

First Steps of Young Scientists

Concept of Terrorism in International Relations

Sophio Barbakadze
The University of Georgia

Terrorism is already recognized as a main threat to the international system in the XXI century, rightly compared with the Cold War problem in the 20th century. After the notorious 9/11 events, the issue of terrorism has prevailed over such serious problems as proliferation, organized crime, etc. Thus study of terrorism is increasingly becoming one of the most challenging activities. Terrorism is an extremely complicated phenomenon, making its study quite difficult. The scholars need to count with a variety of details, often leading them to confusion. Thus a number of directions for study of terrorism had been singled out, including definition of the concept itself; history of terrorism; theoretical explanation of terrorism; and finally-the various forms of terrorism.

ტერორიზმის ცნება საერთაშორისო ურთიერთობებში

სოფიო ბარბაკაძე
საქართველოს უნივერსიტეტი

ტერორიზმის თემა 21-ე საუკუნის მსოფლიოში თავისი მნიშვნელობით პირველ ადგილზე დგას. ეს ის საკითხია, რომელიც თავისი აქტუალობით ცივი ომის დროს არსებულ საფრთხეს უტოლდება. 2001 წლის 11 სექტემბრის ცნობილი მოვლენების შემდეგ, ტერორიზმის თემა უკან ჩამოიჭრა ისეთი საკითხები, როგორებიცაა მასობრივი განადგურების იარაღის გავრცელება, ორგანიზებული დანაშაული, და სხვა პრობლემები. ტერორიზმი რთული და მრავალმხრივი მოვლენაა, რაც საკმაოდ აძნელებს მის მეცნიერულ შესწავლას. ტერორიზმის შესწავლის პროცესში განსაკუთრებული მნიშვნელობა ენიჭება ისეთ საკითხებს, როგორებიცაა მოცემული ცნების განსაზღვრება; ტერორიზმის ისტორია; ტერორიზმის წარმოშობის შესახებ არსებული თეორიები; და ბოლოს-ტერორიზმის სხვადასხვა ფორმა.

The problem of terrorism has already been identified as the main threat of the beginning 21st century. The problem has become so sheer, that many experts equalize it with the danger the Cold War was posing to the security and stability of the international system in the 20th century. After the notorious 9/11 the problem of terrorism has overwhelmed the society leaving such serious questions as the proliferation and organized crime far behind. Terrorism has indeed become the main threat to international system in the 21st century, respectively, studying this global phenomenon is receiving more and more scholarly attention recently.

The concept of terrorism is quite complex and manifold, making its study quite complicated. This fact is partially explaining why most authors try to concentrate their attention only on some specific aspect of terrorism. Some of the most frequently studied aspects are as follows: defining the concept of terrorism; history of terrorism; theories explaining terrorism; various forms of terrorism.

Defining Terrorism

The term "terrorism" has developed from the French "*terreur*" (terror) and has first been used in the period after the French Revolution in 1789.

The application of the term "terrorism" is quite controversial, as it can be easily used to designate the violence sponsored by the state, as well as the violence applied against the state. Although the consensus over this issue has not been yet reached, the definition of terrorism mostly agreed upon is as follows: terrorism is an act of using violence against the civilians or the threat to do so, having some sort of political, economic or social changes in mind (Martin, 2004).

Defining terrorism may be much more difficult then it seems from the first sight. "The statement, "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter," has become not only a cliché, but also one of the most difficult obstacles in coping with terrorism" (Ganor, 2008). Before we begin the task of defining terrorism, we should note, that all of the authors dealing with this issue admit the tremendous difficulty of the task. Moreover, some of the experts try to avoid difficulties by making their definitions as short as possible. As the expert of international relations, Martha Crenshaw (2002) puts it in her article *the Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism*: "Unfortunately, most of the researches dealing with the internal conflicts, avoid the broad definition of terror and terrorism, limiting themselves to simple definitions." Despite the main trend, a handful of authors are bold enough to devote most of their at-

tention to this specific issue. They try to sum up the existing definitions and make one of their own. One of such authors, Kurt Cronin (2002) defines terrorism as an act of violence, which targets not the people, who are killed or maimed, but the government, the society or a specific group in which the terrorists hope to plant terror or radicalism. The author also admits the fact that although the experts have written hundreds of pages to give an exact definition of terrorism the failure was inevitable- as "terrorism itself is linked to individual perception, thus each person is interpreting it in a different way" (Cronin, 2002).

Still, lets make an overview about the ways terrorism is defined with various authors. One of the important experts in the field, Rohan Gunaratna (2002) gives quite a short definition in his article "International Terrorism სავრთაშორისო ტერორიზმი: როგორი პასუხი უნდა გაეცეს მას? "Although we dont have an universal definition of terrorism, everybody agrees that terrorism is a form of politically motivated violence, or its threat, often chosing non-combatants as its target".

In his book "Understanding International Conflicts" (1997) Joseph Nye gives the following definition of terrorism: "terrorism is the politically motivated action carried out by inter-state groups, as a rule chosing non-combatants as a target." Nye continues by acessing the difficulties connected with defining terrorism and than notes that "According to the Panel set up by the UN Secretary General in 2004- terrorism can be defined as any action directed against civilians and non-combatants, which hopes to achieve its political goals in this way" (Nye, 1997).

Boaz Ganor in his "Is One Man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter?" defines terrorism in the following way: " terrorism is the intentional use of, or threat to use violence against civilians or against civilian targets, in order to attain political aims."

Raymond Duncan in the book "*World Politics in the 21st Century*" (2006) proposes the definition of terrorism, which is almost identical to that of other authors: "terrorism is the form of politically motivated violence, directed against civilians. Terrorists and terrorist groups hope to change the political environment they oppose by force."

Joshua Goldstein also gives a short definition of terrorism in his book "International Relations". "Terrorism is the form of political violence which chooses civilians deliberately... Main aim of terrorism is to demoralize the society, what can be later used against the government or any other side of the conflict."

Martha Crenshaw (2002) gives the following definition of terrorism in her article "the Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism": "Terrorism is one of the

strategies to seize the power in the context of internal conflicts or revolutions, leading to considerable social and political changes if successful. This form of violence is often the main instrument of revolution..."

The article "Defining International Terrorism: Pragmatic Approach" by Thomas Badey (2003) cites definitions given by various authors. He particularly concentrates upon the definition of terrorism given by Professor Alex Schmidt, who in his turn rests upon over 50 authors. Badey reiterates Schmidt's definition, saying "Terrorism is a form of repeated violence which has as its aim to create disorder and anxiety in the society. It may be used both by governments and the (semi-)illegal groups, either for criminal or political goals. However unlike the assassination, the target of terrorism is not the actual victim of the attack. Although most often the direct target of terrorism is random, sometimes it may be symbolic; representing a specific social, political or any other group- in this case the terrorist attack carries a special message to the given group." According to the author, there is a special communication process (based on violence) between the terrorist organization, the victim and the indirect target (the society). The goal of terrorist attack is to manipulate the indirect target either by seeding panic, or by representing its group in the preferable light, depending whether the goal of terrorism is coercion or propaganda.

After discussing definitions of terrorism with different authors, we can single out three important criteria, by which any violent action can be qualified as terrorism: 1. the nature of the action; 2. the direct target; 3. the goals of the action- namely, nature of terrorism is always violent, thus any form of non-violent protest (peaceful demonstrations, strikes, etc.) should not be considered as terrorism. (Ganor, 2008). The direct target of terrorist attack, as it was already noted, is chosen indiscriminately, or sometimes symbolically- as a representative of a given group or society. According to Boaz Ganor (2008) goals of terrorism are always political i.e. the regime-change, changing authorities or the social-economic politics, etc. According to the author, the violent action having no political interests in mind should be considered as a criminal act, not terrorism. The author also notes that some authors name ideological and religious goals besides the political ones... however the concept of "political interests" is broad enough to include both the religious and the ideological concepts. Finally the author concludes, that the ideological or religious motivations lying behind the political interests do not make much difference in determining the concept of terrorism.

History of Terrorism

The origins of terrorism are quite hard to determine, however one thing is clear: “, in some respects, that what is today known as terrorism predates by millennia the modern term used to describe it. This is not to say that the act of terrorism has remained static” (Burgess, 2003). According to the author, the problems connected with defining the term demonstrate how much terrorism has changed its form during the centuries- even if retaining some of its main characteristics.

Origins of terrorism go back to antique times. According to most scholars, the first recorded fact of terrorist attack took place in ancient Judea. “ Among the earliest such examples were the Sicari and the Zealots, Jewish groups active during the Roman occupation of the first century Middle East” (Burgess, 2003). As a rule, the assassinations organized by these groups took place in a crowded place to serve as a signal to the Romans and those who supported them- “ a tactic that would also be used by subsequent generations of what would become known as terrorists”(Burgess, 2003).

The ancient forms of terrorism also was common in India and the muslim world (shortly after Muhammed died). According to Mark Burgess (2003) in the 11th century the Shia muslim sect, named Ismailis/Assasines ruthlessly punished those political and religious figures who refused to accept a new, purified version of Islam. “The Assassins’ deeds were carried out at religious sites on holy days – a tactic intended to publicize their cause and incite others to it. Like many religiously inspired terrorists today, they also viewed their deaths on such operations as sacrificial and a guarantor that they would enter paradise.”(Burgess, 2003). According to James Wilson (2004) Ismailis should be considered as first terrorists for two reasons: “ They did not seek simply to change rulers through murder but to replace a social system by changing an allegedly corrupt Sunni regime into a supposedly ideal Shiite one.” (Wilson, 2004). At the same time, according to the author, the only weapon Assassins used during the attack was a dagger, “that made their capture and execution, often after gruesome torture, inevitable.” While surviving was considered to be a great shame for the attacker.

One ancient form of terrorism was developed in India from the 7th to the 19th centuries. “Sacrifice was also a central element of the killings carried out by the Thugees ... who ritually strangled their victims (usually travelers chosen at random) as an offering to the Hindu goddess of terror and destruction, Kali. In this case, the intent was to terrify the victim (a vital consideration in the Thugee ritual) rather than influence any external audience.”(Burgess, 2003). The Thugees must have murdered approximately

1 million people during centuries. Unlike the later terrorists, they did not pursue any political goals, however like the Assassins, the "Thugees when caught, looked forward to their execution as a quick route to paradise." (Wilson, 2004).

Another predecessor of modern terrorism is considered to be the tyrannicide- or the assassination of the tyrant. "Tyrannicide has traditionally been distinguished from political assassination in terms of the difference between public and private life. Tyrannicide was a self-sacrificing act for public benefit (and so morally esteemed)" (George, 1988). The examples of classical tyrannicide include murder of the tyrant of Athens by Harmodios and Aristogeiton in 514 B.C. According to David George (1988) "The two tyrannicides were revered not only as the liberators of Athens from Peisistratid tyranny but also as the founders of Athenian democracy. As a result, they became the object of a popular, official hero-cult". Another widely known fact of tyrannicide was the murder of Julius the Caesar in Rome (44 B.C.) by Marcus Brutus and Cassius, in the honour of whom the Romans had erected a memorial. In his article "Distinguishing Classical tyrannicide from Modern terrorism" David George (1988) discusses tyrannicide and terrorism as two interconnected but separate phenomena. As the author notes, at some moment in history the classical tyrannicide is finishing and the terrorism begins, however its quite hard to draw a distinct line between the two concepts as most of the historical facts have features of both tyrannicide and terrorism. For example such terrorist attacks as "such as that of Karl Sand on Kotzebue (1819), the attempt on the British Cabinet by the Cato Street conspirators (1820), or Orsini's attack on Napoleon III (1858), were represented and (mis)interpreted in terms of that classical genre of political murder, tyrannicide." (George, 1988) Even Napoleon III during his speech on the National Assembly, qualified the attack against him as tyrannicide. According to the author "In part, this was because terrorists and their supporters sought to justify assassination attempts through appealing to the acknowledged legitimacy of tyrannicide".

The idea of tyrannicide, as an act of sacrifice for the purpose of social benefits was later well-used by terrorists for justification of their goals. Although today the target of terrorism include civilians together with the political figures the arguments stay the same. This is the main subject of the article by James Wilson "What Makes a Terrorist?" (2004), where the author writes: "Terrorism, however motivated, baffles people, because they cannot imagine doing these things themselves. This bafflement often leads us to assume that terrorists are either mentally deranged or products of a hostile environment."

Although today terrorism is associated with the non-governmental organizations, initially terrorism as a term designated the violence committed by the state. The word “terrorism” originated from the French *terreur* (fear) during the years after the French revolution in 1789. The new government installed tried to keep its power by the “mechanism of fear” - i.e. having its own population in constant fear of persecution. Thus in the 18-th century “terrorism” was the violence committed exclusively by a state. “Robespierre’s practice of using revolutionary tribunals as a means of publicizing a prisoner’s fate for broader effect within the population (apart from questions of legal guilt or innocence) can be seen as a nascent example of the much more highly developed, blatant manipulation of media attention by terrorist groups” (Cronin, 2002).

In the period between the French and the Russian revolutions terrorism gradually ceased to be the instrument of states and was more widely introduced in the strategies employed by the inter-state groups. In this period terrorism mainly concentrated on assassinations of public authorities. “Yet it was not until toward the end of the nineteenth century that this novel political phenomenon was correctly labeled and to some extent recognized for what it was” (George, 1988). Even then, it was the Russian revolutionaries who named themselves “terrorists” and described their violent methods as “terrorism”.

The 19th century terrorism on the American continent took quite a different shape from the Europe. While the European terrorism targeted the prominent figures, the American terrorism in the face of Ku Klux Klan directed its aggression against the whole middle and low class. Ku Klux Klan was established by the veterans of the Confederation after the Civil War (1865). The ideological background on the organization included the ideas of “the white supremacy”, anti-Semitism, racism and anti-Catholicism. In the beginning Ku Klux Klan directed its aggression against the Afro-Americans, their supporting whites and the federal government. Soon the list of targets was enriched by the minorities economically challenging the middle and low-class members of the Klan.

After the end of the World War II, when the decolonization process gained the speed, the newly-emerged nationalist movements entered the scene. Here we can take as examples the Basque ETA, the Irish IRA, Fatah, the Islamic Jihad etc. In the second half of the 20th century, both superpowers encouraged dissemination of the ideological terrorism throughout the world including Columbia, Bolivia, West Germany, Nepal, etc.

A new phase in terrorism began from 1964 with the emergence of Palestine Liberation Organization. As the Palestinian people have the respect in

the whole Muslim world, their terrorist activities against Israel are seen by other Muslim nations as an example (Frayman, 1999). The aggression against Israel is described in the PLO proclamation declaring “the right of the Palestinian Arab people to its sacred homeland Palestine and affirming the inevitability of the battle to liberate the usurped part from it, and its determination to bring out its effective revolutionary entity and the mobilization of the capabilities and potentialities and its material, military and spiritual forces” (History of PLO). This proclamation in itself was equal to declaring the holy war. In 1975-1978 the organization planned two attacks against Israel resulting in 50 Israeli casualties. However after the Gulf War, (under the USA pressure) the PLO has made major steps to improve relations with Israel (Nye, 1997).

The new page in history of terrorism was opened by Osama Bin Laden-declared the terrorism number one by the USA. Bin Laden began his career with fighting against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in 1980s. Later he created a pro-Islamic terrorist network, Al-Qaeda. He soon contacted other terrorist organizations operating in the Middle East and thus created a global network. The main goal of the organization was to oust United States from the Middle East and arrange a coup in Saudi Arabia. Bin Laden and his network have organized such attacks as the explosion in the World Trade Center in 1993 in New York, the attack on the National Guards' training center in Saudi Arabia (1995); attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania (1998). Bin Laden together with Sheikh Haled Mohammed has planned and organized the 9/11 attacks. Despite the massive war-on-terror Bin Laden still remains undetained (Biography of Osama Bin Laden).

The United States reacted on the 9/11 events by the “War-on-Terror” which began in a week after the strikes. On 18th of September the US Congress validated the use of force against terrorists, and the large-scale anti-terrorist operation began. The campaign covered the immense territories of Europe, Africa, Central Asia and the Middle East. According to Raymond Duncan (2006) the War on Terror can be divided into four phases. On the first stage the world sided with the US in its war against Talib government- suspected in supporting the 9/11 attacks. On the second stage the world alliance has began to collapse. The United States and its allies began to disagree on the strategic and tactic issues. According to the author the disagreement increased after US declared its decision to strike Iraq as well. This was accompanied by US failure to intervene in the conflict between Israel and Palestine- thus dissatisfying its Muslim allies. On the third stage of the anti-terrorist campaign (January 2002) President George W. Bush articulated the concept of “axis of evil”, having such states as Iran, North Korea and Iraq in mind. According to the pres-

ident, these were the countries that supported and sheltered international terrorism. (Schism between US and its allies kept to increase). On the fourth and the final stage of the campaign US has once again opened itself for cooperation and tried to ratify aggression against Iraq in the Security Council. However in March 2003 US assault against Iraq began while four members of the Council- including Germany, France, China and Russia remained against the war. USA successfully occupied most of the Iraqi territory in a month (Duncan, 2006). It should be noted, that after mobilizing the US forces in Iraq the situation in Afghanistan began to deteriorate.

Thus results of War on Terror are still open to question. All what can be said at the moment is that the threat of terrorism has long been underestimated. Perhaps the most dangerous about terrorism is the fact that it already has become a sort of ideology for some societies, believing the violence to be the only way of preserving their traditional values against the overwhelming forces of globalization.

Theories on Terror

The success in confronting terrorism largely depends on studying the nature and the causes of terrorism. This issue is attracting interest of many experts who try to create a theoretical framework explaining terrorism. The main theories applied to terrorism in international relations include the Structural, The Psychological and the Rational Choice theories. There also exist a number of other, less widely accepted theories such as the Communications Theory, Conspiracy Theory, etc.

According to the *Structural Theory* terrorism is caused by the specific social, political, economic and cultural environment existing in various societies. *The Psychological Theory* on the other hand, tries to discover the factors which induce an ordinary citizen to turn into terrorist. The latter theory is also interested in the internal dynamics of the terrorist groups and the interaction of the three elements of the act of terror: the terrorists, the direct and the indirect target (the audience). And finally the *Theory of Rational Choice* investigates the cost-benefit analysis of a person entering a terrorist organization (Ross, 1993).

Jeffrey Jan Ross (1993) in his article "Structural Causes of Oppositional Political Terrorism: Towards a Causal Model" indicates 10 structural causes of terrorism: (the importance of the factors here are presented in the growing order) 1. Geographic location; 2. Type of the political system; 3. Level of modernization; 4. Social, cultural and historical environment; 5. Organizational structure and uneven process of development in various segments of society;

6. Existence of other forms of instability; 7. Support; 8. Failed attempts to prevent occurrence of terror; 9. Availability of weapons and explosives; 10. Feelings of protest against injustice.

According to the *Psychological Theory* terrorism is a product of the pessimism and protest in the society, formed by a number of international, regional or interstate political, economic and social factors. According to Martha Crenshaw (2000) The Psychological perspective unites such psychological theories as the *Frustration and Aggression Theory*- arguing that any frustration will be transferred in aggression, and materialization of the aggression will finally reduce the level of frustration; *the Theory of Relative Deprivation*- when a person compares his own opportunities and needs with that of others. If he sees a difference between the two, he may protest against injustice in a violent form.

The origins of terrorism is also often explained from the perspective of the *Rational Choice Theory*, resting mainly on the cost-benefit analysis. The theory makes a difference between the individual and group rationality and claims the latter to be a superior form of rationality; Namely: during the rational analysis a person makes a choice between his own benefits and the benefits of the society- most often choosing the second option. In connection to terrorism, the rational choice theory can explain the rationality of a suicide bomber- which is views his death as a benefit for the society he belongs to.

The Rational Choice Theory is well discussed by Martha Crenshaw (1981) in her article "Causes of Terrorism": "Significant campaigns of terrorism depend on rational political choice... terrorism is the result of an organization's decision that it is a politically useful means to oppose a government. The argument that terrorist behavior should be analyzed as "rational" is based on the assumption that terrorist organizations possess internally consistent sets of values, beliefs, and images of the environment." Thus from the perspectives of the organization violence is a approved method of fulfilling its aims.

The Communications Theory- connects the spread of terrorist activities to the advancement of communication technologies; namely its is the mass-media which makes terrorism such a powerful instrument against a state. Mass telecommunications also promotes terrorism in the regions where it has not previously existed but where there are relevant economic, social and political factors. Communication technologies can promote terrorism for 4 reasons:

Communications can be easily used for propaganda

Information can be delivered in such a form that will present terrorism in a preferable light

While discussing strategies and tactics of various terrorist organizations, the mass-media unwillingly transfers valuable information to other groups which have some reason to be dissatisfied and are willing to begin applying violent methods.

Describing the details of a successful terror attack in one part of the world may be copied by other groups in another part of the world for their own reasons. (Yazedjian, 2002).

The oldest theory concerned with the origins of terrorism is the “conspiracy theory”, which gained popularity in the end of the 19th century. According to this theory terrorism was the manifestation of the global conspiracy of communists. The adherents of the given theory interpreted every attack in any part of the world as a demonstration of the communist threat.

Together with growing concerns around terrorism, the number of works trying to set up a theoretical framework of terrorism is increasing as well. This in its part, makes a great contribution to discovering new and more efficient methods of confronting terror. Unfortunately, most of the theories deal with only some aspect of terrorism, since its hard if not impossible to find one universal framework dealing with this manifold phenomenon taken as a whole.

The Four Waves of Terrorism

After considering various theories about the origins of terrorism, we should go on with defining various forms of terrorism. Most of the experts single out four types of terrorism- these are the left-wing, the right-wing, the ethnonationalist and the religious terrorism. According to Kurth Cronin (2002) “All four types have enjoyed periods of relative prominence in the modern era, with left-wing terrorism intertwined with the Communist movement, right-wing terrorism drawing its inspiration from Fascism” then the author comments on the remaining two types saying: “the bulk of ethnonationalist/separatist terrorism accompanying the wave of decolonization especially in the immediate post-World War I1 years. Currently, “sacred” terrorism is becoming more significant. Although groups in all categories continue to exist today, left-wing and right-wing terrorist groups were more numerous in earlier decades.” Here we should note that some of the experts merge the left- and right-wing terrorism in a bigger categorie: the ideological/anarchist terrorism.

Kurth Cronin (2002) pays a special interest to the differences between the left- and right-wing terrorism and argues: “left-wing terrorist organiza-

tions, driven by liberal or idealist political concepts, tend to prefer revolutionary, antiauthoritarian, antimaterialistic agendas” The author also stresses the difference between the violent methods the two prefer most: “left-wing organizations often engage in brutal criminal-type behavior such as kidnapping, murder, bombing, and arson, often directed at elite targets that symbolize authority” (Cronin 2002). However, as the author notes, the left-wing terrorist have a difficulty in agreeing on their long-term goals. While the right-wing terrorism “can be ruthless, but in their most recent manifestations they have tended to be less cohesive and more impetuous in their violence than leftist terrorist groups. Their targets are often chosen according to race but also ethnicity, religion, or immigrant status, and in recent decades at least, have been more opportunistic than calculated” (Cronin 2002).

James Wilson (2004) in his article “What Makes a Man Terrorist?” singles out different forms of terrorism and discusses those social, economic and political factors which result in rise of terrorism in this or that part of the world. Wilson makes clear the ideological differences between the right and the left-wing terrorists. While the right-wing terrorists set the past as an ideal and try to restore it, the leftists see materialization of their ideals in the future.

After discussing the differences between the right-wing and left-wing terrorist groups, Kurth Cronin considers the features of the “third wave”- or the ethnonationalist or the separatist terrorist organizations.

“Ethnonationalist/separatist terrorists are the most conventional, usually having a clear political or territorial aim that is rational and potentially negotiable, if not always justifiable in any given case” (Cronin 2002) As these groups always find a wide support in the society whose territorial claims they represent, fighting the ethnonationalist form of terrorism is full of obstacles, often leading to lengthy periods ethnic violence.

The fourth, religious form of terrorism is univocally recognized as the most dangerous form of terrorism by the international experts. As one of the authors puts it: “religion gives its true believers an account of the good life and a way of recognizing evil” then he continues: “if you believe that evil in the form of wrong beliefs and mistaken customs weakens or corrupts a life ordained by God, you are under a profound obligation to combat that evil. If you enjoy the companionship of like-minded believers, combating that evil can require that you commit violent, even suicidal, acts.” (Wilson 2004) This is the reason why the religious extremist so often confront national governments- any structure which is not formed on the religious principles is recognized by them as illegal. Extremists view any step towards modernization as a direct blow to the traditional values and religious teachings their ancestors have long obeyed. Religious terrorism unites two important elements: (the

apocalyptic) hope for the future and the desire to revenge for their past- not only implying but directly demanding violence to be used for the sacred goal of “restoring justice”.

Table 1: Location of Islamic Terrorism



Retrieved from photo-bucket website 12 March, 2008

http://i217.photobucket.com/albums/cc272/full_images/Map-global-jihad.jpg

Audrey Kurth Cronin (2002) in his article “Behind the curve: Globalization and International Terrorism” pays a special interest to the religious terrorism, signing out five factors making this form of terrorism number one threat to the existence of the international system:

1. “Religious terrorists often feel engaged in a Manichaeian struggle of good against evil, implying an open-ended set of human targets: Anyone who is not a member of their religion or religious sect may be “evil” and thus fair game.” (Cronin 2002) Although indiscriminate attacks are also widely used by other forms of terrorism, here it finds a special application, as all individuals outside the group can be viewed as infidels or apostates, going against the will of God and therefore deserving the physical punishment.

2. Religious terrorism views itself as a manifestation of the Divine will, this in itself leads to a number of such problems as: “The whims of the deity may be less than obvious to those who are not members of the religion, so the actions of violent religious organizations can be especially unpredictable” (Cronin 2002). Moreover, such religious implications guarantees the “highest approval” for the terrorists, enabling them to disregard the opinions and negative sentiments generated even in the society to which they themselves belong.

3. “religious terrorists consider themselves to be unconstrained by secular values or laws. Indeed the very target of the attacks may be the law-based secular society that is embodied in most modern states” (Cronin 2002). In

more general terms, the goal of religious terrorism is to topple the Post-Westphalian state system, this ambition makes it far more dangerous than to say, the ethnonationalist terrorism which aims at creating a new unit inside the existing international system.

4. Religious terrorists are completely alienated from the secular society. "They are not trying to correct the system, making it more just, more perfect, and more egalitarian. Rather they are trying to replace it... images of destruction are seen as a necessity-even a purifying regimen." (Cronin 2002)

5. Finally, religious terrorism has a vast network of supporters in the face of Muslim nongovernmental organizations which raise funds to finance expensive training campaigns. However, there is a difficulty in distinguishing these organizations from truly philanthropic groups. "there is the real risk of igniting the very holy war that the terrorists may be seeking in the first instance" (Cronin 2002).

Matthew Morgan (2004) in his article "The Origins of the New Terrorism" also discusses the issue of the "fourth wave", of the religious terrorism. The author rests upon the decisions of the National Commission on Terrorism and says: "fanaticism rather than political interests is more often the motivation now, and that terrorists are more unrestrained than ever before in their methods... Rather than focusing on conventional goals of political or religious movements, today's terrorists seek destruction and chaos as ends in themselves" The author continues the argument by quoting S. K. Malik's *The Quranic Concept of War* : "Terror struck into the hearts of the enemies is not only a means, it is in the end in itself. Once a condition of terror into the opponent's heart is obtained, hardly anything is left to be achieved. It is the point where the means and the ends meet and merge."

Thus we can conclude, that terrorism is a manifold and quite complicated phenomenon, dating back to ancient times. After considering history of terrorism it can be concluded that terrorism is not an external force threatening the existence of the international system, but an internal part of the international system itself which finds its roots in the malfunctions of the system. The rise and development of terrorism was parallel to the process of development of the international system, and all its changes were fully conditioned by the changing environment in the international arena. This fact in itself makes fighting terrorism in the contemporary world quite worrisome and urges us to find new ways and new perspectives for studying the issue. The fact that even defining the concept of terrorism is controversial, in itself demonstrates the complexity of the given issue. The same can be concluded after considering all the various theories trying to explain origins of terrorism. Although each theory can be true in one case, their universal application can

be disputed. The existence of “the four waves” of terrorism makes the issue hard to deal with even more. Here should be noted, that although the four waves can exist simultaneously they still represent different steps of development of the given phenomenon. All of these makes it hard for the scholar to generalize the concept of terrorism and try to study its universal features, leading to difficulties in fighting terrorism in practice. The various forms of terrorism and the reasons leading to its occurrence makes it hard for the governments and the international society to take preventive measures to guarantee international peace and development.

References

A Pragmatic Approach, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, from <http://www.dushkin.com/text-data/articles/30791/body.pdf>

Badey, T. (1998) Defining International Terrorism: Biography of Osama Bin Laden, Retrieved on March 11, 2008 from <http://www.infoplease.com/biography/var/osamabinladen.html>

Bugess, M. (2003) A Brief History of Terrorism retrieved on March 17, 2008 from <http://www.cdi.org/friendlyversion/printversion.cfm?documentID=1502>

Crenshaw, M. (1975) The Concept of Revolutionary Terrorism *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 16, No. 3. Retrieved on December 21, 2007 from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00220027%28197209%2916%3A3%3C383%3ATCORT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I>

Crenshaw, M. (1981), The Causes of Terrorism, *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 4. pp. 379-399. Retrieved on March, 3, 2008 from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0010-4159%28198107%2913%3A4%3C379%3ATCOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-8>

Cronin, K. (2002) Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism.

Duncan, R. (2006) *World Politics in the 21st Century*, Pearson, 2006, p-15.

Frayman, A. *Religion and Culture as Motivations for Terrorism* retrieved on March 16, 2008 from http://www.ictconference.org/var/119/28059-Religion%20and%20Culture%20as%20Motivations%20for%20Terrorism_Amir%20Frayman.pdf

Ganor, B. (2002) *Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter?* retrieved on January 16, 2008 from <http://www.ict.org.il/var/119/17070-Def%20Terrorism%20by%20Dr.%20Boaz%20Ganor.pdf>

George, D. (1988), Distinguishing Classical Tyrannicide from Modern Terrorism, *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 50, No. 3. pp. 390-419. Retrieved on December 4, 2007 from <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=00346705%28198822%2950%3A3%3C390%3ADCTFMT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

Gunaratna, R. (2002) *International Terrorism: What Kinds of Responce?* retrieved on January 26, 2008 from: www.un-globalsecurity.org/pdf/Gunaratna_paper_terrorism.pdf

Martin, R. (2004) *The Encyclopedia of Islam and The Muslim World*, p-153.

Morgan, M. (2004) *The Origins of the New Terrorism*, Retrieved on January 12, 2008 <http://www.dushkin.com/text-data/articles/40436body.pdf>

Morgan, R. (2002) *Demon Lover*. Retieved on March 9, 2008 from <http://www.dushkin.com/text-data/articles/34717/body.pdf>

Nye, J. (1997) *Understanding International Conflicts*, Addison Wesley, 1997, p-11, 249.

Ross, J. (1993) *Structural Causes of Oppositional Political Terrorism: Towards a Causal Model*. Retrieved on March 15, 2008 from <http://www.jstor.org/view/00223433/ap020118/02a00060/0?currentResult=00223433%2bap020118%2b02a00060%2b0%2cFF3F&searchUrl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.jstor.org%2Fsearch%2FBasicResults%3Fhp%3D25%26si%3D1%26gw%3Djtx%26jtxsi%3D1%26jpsi%3D1%26artsi%3D1%26Query%3Dtheories%2Bterrorism%26wc%3Don>

Wilson, J. (*winter* 2004) *What Makes a Terrorist?* retrieved on March 19, 2008 from http://www.city-journal.org/html/14_1_what_makes_a_terrorist.html

Yazedjian, T. (Date Unknown) *International Terrorism and the Case of Usama Bin Laden*, Retrieved on February 24, 2008 from www.lebarmy.gov.lb/article.asp?ln=en&id=1328