CHAPTER - 1

INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(DEFINITIONAL ASPECTS AND CAUSES)

Conflict by its very nature is a social phenomenon which is seen in widely diverse contexts. It is seen within and between various individuals, social groups and other associations, nations, states in the existing system. The causes and consequences of conflicts are very heterogeneous in nature. Violence is a means in the struggle for survival and an instrument in severe political conflicts. We accept that the roots of conflict and violence lie in biological mechanisms that man and animals have in common, war and violence pose two important questions. First, is it possible to predict anything relevant about the nature of violence solely on the basis of human nature, or is violence a psychological phenomenon that cannot be defined by merely observing the human behaviour? Second, is it possible to observe the true essence of human violence by studying the aggressive behaviour of animals in their natural surroundings?
In an attempt to answer these questions first of all one has to find out the vital difference between violence among human beings and the 'intraspecific aggression' of animals? Secondly, what are the distinguishing features between man and his inanimate surroundings? Human being enjoys even greater freedom and is better equipped to control his life. A human being also has different motivations and many attachments to other people through a developed language.

It is doubtful to what extent aggression in animal is comparable to human being. But, atleast it can be said that animals are guided by instincts and humans by consciousness. Human nature and relations have been characterized by the Lasswellian theory, "Who gets what, when and how?", often accompanied by the use of force. Political and ideological violence which arises from or contribute to such violence is known as 'terrorism.'

During the past few decades or so, many opposition groups, functioning under different degrees of stress, have intentionally utilized techniques of physical and psychological force which include intimidation, repression, coercion and destruction of property and lives for attaining ideological and political goals. It is very agitational and destructive violence which is engaged in the disruption process, the disruption of norm, that threatens many nations with disaster and has laid seize to our civilized world in an unprecedented way. Terrorist groups are very small and too weak to achieve a positive result against governments. Therefore, the common element in all terrorist attacks is the inducement of psychological fear and panic in large segments of unprotected citizens. Terrorism thus is a complex phenomenon not because of its immediate effects but because of the fact that the states take tough measures to curb it, which generally affect human rights and basic liberty.

"Terrorism is not a new phenomenon, in one form or another it pervades recorded history. Yet, each time it reappears, still very complex, it looms as a new
menace."² A number of attempts have been made for defining terrorism but while defining terrorism each state keeps certain issues in mind in terms of its sociological background, historical experience and sense of basic value system.

It is said that between 1936 and 1986 more than 100 definitions of terrorism have been provided.³ But so many definitions made this concept even more complex and poorly defined phenomenon.

One of the earliest attempts to clarify the definition of terrorism is provided by the League of Nations Convention on Terrorism, 1937. Article 1 of this

² Robert Kupperman, and Darrell M. Trent, "Terrorism, a Threat, Reality, Response (Hoover, California, 1979), p.7.
convention defines 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. 4

This definition signifies that the terrorists manage to create an image for themselves which becomes a source of power. The favourable image generates more support. According to Article 2 of this convention terrorism was described as "Wilful act causing death or grievous bodily harm or loss of liberty to: (a) heads of state, person exercising the prerogatives of the head of state, their hereditary or designated successors; (b) the wives or husbands of the above mentioned persons; (c) Persons charged with public functions or holding public position when the act is directed

4. Convention was adopted on 16 Dec 1937 at the Geneva Conference. The UN Secretariat Study on Terrorism, UN DOC A/C, 6/418 Annex)
against them in their public capacity".\textsuperscript{5} Article 3 of the convention includes, the attempts, conspiracy, incitement, useful participation and knowingly giving assistance.\textsuperscript{6} In his latest definition Walter Laqueur says that "Terrorism is an attempt to destablise democratic societies."\textsuperscript{7}

The formulation of the League's definition is legal while Laqueur's definition does not make distinction between international conflict and civil conflicts. Similarly Laqueur's definition does not define state terrorism. Both definitions are incomplete because they give an impression that only democratic countries face the problem of terrorism.

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{5} Surya P. Sharma, "International Law; Consensus, still Elusive"; \textit{World Focus}, Vol.VII, no.2, February 1986, pp.7-8.
\item \textsuperscript{6} ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Walter Laqueur, "Reflections on Terrorism", \textit{Foreign Affairs"}, vol.65, New York, (Fall 1986), p.87.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushleft}
The government of France has different arguments about the definition of Terrorism. It says that Terrorism is "Any act of barbarism committed in the territory of a third state by a foreigner against a person who has a nationality other than that of the offenders for the purpose of exerting a pressure on a conflict not strictly internal in nature is called an act of terrorism and that foreigner is terrorist." While defining terrorism each state faces difficulty in finding agreement with:

1. What should be the nature of the definition?

2. Whether the definition should be general or mixed?

3. Whether it should be confined to terrorism as a non-state actor or it should also include state terrorism?

---

4. What should be the difference between the intimidation and terrorism?

5. Whether the definition should include the struggle for self determination or not?

6. Whether definition should exempt the criminal activities and political violence from its scope or include all these concepts alike?

7. What should be the legal nature of the definition?

8. What shall be the limit or range of terrorist activities?

9. What is the international element in an act of terrorism?

10. Who can be recognised as participants in a terrorist acts? What are the targets of terrorist activities?

Terrorism in general has two meanings. First, terrorism is "Government by intimidation as directed and carried out by the party in power in France during the revolution of 1789-1794: The system of terror
Second, it is "a policy intended to strike with terror those against whom it is adopted, the employment of methods of intimidation: the act of terrorizing or condition of being terrorized." 9

This definition includes the concept of motive and fear.

Thornton made an important attempt of distinguishing clearly between terrorism and intimidation. His definition includes symbolic nature of terrorism which intend to influence political behaviour of various countries. While distinguishing between terrorism and intimidation he says that: "intimidation differs from terrorism in that the intimidator merely threatens injury or material harm in order to arouse fear of severe punishment for non-compliance with his demands---- The attitude of political terrorist is entirely

different. He imposes the punishment meted out by his organisation upon those who are considered guilty or who are held to interfere with revolutionary programme; thus he served notice that his organisation will be satisfied with nothing short of the removal of the undesired social or governmental system and of the persons behind it. The terrorist does not threaten; death or destruction is part of his programme of action." 10 Therefore, it is clear that political violence is different from political terrorism.

It is said that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Because a person may be called terrorist by one system and freedom fighter by another at the same time. Yet there are differences between a terrorist and a freedom fighter. Terrorist is a person who indulges in criminal acts regardless of territorial limitations, innocent bystanders and neutral countries for his political and ideological motives. Terrorists

whether organised or unorganised do not recognise legal order and public support. Freedom fighter, on the other hand fights against the regime or government which has made him victim and which is responsible for his miserable life and suffering. His acts represent his claim for the right to self determination and common aspirations of the people. While the act of "terrorist" demonstrate an atmosphere of extreme fear and anxiety. Therefore, terrorism is an effective means of inflicting a feeling of psychological fear and defeat among its adversaries.11

The United Nation has not been able to define terrorism accurately. The outcome of the Aberdeen Conference was that it would be better to use the term political violence instead of terrorism. The United Nation also tried to define aggression. After a long discussion the United Nations adopted the definition of

aggression by consensus in 1974. After the definition it emphasised upon two clauses. First, the definition should not be "construed in any war enlarging or diminishing the scope of charter, including its provisions concerning cases in which the use of force is lawful." Second, the definition should not include "in any prejudice the right to self determination."14

On the other hand Richard Shultz defined terrorism as "the threat and employment of extra normal forms of political violence in varying degrees, with objective of affecting a complete revolutionary change within the political system."15

13. ibid.
14. ibid.
Jenkin sees terrorism "as a reaction to the general trend toward increasing centralization of power in most of the modern nation states, with its cocomitant loss in regional autonomy"\textsuperscript{16}. Jenkin observes that at present the feeling of nationalism is being replaced by regionalism and ethnicity.\textsuperscript{17}

Terrorists do not recognise the legality or legitimacy of any court. Therefore, their actions are justified as being pure deeds of revolution mainly designed to bring down an evil and corrupted political and social order. It is because of this that these acts are directed against the civilians.

During the last few decades or so terrorism has affected the socio-political system of the U.S., France, Britain, Federal Republic of Germany, Spain, Indonesia, Japan and almost all the Latin American and some Asian countries.

\textsuperscript{16} Robert Kupperman, no.2, p.40.

\textsuperscript{17} Brian Jenkin, "International Terrorism :Trends and Potentialities" (Santa Monica, Calif, Rand Corp.,1977) p.26.
The classical terrorism was an extension of war by other means. It is different from warfare in the sense that civilians are mainly targeted. Their strategy was to demoralise the population, cause a collapse of public order and hasten the capitulation of the government. Therefore, terrorist acts include "Explosion, Submersion, ignition of asphyxiating, interruption of normal operation of means of transport or communication, damage to or destruction of government property and public utilities; pollution; fouling, or deliberate poisoning of drinking water or staple foods, causing or propagating contagious or epidemic diseases, any wilful act which endanger human lives and the community and so on." 18

Similarly, the modern Terrorism, was an extension of politics by other means which appeared by the end of the 1960s. Its essential act was aeroplane hijacking. The modern terrorism is different from the old or classical terrorism in three ways: Firstly, classical terrorism emerged in the midst of a war, whereas the

18. Surya P. Sharma, no.5, p.7
contemporary terrorism occurred in the absence of actual military confrontation. Secondly, the classical terrorism occurred to demoralise the socio-political system whereas the new, the contemporary terrorism is mainly aimed at publicity. For example, the PLO seized planes and killed athletes at Munich games to get popularity. Similarly, terrorist groups like the Croatians seized Yugoslav hostages to gain publicity. Thirdly, in classical terrorism, the victim and his class made up the audience. On the other hand, in the contemporary terrorism there is dissociation between target of the message. For example the PLO's Olympic carnage in 1972 was not addressed to the victims but to the world. This kind of terrorism is still prevalent. But recently, a new and even more dangerous terrorism has emerged i.e. state terrorism.

State terrorism is an extension of threat by other means. The Rangoon bombings aimed at wiping out the entire political leadership of South Korea. Similarly, the attempt on the life of the Pope, the attacks on Jordanian envoys in three continents by Syrian agents
in 1983, the Kuwaiti bombing by Iranian agents; the shooting of British from the Libyan Embassy; the complete murder of Politicians including the Prime Minister in India allegedly orchestrated by Pakistan and other foreign powers; the bombing of Vienna and Athens airports by Gaddafi backed agents are the important examples of state sponsored terrorism.

Grant Wardlow defines terrorism as "the use of violence by an individual or a group, whether acting for or in opposition to established authority, when such action is designed to create extreme fear or anxiety indicating effects in a largest group, larger than the immediate victims with the purpose of coercing that group into the acceding to the political demands of perpetrators."\textsuperscript{19} Grant Wardlow's definition includes state terrorism, state sponsored terrorism and terrorism by non-state actors. The ancient Greek

historian Xenophon (c-430-c 349 B.C.) chological emper-
ors such as Tiberius (reigned 14-37 A.D.) and Caligula
(37-41 A.D.) who used banishment expropriation of
property and execution as means to discourage opposi-
tion to their rule, the Spanish used arbitrary arrest,
torture and execution to punish what it viewed as
religious heresy, after the US civil war (1861-65)
defiant southerns formed a terrorist organization
called the Ku Klus Klan to intimidate supporters of
reconstruction are some of the important examples of
the old terrorism. With the passage of time industria-
lised society became so dependent on the interlinked
and highly sophisticated agencies that it became possi-
ble for terrorists to simply sabotage them at one point
to control the entire socio-political system of the
entire community and state. For example, by cutting
off water, electricity, fuel and other such services.20
Therefore, the modern terrorists are more sophisticated
and well equipped than their counterparts in the earli-

20. V.K. Anand, Terrorism and Security, (Deep, New
er phase. Therefore, contemporary terrorism disrupts the entire world. During the last few decades or so, countries like Burma, African states like Kenya, Sudan, Nigeria, Chad, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Cango, Angola, Bangladesh, India, Israel and the entire Middle East have witnessed the ghost of terrorism in one form or another. The problem of Terrorism in Guatemala, Honduras, Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, Argentina, Venezuela, Uruguay and El-salvador was aggravated due to the political dissentions and ideological differences. On the other hand, social discrimination and economic disparity have been the root causes of widespread terrorism in most of the third world countries like Malaysia, Indonesia and India. Therefore, it is clear that modern terrorism did not erupt all of a sudden. In the beginning, man, frightened of the Celestial phenomenon, is believed to have sacrificed virgin maidens to appease the Sun God.21 Later, the tribal world has spread the cult of violence and it has been

very terrorising. Similarly, butchering of thousands of people by Attila, the Hun, in the fifth century A.D. and the cruelties heaped on common people by the wars between the cross and crescent have been very terrorising.22

In the thirteenth century, most of the terrorist violence was caused by the hills of "human skulls" which was furtherly roused by the Mongols under Chengez Khan and it was very much terrorising. In the twentieth century after the massacre at Munich Olympics, the UN got bogged down at the very definition of terrorism. Being a complex phenomenon the job of defining terrorism became more difficult. Since then 35 members adhoc committee was set up for resolving the controversies about the definition of terrorism. Finally, the problem was put up before the fifth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders at Geneva in 1975.23 But even then this body could not

--------------------
22. ibid.

23. ibid., p.138
agree upon a very comprehensive definition of terrorism. The international concern about the horrors of terrorism can be very well visualised in the resolution adopted on 9 December, 1985 by UN General Assembly through consensus. This resolution condemned "All acts, methods and practices of terrorism whenever and by whomever committed; including those that jeopardise friendly relations among states and their security."\textsuperscript{24} This danger was signaled in the document prepared by the Secretariat for the Sixth Committee of the UN. The documents says:

The effort to eliminate those causes should be intense and continuous, as mankind, despite its intellectual powers, has not yet succeeded in creating social order free from misery, frustration, grievance and despair—in short, an order which will not cause or provoke violence. Yet terrorism threatens, endangers or destroys the lives and fundamental freedoms of the innocent, and it would not be just to leave them to wait for protection until the causes have been remedied and the purposes and principles of the Charter have been given full

affect. There is a present need for measures of international cooperation to protect their rights as far as possible. At all times in history, mankind has recognized the unavoidable necessity of repressing some forms of violence which otherwise would threaten the very existence of society as well as that of man himself. There are some means of using force, as in every form of human conflict, which must not be used even when the use of force is legally and morally justified, and regardless of the status of perpetrator. 25

On 31 July, 1966, the adhoc committee was divided into three subcommittees to deal with the definition, the major causes and measures for the prevention of international terrorism. The first committee was of the view that no proper definition of terrorism can be given. The second committee held a debate as to whether measures could be taken to combat terrorism parallel with efforts to deal with the important causes. Therefore, no general consensus or compromise was reached. 26 Similarly, the third subcommittee could not reach at


26. ibid.,
common point of compromise and consensus about the
definition of terrorism. There were differences as to
whether to aim for a general convention on terrorism or
a series of conventions because each was related to a
different kind of act. There was also disagreement
over whether acts like abduction for ransom, kidnapping
of diplomats or the sending of letter bombs should
cover state terrorism.

There was also disagreement over whether a new
convention should be treated an important issue or
whether dialogue and treaties should be held at a
special conference of UN.27 Inspite of immense incli-
nation of UNO in the problem of terrorism, there has
not been a very concrete agreement on its satisfactory
definition.

The Government of Haiti defines terrorism in
terms of violence committed by an individual or a

27. United Nations, General Assembly, Report of the
Sixth committee Agenda Item 85 (A 8892),
November 21, 1972, pp. 41-72.
group of individuals under the international legal order against any one for the political purpose.\textsuperscript{28}

Therefore, terrorism is a systematic use of violence created either by an individual or a group of individuals for their political and ideological motives. Paul Wilkinson has categorised terrorism into three main ways. Firstly, Repressive terror, (total suppression), Secondly, war terror (in this kind of terror terrorist use all kinds of arms and weapons to frighten people); Thirdly, Revolutionary and Sub-revolutionary terror (It includes those acts which are committed for political and ideological motives).\textsuperscript{29}

Terrorism has two more dimensions the first one is simple criminal and the second one is political. The simple or plain criminal is related with the acts like threat to poison certain things and abduction of a person for ransom for example, Jennifer Guomners in Ireland was kidnapped for a ransom demand of 2 million

\textsuperscript{28} UN General Assembly Official Records, no. 28, p. 22.

\textsuperscript{29} D.C. Pande, "National Law: The Lumpen Element", no. 15, p. 3.
dollar. The political terrorism includes acts like placing explosives in aircraft and cars, hijacking of passenger, assassination of major political personalities. For example, since 1981 there have been a number of attempts to create terror in Turkey by killing its diplomats.

According to Brian Jenkins 1985 has been the worst year for terrorism because at least 77 countries were effected by terrorist violence in 1985. Terrorism against diplomats has prompted the Reagan administration to allocate funds to provide full time bodyguards for foreign ambassadors in the U.S. who face terrorist threat.

One of the most common form of terrorism is the hijacking of aircraft during scheduled flights. It is observed that most of the hijackings are linked with the Arab-Israeli dispute and mainly aimed at citizens of the U.S. and western world. 1968 has been the peak

30. K. Subramanyam, "Terrorism: To the Forefront of the stage", no.19, p.237.
hijack period because 35 hijacking incidents took place. The period of 1968-72 witnessed a wave of hijacking not less than 65 a year. The International Civil Aviation Organisation held an urgent session in June, 1970 with a single item on its agenda - a call for the development of adequate security standards and practices aimed at protection of air passengers and aircrafts. During the last few decades or so there were more than 600 recorded incidents of hijacking, 116 resulting in death or injuries to hijackers themselves, airline or airport staff which include 11 pilots and law enforcement officials. Twice Indian Airlines flights were hijacked to Pakistan. Similarly, a Chinese terrorist hijacked a British flight to Taiwan. On 23 June, 1985 Air India’s Jumbo Jet, "Kanishka" was plunged into the Atlantic Ocean by Sikh terrorists who had planted a time bomb in the Cargo. Atleast 329 persons including 86 children were killed.

Many experts believe that terrorism perpetrated by countries for strategic objectives is even more dangerous. The abduction and assassination of an Indian diplomat in Birmingham, the hijacking of an Indian
Airlines plane to United Arab Emirates and killing of the British Deputy High Commissioner in Bombay were the most disastrous terrorist incidents.

There have been many interpretations about the definition of terrorism. But David Fromkin's definition seems to be most appropriate because his definition includes state terrorism or state sponsored terrorism and terrorism by non-state actors. David Fromkin defines terrorism as

Terrorism is violence used in order to create fear, but it is aimed at creating fear in order that the fear, in turn, will lead somebody else - not the terrorist to embark on some quite different program of action that will accomplish whatever it is that the terrorist really desires. Unlike the soldier, or the revolutionist, the terrorist therefore is always in the paradoxical position of undertaking actions, the immediate physical consequences of which are not particularly desired by him. An ordinary criminal will kill somebody because he wants the person to be dead, but a terrorist will shoot somebody even though it is a matter of complete indifference to him whether that person lives or dies. He would do so, for example, in order to provoke a brutal police repression that he believes will lead to political conditions propitious to revolutionary agitation and organization aimed at overthrowing the government. The act of murder is the same in both cases, but its purpose is different
and each act plays a different role in the strategies of violence.\textsuperscript{31}

Terrorism as an issue has gained lot of attention in the forefront of the international stage. But the important problem is to find out the causes of terrorism.

**CAUSES OF TERRORISM**

It is said that "Terrorists are not born but created by particular, sociological, economic and political conditioning processes."\textsuperscript{32} Jenkins says that the violence of terrorism is a reaction to the general trend toward increasing centralization of authority in modern states. The increasing importance of nonstate actors in the international politics with groups like PLO attaining global recognition also leads to the problem of conflict and in this way relatively weak

\textsuperscript{31} David Fromkin "The Strategy of Terrorism" *Foreign Affairs*, July 1975, p.693.

\textsuperscript{32} Yonah Alexander, no. 1, p.83
organization could dictate terms to powerful nations on the basis of the threat of irrational or disruptive behaviour. Terrorists take to violent activities because they regard the adoption of violence as a cause of action fully warranted by the injustices, real or imaginary done to them. Terrorists do not recognise law and order and they consider laws as unjust impositions, unlike other criminals terrorists are highly politically and ideologically motivated groups. Political intolerance Crusades motivated by Religions, feeling of insecurity among minorities, grievances and frustrations create psychological and socio- logical conditions for the growth of terrorism. For example, whenever, some groups of people and some minority communities feel deprived on same account they resort to violence. Resort to violence by unauthorized individuals and groups cannot be justified even when aggrieved people have a legitimate cause for such outbursts of anger. The government’s responsibility in the matter lies in failing to redress, through states-

manship, the grievances of certain groups and communities.

At the root of terrorism lies economic and political interests of strong groups and institutions. Therefore, the individuals and groups cannot be restrained from indulging in violent activities when some interested syndicates and incumbent political authorities aggravate the problem of violence and terrorism. The contemporary society has now become much dependent on the inter-linked and sophisticated agencies.

Behind the terrorist activities there is an attempt to attract attention to communicate a purpose and to intimate a target group larger than the victims. The causes of terrorism and political violence are more or less same the as underdressed grievances by the government, denial of legitimate civil and political rights, frustration over the economic plight, unemployment, social and political injustices, misery, fundamentalism, racialism, the state of lawlessness, the brutal suppression, physical torture and cultural

34. K. Subramanyam, no. 19, p.239.
The unchecked terrorism may lead to civil war which can threatens the existence of a society and may open the door to foreign interventions. For example, the Indian experience is full of such instances when foreign powers split the people. Similarly, communal strife persisted for decades together. On the other hand the social and economic deprivation and disparities are growing in this world and taking the shape of violence and terrorism in one way or another. Therefore, substantial sections of world population are on the brink of survival due to economic distress of various kinds like, poverty and hunger, lack of clothing and shelter or victimisation by powerful groups. Consequently, as a reaction to this feeling of deprivation, economic inequity and oppression, the deprived sections have taken recourse to political violence and terrorism. Sometime the problem of terrorism is also caused by the economically powerful states. They spread violence and indulge in coercive diplomacy with a view to intimidating the poor and underdeveloped countries.
On the other hand, the psychological reaffirmation of self esteem leads to the problem of terrorism. The ego-ideal, self respect and sense of one-self as an effectively functioning person, the question of position and resource scarcity, the problem of depersonalisation are some important factors which contribute to the problem of terrorism in one form or another. For example, the depersonalised person feels that it is ineffective for him to exist as an individual and gain the popularity which can create a sense of impoverishment of the ego. Therefore, due to a number of psychological factors he merely becomes an instruments in the hands of powerful terrorist groups. Similarly, an individual also feels that he is deprived because he is incapable of arousing any interest. By terrorising he tries to enforce recognition and position and he feels a sense of intimacy with his victim. The feeling of desire and alienation also contribute to psychological conditions for the development of violence and terrorism.

On the other side of coin of terrorism is a threat arising from political disorder. The question of
autonomy also leads to the development of struggle for control over the state’s organisations and emergence of anti-social behaviour. Subsequently, it leads to the problem of anti-social power seeking and terrorist activities, violent tussle over the question of administration pose an intermittent and serious threat to the civilians.

Because of terrorism, Society as a whole stands in a state of siege, fear and political violence. For example, in late 1970’s the situation in Turkey became endemic with serious gun battles and assassinations which caused many casualties on a war like scale.35 Domestic terrorism frequently opens more venues for further threat from international terrorism either in the form of participant on one side or other.

Terrorism also occurs due to lack of open political participation. Frantz Fanon says:

In the colonies it is the soldier and policeman who are the official instituted to go between the spokesman of settler and his rule of oppression – on the other hand in colonial countries – the policeman and the soldier by their immediate presence and their frequent and direct action maintain contact with native and advise him by means of rifle and napalm not to budge. It is quite obvious that the agents of the governments use pure force only. The intermediary does not lighten the oppression, nor seek to hide the domination, he shows them up and puts them into practice with the clear conscience of an upholder of peace, yet he is the bringer of violence into the home into the mind of native.36

Terrorism, like other kinds of violence does not only undermine the individual’s security directly, it also creates threats to individual’s security offered by the state itself, and also those coming from other states.37 Contemporary terrorism is known to produce high risks and high casualties and it poses threat to the security of the state to create a state of extreme fear and anxiety among the masses. Perhaps the most


37. Barry Buzan, no. 37, p.27.
important dimension of terrorism is related to the motives or the type of objectives, held by them. Terrorist's motives can be interpreted as a power-struggle between ins and outs.\textsuperscript{38}

Nevertheless, despite these motives, connections and causes of terrorism, can be categorised into three categories. Firstly, orthodox terrorist who do not challenge the main status quo. This kind of terrorism can be seen in struggle occurring within the status quo which aims at redistribution of power, status and influence. It constitutes a struggle for power within prevailing framework of ideas and relations.\textsuperscript{39} Secondly, revolutionary terrorist which involves struggle for power within the system and also create threat to the organising principles of the system itself. Thirdly, the contemporary or modern terrorists challenge the entire political set-up to project their political ideology not only at the national but also at the international arena. This makes struggle much more

\textsuperscript{38} ibid., p.181.

\textsuperscript{39} ibid.
serious. In general, the change to an urban focus, terrorism appears as a combination of factors such as "(1) The increasing rural population resulting from continued and accelerating urbanization; (2) The presence of many metropolitan areas of a growing, articulate and generally aroused cadre of students and young intellectuals willing to embrace terrorism as the most effective means to destroy the governments whom they consider corrupt and ineffective; (3) The availability in urban versus rural areas of the basic necessities for successful revolutionary activity. 40

Generally, terrorists aim at psychological rather than physical results, therefore, the purpose of most of the terrorists activities is to build up an emotional state of fear in a particular individual, group or syndicate. 41 On the other hand terrorist movements have been pawns in the hands of political and social elite. 42 The orthodox or old terrorist groups in

40. Robert H. Kupperman and Darrell M. Trent, no.2 pp.185-86.
42. ibid., p.30.
the US were organized to keep law and order in the state of flawlessness. But they were soon controlled by the frontier elites, and they tried to serve their interests by terror.\textsuperscript{43} This type of terrorism occurred in many areas of northeastern Pennsylvania during the 1970s. The two terrorist groups of the past few years — the Weatherman Faction of students for a democratic society (SDS) and the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) of U.S.A. claimed that

the struggle activity, the actions of the movements, demonstrates our existence and strength to people in a material way. Seeing it happen, people give it more weight in their thinking. For the participants, involvement in struggle is the best education about the movement, the enemy and the class struggle. In a neighbourhood or whole city the existence of some struggle is a catalyst for other struggle — it pushes people to see the movement as more important and urgent, and, as an example and precedent, makes it easier for them to follow.\textsuperscript{44}

The complete decline of faith in the law, due to the failure of administration and legal authority have helped the terrorists. For example in domestic law, an

\textsuperscript{43} ibid., p.31

\textsuperscript{44} ibid., p.38.
accused remains innocent until the prosecution proves him guilty beyond doubt. It becomes difficult to collect all evidence and witnesses against the terrorists. Hence, they are released without punishment. The interested powerful syndicates exploit their helplessness by bringing them back to the fold of terrorism.45

Similarly, international law permits political asylum and exemption from extradition in case of political offense. Terrorists escape to a state with which the victim state does not have an extradition treaty and they get political asylum.46

Another drawback of international law is that it is helpful to terrorism with regard to diplomatic immunities.47 The diplomats have made full use of the

46. ibid.
immunities and privileges. A number of diplomats have used diplomatic bags for all kinds of things, including drug trafficking, smuggling and transportation of arms. Walter Laqueur says that terrorism has emerged in responses to repression. The correlation between grievances and terrorism is quite obvious. Recently, more repression has led to less terrorism. For example, in Spain terrorism emerged only after General Franco's death; the terrorist upsurges in West Germany, France and Turkey took place under democratic or left of centre governments.48 William Butler Yeats, in his poem, 'The Second Coming', displays an orientation to violence that has been shaped largely by the teachings of Sorel, Bakhunin and Fanon. Many of modern terrorist groups have abandoned the idea of distinguishing between combatants and non combatants.49 As a result of


49. Louis Rene Beres; Terrorism and Global Security; The Nuclear Threat; (West view, Colorado, 1979); p.29.
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this type of inhuman behaviour, the mad fury of terrorist activities has occasioned the killing and maiming of many innocent people.

A mere threat or use of violence political purpose does not signify the operation of terrorism. It is important that such force should be applied indiscriminately.

The modern terrorist groups believe in romanticization of brutality and it is a dominant motive of terrorist thinking. Modern terrorists believe that violence is a purifying force and it frees them from their inferiority complex and from despair and inaction. It is only violence which makes terrorists fearless and restores their self respect. 50 Al Fatah in its writing "The Revolution and Violence: the Road to Victory" states that man is liberated not only through liquidation of enemy but through therapeutic

50. ibid., p.30.
and purifying effect on revolutionary. Fatah says that violence is a healing medicine for all our people’s diseases. 51

Many of today’s terrorists are able to avoid individual responsibility for their acts by displacing this responsibility upon the terrorist group itself. By transforming persons into members of the group, i.e. into servants of a "higher cause", feelings of individual responsibility have been submerged by the 'psychology of the cell'. The effects of this psychology increase the likelihood of worst kind of terrorism. 52

Hannah Arendt says that terrorist violence is always applied with unforeseeable effects. 53 "Today's terrorists come from an affluent middle or upper class


52. Louis Rene Beres, n.33 p.32.

53. ibid., p.8.
family also and enjoy some social prestige."\(^{54}\) It is also observed that many terrorist groups share a basic hierarchy of wants and a general strategy. Sometimes terrorist operatives are willing to "die for the cause" and this renders them insensitive to the kinds of retaliatory threats that are the traditional mainstay of order between different states.\(^{55}\) On the other hand terrorism is not merely spread by the terrorist but the governments themselves have been encouraging through their secret agencies against the people and indigenous authorities of other countries to create institutional instability, social and political insecurity and chaos. Terrorism can also be committed in territories or against the governments or people which are in no way


\(^{55}\) Louis Rene Beres, n.33, p.33.
involved in any act of violence. An example is Palestinian attacks on the Israeli athletes at Munich during the 1972 Olympics.

Whatever the socio economic order, invariably, it is one form of terrorism which gives way to another. Terrorists think that the threat of violence is more rewarding than violence itself. Therefore, the fear of death is more dangerous than the actual death.

While the causes of terrorism could be local, international, revolutionary, ideological, fundamentalist or grievance real or imaginary but terrorist violence is generally spread to gain maximum publicity and propaganda, whether for short or long term.

Kent Layne Dots in his study on terrorism emphasised the following motivations with a view to finding the causes of terrorism.

1. Terrorism is motivated by the individual and collective guilt.

57. ibid., p.152.
2. **Terrorism is committed for publicity.**

3. **Terrorism is also committed to attract new members for the group.**

4. **Terrorism is also committed by a need for financial resources.**

5. **Terrorism may be motivated by a desire to provoke repression.**

6. **Terrorism is also committed to bring disorder in society.**

7. **Terrorism is also committed to demonstrate the group’s ability to act.**

8) **Terrorism may be an outcome of bad conditions.**

9) **Terrorism is committed to undermine authority.**

10) **Terrorism is also committed to punish the enemy.**

Although, no exhaustive framework of the underlying causes of terrorism is possible because terrorists differ in their nationalities, religions, ideologies, societies, and ethnic groups but they have many things in common like dissatisfaction with the existing system, the use of unjustified and cruel means to achieve certain goals, some kind of motivation and behaviour.