"Diplomacy and Terrorism"

The word 'diplomacy' is believed to have originated from the Greek verb 'diploun' meaning to fold. According to Nicholson, "In the days of the Roman Empire all passports, passes along imperial roads and way bills were stamped on double metal plates, folded and sewn together in a particular manner. These metal passes were called 'diplomas'. At a later date this word diploma was extended to cover other and less metallic official documents, especially those conferring privileges or embodying arrangements with foreign tribes. As these treaties accumulated, the imperial archives became encumbered with innumerable little documents folded and endorsed in a particular manner". It was found necessary to employ trained hands to index decipher and preserve these documents the subject matter of these collected state papers, kept in the archives, which were connected with international relations, were known in
the Middle Ages by the titles diplomatic or diplomatique. Those who deal with these papers were said to belong to res diplomatique or diplomatic business.

From these antecedents gradually the word 'diplomacy' came to be related with the management of international relations, and those who managed them came to be regarded as 'diplomats'. The actual use of these words conveying the above senses is comparatively recent. According to Earnest Satow, Burke used the word 'diplomacy' to signify skill or success in advancing the interest of the state as far as practicable through peaceful means. Hence, maintenance of peace without injuring state interest is a major aim of diplomacy. But if peaceful means fail to safeguard the national interest, force may be employed. It is an acknowledged fact that there are close links between diplomacy and war and war of different kinds. Diplomacy is closely connected with the aims of foreign policy of the state concerned. Modern diplomacy is closely related to the state.
It is very difficult to define diplomacy in clear cut terms. We can, however, try to frame a definition which will portray the different aspects of this skilled trade as much as possible. "It is the art of forwarding the interests of a state through negotiation and peaceful means, if possible, in relation to other states". If pacific means fail to obtain the desired objective, diplomacy permits to take resort to threat or actual use of force as a means to achieve its ends. A state's diplomacy will also have to undergo necessary transformation to serve the national interest in the changing conditions thus may deviate from its originally conceived definition.

Objective of Diplomacy

We may begin our examination of objectives of diplomacy by taking into account views of Kautilya, a master diplomat of ancient India. Although we are not strictly restricting this discussion to the Indian
context. Kautilya in his famous treatise, Arthasastra, said that a proper pursuance of nayaya, or policy, will produce favorable results. According to him, this implies, following a course that will prove beneficial to the king concerned, or which will entail loss to his enemy. Kautilya’s emphasis had four chief objectives of diplomacy. They are: acquisition, preservation, augmentation and proper distribution. Besides the above mentioned objectives, the aim of Kautilyan diplomacy also includes the attainment of Siddhi or happiness. And since the above objective can be attained only through possession of power, he goes on to say that a king shall always endeavor to augment his own power and elevate his happiness.

In other words, the objective of good or effective diplomacy is to secure maximum advantage for one’s state. The foremost interest evidently is the preservation of security. But apart from this fundamental consideration of national security, there are other vital objectives as well. Among other things these include promoting of economics, trade and
commercial interests, protection of nationals in foreign countries, propagation of the culture and ideology in which a state believes, enhancement of the national prestige, gaining friendship of other countries, isolating its enemies and fighting them in all forms singly or collectively. These objectives may broadly be divided into four heads: political, economic, cultural and ideological.

Political Objectives of Diplomacy

For a state, primary concern of its diplomacy is the safeguarding of its political independence and territorial integrity. This can be done by strengthening of relationships with the friendly countries, cultivating cordial relations with the countries indifferent to it and the neutralization of the hostile forces. Friendship can be cemented and new friends obtained through fruitful negotiations. Diplomacy, thus, can fulfil its political objective only if it is effectively backed by power.
Economic Objectives of Diplomacy

Though apparently political considerations appear to be the prime concern of a state's diplomacy, the economic factors are also no less important. The capitalist countries of the world are constantly busy in acquiring foothold in new markets and at the same time are eager to safeguard their economic interests in the region where they have been able to secure a strong footing by eliminating competition. The use of the terms like Financial imperialism', 'dollar diplomacy' etc., testify to this fact. With the breakdown of laissez faire and free trade system and the consequent over emphasis on national economics, both the developed as well as the underdeveloped nations have found that trade and commerce can be used as major instruments of national policy.

In order to gain access to new markets, countries around gave some concessions and bargained
for more. So both the parties took to diplomatic methods to obtain greater advantages.

Revolutionary improvements in the field of communications and the consequent interlinking of different countries has facilitated international trade to a great extent. The international trade is now mainly controlled by the state and obviously each country seeks to establish a pattern of trade suitable to its economy. Diplomatic negotiations are carried to promote the trade interest. To serve trade and economic interests modern diplomacy has thus come along way now.

Functions Diplomacy

Diplomacy which has often been described as "the instrument of international relations" has evolved on a continuous basis over the course of history as a method of dealing with a world that has nations as actors. In a world consisting of power centered state system, the states contend with each other for
survival and supremacy to further their national interests and for gaining ascendancy over the others. A constant rivalry is going on between the nations for achieving these aims. Moreover, often a state pursues its plurality of interests. A function of diplomacy is to reconcile the plurality of these interests or at least to make them compatible in order to provide a peaceful international society.

It is generally recognized that one of the major functions of diplomacy is negotiation. Diplomacy has the scope of resolving differences and securing the interests of states through successful negotiations. When the negotiations fail, the diplomats try to put their adversaries on the wrong side of the fence before the international community. A classic example of this may be found in the Mahabharata. Before the great battle of Kurukshetra Sri Krishna went as a special envoy of the Pandavas to the Kauravas to negotiate and to settle the issues peacefully. Every body knew that the Kauravas did not want a peaceful solution of the issue. So while he was
getting prepared to start for the purpose, Draupadi, the Pandava queen, asked him why he was undertaking such a hopeless mission. Sri Krishna said in reply, I shall go to the Kaurava court to present our case in the best light and try to persuade them to accept our demands, but if my efforts fail and war becomes inevitable, we shall show the world that we are right and they are doing injustice to us so that the world may not misjudge between us. This clearly reveals a major purpose as well as a major scope of diplomacy.

Though diplomats negotiate on behalf of their states, as the real parties are nations and not individual diplomats, the area where persuasion alone can be effective is extremely limited. It is generally argued that diplomacy is for safeguarding the interest of a nation. But often the question is raised about what are the most vital interests of a nation. These interests are generally determined in accordance with the wishes of the most powerful groups in a state. So at the time of framing and concluding agreements, diplomats to a great extent are handicapped by the
special interests shown by these dominant groups in various matters in their respective countries. In the circumstance even most cogent and well founded arguments may not help in reaching a reasonable agreement. Thus in spite of the general belief that international disagreement is caused by misunderstanding, this is rarely true. The parties involved usually understand each other's viewpoint all too well, but they simply cannot or do not agree.

Moreover, when a nation feels that its vital interests are at stake, it may refuse to come to an agreement, no matter what concessions are conceded to, or what rewards or punishments are proposed. So, when nations differ on questions that are vital to them, diplomacy will not be able to resolve the differences.

The bureaucratic structure and organization of foreign offices often impose barriers that obstruct the timely arrival of reports and recommendations to the persons who formulate policy at the highest level. Often the top policy makers may not like some
unpalatable information, though correct, to be sent to them and the diplomats sending such reports may be blamed for lack of judgment. In order to avoid the displeasure of their superiors they may abstain from sending any recommendations on the basis of such unpleasant information. This hinders the adoption of an effective diplomatic step.

Successful conclusion of negotiations between nations depends to a great extent on the ideologies they believe in the kind of world order they desire for, and the methods they adopt. When two nations share common views on ideology, negotiations between them often prove fruitful and differences are amicably resolved. But if they belong to two hostile ideological blocs and if they are in profound disagreement over most of the aims and methods of their foreign policies, then it is generally very difficult to come to an agreement even over minor issues. Thus diplomatic success is often limited by ideological factors.
Viewed from the historical angle, it seems that the nineteenth century was much more suitable for settling differences through negotiations than the twentieth century. The nineteenth century was dominated mostly by the bourgeois states of the West in which the rising bourgeoisie wielded real power. They had a common ideology and identical ideas about international order. This identity created an atmosphere of identical interests which favoured the success of diplomacy to a great extent.

Diplomacy in the 20th Century

On the other hand, the twentieth century presented a completely different picture. Different ideologies, different political and socio economic ideas that are sharply opposed to each other have cropped up. This views on social order are also radically different. In a world where states are highly suspicious of each other it has become very difficult to settle even minor differences through negotiations. So the possibility of diplomacy to
attain success has been greatly diminished in this period.

In the nineteenth century preponderating power of Britain and one of the great continental power of Europe had helped in the maintenance of power balance that assisted in smooth functioning of diplomacy. In the present century balance of power has been replaced by the so called balance of terror, which has created obstacles in the path of diplomatic understanding.

Moreover, with the progress of the twentieth century, Conference Diplomacy, in which diplomatic manoeuvrings are conducted publicly, is becoming more popular. In the international conferences nations argue over various issues. Citizens of different states come to know about these arguments and they put pressure on their representatives not to yield on points which they think will lower the prestige of their country. This puts great restraint on the diplomats and consequently it has narrowed the scope of diplomatic success.
Considerable improvement of communication system, the role played by mass media like radio, television etc., have increased the scope of dissemination of information, thereby creating an opportune field for lunching effective propaganda. Adverse and vehement propaganda by any group opposed to a settlement often ties the hands of a diplomat and largely restricts his bargaining power.  

Diplomacy has many and varied important roles to play in international relations. It has been appropriately regarded as the oldest method that men have devised for resolving the problems of war and peace. In the conduct of relations among organized societies, diplomacy, by adopting the methods of negotiation, persuasion, exchange of ideas etc., reduces the possibility of the use of force that often lurks in the background.  

In a world consisting of so many sovereign states two factors, diplomacy and international law are most important in the maintenance of peace. While
international law has given some semblance of order in an otherwise anarchical world, in the preservation of peace diplomacy has always played a vital role. Importance of diplomacy as a preserver of balance and peaceful international order has been greatly elevated in the modern world. As Morgenthau points out, a precondition for the creation of a peaceful world is the development of a new international consensus in the foundation of which diplomacy can contribute peace through accommodation. This international consensus provides favourable situation upon which more adequate world political institutions can be built. Kissinger, like most other realists, also had assigned an important role to diplomacy in reducing of differences among nations.

Diplomacy has always played a very great role in adjusting international policies. It is evident that very few problems in international relations can be completely erased. Majority of them have to be adjusted or settled through compromise. This can be done through diplomacy. In this respect Richard W.
Sterling's observation deserves notice. He says, Diplomacy is indeed, the politics of international relations, it is international politics in the most precise sense of them term.

He says, Apart from the differing contexts, the purposes of politics and diplomacy are identical. Both seek to unite a plurality of interests or at least make them compatible, or both seek to make good bad over others. Indeed, it goes to the credit of diplomacy that it seeks to reconcile plurality of interests thereby reducing the chances of conflict.

That diplomacy is an important element of international politics, finds support from the French and German usages of haute politique and grosse politique. These terms are poor synonyms for diplomacy. An accurate rendering of these words in English would mean something between top level politics and high policy. In any case, both the French and German expressions have been traditionally used to convey the sense that on a scale of rising
political importance, diplomacy politics among sovereign states stands at the very top in terms of impact on men and societies. Here it may also be noted that the ancient Indian master statesman, Kautilya, also used the term nyaya, policy, to denote what is more or less meant by diplomacy. According to Kautilya, nyaya enjoys a very important place in the inter-state relationships. This indicates that even the ancient Indians had justly estimated and appreciated the importance of diplomacy.

Diplomacy has been described by Organski, as the least expensive way of exercising power in international affairs. Even a small nation can maintain a core of diplomats who represent them in other nations and international conferences. As the representatives of sovereign states their status is at par with the representatives of powerful states. They can voice the opinion of their states in international conferences and in some cases, in unison with other small nations or even individually influence their decisions to a considerable extent. They can also make
diplomatic bargaining with other powerful states and extract concessions from them which they cannot otherwise expect. Diplomacy has been praised as it tries to achieve the maximum of group objectives in times of war or war like crises situations. But diplomacy is not wholly incompatible with war or in crisis situations. It is equally important during these times. It creates favorable conditions for such situations and assists in forming alliance neutralizing a potential enemy, by creating dissention in the ranks of the adversaries. To extract the maximum advantage such situations or to reduce the disadvantages from adverse situations diplomacy seeks wider areas of agreement through pursuing policies of accommodation. Viewed from this angle it can be said that the tendency of diplomacy is to work towards common cause which in the larger interest of humanity goes a long way in the survival of human race. But the fulfillment of this idealistic goal may still take a long time. In the meantime tendencies inherent in diplomacy to facilitate closer and peaceful relations have immense importance in maintaining peace and
harmony. Quincy Wright emphasized these tendencies of diplomacy and their importance in the following terms. These tendencies inherent in diplomacy itself are augmented by the natural tendencies of a civilization to develop closer contacts among its members. With the progress of trade, travel, and migration, the acceleration of invention in the fields of transport and communication facilitated such contacts. As a consequence, the increase in mutual understanding of the different cultures and the establishment of certain common standards of human rights and international law were achieved. These developments also gave greater weight to the human values contingent upon peaceful cooperation and less to heroic values contingent upon struggle. The natural tendencies of a developing civilization are therefore to augment the role of diplomacy and to diminish that of war and to save the world from the consequences of doomsday.  

Thus judging from the various activities of diplomacy, its importance as an instrument of state
particularly of anti terrorist policy given to the current international order is undeniable.

TERRORISM: AN INTRODUCTION

There have been encouraging signs over the past few years of a growth of scholarly interest in the phenomenon of political terrorism. Surely it is not entirely coincidence that this has occurred especially so when incidence of terrorism in many parts of the world has been dramatically increasing. It has never been the view that it is improper or demeaning for academics to interest themselves in the urgent practical problems of the day. Indeed in discussing the problem of terrorism with members of the public, politicians, officials, members of security forces and fellow academics, one is impressed by the widespread desire for serious analysis and long term thinking concerning the nature of terrorist phenomena, their causes, effects and policy implications for Western governments and societies. The present book is an attempt to contribute to this
analysis and to stimulate further debate through an investigation of the problem of terrorism from a liberal democratic perspective, and to suggest some practicable and effective means of tackling it.

It will come as no surprise to the reader to learn that in the colorful aviary of contemporary Academia many shriek and squawk against any project of this kind, while admitting the fact of terrorism in the contemporary world, wants its defenestration from the ivory tower either because of academic snobbery or plain squeamishness. One is reminded of the widespread academic prejudice against war studies. War, like terrorism, is a nasty, bloody, messy business which, some wish to argue, should only be studied by universities under the cache of 'Peace' or 'Conflict' studies. Yet another group will hold to a position of invincible ignorance about terrorism; they hold that the world has no meaning but is simply a pejorative for freedom fighting or rebellion disapproved of by the authorities. It would be foolish to deny that the world has been abused in this way. For example, the
South African government tend to designate all those who actively oppose them, by whatever means, as terrorists. But the mere fact of propagandist abuse of a political term surely does not justify dropping it altogether from our vocabulary. Should we drop the word democracy because of the way it has been used by the so called 'People's Democracies'? Or is the term 'socialist' to be consigned to oblivion because of its appropriation by Hitler's National Socialist Party?.

One tries to make clear in the conceptual discussions there are quite clear differentiations between the intent, aims and psychological effects of terrorism which are apparent and those of other forms of violence, such as the collective violence of riots and revolutionary uprisings and conventional war. It is an elementary but common mistake, for example, to equate terrorism with guerrilla war. As a matter of history many guerrilla struggles have been fought without recourse to the tactics of terrorism, and as will be discussed later, many guerrilla leaders have been explicitly opposed to any policy of terrorism both on grounds of expediency and morality.
Those who claim to eschew the word 'terrorism' on the grounds that it is contentious and implies value judgment are by so doing dodging a whole set of issues (i) they implicitly abandon the essential conceptual basis and framework for analysis of state terror and terroristic agencies and practices; (ii) they would be simply ignoring the very explicit theorists and manuals prescribing systematic terrorism as a political weapon and spelling out appropriate tactics and techniques (iii) They in other terms would be suggesting the idea to differentiate between those governments, political leaders and revolutionaries who do favour and practice such methods from those who do not. It is surely ridiculously ostrich like to hide our heads from this whole ugly area of historical experience.

A more fundamental opposition is also expressed, predictably, by the small groups of anti liberal democratic intellectuals and ideologues. They often have a sophisticated awareness of the possible
political use of terrorism, and generally offer terrorist movements a promising recruiting ground, a revolutionary ideology or program and leadership. Even if they do not actually plan and promote acts of terrorism, they are likely to encourage and condone acts of violence, destruction, disruption and intimidation damaging to the liberal democratic system they so loathe. Whereas it may be our hope to communicate with some sceptical and reflective members of the first group it would be delusive to hope to get throughout to the hard core allies, apologists and front men of terrorist movements. It is supposed that it is little use pointing out that post revolutionary regimes have also proved vulnerable to calculated terrorization by powerful political and para military movements or that citizens in revolutionary societies also have basic human needs for security against murder, in jury and destruction whether at the hands of the ruling party or its agencies or of private terrorist factions. One can only assume that communists and their fellow travelers who remain unmoved by the testimony of The First Circle or The
Gulag Archipelago, who cannot or will not listen to the cries of generations of victims of Soviet tyranny, have blotted out all sense of individual rights and freedoms. By suppressing all human feeling or sympathy for individuals in the name of that deadly abstraction, revolutionary justice, they have strangled their own humanity.

The main concern of the present work in this chapter is to try to improve our understanding of the problem of terrorism against the whole background of contemporary international relations and continuing ideological conflict in order to attempt that diplomatic relations between nations and multi lateral approach could help find a solution to this problem. It is necessary, therefore, to examine the extent to which some, though by no means all, terrorist movements and campaigns are promoted, aided and deployed as auxiliary weapons by revolutionary movements and as modes of unconventional and surrogate war by some states. It will be shown that the Soviet Union has a considerable record of involvement in this
type of conflict, and that this has important consequences for Western internal and external defence policy and strategy. However, the reader should be reassured that the author does not seek to present any general conspiracy theory or cold war grand simplification to 'explain' contemporary terrorist phenomena. On the contrary.

Terrorism today is a very clear manifestation of the intensifying multipolarity of international conflicts, of the almost infinite variety of actual and potential ideological, religious, ethnic, particularistic, secessionist and international sources of terrorist conflict that beset us. Terrorism is not the monoply of any ideology or cause in many countries and circumstances for example in Italy, Spain, Brazil and Argentina neo fascist and ultrarightist terrorist groups constitute a growing menace. Indeed Mussolini and Hitler can claim the dubious distinction of having pioneered many techniques and tactics of terrorization as an auxiliary weapon for seizing and consolidating power.
Therefore theorizing about political violence and about terrorism in particular raises fundamental and complex ethical issues. Can terrorism ever be morally justifiable in an operative liberal democratic society? If not, may it nevertheless be justifiable against totalitarian or authoritarian dictatorships, or against a foreign conqueror. Is there some argument analogous to the case for the just war which may be used to justify terrorist violence under certain circumstances. There are some enormous questions to be posed about the practice of terrorism itself. Should there be some kind of terrorist 'ethic', or rules about the limits of violence that is to be used. Can terrorism be selective, precise and discriminate? Who is to decide, and on what basis are they to decide, who shall be the recipients victims of terrorist "Justice"?. In liberal democratic societies acute ethical problems arise concerning the appropriate treatment of convicted terrorists who have been attempting through terror to blackmail and intimidate a government, group or community which has majority
legitimacy and support into conceding to their political demands. Does their claim to have a political motivation entitle them to special treatment or status in the judicial process? Should the lives of convicted terrorists dedicated to making war on Society be forfeit? These are a few of the ethical questions that will be discussed recurrently throughout the present work.

However, there is another kind of theoretical complexity involved. Complexities, ambiguities and uncertainties in the international system, in particular the fluctuating relations between domestic and international political forces, raise baffling problems of empirical theory. Are current trends in terrorism symptomatic of an increasing swing away from bipolarity to multipolarity, and a of a relative weakening of super power capacity to mould international relations. Thus, Terrorism can be interpreted as a desperate response of the growing number of weak or powerless groups challenging the rigidities of frontiers, power and resource
distribution underpinned by the current intentional system. A French theorist has asserted Terrorism is the weapon of the weak pretending to be strong.) We must go on to ask whether the weak are gaining strength at the expense of the strong or vice versa. Is terrorism, particularly in its international and transnational manifestations, a true harbinger of wider and far more sanguinary and dangerous revolutionary struggles by movements claiming to represent the poor and underprivileged of the Third World against the rich states of the First World. Or, on the other hand, is the very desperation and the fanatical, almost suicidal style of the transnational terrorist brotherhoods indicative of their weakness, vulnerability and ultimate political irrelevance. Could they really survive a concerted campaign by the international community to outlaw and eliminate them through the medium of Diplomacy as an instrument of anti terrorist policy

By contrast many indigenous terrorist struggles at regional and national levels are by no means so
clearly asymmetrical in character. In some cases particularly where external powers are acting as their sponsors revolutionary movements engaging in terrorism may acquire the resources, weapons and popular base equaling or even surpassing the resources of the target regime.

These ambiguities and contradictions should warn us against any premature general theory or model of the causes, inception and development of terrorism. For in reality there are many terrorism's, each calling for different theories, models and approaches from the scholar seeking to relate these phenomena to other dimensions of political change. Therefore the primary tasks must be to clarify and refine the concept of political terrorism to establish a working typology of political terrorism, and most difficult of all, to relate terrorism to there modes of violence and to the basic political values, structures and processes of liberal democracy. These tasks are attempted in the present work.
The heart of this work, deals with the special problems of revolutionary and sub revolutionary political terrorism in liberal democracies. It discusses the underlying and precipitative cause of terrorism in liberal states and assesses influential causal and developmental theories and models of terrorism under these conditions. The ideologies, aims, beliefs, strategies, tactics, organizational structures, recruitment and logistics of terrorist groups are identified and their influence and efficacy are analyzed. Considerable attention is given in this section to evaluating both the implications of terrorism for liberal democratic states and the most practicable and potentially effective strategies of prevention, deterrence, internal and external defence and counter offensive open to governments and security forces. Attention is given to the lessons of recent experience of anti terrorist campaigns regarding the administrative, police, military and psychological resources, tactics, equipment's, security, judicial and political measures most appropriate to the varying intensities of anti terrorist operations, ranging from
isolated bombings and assassinations to major anti 
terrorist emergencies. The conclusion this section is 
done by highlighting what in my view are the most 
serous dangerous mistakes that may threaten the 
success of anti terrorist operations by liberal 
states: under reaction, political inertia and the 
disintegration of the state; over reaction, 
indiscriminate repression and the loss of popular 
support and legitimacy.

Liberal democracies are particularly vulnerable to 
infiltration and attack by international and 
transnational terrorists and it is with this 
particular challenge that this work is concerned. It 
is now experienced that, the specific problems of 
skyjacking, diplomatic kidnappings, embassy attacks 
and assassinations can be possibly conferred at 
regional, national, bilateral, and international level 
through those measures and co operative actions using 
diplomacy as an instrument of negotiation and exchange 
of Ideas and information.
It will be clear from the foregoing that this work does not offer a general historical narrative of terrorist movements and campaigns, a survey of empirical data or a guide to the literature. Readers should refer elsewhere for these. Our aim has been to concentrate on debating theory, analysis, strategy and policy, and in order to give the main lines of argument, sharper definition. We have tried to keep cross references and academic apparatus to an unobtrusive minimum.

This therefore makes this study of Diplomacy and terrorism a relatively new and undeveloped, younger by far than the study of civil violence and revolution despite its limitations and constraints. In a field with so few wise men to follow, the contributions of Professors Feliks Gross, Joseph Roucek and Eugence Walter shine like beacons, and all succeeding students of terrorism rest heavily in their debt. We would also like to pay tribute, in this connection, to that pioneering triumvir of British experts on terrorism: Brian Crozier, Robert Moss and Dr Richard Clutterbuck.
The superb quality of their contributions is internationally recognized though inadequately acknowledged in British Academia. We wish to thank all three for their generous contribution and insights, of which we have drawn on freely.

Terror and Terrorism: Conceptual analysis

We must now consider the slippery and much abused concepts of terror and terrorism and their complex and often ambiguous relation to other forms of political violence and to criminality. Terror, to state a truism, is a subjective experience we all have different 'Thresholds' of extreme fear and tend to be more easily terrified by certain experiences, images and threats than by others. It is the interplay of these subjective factors and individual irrational, and often unconscious, responses that makes the state of terror, extreme fear or dread a peculiarly difficult concept for empirical social scientists to handle. It has been the tendency recently in the social sciences to shy away from the study of
phenomena that are extremely difficult to define and almost impossible to measure. Furthermore the concepts of terror and terrorism have obviously very strong evaluative and emotive connotations.

Historians and political philosophers have not been so ready, however, to ignore the many real and significant individual and collective experiences of a state of terror. Nor have they neglected to study those leaders, regimes and movements responsible for developing explicit theories and policies of terrorism, or to attempt to assess the socio economic and political conditions and consequences of terror. For our purposes, however, it will be useful to make two between political terrorism and other forms of terrorism.

Much of our experience of terror is the unintended or epiphenomenal by product of other happenings. Since this study is basically concerned with Terrorism in Political Terrorism in particular let us concentration on those issues also which are beyond our power to
predict or control. Indeed inability to understand what itself a cause of more intense fear. And outbreaks of cataclysmic mass violence such as wars and revolutions inevitably bring a vast amount of epiphenomenal terror in their wake. This large scale, and often sanguinary, epiphenomenal terror, should, of course, be clearly distinguished from the systematic regimes of terror which, for example Walter has shown, in a pioneering analysis, regimes and processes deliberately maintained even when it can be shown that they have counter productive effects on the society in question. It is therefore necessary to maintain the distinction between epiphenomenal and incidental terror of the kind that frequently accompanies mass violence and the systematic terrorism of groups or regimes of terror in which the use of terror as a mode of psychological warfare is explicitly intended and planned. This is the preliminary stage of recognising these differences.

Terrorism may or may not in this context be politically motivated. Criminals have used it to
obtain ransom and for other forms of private gain. Psychopaths have terrorised from motives they themselves may not fully understand. The bored, sadistic and weak minded may terrorize to express their frustrations and hatreds in acts of symbolic protest and revenge against society. An appalling aesthetic explanation was attempted by Taillhade when he said, Matters are complicated by the fact that criminals and psychopaths sometimes clothe themselves in political slogans of justification, and by the well known propensity of terrorist movements to recruit assistance from and to collaborate with, the criminal underworld.

However it is the politically motivated terrorism with which the present work is primarily concerned. It has often attracted and spread attention of nations. It is therefore necessary to understand as to what is political Terrorism. Political terrorism for the sake of an academia study could be briefly defined as coercive intimidation. It is the systematic use of murder and destruction, and the threat of murder and
destruction in order to terrorize individuals, groups, communities or governments into conceding to the terrorists political demands. It is one of the oldest techniques of psychological warfare. A primary target for terrorization is selection or the objective, or message to be conveyed, is determined, and credibility is established by convincing the target that the threat can actually be carried out. While the victim or victims of the actual act of terrorist violence may or may not be the primary target, the act of Terrorism to me is well defined is the following words and the effects of relatively small amounts of violence will tend to be quite disproportionate in terms of the number of people terrorized in the words of an ancient Chinese proverb, Kill one, frighten ten thousand. The terrorist wants a lot of people watching rather than a lot of people dead. Though this may hold for the relatively rare case of pure terrorism, such as mass hostage situations, repressive and revolutionary terror often result in the massacre of large numbers of people. Furthermore, strategic theories of terror as a psychological weapon assume a logic and symmetry
in the rational of the terrorist which is generally lacking in the real world. Terrorists are more often than not consumed with hatred against a perceived class or race enemy and often deliberately attempt mass slaughter in public. Indeed this was advocated by the pioneer German terrorist theorist, Johannes Most, in the 1880s. It is a great mistake to assume that political terrorists will conform to some minimum standard of rationality and humanity. Clausewitz once remarked that war has its own language but not its own logic. The same is true of terrorism which is, after all, a kind of unconventional war.

We would do well to question not only the assumed rationality of the terrorists, but also the strategic rationale of terror as a weapon. It is easy to see how a terrorist can terrorise individual victims into submission when the latter are unarmed, captive and entirely at the mercy of the terrorists. But how can the terrorist be certain as to the effects of his act of violence on his primary target, his chosen audience. The target audience may well be frightened
but this may galvanise them into self defence or counter measures against the source of terror. Far from automatically leading to a climate of collapse in which the primary target is prepared to surrender to the terrorists demands, terrorism may lead to mobilization and hardening of resolve to resist their demands and eliminate the terrorism. Terrorism thus is someone has shrewdly remarked, is a weapon that often drives the terrorists to their goals or backfires. Those who instigate it may find it leads to a wave of outrage and revulsion against them weeping aside any latent or actual base of public support and sympathy for the terrorists political cause. Or, in other conditions, it may lead to unanticipated spontaneous counter violence and terror with vigilance or rival groups. Terrorists may then find themselves sucked into a kind of inter communal or inter movement struggle which effectively neutralizes their effectiveness in influencing long term constitutional or policy changes. Thus, Terrorists can also, paradoxically be the unwitting agents providing the justification and the opportunity for governments and
security forces to acquire the far reaching emergency powers and systems of control which may be used to permanently to suppress or exclude the terrorists political movement from power.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF TERROR

The obscenities and stones hurled against liberal democratic institutions at the height of the student revolt in the late 1960s by the spoiled children of Western affluence and privileged dramatically shattered the illusion that the sole forces remaining to challenge liberal democracy in the West were fascism and communism. By the mid 1960s fascism appeared as a totally discredited and defeated movement within Western liberal states, while communism was viewed rather more seriously, as an external threat in the shape of the Warsaw Pact and expanding Soviet military power. Liberal observers of the politics of France and Italy, which both have traditionally large communist votes, noted the extent to which indigenous communist parties and trade union
movements could be tamed by the discrete pressures of embourgeoisement and privatization of workers, and by the parliamentarisation of parties. But the street and campus battles of the student revolt disclosed the fanaticism of new, small, but strident minority movements fundamentally hostile to liberal values and politics. A veritable zoo of conflicting sects and factions covering the whole spectrum of neo Marxists and Third World revolutionism and anarchism sprang up in the heart of Western Academia. And although these groups commonly identified with Third World revolutionary heroes such as Mao, Ho Chi Minh and Guevara, have identified the true intellectual mentors of these terrorists philosophy to Herbert Marcuse and Jean Paul Sartre, as spinning fresh revolutionary doctrines and myths anywhere else but within the liberal societies they so profoundly despise.

The most elaborate and systematic attempt to create a philosophy, or perhaps more accurately, an ideology, of terror and violence is directed to wards Jean Paul Sartre. Sartre significantly and explicitly
takes an extreme position concerning violence, and he makes a determined attempt to work through the implications of this for both the individual and society. It would be dangerous to assume that Sartre is in any way a representative figure. It is difficult to gauge both the degree to which he has influenced, and the extent to which he has been moulded by, contemporary neo Marxist and existentialist thinkers. Certainly there are close affinities, for example with both the Frankfurt School and the 'situationists' as well as more obvious links. However, I am not concerned so much here with intellectual pedigree. Sartre is important as both the most radical intellectual proponent of violence and terror, and as one of the leading, and most intransigent, antagonists of liberal values and the liberal state. His Critique de la raison dialectic (1960) provides the most dramatic antithesis to the contemporary liberal view of the state and society. It is therefore worth examining his ideas closely not merely because However, conation is necessary before Brushing that (he is an influential exemplar of apologia for violence and
terror, but also because he dares to seek or the consider him as giving philosophical respectability to the notion that terror, far from being a cancer of the body politic, is indeed its very lifeblood.

In fact Sartre, in his major theoretical work on violence and terror, attempts to fuse elements of bleak existentialism and Marxian dialectic. He develops a social doctrine which is diametrically opposed to the humane optimism of liberalism. For Sartre the true motive force of history is scarcity each man is an enemy to every other because each is a dangerous rival in the struggle against scarcity. It is for this reason, he claims, that evil is irremediable and must be made the basis of our ethics. It is important to recognize these explications in Sartre's theory for its influence, often in vulgarized forms, has permeated many revolutionist and terrorist ideologies that have grown within liberal societies.
Similarly in the context where the state of nature is portrayed in Critique is infinitely bleaker than that of Hobbes. The world we live in, comprising the world of Nature and Praxis is seen as essentially indifferent to Man's well being. This world, which Sartre terms the world of the Practico inert, is seen almost as an antagonist, at times mocking man by the failure of his inventions, and the folly of struggles and actions that actually worsen his position in the struggle against scarcity. And therefore the struggle of every other individual is viewed as a cruel and rapacious antagonist, is attempt at once as predator and prey. Nothing indeed neither wild beasts nor microbes could be more terrible for man than this intelligent, flesh eating cruel species, which knows how to follow and outwit the human intelligence and of which the aim is precisely the destruction of man my italics In Sartre's state of nature no lament of altruism or love exists the individual man is seen not simply as lusting and fighting for power after power, anything but as a destroyer implied to murder his fellow men. Man in a state of nature thus only shares
the negative reciprocity of mutual and deadly antagonism in the interpretation of both these thinkers.

Sartre argues that this negative reciprocity is 'dialectically' negated by the social collaboration between neighbors which man finds is essential to overcome scarcity. The terms the form of social structure which man creates to collaborate for collective purposes the group. Sartre differentiates the groups from the series which is a random gathering or clustering of people defined merely by their mutual proximity. Thus a working class may be nothing more than a series of series, a mere category, something less even than Marx's' conception of a class in itself. But if a working class becomes committed to a common objective or end, such as revolutionary socialism, it becomes a 'pledged group', something closer to Marx's class for itself. Le Serment (the pledge) is the commitment that actually gives birth the to group. Sartre plainly sees it as an almost sacramental act which is binding on the members
because it carries the explicit implication that violent sanctions will be invoked against any who break their pledge, or betray or desert the group.

Thus for Sartre the pledge group is created not from a rational and freely given contract or covenant but from fear, and it is the rule of 'Terror' over every member of the group by all their fellow members that keeps the pledge enforced and sustains the group. It is only the constant presence of violence and terror, argues Sartre, and Hobbes to certain extent that prevents the group from dissolving into mere sterility. In this strangely dark and melodramatic vision of the world there are no such things as lover or loyalty or fraternity for their own sake all social relationships are governed by the violence of the terror that negates violence. As Maurice Cranston has observed, for Sartre, 'Terror in fact is fraternity. For terror is the guarantee that my neighbor will stay my brother, it binds my neighbor to me by the threat of the violence it will use against him if he dares to be unbrotherly.
Terror is at the centre of Sartre's political philosophy; it is the very cement of the State which is the most important form of political organization. Like Hobbes, Sartre assumes that the pledge of obedience to the state totally subordinates the individual to the authority of the sovereign. Hence the Terrorism outrage for Freedom thing a violence. And because the sovereign henceforward represents the will of the subjects, the pledged subject, by obeying the sovereign's command, obeys himself. The ultimate paradox of Sartre's terroristic philosophy is that the state's exercise of terror becomes the condition of freedom. His bizarre conclusion is that those who are pledged to the state and have thus totally given themselves to its ends can only be truly free when they are obeying the commands of the state which rules them by terror. What could be further from the liberal conception of the state as a means of security, peace, individual liberty and happiness.
It may be therefore understood that terrorism constitutes a direct repudiation of liberal and humane values and principles, and that terroristic ideology is inevitably and constantly deployed in a struggle to defame and discredit liberal democracy. It is an important, sometimes over riding, terrorist aim to undermine the political will, they are made more vulnerable to political and social collapse. A second major terrorist political stratagem is the attempt to push the liberal state into authoritarianism, and hence into denying its constitutionalism, into dropping all humane restraints and checks on power, and ultimately into becoming a paramilitary or police state, a mirror image of the terrorism it is supposed to be defeating. Carlos Marighela’s ideas of militarizing the situation by trapping the authorities into brutal repression and over reaction which then alienates the public and drives them into tacit or active collaboration with the terrorists have been widely employed and refined by others. Certainly liberals who neglect the political and ideological warfare dimensions of terrorism do so at their peril.
Every action, every response by a liberal democratic regime faced with political terrorist campaigns, should therefore be considered not only for its purely military and physical implications but also for its wider political and socio psychological consequences for the liberal state. For terrorism thrives and trades on the graver mistakes and is judgments of the government authorities and security forces, powerful parties and groups within society. Indeed by a whole series of such mistakes liberal democracy can bring itself to the very brink of disintegration without the terrorists having to win any decisive military victory.

Political terrorism is thus, par excellence, a weapon of psychological warfare. Its theorists and skilled proponents hope to achieve a climate of fear, panic, disorientation and capitulation out of all proportion to the actual military strength and numerical support of the terrorist movement. And the terrorists judge their own success or failure primarily in terms of political psychological and propaganda impact rather than purely by the
These considerations are important not only in assessing the strategy and tactics of terrorists, which we will be considering more closely later, but also in trying to answer a more basic question does internal political terrorism constitute a clear and present danger to the security and internal stability of the liberal democratic state. For if we fall into the Terror of exaggerating the military capabilities and ambitions of terrorists and underestimating the strengths and advantages of democratic governments and their security forces actively combating them, we are in danger of helping terrorist propaganda. A great deal of terrorist effort is devoted to creating an impression of growing and ultimately invincible strength, ubiquity and cleverness. In addition there is a risk of the government being pushed into over reaction and ill judged and counter productive measures. On the other hand there are circumstances where the greater dangers appear to lie in government
weakness, vacillation and under reaction. It will then be important to communicate the indicators and signals portending a more serious escalation of strife to the authorities, and every effort must be made to mobilize government and public to take urgent and tough measures to deal with the terrorism. In summary one can say that an exaggerated assessment of the threat posed by a particular terrorist campaign is always likely to help the terrorists more than the government, and may indeed give the former a considerable propaganda advantage. Realistic, accurate and frequent assessments of terrorist strength and potential, however unpalatable their conclusions, must continually be made available to government and security chiefs in order to guide anti-terrorism policy. Hence this study, if on one side there is an effort to come together by countries to coordinate and act diplomatically against the odds of Terror, the philosophy of Terrorism on the other hand attempts at wreaking these states themselves hence the chapter III to understand the sources of diplomacy as an anti-terrorism policy.
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