



UDK 351.78:323.28  
Manuscript received: 07.08.2010.  
Accepted for publishing: 12.10.2010.  
Review article

Serbian Political Thought  
No. 1-2/2010, Year II, Vol. 2  
pp. 145-158

Radoslav Gaćinović  
Institute for Political Studies, Belgrade

## Phenomenology of Modern Terrorism

### Abstract

This paper focuses on conceptual definition of modern terrorism and scientific problems related to the trajectory (development) of generally acceptable definition of terrorism. In this paper, in addition to the conceptual definitions of terrorism, the author proposes his own definition of terrorism. The author has given special attention to the motives of the perpetrators of modern terrorism, offering his postulate that each type of terrorism is politically motivated. In addition to the analysis of the concept and definition of terrorism, the concepts and definitions of terror and guerrilla are also presented in this paper. Definitions of terrorism given by famous theorists are also critically analyzed, particularly academic and administrative definitions of terrorism, with the emphasis on administrative, or fiat definitions. In the conclusion of the paper the author emphasizes great challenges facing the international security system of today, specifically the problems of preservation of integral security of citizens and protection of citizens from the emerging controlled political violence - terrorism.

Key words: terrorism, terrorist activities, antiterrorism, terror, guerrilla, international community, motives

Phenomenology of modern terrorism has increasingly become an object of interest for modern legal science. In regard to Kant's statement that phenomenology is a phenomenon and the newest scientific theories that phenomenology is a description and analysis of the phenomenon in a certain scientific field, it is evident that modern terrorism has become a very dangerous phenomenon. At the beginning of the 21st century, terrorism as a type of violence has become the most significant challenge for an individual state and its security institutions, as well as for the Organization of the United Nations. Terrorist activities in the 20th century were an enigma and a big problem to the international security system, however in the 21st century it is to become even bigger one, so each step forward in finding out the methods, identification and contents of terrorism is a significant improvement towards creating the preconditions for successful opposition to such type of violence. Consequently, an intensive preparation of not only certain states but of all states is necessary for connecting theory and practice in the identification of and opposition to the violence that is becoming more frequent and dangerous.

Through research of this type of violence, it can be concluded that the problem of terrorism was one of the problems of the 20th century indeed, having developed itself on the grounds of alienation of individuals and groups, national conflicts, tensions, misuse of power in the states with dictatorship and absence of functioning of legal state. By its ideological foundation, terrorism in the past appeared as an ultra-right ("black" or fascistic) and ultra-left ("red"), or so-called quasi-revolutionary, and therefore intrinsically motivated targeted terrorism. By its field of action, terrorism is divided on urban and rural terrorism, maritime traffic terrorism and international air traffic terrorism. By its appearance on the territory of its own state, it is conditionally divided on domestic and international terrorism, based on its determining "element of foreignness". On the territory of their own state, domestic terrorists may commit a terrorist act against foreign diplomatic branch offices or persons with diplomatic immunity, which represent the elements of foreignness, thus causing it to become an international terrorist act. Hence domestic terrorism is the type of terrorism by which terrorists of one state make the citizens, government or properties of their own state the target of their violence or the threats of violence.

Modern-day models of international and domestic terrorism should be conceptually distinguished from other activities that are similar to them at first sight, such as guerrilla and terror.

In contrast to terrorists, guerrilla fighters wear the same kind of uniforms and formational armament; they appear in public - never hiding, and publicly announce the goals of their fight. According to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, the guerrilla actions are defined by the Articles 4, 1 and 13, and the guerrilla fighters are also subjected to fulfill the conditions of the Article 1 of the Hague Rulebook. These conditions are as follows: They must have a leader responsible for his subordinates; they must have a certain symbol of identification - an emblem that could be recognizable at a distance; they must comply with the regulations of the international laws of war.

In non-democratic societies, a state uses terror towards its own citizens by imposing its influence on public opinion, aimed at the extortion of certain political decisions that the citizens would not accept in democratic circumstances. Sometimes a state uses terror against its own opposition, when there is a sufficient number of strong political personalities in the opposition that could pose political problems for the regime in certain circumstances. Two basic types of terror have to be distinguished: genocidal terror and terror as a way of ruling. The goal of genocidal terror is total extermination of a national, ethnic or religious group. In contrast to genocidal terror, terror as a way of ruling is a more rational one, because extermination is not a real goal of ruling the people, given the fact that the perpetrator of terror cannot rule the people after he has exterminated them. Therefore the circle of victims is narrower than the overall population, while the manipulation and threatening (Dimitrijević 1985: 105-167) can be directed to a larger target.

Terrorist actions are very complex and are not clarified yet, in particular the issue of their factors and in general the causes of their existence. Besides that, the objects of the attacks, as well as the methods implemented, are subject to constant change. Therefore the work on continued and successful opposition to terrorist actions is influenced by various circumstances, and it demands moderate conduct, patience, serious scientific research and top quality organization of protection and control for the purpose of early spotting the goals and methods in the activities of modern terrorism.

### **Definition of modern terrorism**

Modern science is striving to offer a generally acceptable definition of terrorism. However, despite the fact that terrorism represents a real calamity for modern civilization, politics of many powerful states procrastinates defining of modern terrorism. There is a double standard in this case - some states use terrorism and then plan to provoke conflicts and instability in some regions without needing to involve their own military forces. Therefore, there are no good or bad terrorists, or justified and unjustified terrorism (all terrorists are bad and wrongful), despite the fact that great powers sometimes mislead public opinion in identification of modern terrorism with their own unethical demystification of these terms.

In the conceptual determination of modern terrorism, there are academic and administrative definitions. In the French language dictionary, terrorism is defined as “a set of violent acts carried out by some political organization for the purpose of making an influence on the population and creating a feeling of uncertainty” (Reyet, A. and Rey-Debove, J. 1979: 1950). In the English language dictionary terrorism is defined as “a method of the rule, or the opposition to some government, in attempt to cause fear” (Flaxner, S. B. 1971: 1447). In the Italian language dictionary terrorism is defined as “a tool of extreme and illegal violence in political battle” (Felici, L. 1989: 2006).

For example, Raphael Lemkin (Lemkin 1993: 900-901) defines terrorism as “premeditated use of any tool that can create a general danger (danger commun)”.

The general danger is indeed a danger threatening interests of many states or their citizens alike. Lemkin thinks that, in its broadest meaning, terrorism embodies intimidation of people by doing violent actions.

Antoine Sottile (Sottile 1938: 96) defines terrorism as a method of criminal activity characterized by terror and violence for the purpose of attaining a certain goal. Hence it is a criminal act carried out with the use of intimidation and violence for the purpose of accomplishing a certain pattern.

G. Pontera (Pontera 1979: 58) defines terrorism as each act that is carried out as a method of political struggle, using extreme violence towards the victims. A theoretician Glaser thinks that terrorism is “the use of violence with the help of

various tools, aiming at realization of an individual profit on its own, or of a certain political doctrine which determines whether it is the crime of general law or political delict". P. Robert defines terrorism as "the use of measures of violence with the aim of achieving political effects through individual or collective assassinations or the ravage in form of taking, preserving or executing the power as directed by certain political bodies in attempt to cause fear and uncertainty."

According to A. Schmidt, 22 elements are singled out as characteristic to the concept of "terrorism": use of force; political characteristic; raising fear; intimidation; threat; expectation of psychological effects; diversity of types of victims and a wide range of attack; organized action; methods used in the fighting strategy; breaking the rules and inhumanity; extortion and coercion; publicity; tyranny and absence of discernment; victims are mostly civilians; principally the victims are innocent people; organized acts of violence; exposure to the publicity and presentation of their "acts" to others; unpredictability; secretiveness (or concealment); repetition; criminal nature; demands and ultimatums directed to other people (Gacinovic 2005: 39).

Even Karl Marx ( 1979: 47) in his reflection on terrorism wrote: "In most of the cases, terrorism is a compound of useless cruelties made by people being frightened themselves, trying in such a way to abolish the precariousness."

Walter Laqueur, a former manager of London's Institute for Contemporary History, counted 109 definitions of terrorism in the period from 1963 to 1981<sup>1</sup>altogether, and to this day many more have followed. Unsuccessful attempts to establish a definition that would be acceptable by everybody are quite numerous. Laqueur thinks that terrorism is a contribution to achieving political goal by illegal use of force, having innocent people for the target.

According to Katarina Tomasevski, "The concept of "terrorism" encompasses various acts of violence and imperilment of human rights and human lives, as well as public or collective, and individual property. Multitude and diversity of the acts referring to the concept of "terrorism" partially explain the fact that a comprehensive and generally acceptable definition of terrorism has not been found yet". However, an even more important cause of the failed attempt to reach a compromise on defining terrorism should be searched for in the fact that terrorism is always politically motivated (Tomasevski 1983: 13-22).

1 The oftenness of the definition elements of terrorism in 109 definitions of terrorism: Violence, force 83,5%; Political element 5%; Fear, reinforced terror 51%; Threat 47,5%; (Psychological) Effects and (expected) Reactions 41,5%; Differentiation of the victim-target 37,5%; Intentional, planned, systematical, organized action 32%; Method of the battle, strategy, tactics 30, 5%; Anomalies in the break of accepted rules without humanitarian limitation 30%; Coercion, extortion of compliance 28%; Publicity 21,5%; Tyranny, impersonality, rambling personality 21%; Civilians, neutral persons, outsiders as the victims 17,5%; Intimidation 17%; Emphasized innocence of the victims 15,5%; Group, movement, organization as executor 14%; Symbolical aspect, demonstration for the others 13,5%; Unpredictability, suddenness of violent action 9%; Secret, hidden nature 9%; Repetition, serial or campaign character of violence 7%; Crime 6%; Demands made to the third parties 4%. (Walter Laqueur, "Reflections on terrorism", *Foreign Affairs*, Fall 1986).

Therefore terrorism is “a peculiarly legal concept” (*delictum sui generis*) - its history is always closely connected with the history of political delict.

Paul Wilkinson uses a syntagm “political terrorism”. According to Wilkinson, besides political one there is also criminal terrorism, and he defines criminal terrorism as “the systematic use of acts of terror for objectives of private material gain” (Wilkinson 1974). However, this author has not made a clear distinction between terrorism and crime, and so this problem is even more ambiguous one, and this definition is not related to the scientific insight into profound dimension of terrorism as a precondition for the attempt to successfully define it.

Philip Karber (Karber 1971: 527-533) thinks that “as a symbolic act, terrorism can be analyzed much like other mediums of communications, consisting of four basic components: transmitter (terrorist); independent receiver (target); message (bomb, ambush or some other terrorist action) and feed-back (reaction of a certain circle of listeners).” There are theoreticians who define terrorism as a theatre whose goal is not to have the victims involved, but to provoke a reaction from the observers. Hence modern terrorism can also be understood as an attempt of transmitting a message using political terrorism.

Willemijn Schreuder accepted a definition from the Webster University Dictionary (1981), by which terrorism is defined as the systematic use of terror as a method of intimidation, and that terror is violence carried out by groups for the purpose of intimidating population or government for getting the approval of their demands (Schreuder 1988: 52). Regardless of the fact that it is the definition from the prominent University Dictionary, the main flaw of this definition is the equalization of terrorism and terror, which should be avoided when defining terrorism, because the government cannot be intimidated by the use of terror, on the contrary, the government with the use of terror can intimidate its own population.

Gaston Bouthoul wrote the following lines on terrorism: “Terrorism has been greatly influenced by intellectual and doctrinal ideas. In the context of research of the motives for terrorism, it is possible to discover a changing level of ideological values. One ideological trend after another got rid of series of terrorist violent actions whose justification went in line with current opinions based on patriotism, nationalism, racism, cultural intolerance, religious fanaticism and political dogma” (Bouthoul 1975: 52).

Martha Crenshaw thinks that terrorism could not be defined if the very act of terrorism itself is not analyzed, as well as its goal and chances for success. According to Crenshaw, terrorism represents socially and politically unacceptable violence directed at innocent people in order to achieve psychological effect (Vajt 2004: 10).

Ronald D. Crelisten defined terrorism as a form of political communication. More precisely, it is an intentional use of violence or the threat of violence that should provoke fear (or terror), while the demands for compliance are directed at another group of targets. Provoked terror is the tool by which the compliance or obedience are

achieved. The use of violence or the threat of violence is usually directed at one group of targets (the victims), while the demands for compliance are directed at another group of targets. This is about the ternary relationship between terrorists and two different groups of targets. The obedience is achieved or maintained with one group of targets until it weakens in another group of targets from which the obedience is demanded, and until it weakens in other groups that the terrorists regard as their enemies. Regardless of the goal, each form of terrorism is created for the purpose of influencing the relationships between people, individuals and groups in one way or another. The conclusion is that terrorism is a tactic of using violence, or the threat of violence, with a communicative purpose. Its methods and causes depend on the context (Ibidem).

Jessica Stern proposes that terrorism represents the act of violence or the threat of violence against persons who are not soldiers, with the goal of getting a revenge, intimidating or influencing certain public in some other way (Dimitrijević 2005: 973). This definition, being rather imprecise, does not identify the doer of the act, nor does it define its purpose.

Boaz Ganor, the manager of Israeli Institute for Counter-Terrorism and former analyst of Israeli Ministry for Anti-Terrorism, approached the defining of terrorism from the point of positioning terrorism on the scale of violent conflicts, by which terrorism is pertained to conventional conflicts. Ganor's opinion is that "terrorism is an act of violent fighting that involves violence or threatens with the use of violence against civilians for the purpose of achieving political goals, while the guerrilla fighting is a violent fighting that involves or threatens with the use of violence against military targets, security forces or political leaders for the purpose of achieving political goals" (Ibidem: 974).

Paul Johnson proposes that terrorism is an intentional, systematic murder, involving mutilation and imperilment of innocent people with the aim of provoking fear for the purpose of achieving political goals (Gacinovic 2005: 39).

Nathan Brown, a professor of political sciences at the George Washington University, defines terrorism as "committing a violent act directed against one or more persons, aimed at intimidating one or more persons and in such a way to achieve one or more political goals of the person committing such an act" (Ibidem: 41).

M. Pashanski considers that terrorism involves systematic undertaking of armed activities, (or threatening that they will be undertaken), directed at carefully selected targets of the attack, in accordance with previously drafted plan and with the goal of causing political consequences in a society or, on a broader scale, in the international community. In the case when two or more states become directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally involved in the terrorist acts, being involved either through their citizens or its property, being subjects or objects (or both subjects and objects) of the terrorist acts; or by the fact that certain persons and property (or both persons and property) which are under protection of the

international conventions are imperiled by such terrorist act, it is considered to be international terrorism (Pashanski 1982: 78) due to the elements of foreignness involved in it.

Vojin Dimitrijevic proposes that each act of terrorism committed by the people with political motives is determined with its relation to the government, and that “as such, it is political. Even though the political substance might sometimes be blurred by the diversity, it does not change the substance” (Dimitrijevic 1982: 37).

Academic definitions of terrorism concur in a statement that the most frequent elements in the definition of terrorism are violence as the method, the citizens and the government as the target, intimidation and extortion of political or social changes as the goals, and a great number of victims being the target towards which the terrorists aim at, points out the spectacularity as a defining element of terrorism.

Therefore, the political motive of a person committing an act is the prerequisite for defining some action as the terrorist one, because it is the only component of the definition that distinguishes terrorism from ordinary crime. Since the meaning of the word “terrorism” has been changing throughout history in accordance with political risk in each period that followed, the difficulty of establishing a conclusive definition of terrorism is not surprising.

Most of the authors who studied the phenomenon of terrorism are of the opinion that the political component is one of the main elements of terrorism. This can be noticed even in bilateral agreements, and in the legislatures of a great number of states, as well as in the documents of repressive state institutions.

Through the analysis of definitions of terrorism to date, the elements of the concept of terrorism such as violence, fear, goal and motive are clearly indicated.

Power is demonstrated by violence destruction of which goes beyond its psychological effects. Even though there is a high level of agreement in the academic literature that violence is the most relevant component in defining terrorism, psychological and structural violence needs to be unavoidably added to the concept of physical violence in the context of terrorism. A motive of a terrorist to commit a violent act is the most mysterious, and for the scientists it is still unreachable (unknown) element of a terrorist activity.

Terrorist activities, as long as they are perceived as the terrorist ones, never receive massive support of the citizens and general population. If the massive support becomes evident, then it is no longer terrorism, but guerrilla or mass uprising of the population. It is as equally important to keep in mind that the demands of the terrorists are never realistic or based on the law.

Academic definitions are based on scientific elaboration of the problems of modern terrorism. The majority of academic definitions are focused only on fear as an element that defines terrorism. However, there are also other forms of violence, such as threats, even self-initiated acts that may cause fear, and in these cases terrorism



is neither precisely defined, nor sufficiently distinguished from other political, social, even psychological phenomenon. Equalizing of terrorism and crime is noticeable, as well as equalizing of terrorism and terror, which certainly postpones bringing out generally acceptable definition of terrorism in the science.

It is a well-known fact that those having a political power to define legitimacy equally have a power to define terrorism. Accordingly, the problem in analytical defining of terrorism is still present.

Administrative definitions of terrorism, although with its deficiencies are the only ones being exercised in practice, i.e. the US State Department, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Team of Vice-President of the US, The US Ministry of Defense, The Informative Agency of the US Ministry of Defense and the Guidebook of The American Army for the fight against terrorism define terrorism in different ways.

The United Nations Organization defines a terrorist as each person acting without knowledge of the state, either as an individual or as a member of a group that is not recognized as a formal body or part of some nation, destroying or damaging property of civilians or government with the aim of achieving certain political goal. Terrorism is an act of killing, injuring, destroying or damaging property of civilians or government without clear permission of a certain government, committed by an individual or a group of people acting independently, or the governments acting by their own intentions or beliefs with the aim of achieving certain political goal (Gacinovic 2005: 47).

The United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 1377 in 2001, states that “the Security Council, on the level of the ministries of the member-states, announces that the acts of international terrorism represent a challenge to all states and the whole mankind... that the acts of terrorism cause harm to dignity and security of the people everywhere, imperil social and economical development of all states and that on the international level they undermine stability and welfare”, and that the Security Council is “most deeply concerned for recorded rise of terrorist actions in (the context of) various world religions, motivated with intolerance and extremism.”

The European Union defines terrorism as an intentional act that can seriously damage a state or an international organization, that is committed with the aim of severe intimidation of the population which unjustifiably forces the government or the international organization to do something or to refrain from any action, seriously destabilizing or damaging basic political, economical or social structures by attacking on one’s life or physical integrity of a person, kidnapping, taking hostages, taking (seizuring) airplanes or ships, or producing, owning or transporting weapons or explosive.

In such way, so-called administrative definitions of terrorism are the ones that are the product of certain state (national) or international institutions. Their



inadequacy lies in the fact that they reflect ideological political views of the state or some other authority in generalizing, or in comparing with a concrete situation, therefore making such definition less generalized and consequently less applicable to some new and in many ways different situation.

### **Why it is difficult to define terrorism**

There are many dilemmas (crux) in the world of science when defining terrorism, such as the following: How to distinguish terrorism from the fighting on the basis of the struggle of the people for self-determination and the fight against occupation; A question arises whether the activities of the state armed forces connected with potential use of nuclear weapons (given that the nuclear weapons by their own existence inflict fear/fright amongst the people) should be included in the definition; The issue of the relations between modern convention and the existing and future antiterrorist agreements. It is as well difficult to define terrorism due to the fact that it is “a contextual concept” and having stated that political, legal and social sciences are often disaccorded in their approach to defining this problem; due to the fact that the question of the definition is related to (de)legitimization and criminalization; due to the fact that there are many phenomenal models and kinds of terrorism with their various displays; due to the fact that the concept has been interpreted in different ways due to different understanding of terrorism during the last two hundred years of its existence.

It is necessary to point out the additional causes for not establishing generally acceptable definition of terrorism:

- a) Emergence of a great number of incompetent, self-proclaimed experts in theoretical interpretation of modern terrorism who, due to the attractiveness of the phenomenon on the surface, got themselves into the labyrinths from which they are only occasionally taken back onto the surface by the politics of which they are eligible and naive vassals.
- b) The double standards of great powers, in particular of the United States of America and the Great Britain, on conceptual determination and definition of terrorism. In consequence, the same content is interpreted in different ways, depending on their current political interests, which creates the biggest problem in launching a definite overall international anti-terrorist activity in the 21st century, at least in order to keep it under control.
- c) Defining terrorism according to the orders. Anyone having political power to define “legitimacy” has the power to define terrorism as well. For example in the United States of America there are various definitions of terrorism by the State Department, the FBI, the Team of the Vice-President of the United States of America, the US Ministry of Defense and the Informative Agency of the Ministry of Defense, the CIA.

Scientists do not have a dilemma that terrorism is a problem, but there is still no unique answer to the question: What is terrorism?

### Reaching an acceptable definition through a comparative analysis

By analyzing the definitions of terrorism given so far, a conclusion can be drawn that it is directed against the civilian population and against the state institutions in order to fight for achieving political goals. It is important to distinguish that systematic terrorist activities are different from the activities of criminals and pathological murderers. A criminal, in a similar way as a terrorist, uses violence as a tool for achieving his own goal. It is not relevant if the criminal uses violence as the goal for gaining money or material resources, or if he murders or inflicts injuries to certain victims for financial compensation - what is relevant is that in the essence he always acts for his own selfish (personal) reasons.

In contrast to terrorism, violent act of an ordinary criminal is not aimed at causing damage, especially not aimed at causing psychological consequences, apart from committing the act itself. The criminal undertakes a certain violent act to "terrorize the victims", such as is the case of threatening a salesman at the cashing desk full of money with a knife for the purpose of forcing him to handle the money. In consequence, the activity of a criminal does not imply consequences towards the masses or the surrounding environment, hence the most significant difference between a terrorist and a criminal is that the criminal is not interested in the influence he can have on the public - all that he wants is to take the money, run away and be as less visible as possible while doing it.

In addition, in order to successfully define terrorism it is necessary to distinguish terrorism from terror, being violence of a state and its institutions towards its own citizens.

By distinguishing terrorism from other forms of crime, a conclusion is drawn that terrorism is inevitably politically motivated; it can be violent or threatening with violence; directed at long-term psychological consequences apart from the context of direct victim of the violence; led by a certain terrorist organization whose members do not wear uniforms or identification insignia.

Terrorist, as a rule, thinks that he is not guilty for the crime that he committed, but the one who did not obey his order, which led to the crime committed. Unfortunately, there is no ultimate system of protection against terrorism. It is the Phoenix phenomenon. It is easily revitalized if one of its parts is kept alive. When determining - defining terrorism, the fact that a terrorist act is, as a rule, always intrinsically motivated should be taken into account.

Having this in mind, all the definitions of terrorism given so far have their own quality, but none of them has been generally accepted by the UN Organization.

There are justifications for that, as many definitions have been embroidered with political motives of those defining terrorism. Similarly, they do not seem to be strong in defining terrorist actions, which creates a space for applying double standards and for postponing the launch of an ultimate fight against terrorism on the global level.

With this in mind, the following prerequisites have to be taken into account for the purpose of drafting the most acceptable defining of terrorism:

- Terrorist commits a violent act or threatens with violence; terrorist is inevitably politically motivated (*animus terrorandi*) and is a member of a certain organization.
- Terrorists' actions are related to long-term psychological consequences (i.e. for the terrorists, the target of the attack is not as important as political repercussion of the action).
- Terrorism is never supported by the majority of the population. If a specific type of violence is supported by the majority of the population it is no longer considered to be terrorism but guerrilla or mass uprising.
- Terrorists' demands are neither realistic nor based on the law; they are always the consequence (the result) of their political motives - separatism, or liberation of their members from the state prisons.
- Terrorists believe that it is easy to impose their will against an intimidated person and they build their strategy on the basis of such an assumption, continuously keeping the tension of the public, as no person is afraid of the past, but of the uncertainty that follows.
- Terrorism as a dangerous phenomenon is always one step ahead of the state security institutions, amongst other things due to the fact that the state officials think about this problem only during their working hours, while terrorists think of it 24 hours, which many examples from the past have indicated so far.
- Terrorists sometimes plan their actions for years in order to undertake them in few minutes.
- Terrorists have the advantage over the state security institutions. They prepare as long as they need to, and choose the target of the attack and the time of the attack by themselves. They usually attack with the aim to surprise and they usually attack so-called "soft targets".
- One of the most important and possibly the most crucial element on which the future of terrorism depends is the reaction of a society to terrorism. This concerns not only the reaction of the state institutions, but behavior of the public. The army and the police cannot eliminate terrorism. Unfortunately, it is impossible to do that nowadays, however only determination (and strong support) of the public can keep modern terrorism under control.

Therefore, considering the above-mentioned facts amongst other facts, a highly acceptable definition of terrorism proposed by the author of this paper is the following:

“Terrorism is an organized use of violence (or threat of violence) committed by politically motivated perpetrators, determined to impose their will on governmental institutions and citizens through fear, anxiety, defeatism and panics” (Gacinović 1998: 31).

Even though terrorism is formally condemned everywhere in the world, practice proves that terrorism is still an effective weapon for achieving political goals by certain nations. History reminds us that the UN Organization formally condemned the actions of many terrorist organizations in the world, but the great powers did not respect the international law all the time, as they were supporting and enhancing the actions of terrorist organizations in many regions at certain times. They unjustifiably treat certain terrorist organization as the liberating, by creating distorted public opinion in the world through the mass media. In this way, substantial support is given to the terrorist organizations, and a state which is the victim of violence is proclaimed as the creator of a terror. In such way, the state is deprived of its legal and legitimate rights to fight against terrorism in its own territory. This is the case with “OVK” and “ANA” in Kosovo and Metohija. If such tendency of double standards continues, the danger of modern terrorism will drastically increase worldwide, in particular in the Great Britain, Spain, France and Serbia.

## **Conclusion**

It is necessary to fight against terrorist activities and other models of imperilment first of all through the systems of the state and of the society, by using their strengths, qualities, vitality and democracy as the basis; within a framework of the legal state and further supporting freedom and citizens' rights by strengthening these relations in all fields of social life.

The stronger and more stable democratic society becomes ethically, economically and organizationally, the more it feels responsible to secure its society and, as a consequence, a possibility of emerging terrorist activities will decrease. There is a strong need for high quality training of the state anti-terrorist units.

In the following period, the international security system will be facing great challenges on how to provide collective safety of the population and protect the citizens from this wide-spreading danger that is hard to be controlled. This can be achieved, amongst other things, through an adequate organization, high quality training and providing modern equipment to the anti-terrorist activity units; through continued following of achievements in the field of military, social and technical sciences; through analysis of former experiences

in anti-terrorist activities; by improving the system of measures for prevention of terrorist activities and continuous strengthening of internal authorities and capacity of the society for continuation of democratic processes. Along with these prerequisites, the basic prerequisite for success is a firm support of the public to confront modern terrorism. To put modern terrorism under control would be a great success for the United Nations Organization, as the elimination of terrorism in the world has only been a wish of the majority of the mankind so far.

A conclusion can be drawn that modern terrorist activities are getting more and more present in the world. They can be strongly controlled by a certain state, to which they serve for achieving its interest in a certain region with important economical and geo-strategic location, and this presents the greatest problem for the security in the world. The public opinion in the entire world should stand up against these dangerous acts.

Modern science makes great efforts to define modern terrorism. Despite the fact that terrorism represents a real threat for modern society, official politics of many powerful countries postpone defining modern terrorism in generally acceptable terms since double standards are the dominating factor. There are no good or bad terrorists, regardless of the fact that the unethical interpretation of this phenomenon by the great powers misleads the public opinion in recognizing modern terrorism. Majority of population world-wide never supports activities as long as they are called terrorist. Should they have a large-scale support, these activities are no longer considered as terrorism but guerilla or rebellion.

When defining terrorism we must be aware that the terrorists are unmistakably politically motivated, inclined to use violence, that their activities are directed towards far-reaching psychological consequences, reaching beyond a direct victim or target of an attack and that the terrorists are members of an organization. It is also important to be aware that terrorist demands are never realistic or legally based. Having said that, when defining terrorism, the importance of establishing the definition of terrorism that would serve the international cooperation in demystification of the term, i.e. according to which the consequence is a condition without which there would not be a consequence (*Conditio sine qua non*) should be taken into account.

According to the results of his academic work and research conducted so far, the author of this paper defines terrorism as follows: "Terrorism is an organized use of violence (or threat of violence) by politically motivated individuals or groups, determined to impose their will on governmental institutions and citizens through fear, anxiety, defeatism and panic."

## Bibliography

- Bouthoul, G. (1975) "Definitions of Terrorism", in: *International terrorism and World Security*. Carlton, D. and Schaerf, C. (eds), London: Groom Helm.
- Reyet, A. and Rey-Debove, J. (ed) (1979) *Dictionnaire de la langue française*, Paris: Paul Robert.
- Dimitrijević, I. (2005) "Problematika naučno-teorijskog definisanja terorizma". *Bezbednost* 47(6).
- Dimitrijević, V. (1982) *Terorizam*. Beograd: Radnička stampa.
- Dimitrijević, V. (1985) *Strahovlada*. Beograd: Rad.
- Gaćinović, R. (2003) "Pojmovno određenje nasilja,uzroci,vrste i posledice". *Politička revija*, 2 (2): 257-280.
- Gaćinović, R. (2005) *Terorizam*. Beograd: Draslar partner.
- Gaćinović, R. (2006) *Antiterorizam*. Beograd: Draslar partner.
- Gaćinović, R. (2007) "Odbrana od terorizma" *Politička revija*, 2-4: 571-594.
- Gaćinović, R. (2010) "Terorizam u političkoj teoriji". *Srpska politička misao*, 2(2): 177-195.
- Galijašević, Dž. (2007) *Era terorizma u BiH*. Beograd: Filip Višnjić
- Hoffman, B. (2000) *Unutrašnji terorizam*. Beograd: Narodna knjiga.
- Horowitz Leonard, G. (2001) *Death in the Air: Globalism, Terrorism, and Toxic Warfare*. Sandpoint: Tetrahedron.
- Felici, L. (1989) *Il grande Dizionario Garzanti della lingua italiana*, Milano.
- Palazzi, E. (1965) *Dizionario della lingua italiana*, Milano: Garzanti.
- Jakovljević, D. (1997) *Terorizam s gledišta krivičnog prava*. Beograd: Službeni list SFRJ.
- Karber, P. (1971) „Urban Terrorism: Baseline Data and Conceptual Network“. *Social Science Quarterly* 52.
- Laqueur, W. (1986) "Reflections on Terrorism". *Foreign Affairs*, 65(1): 86-100.
- Lemkin, R. (1933) "Faut-il un nouveau droit des gens nommé terrorisme". *Revue de droit pénal et criminologie*, 13.
- Marks, K. and Engels, F. (1979) *Delo*, vol. 40. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Pluchinsky, D. A. and Yonah, A. (eds.) (1992) *European terrorism today& tomorrow*. Washington: Potomac Books.
- Pontera, G. (1979) *Violenza e terrorismo, Il problema della definizione e della giustificazione: dimensioni del terrorismo politico*. Milano.
- Wilkinson, P. (1974) *Political Terrorism*. New York: Halsted Press.
- Flaxner, S. B. (ed.) (1971) *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: Random House.
- Schreuder, W. (1988) "International Legal Measures Against Terrorism". *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 1(1).
- Simonsen, C. E. and Spidlove, J. R. (2000) *Terrorism Today: The Past, the Players, the Future*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Sottile, A. (1938) *Le terrorisme international*. Recueil des cours, Vol. 65, Issue III, Paris, pp. 87-184.
- Srdanović, R.B. (2002) *Međunarodni terorizam*. Beograd: Službeni list SRJ.
- Taylor, M. and Horgan J. (2002) (ed.) *Terorizam i budućnost*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing.
- Tomasevski, K. (1983) *Izazov terorizma*. Beograd: NIRO Mladost.
- Vajt, Dz. (2004) *Terorizam*. Beograd: Alexandria Press
- Wilkinson, R. (2002) *Terorizam protiv demokratije*. Zagreb: Golden marketing.