
UNIT 7 NON-STATE VIOLENCE (TERRORISM)

Structure

7.1 Introduction

Aims and Objectives

7.2 Defining Terrorism

7.3 Core Characteristics of Terrorism

7.4 History of Terrorism

7.5 Theorising Terrorism and Its Causes

7.6 Other Forms of Political Violence

7.7 Summary

7.8 Terminal Questions

Suggested Readings

7.1 INTRODUCTION

A sub-classification of political violence, i.e., terrorism is a pervasive phenomenon, which is not only hard to ignore but also a much debated notion in contemporary times. The objective of this unit is to enable the students to gain a comprehensive and much broader perspective on the understanding of non-state terrorism rather than attributing it to a particular religion, geographic location or time line. Very often the mass media carries terrifying news about acts of violence and terror perpetuated by non-state actors or groups. These non-state actors often create a profound sense of fear in the public and anger towards the state machinery. The act of terror is a political statement that particular underground group makes to express its anger. This is done to question the legitimacy of the governments in place by projecting their inability to protect the people from violent assaults of the non-state actors particularly terrorists or militants groups. Therefore, to validate or create this type of sense terrorists and militant groups often stage indiscriminate attacks at public places like theatres, shopping centres, buses, planes, office buildings and streets.

Aims and Objectives

After going through this Unit, you would be able to:

- explain the concept of non-state violence
- understand terrorism as a major threat and its history
- analyse the theorising of the causes of terrorism.

7.2 DEFINING TERRORISM

There is considerable disagreement in academia and policy making bodies regarding the definition of terrorism. Although there exist numerous definitions of terrorism, none of them are clear, concrete or even measurable. Some definitions, though, are legally employable simultaneously, they too lack the definitive parameters for them being politically accepted.

Terrorism is a tactic – a method in the place of direct political action. It is characterised by three important dimensions – political, military and legal – the imprecision, non-uniformity and lack of a discrete and concrete definition not only leads to confusion and misuse, but also fails to ensure consistent and valid conclusions. This apparently makes the study of this phenomenon extremely difficult.

Harvey W. Kushner, in the *Encyclopedia of Terrorism*, notes that, ‘there are as many definitions for the word terrorism as there are methods of executing it; the term means different things to different people, and trying to define or classify terrorism to everyone’s satisfaction proves impossible’. Louise Richardson also documents this confusion in his writings. He writes: ‘The widespread usage of the term terrorism, in many contexts, has rendered the word almost meaningless. Today, it’s only universally understood connotation is so pejorative that even terrorists don’t admit to being terrorists any more. A glance at the current usage reveals child abuse, racism, and gang warfare all incorrectly described as terrorism.’

Poly-semantic nature of defining Terrorism

At the outset, the Oxford English Dictionary defines terrorism as ‘the systematic employment of violence and intimidation to coerce a government or community into acceding to specific political demands’. While the use of violence most definitely is a significant characteristic of terrorism, most definitions also attest to the political motive of its perpetrators and their target/source as being the state. In this regard, G. Pontara’s definition is as good a starting point as any: ‘A terrorist act is any action carried out as part of a method of political struggle, aimed at influencing, or conquering or defending the State power, implying the use of extreme violence (inflicting death, or suffering or injuries) against innocent, non-combatant persons’. This definition includes both the non-state actors as well as state sponsored terrorism.

It needs to be mentioned here that ‘enforcement terrorism’ or ‘terror from above’ is used by governments and authorities to maintain their control to suppress threats to their own power, whereas ‘terror from below’ or ‘agitational terror’ is used by those who wish to replace, transform, or destroy the existing order.

Grant Wardlaw, in his book *Political Terrorism*, defines terrorism as, ‘the use, or threat of use, of violence by an individual or group, whether acting for or in opposition to established authority, when such action is designed to create extreme anxiety and/or fear-inducing effects in a target group larger than the immediate victims with the purpose of coercing that group into acceding to the political demands of the perpetrators’. This view too remains consistent with the three dimensions of terrorism discussed in the preceding section.

Further, the US Department of Defense makes a specific distinction between terrorism and insurgency. It defines terrorism as ‘the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to inculcate fear; intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious or ideological’, while insurgency is defined as ‘an organized resistance movement that uses subversion, sabotage, and armed conflict to achieve its aims. . . . [and which] seek to overthrow the existing social order and reallocate power within the country’.

Despite terrorism being defined spatially and in terms of identities, state and non-state actors, it is possibly comprehensively defined by the UN Resolution 1566, which refers

to it as, 'criminal acts, including against civilians, committed with the intent to cause death or serious bodily injury, or taking of hostages, with the purpose to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act'. This can be considered a working definition.

Methodological Issues

The definitions of terrorism, as explained above, explicitly posit that despite being an extensively studied phenomenon it remains a largely contested domain. As the famous cliché goes, 'one man's terrorist is other man's freedom fighter'. The inherent assumption herein is apparent, thereby making terrorism an extremely complex phenomenon, not only in terms of definition, but also in terms of context. This has perhaps led Kalliopi K. Koufa to state that there is a 'tendency amongst commentators to mix definitions with value judgments and either qualify as terrorism violent activity or behavior which they are opposed to or, conversely, reject the use of the term when it relates to activities and situations which they approve of'.

7.3 CORE CHARACTERISTICS OF TERRORISM

Nevertheless, certain central tenets of terrorism, generally agreed to by political commentators, can be delineated for our purposes. Use, or threat of use of lethal violence and political nature of the crime (in a sense that the claims of terrorists are for/against political authority) can easily be identified as its two central features, the former being employed necessarily for achieving political ends. While there exists a consensus on the former characteristic of terrorism, the rise of organisations like Al Qaeda, which many claim have millenarian objectives, seems to contest the political argument. However, even organisations like Al Qaeda have immediate political objectives (like upstaging the Saudi regime or destabilising the Western hegemony).

Besides, the threads of terrorism weave some common but recurring themes. Jason Franks clubs them under three areas – functional, symbolic and tactical. All these three attest to claims towards achieving the 'means to the end' of the terrorists. The functional argument suggests that the purpose of terrorism is to 'provoke a response', in fact an exaggerated response, from the established authority/government against the perpetrators, their supporters and even the people in general. The state repression let loose in response to terrorism exposes state authority to claims of illegitimacy and undermines its own legitimate claim to authority. This helps in weaning the legitimacy of the state authority away from the government towards the terrorists. The terrorists, by exposing the general populace to violence, also undermines the capability of state by challenging it on the *raison d'être* of its existence – providing security to its citizens.

The symbolic characteristic of terrorism suggests that use of violence is highly emblematic in order to intimidate and strike fear into those against whom the violence is directed. The violence could be minimal, but is directed to harness it for maximalist propaganda. Thus, violence has a clear demonstrative effect here; the violence being intended for more than just incurring physical damage. In fact, most times it might not even be necessary to inflict physical injury on the intended target, i.e., the government or another community. A mere demonstration of violence is enough. Also, at times, violence is used merely to internationalise (or even nationalise) the issue and thus, open up government's claims of authority to international scrutiny.

The third important component of terrorism is its tactical nature. Terrorism, most analysts argue is neither a pre-conceived strategy nor ideologically oriented, but rather a mere tactic employed by organisations for achieving their political objectives. In this context, it can be used to achieve short-term aims or employed as an approach for demonstrating the attainment of long-term objectives. Plane hijacking to release a particular prisoner could be a useful demonstration of the former, while the use of guerilla warfare would be an instance of the latter.

A major lacunae on understanding terrorism, according to major critical theorists, are that the whole discourse is centered around *what* and *how* aspects of terrorism. No consideration is given to the *why* aspect of terrorism, implying that while terrorism remains universally demonised in the discourse, very little effort is spared to understand its causative characteristics. This, if the analysts are to be believed, is perhaps deliberate, more so to undermine the fact that any thorough scrutiny of the causative factors of terrorism might actually end up justifying *why* it was perpetuated in the first place and at times, even legitimise the means employed by the terrorists. The mainstream discourses on terrorism are, thus, employed with a specific purpose of allowing the state to tackle terrorism without undermining its own legal authority.

7.4 HISTORY OF TERRORISM

‘Terror’ is etymologically derived from the Latin word *terrere* meaning ‘to frighten’. The earliest precedent of the use of the word comes from *terror cimbricus*, which was a state of emergency in Rome in response to the approach of warriors of the Cimbri tribe in 105 BC. Jewish *Sicarii*, *Hashishin* (mythologinised Shia Ismaili sect) and *thuggees* (the Indian cult of Kali worshipers) are some of the historical modes of terrorism. In the modern era, perhaps the first case of the state induced terror could be attributed to the Jacobians after the French revolution in France.

Terrorism, of the non-state variety, could trace its first organised manifestation to, what noted political historian David Rapoport calls, the ‘anarchist wave’ of 1880s. This wave first appeared in Russia and then spread to Western Europe, the Balkans and Asia. The anarchists were rebels against state authority and also against the traditional revolutionaries who, according to them, were mere ‘idle word spillers’. The anarchists believed that dramatic action was required to shake the foundations of state and the most direct way was to assassinate state officials. The first major assassination was of the Russian Czar Alexander II in 1881. The 1890s was the age of assassination as a number of monarchs, prime ministers and presidents were killed by assassins. Perhaps the most notorious assassination proved to be that of Archduke Ferdinand in 1914 which resulted in the catastrophic World War I.

The second wave, according to Rapoport, started after the conclusion of the Treaty of Versailles when national aspirations of many colonies in non-West were not respected. It was the age of Wilsonian idealist principles, but these principles were only applicable to the victors in the West. By now, the domestic nationalist movements in most of the Third World countries had got disillusioned with their elite-petitionist struggle. Moreover, the League of Nations was a bystander to the onset and perpetuation of colonialism in many parts. Soviet Union had emerged as a new beacon of light and Marxist revolutionary ideology became the flavour of the time. This started an ‘anti-colonial wave’ where the colonised resorted to violent action against the coloniser. The colonisers deemed it as

‘terrorism’ and labeled the ‘freedom fighters’ as terrorists. Broadly, this came to end with the decolonisation of Third World states after the Second World War.

Rapoport calls the third wave as the ‘New Left Wave’. The late sixties started a new radical turn in the West as the new post-War generation grew disenchanted with the new liberal order. The economies in the West had become stagnant after the post-war boom and unemployment grew, Vietnam war had exposed the hypocrisy of liberalism in America, Cold War was consuming enormous resources and states were increasingly militarised, the superpowers had initiated a number of proxy wars in the hapless Third World and had supported a number of dictators, and so on. The decadal period of the 1960s marked this radicalisation of the youth across many countries as the youth announced their revolutionary credentials. Many such new left radical student organisations mushroomed in Europe. The American Weather Underground, the West German Red Army Faction, the Italian Red Brigades, the Japanese Red Army, the French Action Directe were many such groups.

This radicalism was combined with nationalist struggles by Vietnamese, Palestinians, Basques, Armenians, Kurds, Irish, Black South Africans and so on. This wave also saw a number of innovative strategies being adopted, like plane hijackings, where the aim of the terrorists was larger than merely killing the state officials or conveying the message to the state government. The urge was increasingly to put the message across to the international community and international legitimisation was seen as a crucial step towards domestic legitimisation.

The fourth wave, and also the current wave, is what Rapoport defines as ‘religious wave’. The 9/11 definitely acts as a point of departure for this. It has also heralded what many call ‘new terrorism’. This wave is greatly different from all previous waves on two accounts. First, the objectives of the terrorists are not very clearly couched in either political or economic coatings. Their stated objectives are ‘religious’, perhaps more aptly captured in Samuel Huntington’s ‘Clash of Civilizations’ thesis. However, many political commentators, as argued earlier, believe that the religious motives of these terrorist organisations merely act as alibi for their strong political aims. Al Qaeda, for example, clearly has a more direct aim of toppling regimes in Saudi Arabia and Egypt. The other difference is the enormous advances in technology. These religious groups, no matter how conservative and traditional they pose themselves to be, are extremely efficient at harnessing technology for the purpose of their activities. With minimum resources, they can inflict maximum damage. Causing maximum damage in the form of huge losses of lives and property as against the highly selective killings of the previous waves has become the chosen strategy of this brand of terrorism. Violence, thus, eschews its symbolism for more physical effects. The technology also allows these organisations to work not as centralised and highly institutionalised formations, but as loosely bound networks. This helps them to spread much more widely without compromising much on the efficiency of execution.

7.5 THEORISING TERRORISM AND ITS CAUSES

The theory of terrorism seeks is explained by a wide range of factors. Major theoretical approaches identify terrorism as having personal, psychological, socio-economic, historical, religious and political underpinnings. At the outset, it must be understood that terrorism is a complex issue with a multi-faceted disposition. Its analysis requires an insight that avoids simplistic causal modelling of social phenomenon. However, for our convenience, we shall

delineate some important factors that have been utilised as analytical tools to enhance academic understanding of terrorism. Broadly, such causative factors can be summarised as under:

1. Personal and psychological causes;
2. Political causes;
3. Economic causes;
4. Religious causes; and
5. Spatial dimension of terror: Domestic and International.

Personal and Psychological Causes

A number of analysts believe that terrorism stems out of personal causes. Theodor Adorno propagated an **Authoritarian Personality Theory** in which he argued that a person is drawn towards the right-wing ideologies and extremist violence due to paranoid worldview, misanthropy and rigidity. He, thus, attributes acts of violence akin to terrorism to psychological abnormality or unique pathological personality.

However, critics argue that terror acts are merely not pathological and cannot be solely attributed to mental paranoia. They are of the opinion that most terrorist acts are committed by extremely sharp and mentally sound individuals. Besides, psychological disorders do not explain why only some people suffering from such disorders commit such acts while others do not. Many analysis shows that the terrorist is educated, employed and not poor. He or she has analysed the world view and calculated the outcomes but is willing to commit terror for martyrdom or cause.

Another theoretical formulation, which could possibly explain the transition of individuals towards political extremism or terror, is the **Social Networking Theory**. According to this formulation, individuals romanticise community ties, familial kinship affiliations, etc. to maintain and continue social interaction, which, in due course, translates into collective action. The process of absorption in this case is not instantaneous, initially being based upon a shared identity and later indoctrination into the group.

Another theoretical underpinning, which seeks to explain why individuals are drawn towards extremism (including acts of terror), is the **Frustration-Aggression Theory**, which posits that in a state of alienation from access to resources or perceived rewards an individual is likely to exhibit a behaviour sequence, which largely negates the existing or established code of conduct. There is also a belief of collective victimhood, which the potential terrorist is willing to kill and get killed for.

Political Causes

Much of the literature on terrorism attests to the political causation of terrorism. Terror acts are committed by some groups/communities/actors against the state with the purpose of making the state negotiate or accept their political demands. Terrorism, such analysts argue, is a deliberate strategy employed by groups using violence as a weapon to convey their grievances (to the state) and simultaneously, negotiate outcomes. Moreover, by directing the violence towards the state and its instruments, these groups intend to expose the vulnerability of the state (the government in power) in protecting its citizenry and thus, rob the state of its legitimacy. Perhaps, the most illustrative instance of this typology of

terrorism is inherent in the anti-colonial movement. In recent times, ethnic violence has emerged as a huge challenge to the state authority.

The anti-colonial movements in various parts of the globe, especially in the twentieth century, had stemmed out of political oppression of the colonised by the colonisers. Although, Marxists have theorised colonialism as an economic system (Lenin's theory of Imperialism), most postcolonial theorists argue that colonialism was predominantly a political system. In the writings of scholars like Jean Paul Sartre, Albert Memmi, Frantz Fanon and Cabral, it becomes clear that colonialism was a political problem and the colonised could only overthrow it through violent means. These writers became prophets and justifiers of many anti-colonial movements that used violence.

Economic Causes

The political and economic causes are usually intertwined in generating acts of terror. Ted Robert Gurr has argued in his **Relative Deprivation Theory** that people would resort to civil protest or political violence when concrete social, economic, or political privileges are withdrawn or denied to them (that they had come to expect as rights). He argues that ordinary crime or political violence is directly or indirectly motivated by perceived or actual conditions of economic, social, and political inequality. Economic inequality leads to acute tensions in the social milieu and the deprived resort to acts of violence to gain access to resources. Moreover, the economically deprived, who according to Marxist literature in turn become politically and socially deprived, also make use of violence to prevent the bourgeoisie from exploiting them further. Naxalite or Maoist resistance in India is an example of using terrorism as a tactic linked to organised resistance because of economic deprivation and marginalisation. The critics of this school, however, have argued that based on this interpretation, terrorism should be most prominent in places of high economic inequality such as Africa and Latin America, which is not the case. They naturally ask why is that 9/11 happens in USA and not in China or Brazil?

Religious Causes

The post-9/11 terrorism has generally been characterised as religious terrorism. This line of reasoning believes that the new terrorism (post-9/11) stems out of rising tensions between two proselytising religions of the world – Christianity and Islam. Islam, having been displaced from its great pedestal in the medieval times, when it was the fastest rising religion and also perhaps the most domineering with its influence spreading from Europe to India, has been trying to assert itself. The fundamentalist elements within Islam believe that Muslims have been greatly marginalised and discriminated against in the new world order and that the nefarious alliance between Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism has been the vanguard contrary to their belief. This thesis, as propounded by Samuel Huntington, in his now famous 'Clash of Civilizations', has been an issue of much criticism and debate.

The fundamentalists in Islam, analysts behind this reasoning argue, seek millenarian objectives and wish to bring back the golden age of Islam. They problematise Western modernity for its morally defunct value system. To remedy this, they seek a complete structural change, which the terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda believe can only be established through unmitigated violence. Other analysts, however, point to the fact that all religions have fundamental elements that believe in such radical ideologies and employ similar methods. Moreover, it is not religion per se but its misuse or misinterpretation by certain individuals/groups within them, which causes terrorism. Also, there is a need to

accentuate that religions are not monolithic homogeneous whole and comprised of multiple belief systems.

Ideological Causes

Most analysts agree that ideological affiliations by far remain the beacon, which not only influence actors but also serve to influence or rationalise the terror acts they continue to commit. The terrorists are generally regarded as irrational actors, who are willing to kill and get killed for their actions. The moot question, often, asked is how can any individual agree to die for a cause, which is largely perceived to be irrational? The answer perhaps lies in the ideological affiliation, indoctrination process and the manner in which irrationality is rationalised. Nazism, fascism, anarchy, Marxism, Leninism, Maoism, even nationalism, etc. have provided the ideological bases to the acts of terrorism. Marx is said to have stated in context of religion – ‘religion is the opium of the masses’. A similar statement could be made with regard to any ideology.

In sum, the factors mentioned in the preceding sections are widely regarded both in academics and policy circles as being causative or explanative of terrorism and also are widely utilised as analytical tools to place terrorism in a proper context. However, as was stated earlier and is evident from the above analyses, terrorism predominantly remains a multi-causal phenomenon. Most instances of terrorism synergise one or more of these factors. They also point out to the fact that terrorism is not a passing fad. It has existed, in one form or other, over the centuries. It also cannot be merely understood in the popular terminology of ‘phases’ or ‘cycles’. However, historical analyses suggests that what is evidently apparent is that it has existed over centuries, but what perhaps needs to be accentuated is that it undergoes changes in its content and manifestations – in the present context it is seemingly sophisticated, employing technological advances both in weaponry and communication. In the past century, political historian David Rapoport has aptly explained terrorism to have ebbed and flowed in different forms. The new terrorism is merely another wave in this cycle.

There are numerous elaborative typologies of terrorism based on place, personality traits, purpose, target and issues. And, most of them include some form of state terrorism (also known as mass terrorism, authorised terrorism, enforcement terrorism, repressive terrorism) as well as individual and group terrorism.

However, in most of these typologies, there is no mention of motive and behaviour. Some of them follow the liberal view and some the conservative view. From liberal perspective, violence against the state and its establishments is justifiable whereas conservative outlook condemns terrorism and justifies ruthless countermeasures. Also, there have been attempts to define terrorism from historical, sociological and psychological perspectives.

While placing their individual purviews, historical, sociological and psychological perspectives fail to integrate the motive and behaviour of terrorism. Hence, in this Unit, for a holistic typology of terrorism, viewpoints from political science have been taken thereby dissecting the problem from various angles.

Terrorism has various strands. Each one of them differs in terms of objectives, strategies, targeting patterns, tactical tendencies, operational areas and operational codes. Such strands, especially the ones with ideological underpinnings (anarchist terrorism, left-wing terrorism, right-wing terrorism, ethno-nationalistic/separatist terrorism) are briefly discussed as under.

Firstly, **Anarchist Terrorism** has its roots in the 19th century's idea of anarchism. Anarchist groups, organisations or individuals believe that the government/state is 'unnecessary and harmful'. Therefore, to make their argument known to the masses they resort to violent means employing the strategy of 'the propaganda by the deed'.

Secondly, another form of terrorism, which gained a very high degree of internationalisation, is known as **Left-wing Terrorism**. Being the 'vanguard of the oppressed proletariat', this form of terror is extremely radical as it intends to bring about political change from a capitalist status quo to Marxist, Leninist, Maoist, Trotskyist, Communist or any other socialist style of government. This form of political violence is deep rooted in ideological underpinnings and the strategies employed are extremely efficient with a strong cadre base. Some instances of left-wing terrorism are the Baader-Meinh in West Germany, Italian Red Brigades, Weather Underground and Symbionese Liberation Army of the US, Naxals in India, Communist Party (Maoist) of Nepal, etc.

However, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, a new form of left-wing terrorism emerged known as the **New-left Terrorism**. Contrary to the left-wing terror, this form of terror largely consists of a loosely organised cadre, which is rarely full timer. The issues circumventing this form of violence range from radical environmentalism, anarchism and anti-globalism.

The third strand of ideologically motivated terrorism is the **Right-Wing Terrorism**. It consists of acts of violence perpetrated by outlawed groups that do not seek a social revolution, but resort to violence as a way to express and advance their political goals, such as ultra-nationalism and anti-communism. For the same, such groups utilise policies of Xenophobia, racism, anti-semitism and conservatism. Sturmabteilungen in Weimar Germany (SA), Ku Klux Klan of 1930s, Neo-Nazis and skinheads in Europe, Patriot Movement groups of the US, Neo-Fascism in post-war Italy etc. are few examples.

Finally, the fourth form of terrorism in the spectrum discussed above is that of **Ethno-Nationalist/Separatist Terrorism**. Its resurgence is a relatively recent phenomenon and is largely based on disagreements and dissidence among ethnic and national communities. This form of terror – having clearly demarcated political cause (s) – seeks to establish autonomy, self-determination or even complete independence from the existing political order, for example, Chechen separatists in Russia.

Spatial Dimensions of Terrorism

Spatially, the most distinguishable forms of terrorism are **Domestic** and **International**. The former intends to further a domestic and political social agenda and is primarily located in the host country and its organisation (in terms of membership, finance, and logistics), victims and targets too consist of the host country. Correspondingly, the international form of terrorism, synchronous to contemporary conflicts, differs from the former with regard to its spatial dimensions, membership, victims, finance and related logistical support. Unlike domestic terrorism, it is not localised with regard to its ideological affiliations or intended objectives. Also, the externalities in this case differ considerably.

7.6 OTHER FORMS OF POLITICAL VIOLENCE

As is evident from the discussion in the preceding sections, the boundaries between terrorism and other forms of political violence overlap considerably. Nevertheless, none of

the groups/individuals indulging in acts of terror admit to the label of being ‘terrorists’; secondly, most use terminologies which are self-preferred (freedom fighters, warriors etc.); thirdly and unambiguously, most militant groups are driven by more than one motivation (the overlap is elucidated in them internalising and synthesising right-wing extremism and religious fundamentalism; nationalism and left-wing radicalism or religious extremism and radical nationalism).

Nevertheless, it is still important to distinguish between acts of terror and other forms of political violence. This is necessitated on two accounts. First, not all forms of political violence can be termed under the broad umbrella of ‘terrorism’; and second, if the first assertion is logical then what are the forms of political violence that differ from terrorism and how so?

The dominant forms of political violence that cannot be juxtapositioned within the broad ambit of terrorism are **Guerrilla Warfare** and **Insurgency**. Both these forms constitute ideologically oriented legitimate typology of protest. Principally, these forms differ from terrorism in the following manner. First, the very nature of the act differs considerably – terrorism is deliberate, indiscriminate, sporadic and a highly visible form of violence to inflict casualties on non-combatants; while guerrilla warfare and insurgency are not so. Secondly, terrorism and guerrilla warfare and insurgency differ in their contexts.

Thirdly, the intended targets of terrorism and guerrilla warfare and insurgency differ. While in the former, the targets are indiscriminate, in the latter, the targets are usually the government and its institutions. Fourthly, the goals of terrorism shuffle from specific to abstract, while those of guerrilla warfare and insurgency are largely specific. Fifthly, while the support base of terrorism is ambiguous, that of those indulging in guerrilla warfare and insurgencies is highly localised. Finally, terrorism is asymmetrical in nature while guerrilla warfare and insurgencies are somewhat symmetrical in comparison.

7.7 SUMMARY

One of the forms of non-state actor violence is terrorism that involves the use of a violent strategy for essentially political reasons. It is a tactic that has no specific independent ideology, but an ideological or religious group can use it to further its end. Terrorism targets the state and particular communities but ends up killing and damaging innocent people who may have nothing to do with the idea that the terrorists target. There are different causes for the employment of this method. Even guerrilla warfare and insurgency are considered as forms of terrorism. States and government need to address the causes for terrorism as well as to make their citizens secure from this threat.

7.8 TERMINAL QUESTIONS

1. Critically comment on the non-state aspects of terrorism.
2. How does terrorism undermine the governmental credibility, legitimacy and how does it destabilise the social fabric of society?
3. Terrorism is an asymmetrical form of political violence. Explain.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Combs, Cynthia., *Terrorism in the 21st Century*, Prentice Hall, New York, 2004

Connor, James E., (ed.) *Lenin on Politics and Revolution*, Pegasus/Bobbs-Merrill, New York, 1968.

Crenshaw, Martha, and John Pimlott., (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of World Terrorism*, M. E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, 1997.

Hoffman, Bruce., "The Confluence of International and Domestic Trends in Terrorism", *Terrorism and Political Violence*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp., 1997.

Hoffman, Bruce., *Inside Terrorism*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2006.

Kegley, Charles W. Jr., ed., *The New Global Terrorism: Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2002.

Laqueur, Walter., *The New Terrorism: Fanaticism and the Arms of Mass Destruction*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.

Lutz, James Michael and Brenda J. Lutz., *Terrorism: Origins and Evolution*, Palgrave, New York, 2005.

Rapoport, David C., "The Fourth Wave: September 11 in the History of Terrorism", *Current History*, December 2001.

Reich, Walter., (ed.), *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind*, Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C, 1990.

Wardlaw, Grant., *Political Terrorism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, 1989.

Young, Reuven., "Defining Terrorism: The Evolution of Terrorism as a Legal Concept in International Law and Its Influence on Definitions in Domestic Legislation", *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review*, Vol. 29, No. 23, 2006.