered from lack of definition, but in late 2004, Three years after imposing measures against terrorism, the Council adopted a resolution generically defining it. While not expressly framed as a definition, resolution 1566 of October 2004 recalls that the following acts are never justifiable:

Recalls that criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act, which constitute offences within the scope of and as defined in the international conventions and protocols relating to terrorism, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature 91.

States were urged to prevent such acts, and punish them “by penalties consistent with their grave nature”. The resolution also created a working group to report on measures that could be imposed on individuals, groups or entities involved in, or associated with, terrorist activities, other than those designated by the 1267 committee.218 The


resolution thus seeks to universalize (in a parallel regime) the proscription model developed by the 1267 Committee for the Taliban and Al-Qaeda. It was based on a Russian proposal to proscribe Chechen terrorists, which was opposed by Arab States objecting to the potential designation of Palestinian groups.

According to this statement, international courts may able to legally recognize the criminal acts based on terroristic operations. But yet the definition in resolution 1566 does not require a political or other motive, thus encompassing private acts which terrorize, intimidate or coerce. Consequently, some of the distinctiveness of terrorism, as political violence, is lost. Pragmatically, the definition may be too little, too late. In the three years to 2004, many States adopted laws implementing their obligations, and it is unlikely that they will further reform their laws to limit “terrorism” in conformity with the resolution (which merely “recalls” that certain acts are never justified and does not require law reform). As discussed earlier, there are also legitimacy costs in circumventing the treaty process.

**Types of terrorism in new era**

As long as the difficulty of making a relevant and universal accepted definition about the concept terrorism is exists, categorizing types of terrorism cannot be very easy task. In general, we can categorize terrorism in to two types. One can be defining as such activities based on political purpose, the other, can be called as non-political terrorism.

---

With respect of such division, political terrorism can be divided into twelve general types:

**Revolutionary terrorism**: Revolutionary terror refers to the institutionalized application of force to counterrevolutionaries, particularly during the French Revolution from the years 1793 to 1794\(^93\). The term Communist terrorism has also been used to describe the revolutionary terror, from the Red Terror in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) to the reign of the Khmer Rouge\(^94\), and others.

**Nationalist terrorism**: This type of terrorism action seek to form a separate state for their own national group, often by drawing attention to a fight for “national liberation” that they think the world has ignored\(^95\). Nationalist terrorism is a form of terrorism motivated by nationalism. Nationalist terrorists seek to form self-determination in some form, which may range from gaining greater autonomy to establishing a completely independent, sovereign state (separatism). Nationalist terrorists often oppose what they consider to be occupying, imperial, or otherwise illegitimate powers.

Nationalist terrorism is linked to a national, ethnic, religious, or other identifying group, and the feeling among members of that group that they are oppressed or denied rights, especially rights accorded to others.

---


\(^95\) George A. Lopez, *Terrorism, Edited by Henry Hyunwook Han*, Terrorism, Political Violence and World Order, Maryland Journal of International Law, 3-7-2013, Volume 9, Issue 2, P.174
1- **Suicide bombing terrorism**: suicide terrorism is an attack upon a target, in which an attacker intends to kill others and/or cause great damage, knowing that he or she will either certainly or most likely die in the process. Between 1981 and 2006, 1200 suicide attacks occurred around the world, constituting 4% of all terrorist attacks but 32% (14,599 people) of all terrorism related deaths.  

2- **Religious terrorism**: this type of action performed by groups or individuals, the motivation of which is typically rooted in faith-based tenets. Terrorist acts throughout the centuries have been performed on religious grounds with the hope to either spread or enforce a system of belief, viewpoint or opinion. Religious terrorism does not itself necessarily define a specific religious standpoint of view, but instead usually defines an individual or a group view or interpretation of that belief system’s teachings. Religious Terrorism consists of acts that terrify, the definition of which is provided by the witnesses - the ones terrified - and not by the party committing the act; accompanied by either a religious motivation, justification, organization, or worldview. Religion is sometimes used in combination with other factors, and sometimes as the primary motivation. Religious Terrorism is intimately connected to current forces of geopolitics.

---

96 Hassan, Riaz, *What Motivates the Suicide Bombers?* Study of a comprehensive database gives a surprising answer, YaleGlobal(Yale Center for the Study of Globalization), 3 September 2009, URL: http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/what-motivates-suicide-bombers-0

Bruce Hoffman has characterized modern religious terrorism as having three traits:

- The perpetrators must use religious scriptures to justify or explain their violent acts or to gain recruits.
- Clerical figures must be involved in leadership roles.
- Apocalyptic images of destruction are seen by the perpetrators as a necessity.\(^9\)

3- **Anarchy terrorism**: From the 1870s until about 1920, anarchist terrorism was a major global phenomenon. Revolutionaries seeking to overthrow established governments launched a wave of bombings and assassinated a series of heads of state; one such victim was President William McKinley, killed in 1901 by a young Hungarian refugee influenced by anarchist sentiments. Some experts see signs of a new interest in anarchist violence arising out of the recent wave of protests against globalization.

4- **Left-wing terrorism**: Left-wing type of terrorism is a set of tactics directed at the overthrow of capitalist governments and their replacement with Marxist-Leninist or socialist regimes. Left-wing terrorists view the governments they oppose as authoritarian, exploitative and corrupt, and emphasize idealism, pacifism and anti-imperialism. Marxist and other communist and socialist thought heavily influence their ideology. Narodnaya Volya, a 19th century terrorist group that killed Czar

Alexander II of Russia in 1881, and developed the concept of propaganda by the deed is a major influence.\footnote{99 Trial of the czar’s Assassins, Wanganui Herald, Volume XV, Issue 4132, 7 May 1881, Page 2}

5- **Right-wing terrorism**: this type draws its inspiration from a variety of ideologies and beliefs, including neo-fascism, neo-Nazism, racism and opposition to foreigners and immigration. Incidents of this type of terrorism have been sporadic with little or no international cooperation. Their actions are generally poorly coordinated and there are few identifiable organizations. Modern right wing terrorism began to appear in Western Europe in the 1980s and in Eastern Europe following the collapse of the Eastern Bloc.\footnote{100 Right-wing terrorism, Encyclopedia Wikipedia, URL: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right-wing-terrorism#cite_note-Aubrey.2C_p._45-1. Retrieved on (September 30, 2012).}

The objective of right-wing terrorism is the overthrow existing governments and their replacement with nationalist or fascist-oriented governments.

6- **Cyber terrorism**: It can be defined as the use of information technology by terrorist groups and individuals to further their agenda. This can include use of information technology to organize and execute attacks against networks, computer systems and telecommunications infrastructures, or for exchanging information or making threats electronically. Examples are hacking into computer
systems, introducing viruses to vulnerable networks, web site defacing, denial-of-service attacks, or terroristic threats made via electronic communication.\textsuperscript{101}

7- **Nuclear terrorism**: Nuclear terrorism is an immediate challenge for the entire world. Nuclear terrorism denotes the use, or threat of the use, of nuclear weapons or radiological weapons in acts of terrorism, including attacks against facilities where radioactive materials are present.

8- **International terrorism** (state and non-state): in general, such actions happen when more than two or three countries are involved. State terrorism may refer to acts of terrorism conducted by a state against a foreign state or people. It can


\textsuperscript{102} February 2013 Cyber Attacks Statistics, URL: http://hackmageddon.com/2013/03/08/february-2013-cyber-attacks-statistics/
also refer to acts of violence by a state against its own people.\textsuperscript{103} Scholar Gus Martin describes state terrorism as terrorism "committed by governments and quasi-governmental agencies and personnel against perceived threats"\textsuperscript{104}, which can be directed against both domestic and foreign targets. Noam Chomsky defines state terrorism as "terrorism practiced by states (or governments) and their agents and allies". Jeffrey A. Sluka has described Noam Chomsky and Edward S. Herman as pioneers in academic studies about state terrorism.\textsuperscript{105} Non-state international terrorism in nature is just like state terrorism but individual people or terrorists groups are involving instead.

9- \textbf{And Global terrorism}: Referring to the vast worldwide communications facility like internet and mass media and various equipment facilitated by phenomenon called Globalization, international terrorism now is turning to the global terrorism. Global terrorism not only has the international nature, but also can be defined as a phenomenon that involved whole the Globe atmosphere by its threat and universal actions. Obviously, the best and the only good example for this phenomenon is Al-Qaeda.

In addition, \textbf{non-political} terrorism can be divided into two types: psychological terrorism and criminal terrorism. Besides, some others have proffered deferent types of...
terrorism. Oracle thinkquest education foundation suggests the category given below. It suggests six different types of terrorism; they are anarchist terrorism, state-sponsored terrorism, right wing terrorism, left wing terrorism, religious terrorism, and nationalist terrorism\textsuperscript{106}.

**ANARCHIST TERRORISM**

Anarchist terrorism was a major global phenomenon from the 1870s to 1920. A young Hungarian refugee killed President William McKinley who was persuaded to by anarchist sentiment in 1901.

**STATE-SPONSORED TERRORISM**

Iran accused Cuba, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, and Syria of supporting terrorism. The Abu Nidal Organization is an example of state-sponsored terrorism.

**RIGHT WING TERRORISM**

Right wing terrorism is one of the least organized terrorists. They attack immigrants and refugees.

**LEFT WING TERRORISM**

Left wing terrorism limits the use of violence, but destroys the democracy and takes over with socialist or communist regime. They also stay away from harming victims. Baader-Meinhof Group (in Germany), the Japanese Red Army, Weathermen (The

\textsuperscript{106} Types of terrorism, Oracle thinkquest education foundation, URL: http://library.thinkquest.org/TQ0312031/hs/totinfo.htm, Retrieved on (march 31, 2013)
Weather Underground Organization) (WUO), and the Red Brigades are all examples of left wing terrorism.

RELIigious TERRORISM

Religious terrorism attack large numbers of their enemy. They use violence as their strategy. Here are some examples of religious terrorism: Al-Qaeda, Hamas, Aum Shinrikyo.

NATIONALIST TERRORISM

Nationalist terrorists use violence. These terrorists are usually successful at getting people’s sympathy because they try to fight for "national liberation". Irish Republican Army, Basque Fatherland and Liberty, and the Kurdistan Workers’ Party are examples of nationalist terrorism.

In early 1975, the Law Enforcement Assistant Administration (LEAA)\(^{107}\) in the United States formed the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. One of the five volumes that the committee wrote was entitled Disorders and Terrorism, produced by the Task Force on Disorders and Terrorism under the direction of H.H.A. Cooper, Director of the Task Force staff.\(^{108}\) The Task Force classified terrorism into six categories.

\(^{107}\) The LEAA was established by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and was abolished in 1982.

\(^{108}\) Disorders and Terrorism (1976), National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Washington D.C.
Civil disorder – A form of collective violence interfering with the peace, security, and normal functioning of the community.

Political terrorism – Violent criminal behavior designed primarily to generate fear in the community, or substantial segment of it, for political purposes.

Non-Political terrorism – Terrorism that is not aimed at political purposes but which exhibits “conscious design to create and maintain a high degree of fear for coercive purposes, but the end is individual or collective gain rather than the achievement of a political objective.”

Quasi-terrorism – The activities incidental to the commission of crimes of violence that are similar in form and method to genuine terrorism but which nevertheless lack its essential ingredient. It is not the main purpose of the quasi-terrorists to induce terror in the immediate victim as in the case of genuine terrorism, but the quasi-terrorist uses the modalities and techniques of the genuine terrorist and produces similar consequences and reaction. For example, the fleeing felon who takes hostages is a quasi-terrorist, whose methods are similar to those of the genuine terrorist but whose purposes are quite different.

Limited political terrorism – Genuine political terrorism is characterized by a revolutionary approach; limited political terrorism refers to “acts of terrorism which are committed for ideological or political motives but which are not part of a concerted campaign to capture control of the state.
Official or state terrorism –“referring to nations whose rule is based upon fear and oppression that reach similar to terrorism or such proportions.” It may also be referred to as Structural Terrorism defined broadly as terrorist acts carried out by governments in pursuit of political objectives, often as part of their foreign policy.

Moreover, we can count some other types of terrorism like nuclear terrorism, single-task terrorism, Norco-terrorism etc.

Global Terrorism:

Global terrorism is a new phenomenon that emerged with emergence of "Al Qaeda". This type of terrorism by using scientific and technological developments which caused integration of the world in all the economic, social, cultural and political fields; so that it has created the international community and in the words of "McLuhan", it has created global village. It can take advantage of the new conditions and by doing lethal operations affect the whole world at once. The distinctive features of this type of terrorism and international terrorism are:

1 – Agent of international terrorism is a terrorist state which its terrorist measures (with support of a terrorist group) cause conflict among countries.

2 - In international terrorism only one or a few states involve in issue.

While in global terrorism, the terrorist individuals and groups are agents of terrorist operation and due to the development of communication technologies, they can gain the most advanced and sophisticated weapons of mass destruction and internet
networks. This issue has enabled them to integrate the whole world is affected by their acts of terrorism. Its transparent instance is September 11, 2001 attacks.

The difference between liberation movements and terrorism:

On if there is little hope for reaching to agreement in national level, or local level (if deemed impossible), but essentially in the international level, such understanding does not exist, because the conflict of interests is considered in macro and grand level i.e. in states levels and great cultural and geographical regions. The most striking difference of governments if about the separating of the terrorism from the national liberation movements that is typically called terrorism by western governments. So even after the Second World War, there was using of force and violence by the global powers against movements which officially were recognized by the United Nations as liberation movements (such as the Liberation Movement Palestine). This issue shows there are many problems that have caused an increase in terrorist actions, because knowing the liberation struggles (which UN has recognized its legitimacy) that it’s equal to terrorist attacks, shows false evaluations. Legal struggle of people under alien or foreign domination for independence and self-determination is respectable and they should not be confused with terrorist acts. Therefore, lack of a reliable and central point where everyone can rely on and follow it, can create chaos in the meaning of signifier and

---

109 The cultural area are countries which have common features in terms of values, norms, religion, rituals and beliefs of people and they are very close to each other; so that we can set them in a general definition such as Islamic countries and Arab countries. The geographical locations mean the countries which are in a specific geographical area. This juxtaposition creates the common interests, such as members of Europe Union and the Organization of African Unity.
signified. With these interpretations finding a single meaning for political phenomenon is no more than an illusion. World of political phenomenon like philosophical world of Heidegger and Gadamer would be meaningful. In light of this ontological and epistemic problem, it can be said that "a terrorist on the other hand is a freedom fighter" that shows "political offense exception" and is an attempt to exclude political offenders from the scope of the duties of extradition.\textsuperscript{110}

Word of terrorism has not the capacity for drawing an objective fact and applicable to everyone. German army used this term about French resistance groups; Russia used this term for Chechen fighters and none of the illegal groups such as "freedom fighters", "Nationalists", "refugees of proletarian guards," "Soldiers of Islam" and others are not only crystallization of this term.\textsuperscript{111} In 1985 Ronald Reagan, former US President, in a meeting with Afghan Mujahedeen called them freedom fighters like founders of United States and provided for them financial, political and military supports. But after September 11 event, some of these individuals and groups were called terrorists by the U.S. government. Interestingly in the same year, Nelson Mandela, leader of the African National Congress was held in prison as terrorist by racist regime in South Africa. But


\textsuperscript{111} With changing the national interests of each country that occurs over the time, the interpretations of a single issue are evolved. In this regard, we can refer to Al Qaeda group in in the period of bipolar structure of international relations, labeled it as the Liberation group by United States, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union due to changing of international system’s nature, it was called terrorist group by United States. Before September 11 event, United States was criticizing Russia and China for ignoring minorities’ rights, but after that time, helped Russia to crackdown Chechens. Also, Yaser Arrafat was called revolutionary by Iranian leaders, but in period of Iraq-Iran War he was called reactionary.
now he deserves Nobel Peace Prize as a symbol of fighting racism and the struggle for freedom.

Therefore, it should be accepted that developing of a common approach for policy making about issue of international terrorism by the General Assembly, is necessarily complex and difficult. Although ideological and political differences within the international community on terrorism and how to deal with it, have reduced, but it is still an extremely sensitive problem for many governments. In this regard, there are four main problems that should be considered:

1. Some governments due to concern for their national security do not want to cooperate for countering international terrorism. Due to fear of terrorist attacks, they instead of countering terrorists, leave them.

2. Sometime counter-terrorism can be cause of violating Human rights and against innocent people, because the governing authorities, under the guise of anti-terrorist precautions, deprive their citizens from human rights.

3. There are technical obstacles in front of cooperation in counter-terrorism. Different rules could grant refugee status to terrorists in some countries or make some countries a haven for them. When a country allow capital punishment, and it is forbidden by another country, this problem may become extraditing the terrorists difficult or even impossible and paying attention to the security or national sovereignty can prevent intelligence cooperation.
4. The current difference between the fighting terrorism and organized crime should be clearly recognized. Obtaining cooperation to combat organized crime is much easier, because the issues concerning sovereignty or continuing life of government is rarely discussed. In many cases, the methods of combating transnational crime, are not like the methods which should be adopted to combat terrorism, but It is also true that terrorists who seek political power or to meet religious objectives (not obtaining wealth) sometimes to finance their terrorist operations, cooperate and conspiratress with people who are active in organized crime. These are complex and problematic issues and should be clarified in more advanced anti-terrorist mechanisms.\textsuperscript{112}

These problems are initially the problem of humanity and after that problem of United Nations; of course, the best option available to resolve this serious world problem is the United Nations.

**Technology and Terrorism**

Biological, chemical and nuclear weapons (NBC) have three dreadful characteristics. "The first characteristic of them is serious deadliness. To the extent that any of such weapons can kill tens of thousands of people. The second characteristic is their portability. Therefore, the use of them against civilians and unprepared military forces are easy. The third characteristic is their availability; meaning that despite widespread precautions, these weapons may be given to potential aggressors. Existence of these

\textsuperscript{112} Boutros Boutros-Ghali, United Nation Organization and Comprehensive Law Measures for Countering International Terrorism, Translated by Seyed Ghasem Zamani, Terrorism (Articles Collection), Alireza Tayeb, Ibid, p. 351.
three characteristics in NBC weapons has made them the most dangerous problem for countries’ long-term security.” Moreover, with the development of science and information technology and industry, governments’ power of hidden control (latent violence) has increased. This will cause domestic or international enemies of governments have no alternative but to carry out unconventional attacks, including terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction. Possibility of more groups access to these weapons is increasing and nature of public and private agents is changing in a way that clearly shows an increase in attacks by weapons of mass destruction.

One of the main reasons for increasing the ability of non-governmental agents in the production and use of weapons of mass destruction is that unlike the past few decades that nuclear knowledge and biotechnology was completely a secret subject, today they are considered an educational issue; So that even at the high school courses in developing countries they are taught. In addition, all the necessary information about production of weapons of mass destruction and even terrorist operations in history (as far as there are the human’s verbal and written memory) and also plan of operations, their way of implementation and their strengths and weaknesses can be found by pressing a button in the Google search bar or any other search engine in short time.

Therefore, development of information technologies has had an important role in the spreading global knowledge of production and use of weapons of mass destruction. It is sufficient that these technologies become available for terrorist groups; then all the countries’ alarms will sound (as has been sounded); because the security of all countries will be endangered and threatened. The availability of these weapons enables terrorist organizations to carry out covert attacks and massacre.
characteristic of a covert attack is that it is done in a way that everyday activities are not easily separable.

Hidden and terrorist style of NBC attacks can be very simple or complex and may be done by anyone who has appropriate access to NBC weapons. Regarding these issues, NBC threats may come from state or non-state agents (including terrorist organizations), because each of these factors can achieve to these weapons. Often hidden threats of NBC are considered equivalent to “terrorism of NBC”, because such threats require measures and plans which usually are done by terrorist groups; however, "hidden threats" are more comprehensive concept, because it determines the way NBC attacks, not congruity.

Generally, to address and to curtail implications of international terrorism on the emerging international system, "problem of definition" should be resolved sufficiently. UN resolutions changes in domestic laws will have no effect or little effect without common agreement on the basic principles. No satisfactory definition which has political and academic value, have addressed the problem adequately.

There are factors that individually or in combination which distinguishes terrorism from other forms of violence, including: Repetition, motive, intent, factors, and the effects of these factors and other factors should be followed and recognized. When these factors were recognized, they should be studied and adjusted in a way that instead of encouraging continuation of dispute over the definition, political consensus becomes realized. This can be done without sacrificing the academic accuracy or political flexibility.
Traditional analytical models (state-based) have limited advantages in studying international terrorism and they should be balanced for including non-state actors in various stages of data collection, analysis and political or military reaction. For effectiveness of the government’s response, we should pay attention to the realities of international terrorism not advertised myths of media, politicians or terrorists. Excesses in the role-playing of government and investing billions of dollars on by help of the agreed parties in response to the events which still we have not recognized them, will help little in developing the long-term trust building policies.

There should be a new and practical approach to the issues that not only to the political issues of the day, but to the future political development; this kind of effort should begin with developing practical definition of the problem which is acceptable jointly.\textsuperscript{113}

But in defining the quality and characteristics of terrorist acts often and generally accept this primary definition which is common among most of the definitions:

Generally, these definitions make clear that terrorists’ methods are creating fear and illegal violence and their strategies in the struggle against injustice, tyranny and Colonization is to achieve political and social goals and realizing their nation’s independence and freedom that are different with ordinary criminals’ goals such as thieves and criminals. They are dissatisfied with the status quo in international relations and society in terms of political, economic, cultural, and social and try to disrupt current status.

\textsuperscript{113} Challenges, reflections of ideas and opinions in the field of culture and society (No. 25), p 46.
In fact, origin of terrorism phenomenon is dictatorship, colonialism and lack of civil freedoms and lack of lawful ways for following and realizing demands of different classes of people. Also hostile governments use the gaps in societies (under domination) and by financial, institutional, military, intellectual and ideological support for talented individuals and groups, they provoke them against their rivals or hostile governments. In Cold War era, this issue took a new and organized form. Generally, the definitions of people, institutions, organizations and political entities, each have different and sometimes conflicting differences with others. Even the definition which centers and organizations in the United States have provided are considered different, solely because they are active in two different domains. If such a difference between the activities domain definitions causes the difference in defining concepts, it is clear that the definition of any nation is different with other nation and since there is no acceptable central and stable point as a benchmark of true and false which is out of empirical history of different nations, obviously accepting any definition by governments possible only in power space; otherwise the agreement on the definition of such key term is no longer possible.

Terrorism is an intentionally Threaten to use violence or threat to use it against non-military targets in order to gain political ambitious. It is a complex phenomenon for policy makers and so are the responses. There is no doubt that terrorism is one of the most dangerous threat in present era, but a complicated one. Up to now, there is no universal accepted definition of terrorism. Absence of such an agreement on the definition of this particular word Has led to the some difficulties in so called counter-terrorism. The questions will arises when somebody ask, is this particular definition true? What about
National Liberation? Terrorism or revolutionary violence? Etc. It is quite obvious that while there is no universally agreement on the definition of word terrorism, there would be no successful counter-terrorism. This chapter tried to give some important definition and analyze them to make some more clearance about the subject. Some scientific and official definitions have been described and also terrorism in international relation and low has been discussed. At the end of the chapter, some types of terrorism have been described.

After defining and analyzing various definition and some types of terrorism, some important questions are still remained. Is there any difference between terrorism and freedom fighting? Freedom fighters and terrorists, what differences can be made? Are terrorism and freedom fighter dividable? If so, what kinds of differences would be find? In other word, what acts do the freedom fighter should avoid or should do in order to not to be called terrorist? Are partisan’s actions in Europe against Nazis or Palestinian operation against Israeli occupation terrorism or can be defined as freedom fighter?

This research is not about to answer these kinds of questions but I wanted to show how lack of agreement on definition word terrorism could effect on the real world in international atmosphere.