CHAPTER-3

CAUSES LEADING TO THE SPREAD OF TERRORISM

"One might wonder why reasonable people would allow themselves to be moved to such extreme hatred" — Adolf Hitler.

Arguably there are a number of factors which have created the "frightening demons" of this society. To mention a few, they would be psychological, political, economic, religious, cultural and so on. In a survey it is found that majority of the terrorists suffer from psychological disorders — either they were born with such diseases or have acquired them through the unpleasant traumatizing childhood experiences. It is believed that International terrorism is often performed to change the policies of a particular government, for the benefit of the citizens under that government (as claimed by the terrorists). For e.g. the Maoists, for instance, who are known for their notorious acts, perform such deeds to break free from what they consider as an oppressive government. Terrorism has also now been a profession taken up by the desperate people, who possess muscle strength. Many of them perform such activities even without knowing the main motive or goal which the organization aspires for. They perform the act, because they desperately need money and by doing so they are handsomely paid. For example, the suicide bombers die as their families are well funded after their death. Keeping in mind economic explanation of terrorism, we can, perhaps, talk about the exploitation by the capitalist class of the proletariats, which finally leads to a rebel by the latter, and this gets termed as "terrorism". Again, some of the most violent terrorist groups in recent years propagate a particular religion as a justification of their actions. They want to eradicate all other religions, save their own. Terrorism is sometimes seen as a violent reaction to alien cultural values and influence. According to Samuel P. Huntington, cultural alienation and humiliation have contributed to the rise of international terrorism. Beside these the other factors which commonly lead to the rise and spread of terrorism are:-

a) **Prolonged unsolved conflicts** — U.S., being the central power of the world, has almost tyrannised over other nations, for example, Palestine. They have
backed, nations like Israel with arms and ammunitions, economy etc. to destroy Palestine. This other factors gave birth to the organization headed by Osama Bin Laden, who gave the Americans the same kind of treatment that they received from them. This revolt turned as terrorism. Such a long term unresolved conflict takes a toll on the whole world, spreading terror to whichever nation that joins hands with the U.S. government. The report of the security council of U.N States, states this to be a dangerous cause at contemporary terrorism.

b) **Dehumanization**— whereby all human qualities of the terrorists are extracted out by the organizations which act as forceful causes of their inhuman, irrational acts.

c) **Lack of rules and violation of human rights** – also make terrorism an easy activity.

d) **State Sponsorship** – is another factor leading to the upliftment of terrorism. This is also known as “state sponsored” terrorism, when governments provide supplies, training and other forms of support to non-state terrorist organizations. This form of terrorism is also known as ‘terrorism from above’ as we have already mentioned in the previous chapter.

e) **National Separation and Social Revolution**: is still another factor of terrorism. Nationalism is good and desirable but its extreme form (as had been manifested by Adolf Hitler) leads to perverted nationalism which in its turn, leads to violence and injury/harm of other nations. Perverted nationalism often leads to separatist movement [by virtue of which Jammu and Kashmir, wants to get separated from India, Telengana – a newly claimed province wants to separate itself from Andhra Pradesh, the hills of Bengal, by adopting the new name of ‘Gorkhaland’ aspires to set itself free from West Bengal and so on.] But if such separation is entertained then any nation would lose its unity and integrity and the entire world would be torn apart.

After this overview of the several probable causes of terrorism we would like to concentrate on the supposedly three major causes (which would
undoubtedly cover the rest). These are the logical and psychological, the socio-
political and the religious causes. Let us consider them by turn.

3.1 Logico-psychological cause: This would refer to the terrorist
behaviour as a product of psychological forces.

A comprehensive study of terrorism does not reveal a particular
psychological type, a particular personality constellation, or a uniform terrorist
mind. But although diverse personalities are committed to the path of terrorism, an
examination of memoirs, court records, and rare interviews suggest that people,
with particular personality traits and tendencies, are drawn disproportionately to
terrorist career.

In this context, we would also discuss the ‘logic’ behind such utterly
odious acts performed by them. The terrorists believe and are, in fact, convinced
that they do not do anything wrong, because they just defend themselves from the
harm and injustice brought to them by the others. In fact, they believe that they
just give the offenders the appropriate reply for their actions. Thus a ‘we’ feeling
and a ‘they’ feeling are imbibed in them from the very beginning. The terrorists
would probably state that it is ‘their’ mistake, ‘they’ are doing wrong on us; ‘we’
have done nothing — ‘they’ have started the war where ‘we’ are just protecting /
defending ourselves or at time paying them back by raising a voice against their
oppression. Thus, it is not ‘us’ but ‘they’. The terrorists always think the “other”
to be their enemy. These terrorists are moulded by their leaders in such a way that
they are in no position to see the other party’s viewpoint. After being completely
brainwashed by their leaders they think in this manner that ‘they’ (that is the
government or the other party at dispute) exploit/oppress them and would always
do so; thus they have no trust on such a government or upon the ‘they’, and even
if the other party whom they consider to be their enemies, call the former for
mutualisation, then also the former would never participate fearing that behind
this the other party may have some hidden agenda.

The psychological makeup of the ‘terrorists’ is built around this ‘logic’
which leads them into seeing the other party with an eye of suspicion.
Again if we look into their logic then the acts of terrorism can be meaningfully and innovatively conceptualized as moral action (actions guided by what is right or wrong thing to do in a particular circumstance). Moral actions, including acts of terrorism, result from both rational (deliberation) and experiential (habituation) processes, themselves the outcome of the interaction between individual and environment—specifically, the interaction between a person's morality and moral context in which he or she operates.

Now, the question is why do these terrorists break rules? In reply it can be said that an individual such as a terrorist breaks a law in part because they judge it to be morally wrong or because they think it does not apply in a particular moral context, in other words, law-breaking occurs when there is a lack of correspondence between the law and the individual’s moral values in a given context as per situational action theory which by setting a logic of the terrorists holds terrorism as moral.

Several authors have characterized terrorists as action oriented, aggressive people who are stimulus-hungry and seek excitement. Particularly striking is the reliance placed on the psychological mechanism of “externalization” and “splitting”, — the psychological mechanisms found in individuals with narcissistic and borderline personality disorders. No doubt, it is true that the psychological mechanisms of externalization (venting out their aggression) and splitting are not used by every terrorist. However, it seems that these mechanisms are found with extremely high frequency in the population of terrorists, which contribute significantly to the uniformity of terrorists’ rhetorical style and their special logico-psychological make-up.

This can be brought out from the following study —
Diagrammatic representation of each terrorist group (studied) in the contexts of its own national and cultural history.²

The upper left hand cell signifies those who are loyal to parents, who are loyal to the regime; they carry on the mission of their parents, who were wounded by the establishment. In the lower left hand cell, in contrast, the ‘anarchic-ideologues’ are disloyal to their parents’ generation, which is identified with the establishment. Through acts of terrorism these anarchic—ideologues strike at the generation of their parents, seeking to heal their inner wounds by attacking the outside enemy. The lower right hand cell does not necessarily represent a subset of terrorist. Although it could be arranged to represent the fundamentalist youth, who have turned from the path of modernizing parents, it could also be said to represent the dynamics of children of anti-regime liberals who, in their own policies, have turned to hard line conservatism. Since we aim to discuss terrorism from a psychological perspective, we would consider on topics such as, military psychiatry and terrorism, psychopathology of terrorism, the psychiatrist and the response to terrorism, terrorist personality, psychodynamic or psychopathological approaches to terrorist leaders, to see how all these form the causes of terrorism and also see how the problem from the psychological perspective can be dealt with.
Moghaddam designs a pathway metaphor in favour of a “Staircase to Terrorism”. The Staircase has six floors “characterized by particular psychological processes”.

On the first floor we find individuals who perceive that they do not have any option for mobility and that they cannot participate in the political decision-making process may then displace the blame to an ‘other’.

On the second floor we find individuals who after residing on the first floor for quite a long time become aware of the right place to go to and it is then that they join different terrorist organizations.

On the third floor of Moghaddam’s staircase reside those who exist in a parallel or shadow world, with a parallel morality.

Fourth floor is that floor where assimilation in the secret life and structure of the organization, and socialization into its mores, promotes an in-group or out-group, us-versus-them dichotomy (Post, 1984; Crenshaw, 1988; della Porta, 1992), reminiscent of the polarization experienced by societies in times of war. The clandestine nature of the group fosters isolation from the mainstream social and political environments, and individuals can lose the sense of reality of the world outside the group.

The fifth and the last step provide the individual with the cognitive resources necessary to carry out the terrorist acts which otherwise is not that easy even for the terrorists.

Military Psychiatry and Terrorism — Modern Terrorism and Future Trends

Basically the terrorist methods are implemented where there is an imbalance of power between two antagonists. It is a weapon used by the weak (few) against the many or strong for a change, where the terrorist’s real strength lies in the ruthless, recklessness of his own acts, or in case of psychotic terrorist, on the extent of his mental derangement.

It is important to understand the essentially psychological nature of terrorist objectives. The terrorists not only try to show the weakness of the authorities where the latter fail to prevent themselves from the terroristic attack,
but also they want to provoke the defending authorities into taking repressive
countermeasures that will turn the local population and world opinion [through the
media] against the authorities. The terrorists make things even difficult, by
deliberately hiding among and looking like the common people, whom the
government or military is supposed to protect. The terrorists pollute the minds of
the local population against their securities and the local population tend to
believe that their defenders are unworthy of protection.

The high ambiguity elicits misconduct stress behaviour, including
excessive force and brutality, alcohol and drug abuse (as compensatory tension
relievers that further disinhibit the defenders), insubordination, and commission of
atrocities. The mental health team should play a major role in helping command to
protect soldiers against this threat. The issues are discussed in Field Manual 22-51
and in the combat stress control in operations other than war draft white paper.

Terrorism today (as mentioned before) is found in different forms. A
minor form of terrorism, though often having significant financial repercussions,
is the increasing proliferation of computer viruses. Military psychiatry can do very
little over here other than developing perpetrator personality profiles that often
reveal a highly intelligent, narcissistic young adult with an extensive computer
“hacker” background.

Psychopathology of Terrorism

The terrorist groups usually work on some ideologies, but apart from those
ideologies, the political terrorist’s motivation can also be extremely personal. For
e.g. many terrorists are quite paranoid, and their acts are found to be nothing but
expressions of projected hostility supported by reason. True terrorist behaviour
often show an extremely callousness and disregard for the victim and his feelings.
Response from us is what they (the terrorists) want. But an understanding of the
psychology of the terrorists is necessary, while responding to his act.

Again an assessment of mental state, thought processes and personality of
the terrorist will help towards formulating adequate responses in assessing a
terrorist threat. It is in this assessment that the behavioural scientist can be of
assistance.
Often we think that terrorists are insane persons suffering from a psychological disorder, but this thought is too generalized. There is, however, strong evidence of the paranoid tendency to hold onto over valued ideas (even if mutable) on some political or social issue, which has often subsequently led to the perpetration of terrorist acts.

Above all, only a few terrorists would push their demands, to the extent that they may have to end up paying their own lives. For example, such incidents are truly found where a suicidal fanatic drove a truck loaded with explosives into the military barracks in Beirut.

The Psychiatrist and the Response to Terrorism

Here the role of psychiatrists is a little more challenging. For as compared to their normal treatment with patients, they become a part of law enforcement team to probe the psychopathy of a terrorist or a terrorist group, to assist in threat evaluation and to give necessary advice during negotiations.

As a rule it would not be expected that psychiatrists or other mental health professionals would take a cultural and dramatic role in a terrorist and or hostage holding incident, except in cases in which the psychiatrist has had previous professional involvement with the terrorist or when negotiations have reached the stage at which further rapport with the terrorist is thought to be possible via the psychiatrist. In spite of such previous experiences, the psychiatrist must remain sensitive to the personalities and dynamics of situation and guard against an undue identification with the interest of the terrorist. When asked to comment, they must not talk in technical jargon that may prove incomprehensible or objectionable to police or military personnel.

The participatory roles therefore, suggested for the psychiatrist are discussed below:

Police and Military Training

The psychiatrist may help in curriculum design and provide lectures involving topics such as the psychopathology of terrorist violence, reactions to stress, methods of coping under the stress of terrorist acts, captor-hostage
relationships; threat evaluation and negotiation techniques. The psychiatrist himself should have gone through such training courses to gain insight into problems for which he might be asked to find solutions.

**Threat Analysis**

In this case, the psychiatrist is a part of a multidisciplinary team drawn together to assess the credibility and seriousness of a threat of impending violence. Here his contribution will be related to the field of forensic psychiatry and profiling of the suspect.

**Negotiations with suspects (from a psychological aspect)**

The psychiatrists are not assumed to be trained as much as a law enforcement officer, in the field of negotiating, in a hostage holding incident. Thus here the psychiatrist should hold the position of an adviser to the main negotiator. During the course of negotiations, the psychiatrist should, on the one hand, be able to detect the effects of long-drawn negotiations, as the main negotiator and he should also advise on remedial actions. On the other hand, he should prescribe medicines for stress-reactions or somatic disorders for hostages and possibly anti-psychotic medications for hostage takers. He can also play a role in post-traumatic operations of the surviving victims and families of the affected (to stop creating further more terrorists, from such a stock). The psychiatrist may also be called on to comment on performance of personnel placed under stress and to work out measures for improving his performance.

**Medulla, Cortex, Epicortex**

In the book *Understanding The Militant's Mind*, by Goel and Dr. Saldhanna we find that the terrorists have been classified into three groups on the basis of their mental makeup. They are as follows:

**Medulla**: This is the inner core of all terrorist organization. This classification consists of hardcore anti-social, sociopaths who have an innate criminal disposition, in whom we find total absence of the feeling of guilt. When we talk about transformation of the terrorists, then it is almost impossible to change these terrorists to normal human beings, as they form the core.
Cortex: This group usually consists of the romantic idealists. They are found to be highly academic but they are emotionally unstable people, always found with an ego or complex that they are being neglected or hurt by others. Many of them have undergone childhood trauma and hence have formed terrorist. This is an insecure group always protecting themselves from any kind of danger – hence they land up acquiring rifles in their hands, which bring in them a feeling of self-empowerment.

Epicortex: It consists of people whose lives are subject to mere boredom and uneventfulness. They can be easily moulded and converted to normalcy, as they were once moulded into hardcore criminals, without much difficulty. Some of them also surrender to the government. The government can be suggested to capture the present militants through the surrendered ones.

The Terrorist Personality

Now, the question arises, is there a ‘terrorist personality’? Even if one assumes that the Russian terrorists of the 1880 shared with each other many common characteristic features, an assumption that by no means can be taken for granted, — they had little in common with the Irish; and the Irish were quite different from the Americans, not to mention ‘Abu Nidal’ 3. Although men and women, at certain times and in various places, have engaged in political-violence, throwing bombs and firing pistols, this feature does not necessarily prove that they had more in common with one another than with rose growers or stamp collectors. Generalizations are of limited validity, because much depends on the political and social conditions in which terrorism occurs, the historical and cultural context, the purpose and character of the terror and, of course, its targets. Seen in this light no two terrorist movements can be said to be identical and, in fact, few were even similar.

That their members have been young is the only feature common to all terrorist movements, and that hardly requires explanation. The latest calls to action do not usually fire the middle-aged and elderly with enthusiasm. And daring attacks also necessitate speed of movement which is lacking in the elderly.

The overwhelming majority of active terrorists are in their twenties, and there has been a tendency in particular among the Arab and Iranian groups, to use
The Role of the Leaders of Terrorism

Effective leaders of terrorist organizations must be able to maintain a collective belief system; that is, whatever they want to teach their followers should be confidently imbibed into them by their leaders— even when the leaders themselves know that those teachings are not always correct. For example, the Jihadi leaders who mould their followers by stating that in Quran, Allah has ordered slaughter of all those who belong to any religion other than Islam, actually misinterpret or distort the holy Quran and even the leaders are aware of this truth. But the followers are not well versed with their holy text or many of them do not even know how to read or write hence, they blindly believe in the leaders and follow his instructions dogmatically. This is how a collective belief system of the principle of Quran is formed, the consequence of which is Jihad, which leads to massive destructions of the entire world. The leaders of terrorist groups should be good administrators and should be able to establish and maintain organizational routines well for a proper coordination of the group. They should also have the gift of the gab, i.e., they usually possess an art of oratory which is not possible without wit. Now many followers, before being completely brainwashed by these leaders, might doubt them and may question them in many ways, initially. The leaders should be ready with convincing replies to such questions and, many a time, they should be able to control their flow of communication too. These leaders have a ‘charisma’ which brings them a lot of followers, who are magnetically attracted to them and follow whatever they say and can also surrender their lives for them. Hence by virtue of such charisma, they not only attract followers but also manipulate them, such as manipulate incentives (and purposive goals) for followers. As and when required, they also deflect conflict to external targets and, finally, with all their efficiency and intelligence keep the actions going. It has to be noted here, that not all terrorist commanders are psychologically impaired as, in that case, their dynamism and effective team work would have been impossible with such mental illness. But usually most of the leaders (as Bin Laden has been reported to be) are: - “malignant”,

boys aged between fourteen and fifteen, for dangerous missions—partly because they are less likely to question instructions, but also because they are less likely to attract attention.
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"narcissistic". So also are those people who cannot understand things and the world beyond their own constricted lens. Moreover they have a particular psychology which forces them to think that they cannot do anything wrong. So, according to them, whatever they have done or are doing or would do — would be always correct. They would always magnify other’s mistakes but they themselves think they are infallible. Since they are so sure of their acts, they can transfer them to their followers and can thus pressurise them to execute such ‘always-correct’ acts, against all wrong deeds of the society. Last, but not the least, these leaders should be well informed, technologically and scientifically sound with the necessary education.

Thus, these leaders are those who have a charm to flock people around them, can easily gain their confidence and are able to manipulate people’s emotions. For example, Hitler who is well known for his tirades. Since they are difficult to resist, and are able to intimidate they play a very important role in making thousands of men, whose internal brutality is unravelled and exposed by their leaders — leading to the massive loss of the society that we witness today.

So long we have discussed the psychological conditions behind the rise of terrorists. The psycho-social condition of terrorism can be explained by a clash of interest — social, religious, political or all combined together — over a constant period of time creating tension, leading to a feeling of irrevocability, inescapability — all of which create a situation when overt violent actions brings out the inner tension. When this is severe, and of a devastating nature, this sounds the advent of terrorism.

Let us now turn to the second set of causes of terrorism.

3.2 Politico-Social Conditions of Terrorism:

In most of the cases it is found that the uprisal of terrorism is a result of fulfilment of politico-social conditions. Hence, such causes cannot be ignored. Terrorism always has an objective which is politico-social in nature, conceptual (so that it can be achieved, for example, political aim), a target which is material (so that it can be attacked) and a method which has to be effective (so that it causes panic, fear, disgust and concern among the general audience) and, in turn, coerce the government (so as to eventually yield resultant success for the
perpetrators). On the basis of such observations on terrorism, it can be regarded as a low-level conflict having marginal support of the general public.

We would now make an effort to map the five general politico-social causes which produce the contemporary terrorist instances all over the world. Such causes are as follows:

(a) **State Conspiracy:** Terrorism often results from the conspiracy conducted by some powerful states for their own benefit. Such a conspiracy theory views terrorism as a singular event and speculate a common hidden hand which does all the operation from behind. Claine Sterling, in her book *The Terror Network* presumes that the ‘hidden hand’ behind the terrorist activities in the 1970’s was none other than the Soviet Union along with Cuba and Libya. She gives various evidences in this regard and claims that, Moscow was linked directly or indirectly to a variety of Palestinian groups, the Baader-Meinhof group of West Germany, the Red Brigades in Italy, and ETA in Spain, the provisional IRA in Northern Ireland, and others. During that time, Sterling observed that, the master mind behind terrorist activities was Soviet Union and such activities were directed against the West. Other views blame Washington and other American Central Intelligence Agency for making plans aimed at establishing world domination regarding oil resources, economy and power.

(b) **Moral degradation of the Society** is another reason for such wide spread terrorism. Such a void according to some sociologists, may be due to psychological failing of the terrorists or to the permissive society may be blamed, which creates the basis for such lack of restraint. However, such a moral breakdown can also be a product of moral choice of the people living in a particular society. Globalisation, industrialisation and rapid success create a competitive nature leading to immense greed in the minds of people which break their moral shackles.

c) **Desire for revenge:** Many terrorist attacks of the later 20th century and early 21st century might have been caused for a desire for revenge. Martha Crenshaw and Alek P. Schmid cite various examples in support of this view. They say that the anarchist violence of the 1890s was caused by to
vengeance. The development of terrorism in West Germany was a result of unprovoked killing of a student demonstrator by the police in 1967. In 1981, a few American terrorist groups had attacked targets to take revenge for Turkish massacres that had happened over 65 years ago.

The attack initiated by Osama and his group Al-Qaeda upon WTC was also a revenge staged against U.S.A. for the constant problems it created in Middle East (though the aspect of industrial and economic sabotage cannot be totally ruled out).

Here an important question arises: Do the terrorists take only revenge against those who make them suffer? The answer is in negation, as they also kill the innocents who have done no harm to the terrorists who had once suffered. The common people of those regions suffer too. Thus when they attack their direct targets, i.e., any particular government of a country, the terrorists also make the citizens of the country suffer due to their actions, for it is only then that their revenge becomes complete.

The question arises is it possible to achieve any positive goal by such hatred and vindictive methods. Terrorism ‘from below’ claims to associate itself with some ideology — but what sort of ideology does an act of revenge relate itself to?

(d) **Denial or participation in authority**: Here we would have to see what kind of authority we are talking about. In the present times, authority is viewed as something to be earned. Authority without coercion can only be sustained on the basis of continuous renewed consensus, which requires participation (not always active) of all. When such participation is denied, the authority may be challenged. When a group of individuals feel that they have no other method to make their voices heard, they opt for terrorism as available means to fight such oppression.

(e) **Economic inequality**: We have seen revolution arising from economic inequality right from the time of Marx and Lenin. In fact even before that, constant class struggle was found between the stronger or the more powerful and the weaker (although this inequality was not based on economy but was based on power). Thus whenever there is an inequality,
the notion of superior and inferior creeps in leading to an inevitable clash between the two. In today's society, often men are prominently distinguished from each other on the basis of how much wealth each possesses. Johan Gutting proposes the idea that, the rich and the developed successfully dominate the Third World countries. This shows how the seed of imperialism is planted. In West Germany RAF's political aim is stated as an opposition to American Imperialism. It describes its activities as 'the anti-imperialist struggle', which means annihilation, destruction and the shattering of the imperialist power system.

In world trade policy it is noticed that some nations, which are economically weaker than the others, take economic help from the sounder ones but, at the same time they become subject to reciprocal obligations. At this juncture the patrons rather than the states, regulate economic cooperation, as a form of reciprocation. And the state in its turn has to keep on pleasing these patrons by giving them gifts or whatever help they want in order to get protection from them. Patrons such as lords, dons, uncles and mafias receive gifts and other favours from their clients as expression of loyalty in exchange for life-long protection. This is particularly found in clientist economy. In market economies, in contrast, the mutual obligation of cooperating parties is made explicit in the forms of contracts. All societies have a combination of both clientist and market economy. Whenever there is a shift in the economic structure of the society, those on the lowest rung on the economic ladder are the most vulnerable to the negative consequences of such a shift. In these times leaders arrive to motivate these underprivileged sects with some anti-market ideology.

For example, Islam itself is not responsible for the social approval of terror. Patrons fearing the loss of their privileged status—such as Laden, found an anti-market ideology useful to attract followers. They manipulate Islamism to serve their own ends; just like their counterpart in Europe did a century ago by contorting Christianity to justify terror and mass murder. Thus they use religion not for the sake of loving or upholding their religion, but to serve their own selfish purposes.
(f) **Failure of Mass Movement:** Richard Rubenstein argues that terrorism, in today's world, is caused also by failure of mass political movements. He puts forward three arguments for the creation of the conditions of terrorism—

(a) The growth in the size of intelligentsia;

(b) The shattering of its hope for social transformation and (c) the absence of weakness of mass parties capable of engaging its energies or commitment in a socially useful role.

(g) **Mass participation in Politics:** A theory mostly believed by the communists states that, as more and more people take part in politics, a democratization of violence is found to occur— which is a symptom of terrorism. Ordinary citizens resort to violence more easily as they are denied of social hierarchy and are easily influenced by the local power holders and also by other aspects of industrial and post-industrial society, such as the anonymity of modern cities, providing a safe haven to the terrorists, access to transportation, communication etc.

(h) **Ideologies of anarchists and Marxists:** Some hold the view that the terrorists borrow their ideology from the of anarchists and the Marxists. It is seen the writings of Michael Bakunin and Sergei Nechayev have influenced modern terrorism the most, and the methods adopted by Kropotkin and other anarchists have become popular for their subtle effects on the masses and therefore on the government.

Albert Camus; in the book The Rebel(Penguin Books, England—1967 P.132) shows how Nechayev justified that violence which is done to one’s own people in the name of service of the community of the oppressed. Revolution was the sole value for him, where every act was guided by the sense of duty. In an answer to the question whether it was right, have to take a man’s life, Nachayev replied that, it is not a question of right, but that of our duty of eliminating everything that may harm our cause. For such elimination he recommended every means such as, assassinating ministers and generals, robbing and killing the rich,
destroying state property, blackmailing influential people etc. Marxism also recommends violent means to attain revolutionary goals. This view was supported by Lenin by the renowned syndicalist George Sorel, and many other likeminded thinkers of the time. Jean Paul Sartre, the eminent existentialist, also supported violence as a means of social change. For all of them violence did not only aim at the end of a system but also at social development.

(i) **As a substitute for conventional war**: R.M. Hare explains terrorism as an unconventional war in his paper “On Terrorism” and presumes that people, who cannot take part in conventional wars, take up terrorism as it is more economical than a full fledged war.

(j) **Terrorism is also caused as an act of self assertion**: C.A.J. Coady in the book, ‘The Morality Of Terrorism’ (published at University of Liverpool in 1985;) is found to have speculated that sometimes revolutionary terrorism is employed not to achieve some definite as an aberrational end-in-itself, but a piece of powerful symbolism, an act of self assertion. It takes place as a result of the terrorist’s wish to show earnestness about their independence. For example, the Puerto Rican terrorists who sought independence of Puerto Rica from the United States were motivated by such an ideology. Many terrorist groups had massacred much of the U.S. party and people during 1981.

(k) **Terrorism also emerged due to fight against communism**: Charles P. Monroe, in his article “Addressing Terrorism in the United States” mentions a few more causes of terrorism. The activities of the Cuban anti-Castro terrorism in 1981 were carried out for the purpose of fighting communism. The Cuban Nationalist movement targeted the Mexican consulates of Miami and New York, but failed to yield any result. Again, the Aldo Moro murder in Italy in 1978 by the Italian Red Brigades was committed as a reaction to Moro’s effort to bring the powerful Italian Communist Party into the government.
(l) **Racist Ideologies**: Much of terrorism has been based on racist ideologies. For example, the Klu Klux Klan, an American hate group targeted minorities (namely blacks and Asians; i.e., other than white people) since 19th century, because they believed that the blacks Asians do not have a right to live in the society. Again such domination was found by the ‘Thakurs’ in some parts of India, upon the ‘Dalits’ or the lower classes.

(m) **Terrorism is also caused as an instrument to implement foreign policy.** Terrorism is caused by the nation-state as an instrument to implement the foreign policies effectively. Such states seek to realize their goals through the use of various instrumentalities like propaganda, adherence to international law, membership of international organization, economic aid, military assistance, diplomacy and war. History proves that during the time of conflict between nations these conventional instruments often fail to achieve their foreign policy objectives. Under such circumstances, terrorism emerges as the most viable alternative course of action. Since the Second World War the super powers, i.e., the U.S., the former Soviet Union and China extensively used terrorism as an instrument to implement their foreign policy.

These are mainly the politico-social causes which may be said to give rise to the notion of terrorism.

### 3.3 Religious Cause of Terrorism

After mentioning the two major causes of terrorism we would like to discuss the third most important cause, which has become ‘the cause’ of contemporary international terrorism. This is the ‘religious cause’. Today in the name of religion people kill one another. There are several religions in this world; if each one claims its own superiority over the others, then a conflict is inevitable. Some religions believe in ‘live and let live’ policy, where as some give space to other religions too. Some again embrace all the other religions as they believe that ultimately the message of all religions is the same, i.e., all of them, in whichever form and name, would take us to the same state of bliss and eternal peace, and once we reach there salvation would certainly occur. But in this world there are some religions which believe only in one God or in one Super Natural Power and
reject the Gods of other religions. These religious actually forget that all the ‘Gods’ talk about in the other religions are merely different names of the same infinite, supreme being. They think that their God is the supreme, the absolute most and thus all men should be subservient to Him. Any man who would not follow the orders of that particular God or of that particular religion would be treated as a traitor (as he fails to serve Him) and thus would have no right to live on this earth. They believe (though wrongly) that it is their God’s order to spread His teachings to all fellowmen, and also that their religion should be followed world wide as instructed by their God. Hence they kill those who belonging to other religions, thinking that they do not following God’s will and His orders. But can the Supreme Divine who serves good of all, be so mean — such that He would order to take lives of those who are not slaves to Him? These religious fundamentalists actually do not understand their religion well, or they have purposefully distorted the notion for their own benefits, in order to be the only ruling power in this world and hence the terrorism that they carry out by slaughtering all others from other religions cannot be justified.

Thus a tolerance is highly suggested among the people to aspire for a unity in diversity and also for a peaceful co-existence of ‘human beings’, not merely co-existence of ‘religions’. The religious fanatics creating international terrorism do so because there is a major clash with their religion and other prominent and popular religions of the world, and such a clash is found due to the great diversities between the two religions, where one is conservative and the other is libertarian in nature. In this war of terrorism, one tries to reduce the other into its own religion or tries to change the other — but both being rigid in their own positions, such a change is next to impossible and hence, so many innocent lives are sacrificed for their meaningless never ending religious war. The Islamic world versus the U.S is an example of religious terrorism where the former represents the conservatives and the latter the libertarians.

3.4 Having considered the psychological, politico-social and religious causes behind terrorism, we would now turn to consider the supposed causes for contemporary terrorism found in our very own country — India.
Ethnic causes: Such causes are evident in Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur, also the hells of West Bengal (Gorkhaland). These have led to movements to establish separate homeland states.

Religious fundamentalism: Played a major role in terrorist activities in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir leading to selective killings of members of a particular religious community.

Political Cause: Political reason also plays a significant role in terrorist activities in Assam and Tripura. Large scale migration from Bangladesh led to a change in the composition of the population in these states. The segment of population that lost out politically as well as economically because of this altered ratio reacted with violence. The conflict in J&K is also in part politically motivated, by rival groups supporting the status quo against those who wanted to separate state or incorporate into Pakistan. Some terrorist groups operating in Jammu and Kashmir are often linked to Al-Qaeda and, in recent times, have carried out terrorist attacks in several regions (in New Delhi and Mumbai, especially the Lashkar-e-Taiba militant group).

Economic causes: Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Jharkhand and Bihar are prime examples of economically based terrorism. Economic inequality, lack of development, non-implementation of land reforms are all reasons for the alienation of various groups of especially lower caste people in those states. In this context an alternative political and social system is put forward by leftist – Maoist organizations, generally termed as ‘Naxalites’, has gained acceptance in some quarters.

3.5 Apart from analysing the causes of terrorism we must also consider seriously why terrorism persists. Analysis of the causes of terrorist tactics cannot always explain why terrorism has often persisted when the returns to terrorist actions are declining. There are mainly five factors behind such endurance. First, once a terrorist is implicated in such an act, no longer has he an option to freely join the legitimate group. Second, as Fanon (1968) notes, great psychological barriers must be overcome before someone can terrorize others. But the second time is much easier than the first. So as time goes on, the psychical costs of
perpetrating terrorist acts go down, hence their job becomes smoother. Thus longer they are in the group more expert would they become in their job. Third, if a leadership group plots a terrorist cause, its organizational culture becomes set for future terrorist plans, as Sprinzak (1990) identifies in the left-wing militant organization in the United States. Thus any organization that chooses terrorist tactics will have a difficult time changing its repertoire (Wieviorka 1993, 53-54). Fourth, if funding depends on clear examples of success, a tactical shift towards peaceful negotiation dries up funds from regular contributors (Crenshaw 1991). Fifth, membership in terrorist organization offers a life style that is often more exciting and meaningful than participants’ other options.

For these reasons terrorism seems to persist even among all odds. Let us discuss the upcoming notion of ‘diaspora’ which seems to be another important cause of terrorism in today’s world.

Since the 1990 – parallel to the boom of transnationalism studies – there has been a proliferation of literature and a mushrooming of interest, among members of ethnic minority groups as well as among academics, surrounding the notion of ‘diaspora’. Historians and social scientists describe myriad facets of diaspora, while an ever-increasing number of self-conscious communities call themselves diasporas. The term “diaspora” has been arguably associated with suffering, loss and victimization.

The contemporary common use of the word ‘diaspora’ which links the word to the experience of the Jewish people in their exile to Babylon and their dispersion throughout the Mediterranean world, is too exclusive an application. Viewed as a mass migration or movement or flight from the location or locations, diaspora can be viewed as an event in the history of several people to antiquity. Clearly the fact of dispersion and its many consequences have been an experience of many people, ancient and modern. Major issues for investigation include the question of whether, and how, those ‘dispersed’ people maintain a sense of self-identity and a measure of communal cohesion. The central question of diaspora people is adaptation: how to adapt to the environment without surrendering group identity. These difficulties faced by diaspora communities of antiquity are still apparent in modern times.
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Common features of a diaspora which help us to understand how and why they become terrorists:

1. Dispersal from an original homeland, often traumatically, to two or more foreign regions;
2. Alternatively, the expansion from a homeland in search of work, in pursuit of trade or to further colonial ambitions;
3. A collective memory and myth about the homeland, including its location, history and achievements;
4. An idealisation of the putative ancestral home and a collective commitment to its maintenance, restoration, safety and prosperity, even to its creation;
5. The development of a return movement that gains a collective approbation;
6. A strong ethnic group consciousness sustained over a long time and based on a sense of distinctiveness, a common history and the belief in a common fate;
7. A troubled relationship with host societies, suggesting a lack of acceptance at the least or the possibility that another calamity might befall the group;
8. A sense of empathy and solidarity with co-ethnic members in other countries of settlement; and
9. The possibility of a distinctive, creative, enriching life in host countries with a tolerance for pluralism.

These are not only the causes of the formation of the notion of 'diaspora', but they are also causes of contemporary terrorism. The revenge or aggression of the so-called diaspora leads to terrorism of modern times. Their causes, however, cannot be overlooked, while discussing terrorism.

We have so long considered certain causes of the most discussed phenomenon of today. Let us now see how relevant they are or how and whether they are actually related to the spread of terrorism.
3.7 Assessing the threat

It is found that the data about terrorism are notoriously weak, and those analyses of its causes are controversial. Thus it has been a part of challenge for the international community to find a single explanation for this widely diverse phenomenon. Unless they can pin-point the cause, they cannot combat the threat. Terrorism ranges from, for example, the radical Salafist Wahabi (an arch conservative brand of Islam), Extremist Al Qaeda practices on a global scale to the targeted Maoist terrorism and the Naxalities in India’s northern provinces. Just as war takes myriad forms with diverse causes (such as great power, interstate, internal, irredentist, and separatist), terrorism takes many forms for which there is no prior reason to assume that there is the same cause.

Moreover, efforts to explain terrorism must account for the attitudes and actions of distinct sects of actors: the senior leadership of a terrorist organizations its henchman, especially, those who engage in operations, and its supporters within a population, or state sponsors. The motivations of these groups can differ within a given terrorist campaign. Iran’s motives in supporting Hamas separations in Gaza, for example, are evidently grounded in efforts to combat U.S influence in the religion. The leadership of Hamas itself, however, has been primarily motivated by the desire to be seen as leading the Palestinian national struggle in a fight against Israel.

Meanwhile, operatives join for a combination of reasons, including feelings of humiliation and rage about the occupation, lack of future prospects, and incentives created in the form of substantial monetary payments to families of “martyrs”. Popular support for the Hamas has numerous sources, but seems particularly influenced by disaffection with the corruption and ineffectiveness of the Palestinian authority.

Various causes or factors that influence those actors.

Does poverty really cause terrorism? If it did, then terrorism would be prevalent only in the third world and would be rare in the rich countries. But it is found that every single organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) country has experienced terrorism, both home grown and imported, while only a fraction of less-developed countries have been victimized in the
contemporary period. However, terrorism is closely associated with middle-income countries. Moreover repeated studies have shown that the terrorist leaders and even terrorist operatives tend to be better educated and have higher income than average. Nevertheless, in some cases (Nepal, for example), poverty and inequality — and marginalization from a political process — appear to contribute to popular support for terrorist organization.

Does religion drive terrorism? Survey data covering 90% of world’s Muslim population indicate that it does not, although we, the common men, have the notion that religion is the ‘cause’ of contemporary terrorism. Politics, not religion, seems to be the driver of terrorist actions, even among Salafist Communities.

Religion does not explain who is a radical or who is a moderate. Those who condone the 9/11 attacks did so on the basis of politics. Many of those who condemned the attacks did so on religious grounds. At least some of the Al-Qaeda leadership does appear to be genuinely motivated by ‘religious beliefs’. There is however, a need for a great deal of causation on this point. To describe Salafist Wahhabism (which is dominant in Saudi Arabia and among the Al-Qaeda leadership) as a cause of terrorism is to profoundly overstate the point and to neglect the tens of millions of Wahhabis, including Salafists, who are not involved with terrorism in any way. Similarly, the Palestinian population’s support for Hamas increased between 2005 and 2006, not because Palestinians became more religious or more extreme in their religious views, but because Hamas appeared less corrupt and more credible than the Palestinian Authority, which had lost the popular confidence that it could either govern or negotiate with Israel effectively. Iraquis and Aubar province initially supported Al Qaeda as a counter to the US occupation, and then withdrew their support when confronted with the realities of Al Qaeda’s brutality; neither support nor loss of support rested on religious issues.

Next, it can be questioned, does the denial of human rights contribute to terrorism? Perhaps partly. Recent evidence suggests that in the current wave of terrorism, a high percentage of terrorist leaders and activists come from countries with limited political freedom. In this regard, the fact that much contemporary terrorism emanates from Middle East, the region with the lowest scores on civil rights, including terms of recruitment for Al Qaeda, the Muslim brotherhood, and
other regional network. But how do human rights issues explain the participation of second generation Muslim in terrorist attacks in London or Madrid? Or participation in the Baader – Meinhof Gang, which terrorized Germany from 1968-1977?

Does military occupation cause terrorism? There is strong support for this argument. A very high correlation is seen between large-scale suicide terrorist campaigns and foreign occupation of territory – in, for example, the Palestinian terrorists, Iraq and Sri Lanka – irrespective of the religion or of the group involved. On the other hand, Columbia group waged terrorist campaigns for decades with no reference to any question of occupation. Nor can question of occupation explain attacks linked to Al-Qaeda in Jordan or Turkey.

Now, knowing these variations in the causes of terrorism, counter-terrorism strategies must be tailored to the specific realities of distinct terrorist networks or are different. Terrorism in East Asia, for example, is primarily linked to ethno nationalist struggles and religious minorities (as in Thailand and the Philippines). Along India’s northern border, terrorist activities are associated with leftist-ideologies, underdevelopment and exclusion (as in Nepal, Assam and Bangladesh).

Complicating this divergence is evidence of sporadic tactical cooperation between a subset of these diverge groups and Al Qaeda. In some instances, such as the Bali bombing by Jemaah Islamiyah, evidence points to direct tactical cooperation between the two outfits. On the other hand, no evidence of such cooperation was found between Al Qaeda and local groups involved in the Madrid train bombings. In that case, Al Qaeda appears to have provided inspiration instead of operational support.

In addition to the points mentioned above, I would like to add here that most of the disasters which have occurred to this day are due to scientific and economic development of the nations. With advancement of science newer commodities are manufactured, more and more factories are built leading to emission of unwanted chemicals in the environment creating bio hazards. Hence natural calamities such as earthquakes, tsunamis, tornadoes have increased. Man-made hazards are also due to capitalization or gathering wealth by some sects by
depriving the others and hence the others turn against in the form of revolution. Thus both natural and man-made disasters are caused due to men’s comfortable lifestyles which give rise to fatal consequences. The solution is not stoppage of growth of industrial and scientific development of any nation; rather with scientific development, the nation, should also progress in spiritual development, which would perhaps inculcate humanitarianism in men and hence this would stop them being enemies of both nature and of other human beings. The problem is that the underdeveloped nations are full of slums (indicating poverty) whereas the developed ones are full of scams (indicating misuse of wealth and corruption). A balance between the two can only be brought about by spiritualism or care and compassion shown to the others. And men must give a serious thought in this direction.

So if properly identified then the major cause of terrorism is that some individuals become so dissatisfied with their situation on the ground floor, because they suffer from an inadequate sense of identity, or feel that they are being treated unfairly, or perceive their material conditions to be too impoverished, or a combination of all three, that they start fighting to climb up to the higher floors.

The “staircase metaphor” suggests that the best strategies for dealing with terrorism should be long term and focused on the ground floor, to prevent individuals from starting the fight to climb upwards by removing the existing residents. They try to climb upwards because they are deprived at downstairs. The government should try to look after the improvement of such minorities at the grass root level instead of involving themselves with those at the top floors.

3.8 In all our discussion of terrorism, it is seen that there is one group who kills and the other group who gets killed by the former. The killer group is known as the terrorists. But we need to know the reason why do the killers kill?

- **Coercion by leaders:** During the Holocaust, the German perpetrator were ever killed, sent to a concentration camp, imprisoned or punished in a serious way for refusing to kill Jews.

- **Authority** is a second notion commonly invoked to account for how people who supposedly do not believe that the victims deserve to die will none the
less kill them. Authority including governmental authority, orders, and policies, is contested all the time, at all levels, by societies as a whole, groups within societies including insurgent groups, and individuals – those who would overthrow the authority or who disagree with specific policies.

- **Peer-pressure** implodes on itself a general explanation of mass killing. It cannot possibly explain why the perpetrators in general kill their victims. Almost it might provide clues about the conduct of disapproving individuals finding themselves surrounded by willing killers who furthermore create intolerance against dissenters.

- Another claim about what moves the perpetrators to kill holds that they **personally benefit from killing**, so much so that they are even led to murder, men, women and children whom they have no reason to think that they deserve to die. In many cases the victims' homes and possessions are taken after they are killed. Who would expect the many perpetrators, especially in poor countries to, like ascetic monks, turn their backs on the possessions of people they had just killed?

- Lastly it can be said that much of killing is found in this world because in **every man a Satan resides**. Brutality is found in human nature; in some it is active, in others dormant. Killing is actually enjoyable. The heart of darkness lurks within us, waiting to impress its most murderous self.

Now that we have come to learn the probable causes of terrorism, in later chapters we would also make an attempt to discuss the probable solutions to these problems.
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