Terrorism – conceptualization and development

Jozef Klavec[1]
Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Slovakia

Terrorism – conceptualization and development. The core of terrorism is systemic violence usage to terrify people and spread fear. Fear serves as a policy tool for terrorists. The definition of terrorism that would be widely acceptable is an issue for discussion. The existing definitions vary according following criteria: the amount of definition characters, the orientation of institutions backing those definitions and as well according individual scholars and their orientation. Development of terrorism from radicalism towards extremism is influenced by two accredited indicator groups: Terrorism as a state policy tool in the sense of defence against enemies was born during the Great French Revolution and as a tool of revolutionaries – intellectuals wanting to destroy the existing society. This was born in Russia during Tsarist regime. Anarchists – terrorists created first terrorist international. The point of view of the modern terrorism predecessors emphasizes the organizational structure and operation of Socialist Revolutionary Party military wing. Since the second half of the 20th century the development aimed from social-revolutionary and ethno-separatist groups towards religion-oriented groups. Among these, global Jihadist terrorism is the ultimate threat.

Key words: terrorism, extremism, development, conflict

Terorizmus – konceptualizácia a vývoj. Podstatou terorizmu je systematické využívanie ozbrojeného násilia na zastrašenie a vytvorenie atmosféry strachu, v ktorej je strach nástrojom politiky teroristov. Problémom je všeobecne prijateľná definícia terorizmu. Tieto definície sa líšia podľa počtu definičných znakov, podľa zamerania inštitúcií na pôde ktorých boli sformulované a aj podľa orientácie jednotlivých odborníkov. Na trajektóriu vývoja od radikalizmu k extrémizmu pôsobia ako všeobecne uznávané dve skupiny indikátorov. Terorizmus ako súčasť politiky štátu v zmysle obrany pred nepriateľmi sa zrodil vo Veľkej francúzskej revolúcii. V cárskom Rusku sa stal nástrojom intelektuálov-revolucionárov na zničenie existujúcej spoločnosti. Anarchisti-teroristi vytvorili prvú teroristickú internacionálu. Z pohľadu predchodcov moderného terorizmu bola dôležitá organizačná štruktúra a činnosť vojenského krídla strany Sociálnych revolucionárov. Od druhej polovice 20. storočia vývoj smeroval od sociálno-revolučne a etnoseparatistických skupín k nábožensky orientovaným skupinám. V nábožensky orientovanom terorizme predstavuje najväčšiu hrozbu globálny džihádistický terorizmus.

Kľúčové slová: terorizmus, extrémizmus, vývoj, konflikt

---

[1] Address: doc. PhDr. Jozef Klavec, PhD., Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Bučianska 4/A, 917 01 Trnava, Slovak Republic, email: klavec.j@gmail.com

Definition of Terrorism

Searching for consensus in the perception of the terrorism core and its salient features in the international arena is problematic. The problem is mainly political and ideological; we can work towards the specifics of terrorism and its core through its insertion into the widely perceived idea of politically motivated violence. Here the terrorism is one of its forms or degrees.

The basic feature is systematic violence usage to terrify the chosen group of people, political parties and various organizations to force them to change their attitude towards the issue that is among the first on the agenda of terrorists. The core idea is thus using the fear or intimidation to achieve political goals. For that reason, in relations to the term terrorism some experts emphasize the importance of victims being the aim of this violence, since it helps to create the atmosphere of fear and apprehension.

Terrorist attacks targeted to groups of people, organizations or individuals are subject to specific criteria that promote political importance of victims. Their popularity or vice versa can be a barrier for a long-term terrorist goals. Precedent violence usage or trustworthy threat of violence creates the chronic fear state (Schmid and Jongman, 2011).

As a consequence, members of the group that became the target of terrorist operations have lost their sense of security, and the insecurity feeling spreads over the whole group and other inhabitants as well. Public opinion can then create political pressure towards government to grant concessions to terrorists in the name of citizens' security. On the contrary, such approach does not solve the situation, but it creates better conditions for strengthening the terrorists' pressure towards the government members, worsening the internal security.

There is no single generally accepted terrorism definition. Situation is co-created by a different political understanding evaluating the operation of different terrorist organizations and individuals. It can simply be expressed as two different evaluations on the opposite sides of the spectrum. Terrorist is it a criminal or is it a freedom fighter? Other position held is poles of freedom and security categories, either we are secured, or we are free.

The difficulty lies as well in the choice and the number of salient features forming a base for terrorism definition. Outcome of that is widely formulated terrorism definition that includes different forms of violence, mainly armed violence and there is not enough differentiation and stress on the specific features of terrorism. When terrorism is identified only by chosen types of violence and political regimes, it is as well inaccurate and loose. Questions arise whether there is any sense in trying to find a common definition of terrorism.

Schmid and Jongman (2011) tried to solve the problem by asking larger number of experts to formulate their own definition of terrorism. What specific features of terrorism they would include? They gained 109 terrorism definitions and in them searched for specific characters occurrence. Famous chart was created, on one side chosen definition characters and on another one occurrence (percentage) in 109 definitions.

violence and power	83.5 %
politically motivated violence	65.0 %
fear and terror	51.0 %
threat	47.0 %
psychical consequences	41.5 %

When Schmid later contemplated about the definition of terrorism, he was coming out from the fact that terrorism is a part of more general term of political violence. He was mainly looking for the answer to the question of what factors are the most frequently used as specific characters of the term political violence and what type of violence form the larger or smaller contribution to the term terrorism.

Types of violence:	occurrence in the term terrorism:
taking hostages	80 %
murders	75 %
bombings	75 %
abductions	70 %
threatening	70 %
urban warfare	65 %
sabotage	60 %
torture	45 %
hijacks	35 %

(Schmid, 2008, p. 5)

We need to respect the differentiation of single terrorist actions to impose criminal sanctions on individuals perpetrating them. Differentiation as well influences the possibility of deposition in case of foreign citizens. When it comes to terrorism typology, the framework of politically motivated terrorism includes three groups: 1) socialist-revolutionary, 2) ethno-separatist and 3) religiously motivated.

Terror is a particular activity of individuals or organized groups that use various means to threaten chosen target groups or individuals to achieve political aims through threatening that leads to mobilization and the loss of the ability to withstand the terrorist activities. The security organs and whole

system of institutions then cannot guarantee fixed security environment inevitable for normal society running.

Terror is a tool that can help to achieve specific aims and it represents political approach tied with terror as a common tool to achieve political aims.

There are many problems in effort to find the most accurate and widely acceptable terrorism definition as one of the forms and levels of political violence. The formulation of the definition is unclear; several issues make it difficult to find a consensus in defining what terrorism is. One of the basic problems is the differentiation of terrorism from the other forms of politically motivated violence. Other ambiguity lies in the question whether we can define terror without the framework to put it in. In that case the important feature is the docility of the terrorism definition.

It is unclear whether we can include state terrorism (citizens threatening) and terrorism stemming from armed fighting or uprising against state power under the term terrorism. The ambiguity lies as well in the possibility of differentiating terrorism from ordinary criminal acts, fighting among rival groups and differentiating it from acts that stem from mental disorders and diseases demonstrated by hallucinations, disillusions etc. (Schmid and Jongman, 2011).

Experts in the field of political motivated violence and terrorism have been discussing what the core of political terrorism is; however all of the ambiguities make it difficult to agree on single generally valid definition of terrorism. Recently there have been some attempts to find a common definition for terrorism though. On the ground of League of Nations in Geneva (1937) the terrorism definition proposal was presented, but it was not approved. It includes "all criminal acts targeted against state and openly or indirectly aiming at creation of fear atmosphere in the minds of particular people or group of people or general public." (Samson, 2002, p. 11).

The UN approved several significant resolutions concerning violent performance in many crisis areas of the world. UN resolution no. 51/210 (1999) approved by General Assembly says about terrorism: "First, it vigorously alienates all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable acts no matter who is the perpetrator and where it does take place. Second, it repeats that criminal acts openly or indirectly aiming at causing fear in general public, individuals or group of people in order to achieve political goals are at all times unjustifiable, although the perpetrators try to justify those acts by political, philosophy, ideology, race, ethnic, religious or other reasons." (Samson, 2002, p. 19).

Second significant attempt to define terrorism and put it into broader and more accurate framework was performed in one of the UN agencies dealing with the fight against drug business and criminality. This terrorism definition is

quite extensive covering more definition characters in relation to each other. This definition talks mostly about violent actions, fear and reasons to perpetrate such violent actions, about violence victims and their importance, communication function – delivering the terrorists message including their particular requests having only propaganda function.

"Terrorism is a method that serves to invoke fear from repeated violent actions…reasons for such actions are idiosyncratic, criminal or political… Direct violence victims are chosen either accidentally (as an object of the chance) or as a symbol (representing symbolic aims). The victims are chosen from citizens and should communicate a message. Communication process among terrorist (or terrorist organization), victim and main target (state, public) is based on threat and violence. Main target (state, public) is meant to become a real recipient of requests and addressee of the attention depending on the fact whether terrorist is preferentially looking for threatening, forcing to compromise or propaganda." (Samson, 2002, p. 20)

Risks of extremism

Radicalization leading towards extremism creates under some circumstances favourable conditions for individual, bunk or organization to become terroristic. When analysing reasons for radical groups' development (whether the motivation is social – revolutionary, ethno-separatist or religious) we need to keep in mind that there has been no general consensus among experts in the terrorism issue to work on a framework as an analytical tool to help to analyse single groups and movements. That could help to find reasons for development towards terrorism. One of the main causes why is it difficult to create such analytical framework is the problem to agree on general definition of terrorism as a social and political phenomenon. Trying to achieve such agreement more definitions have been used as work definitions.

Such is the definition in the article 22 of the criminal code of the USA that defines terrorism as "considered, politically motivated violence aimed against non-fighting targets by sub-state groups or secret service agents in order to influence witnesses." Terrorism attacks chosen persons representing particular groups in the society and is therefore a symbolic act of influencing not only direct witnesses of the act but the majority of the society as well.

Within the level of conflict classification terrorism is usually put into the low level conflict group. Tactics and tools of guerrilla warfare are merged with the terrorists acts and operations aimed precisely on the top power-holders or business represents and other significant persons in the society.

Effective tool to press on the government from the terrorist viewpoint have become attacks on the foreign travellers. Those aim to destroy or significantly lower the income of the country from tourism that for many countries is a

major contributor. However that is not the main aim of terrorist groups. It is only a tool to enhance pressure towards government in order to achieve change towards their own organization, release of their jailed members and sympathizers, or a change in the attitude of the government in the chosen areas of foreign policy.

When analysing the terrorist activities on regional or global scale we need to focus on the mutual relations among political, economic and social conditionality of it. Based on the analysis higher number of politically motivated violence is explained, plus drifts towards group radicalization, stemming from non-violent forms of demonstration of disagreement with the government policy and society development condition towards armed violence and terrorism. Individual physique is as well influenced, their opinions radicalize and they try to incorporate into organizations oriented at terrorist methods. Terror is identified with political activity.

The main effort is not to evaluate the factors individually but to follow them as a mutual interaction complex. Risk model should be created as working tool to analyse complex conditionality of radical group change towards terrorism. Many humanities experts are applying this approach.

Marta Crenshaw in the foreword of her volume „Terrorism in Context" comes out from the claim that „casual chain leading towards terrorist acts perpetration is complex. We can see it as a constrictive cone and the decision to commit terrorist action is at its end. We cannot create general theory based on existing conditions, since final decision depends on the conditions evaluation by single political actors. When deciding to use terrorism nothing is automatic. Similarly to any political decision the decision to use terror is influenced both by psychological reflections and inner expectations and considered or strategic reactions to chances and pressure seen in the light of the organization aims. It is possible to integrate macro- and micro-level of analysis to find out which situations instigate opposition or states to use terrorist tactics. Opposition is instigated in order to withstand power or to establish new regime, states use terrorism to hold back real or anticipated defiance or to consolidate state power. Causes and consequences of terrorism as well can be understood in the light of interactions among political actors, governments and opposition namely..." (Crenshaw, 1995, p. 5).

Marta Crenshaw further analyses negative impact that information spread by media about terrorist actions has on the relation to terrorism: „ Conceptions of terrorism are not only applying to experts in the field but government policy and citizens reactions as well. Modern societies discuss political conceptions and they are even created through mass media that serve not only as a transfer channel for information about terrorism but as well as magnifying glass. However problem of terrorism is simplified by focusing the public attention

towards interesting aspects of the phenomenon that is then – unlike everyday affairs – having extra-ordinary or astounding character. Terrorism is then described as dramatic, violent and ineligible. Opposition using terrorism is concurrently fully aware of the publicity chances in its environment and it uses its own skill to focus the attention and increasing the level of awareness. Although the terrorism image is often critical aspect of its effectiveness as a method of political communication, not all terrorists are having relations with mass media. They often dismiss expressions allowed for by the press. States and extremists involved in terrorist actions typically try to avoid publicity." (Crenshaw, 1995, p. 8).

Various models of terrorism development have been created taking into account structural and psychological reasons for terrorism, or they stress the function of political communication mainly. Others are oriented more towards multi-dimensional conditionality of terrorism that is in certain environment co-influenced by more factors. Those factors are sometimes called dynamic variables.

Creation of development model from radicalism and extremism towards terrorism is a problem of choice among value important indicators influencing such development. Very valuable in this sense is a work of E. Sprinzak: „From Theory to Practice: Developing Early Warning Indicators for Terrorism" that focuses on the 11 indicators of early warning signs of politically active groups change to terrorist. Those indicators named by Sprinzak are: *1. De-legitimization intensity, 2. Moral inhibitions, 3. Former violence experience, 4. Rational assessment of risks and chances, 5. Organizational, financial and political resources, 6. Threat perception, 7. Group rivalry, 8. Age of activists, 9. Outside influence and manipulation, 10.Degradation perception and need to avenge, 11. Violent leaders*. (Sprinzak, 1998, p. 37).

Indicators he chose have structured inner content, since they do not cover only violence and terrorism in the narrow sense; they as well include factors possibly co-working this way but being derived from wider context of society development. Such activist protest groups have been formed within society and part of them is having the character of terrorist groups.

In the analysis of how chosen indicators affect the development leading to terrorism there is a permanent dilemma because no matter how hard we try to find important indicators for this analysis it is only a fraction. Second important factor having qualitative content is as well lack of information on radical activist groups limiting the analysis objectiveness.

Analytics need to be aware to use the indicators not in their mutual isolation but to respect them as part of a broader integrated theoretical framework. In spite of the effort terrorist potential index (meaning marking particular group)

has only the character of precursory qualitative estimation. Only further particular factors in the development will influence its level.

Other choice of indicators – factors undermining development from radicalism to extremism and terrorism are:

1. Cultural/regional isolation, 2. Isolation from family, 3. Risk behaviour, 4. Sudden change in religious practice, 5. Violent rhetoric, 6. Negative influence of peers, 7. Isolation from peer groups, 8. Using violent rhetoric, 9. Political activism, 10. Military training, 11. Travels and stays abroad, 12. Death rhetoric, 13. Extremist group membership, 14. Contact with extremist recruits, 15. Special military training, 16. Foreign actions participation

Historical and political terrorism development

The term „terror regime" was born in the Great French Revolution era and it has become a stable part of policies mainly totalitarian and authoritarian political systems. French republic that started to form as a republic in 1789 had big problems at the beginning relating to its domestic political organization – part of the people engaged wanted to subject the king´s power to the constitution – on one hand and on the other hand radicals that wanted to change conditions in the society in a way to form a new man. These were represented namely by Maximillian Robespierre and Saint Just known as Death Angel.

Such aims caused that terror became an organic part of the politics and in relation with state applied terror we can talk about political phenomenon. Wide range application of terror was conditioned by annihilation of social and political regime that was interfering with the „new man" creation. Realization of utopian ideas is very close to using terror as a political tool. We could prove that in this particular case by pointing at the nexus between utopian aims of the revolution leaders: ideal society creation and new virtuous man that is abiding the law. Based on these aims the buzzwords of the French revolution were formulated: freedom, equality and brotherhood. However, such vague terms might include almost anything.

Aims being in conflict with reality strengthened the terror importance in the practical politics. Primary goal was to stabilize the new power thus causing the need to fight real or apparent revolution enemies. Rising level of terror increased the level of suspicion and threat feeling causing paranoia. Its peak was during the Jacobin dictatorship, clearly stated by Maximillian Robespierre: "Patriot is who under all circumstances supports the republic, and who is against it even in a little thing, is a rat." (Camus, 1995, p. 129).

Violence and threatening, the basic essence of terror, was rationalized in the opinions of Jean Paul Marat, founder of „Friend of commons" newspaper. In an effort to be known as philanthropist he wanted to „knock off few heads to save thousands". Those few heads to be knocked off were counted 273 000.

Second factor were activities of some western European powers that wanted to save monarchy in France and the king Louis XVI. and his family in particular. Several military operations occurred against French republic. These were the conditions where broader understanding of the importance of terror was born in the sense of the terror regime as inevitable tool to protect the republic against inner enemies and foreign intervention.

Terror in the Jacobin dictatorship era was interpreted very loose. It led to the fact that „Committee of public safety" headed by Robespierre could identify anyone as enemy of the republic based solely on his own consideration. Terror then as a defence tool was applied not only against its real or apparent enemies, but as well against its advocates that were seen as a threat by the members of the committee. „Revolution eats its own children" is the very well-known phrase.

Terror as a tool to achieve political goals was explained by Robespierre in his Convent speech from 6th February 1794. He said: „We need to stifle inside and outside enemies of the Republic or even to die with it. Main sign of our politics needs to in this situation public leadership and elimination of enemies by terror. If the sign of the public power in peace is virtue, in revolutionary time virtue is connected with terror. Terror without virtue is a disastrous issue; virtue without terror is though impotent. Terror is nothing but an available, austere and stubborn justice. Justice is then the expression of virtue as well. (Bonanate, 1997, p. 10).

Saint Just, close Robespierre friend unified justice with terror and compared them. In an account for Convent on 26th February 1794 he wrote: „No blame is there to be left unpunished or forgiven by the government. Justice is feared by the enemies of the republic more than terror. How many rats fled from terror but did not flee from justice that counts crimes on its scales! Justice is still judging people´s enemies and those that support tyranny. They can hope that terror will end because all the unrest will stop. Terror is a double sword, used by ones to avenge people and by other to support tyranny. Terror filled up jails but those to blame are not punished yet. Terror has blown over as a hurricane." (Bonanate, 1997, p. 10).

Russian revolutionary Tkachev in the first half of 19th century saw as a main barrier for development the old generation. He claimed that all citizens older than 25 must be killed to achieve development in Russia. Camus concisely adds: „Really genius method that will apply itself in the activities of modern super state where the childbearing is helplessly watched by terrorized adults. Caesarean socialism of course down-faces individual terrorism, because it brings to life values not compatible with the ascendance of the history justice. Nevertheless it renews the state-level terror justifiable only by building the society of people put in the same level as God." (Camus, 1995, p. 177).

This line of thought is preserved in the Pisarev´s claims according Glucksmann although in a less radical way: Revolutionary intelligence should mainly have devastating function and barriers that had to be cleared away in Russia were big enough for only a negative behaviour to fulfil a life of his generation. (Glucksmann, 2003, p. 101).

Among well-known theorists that support the violence use and murder as an arm against unjust and immoral environment and political regime (that is murdering officially to advocate injustice and immorality) was Karl Heinzen who wrote the essay „The murderer" in 1849. He claims that fighters against injustice in the society must be able to use knowledge to construct arms and bombs later used against unjust and barbarian regime, mainly against army and police that are well armed. He therefore claims that the response must be „blood for blood, murder for murder and destroy for destroy." (Miller, l995, p. 36).

He thinks that it is inevitable for freedom fighters to search for new methods of killing. Repressive state organs have large infrastructure available that can be used to produce arms, munition and it makes the technology development in armament production. Therefore freedom fighters need to learn how to make powerful bombs able to cause great damage: „ Shoot being shot into the group of few hundred people kills them all." (Miller, 1995, p. 36).

Such opinions were an inspiration for anarchism followers that used terror and created first international terrorist network. One of those anarchists – terrorists having international contacts was Italian anarchist Felice Orsini. He tried to kill French emperor Napoleon III. on 14th January 1858 in front of the Opera House in Paris. Three bombs were used that exploded heavily, however Napoleon III. and his wife managed to flee and survive this attempt to kill them. The bomb shells hurt 156 people; some of them heavily wounded lying helplessly on the ground. Eight people were killed including 13-years old boy. This unsuccessful attempt having many victims and causing shock among Paris inhabitants made journalists call Orsini „a wild beast" with his laboratory of crime, or as we call it nowadays the bomb factory. (Miller, 1995, p. 37).

Orsini prepared this conspiracy by taking use of his international connections from Napoli to London. An expert for arms was involved that had an attachment to anarchists and French doctor having radical political beliefs. Both of them were living in England. Bombs were produced in the Birmingham factory and were smuggled to Belgium before they were delivered to Orsini. (Miller, 1995, p. 38). This fact shows that terrorists' methods have not changed since international anarchists' terrorist network to current global Jihad terrorism at the dawn of the 21st century. They still do need to adjust to the situation to be successful.

Intellectual and revolution theorist Mikhail Bakunin in his volume „Catechism of a revolutionary" stresses the importance of a personal characteristics of a revolutionary, his orientation, interests. He writes about the relationship of a revolutionary to his personal interests and property: He has no interests, property, feelings, and personal relations of his own. He even does not have a name. He is fulfilled by the only interest, that disqualifies anything else, the only thought, the only passion – revolution" (Bonanate, 1997, p. 29).

As stated in the Catechism of revolutionary written by Bakunin and Nechayev that is discussing the personal profile and character of a revolutionary and relationships in his private life (evaluating the importance of violence and destruction):"Revolutionary rejects all doctrines and all the secular science is left for the next generations by him. He only knows one science, science of destruction. He thus studies mechanics, physics, chemistry, and even medicine. He studies day and night, real people, characters, situations, and all the conditions of the current regime in all possible groups of society. He only has one destiny: to destroy that mangy regime as quickly as possible."

„Revolutionary enters the political and social world, so called educated world and he only lives through it believing that this world will be completely and as quickly as possible destroyed. If he feels sorry for anything in this world, he is not truly a revolutionary. He must be able to destroy situations, relationships, persons belonging to this world; he must hate everything and everybody the same way. His family ties, friendships and love affinities do not change that. If those ties can stop him, he is not a revolutionary. In order to destroy and destruct unmercifully the revolutionary can and often must live in the society and claim to be someone else."

"Our mission is horrible, complete, general and cruel destruction. When getting close to people we mainly connect to the areas of people's life that never stopped the real protest against anything connected to the state: against aristocracy, bureaucracy, priests, businessmen, against rich and exploitative with the world of wild burglars, those are the only real revolutionaries in Russia. We want to unify this world into one single invincible and massive power." (in Glucksmann, 2003, pp. 102-103).

Revolution catechism further writes about the revolutionary relationships with science and knowledge: "...He only knows one science, science of destruction. He thus studies mechanics, physics, chemistry and even medicine." He only has one aim: to break that filthy regime as quickly as possible." (Bonanate, 1997, p. 29).

Russian nihilists – revolutionaries are characterized as: „...those Russian nihilists, those careless craftsmen of nothingness living in poverty whole life, in self-abnegation, they suffer for their product of death. And all of that without

any hope for reward either on Earth or after death, all only instinctively and purely loving destruction." (in Glucksmann, 2003 p. 103).

At the I. international conference in Haag in 1872 Marx followers and anarchists started to dispute. It was a definitive and organizational divorce of the two when anarchists founded anarchist international in Switzerland, also known as Federation Jura. Most well – known followers of this stream were Enrico Malatesta, Mikhail Bakunin, Peter Kropotkin, James Guillaume and others, all of them members of the international. They discussed and reflected on the level of violence, violent actions as a tool to destroy unjust barbarian societal order and how to achieve change through social revolution. Basic idea discussed and thought was the violence and social revolution nexus. (Kassel, 2008, pp. 240-241).

Well – known anarchy theorist was Johann Most that left Germany for London, where he wrote for an anarchy magazine "Freiheit" (Freedom). Main importance of violence to destroy the old orders he expressed this way: "Kings, priests, or capitalists, they all must be killed, if they still do advocate old orders." (Miller, 1995, p. 44). After he left for USA he continued in his reflections and published in the Alarm newspapers. His opinions on violence and means to use to achieve the old order destruction were expresses as a „dynamite cult". Dynamite is what he sees as a tool to solve social issues. Not only dynamite, since Most promoted to use knowledge from various areas to construct explosives and ability to use them. He called it „revolution – military science". In this sense he published a book called „Short guide to use and preparation of nitro-glycerine, dynamite, cotton powder, igniter cord, bombs and poisons" in New York in 1885. (Miller, 1995, p. 48).

Influenced by the Bakunin and Kropotkin and their opinions and theoretical conceptions more radical groups were organized in Russia, the most well-known terrorist group „Zemlja i volja" (The Earth and Liberty). Its member Vera Zasulich shot the governor of Petersburg in 1878. Other group was „Narodnaja volja" (People´s Will), whose commando killed the Tsar Alexander II. in March 1881. The basic feature of these groups was the fact that all the terrorist attacks perpetrators and its organizers were members of the higher society, as well as the attacks were aimed at the high-society representatives.

The most important target of the Petersburg university students' conspiracy in March 1887 was Tsar Alexander III. Lenin's brother Alexander Ulyanov and brother of Joseph Pilsudski Bronislaw were among the group members. (Pomper, 1995, p. 87).

The modern terrorist groups' ancestor of the second half of 20th century was the military wing of the Socialist Revolutionaries party (SR). This military wing called "Bojevaja organizacija (BO)" was led by two well-known persons: Azev and Boris Savinkov. Azev was also cooperating with the secret service

Protection, when planning terrorist actions and concurrently informing about some of them. The most important person of BO was intellectual and terrorist Boris Savinkov. The most noted terrorist act of BO were killing of the secretary of state Viacheslav Pleve in 1904 in Petersburg, two murders in 1905 – killing Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich, governor general of Moscow and the uncle of tsar, and the second victim was Prefect of police Pavel Andrejevich Shuvalov. The highest number of victims had the terrorist attack that attempted to kill the Prime Minister Peter Stolypin in 1906. He survived this attempt, however was shot at the Kiev Opera House five years later. 1906 – 1907 period marked the highest number of murder attacks by BO, therefore is sometimes called as „terrorist harvest" or „terrorist plague." Next years did not bring the end of such attacks, however, its number was reduced by the agent-provocateurs working for the secret service Protection and giving information about the persons and activities planned, thus the terrorists could be eliminated.

Leftist wing of the Socialist Revolutionaries party got together with Bolsheviks in the era known as „October Revolution". After Lenin and his comrades took power, mainly in 1918 after Brest – Litovsk Peace Treaty signed by Germany and Soviet Russia, socialist revolutionaries stood against new power and its representatives calling them „German imperialism agents." The result was the higher number of terrorist attacks, German ambassador Count Wilhelm von Mirbach was killed on 6th July 1918. Extreme left wing of Socialist revolutionaries terrorist murdered German Gen. Hermann von Eichorn in Kiev. In summer 1918 terrorists turned over to higher positioned representatives of the Bolshevik Party and killed V. Volodarsky and M. S. Uricky (Pomper, 1995, pp. 98-99).

Terrorist attack with the highest number of casualties was committed on 5th September 1919 when Moscow seat of Bolshevik Party saw a bomb explosion killing 12 and hurting 30 people. Nikolai Bukharin was among those hurt, he got a lot popular within the party and was called „ a party darling". His popularity however was seen as competition by Stalin, therefore he was sentenced to death at the well-known trials in Moscow in the second half of the 1930s.

Socialist revolutionaries were quite dangerous for power positions of Bolsheviks, therefore 24 most well-known party top-members were put on trial. It was the end of the era of Socialist Revolutionaries Party and its terrorist activities. At the beginning of the 1920s Boris Savinkov was allured to Soviet Russia from his French exile. He was told that the organization was founded that would fight against Bolsheviks. He came back to Soviet Russia only to get arrested and later died in prison. He wrote „Memories of a terrorist" and two short stories in prison.

Planned murders of the persons representing hated occupying power in certain regions trying to keep the region within the empire or murders targeted at domestic citizens accused of cooperation with imperial power authorities were present during Roman empire era already.

Later, at the end of 11th century it was a separatist group from Shiite sect Ismailia. Its leader was Hasan Sabah, known as „mountain sheikh" as well. His followers attended mystic rituals, took drugs and committed murder attacks at the whole area of the Abbas caliphate against important Sunni Muslims, from the highest rank positions to the lowest. Their victims were also members of the crusades that found themselves in the western part of the Middle East. That is the reason why the French word „*l´assasin*" meaning murderer emerged – derived from this drug takers – "hasheeshins". They terrorized the empire for almost two centuries.

In the 19th century various groups of anarchist mainly in Western Europe became well-known for taking part in the murder attacks. Italian anarchist e.g., that murdered Elizabeth von Bavaria (Sissi) in Venice in the 1890s. Europe was hit by the series of successful and not completed murders that time, mainly anarchists. In 1887 Spanish anarchists prepared a manifesto saying: „If a society does not back up, it is inevitable that devil and sin must die even if we all die as well." (Camus, 1995, pp. 167-168).

Anarchists and nihilists in Russia stood for the already known position that the best promotion of own aims are the one based on death as in the command: Kill killers! Such appeals and argumentation was successful among part of the radically oriented educated young people as Vera Zasulich and Sofia Perovskaya, Nechayev and more exponents of terrorism in Russia in second half of the 19th century.

For anarchists – nihilists in Russia it was important to dissolve the existing society and its structure and using murders and death attempts achieve first level – threat of the leaders and political representatives of the regimes. The top level would be anarchy and power overtaking. Sequential moral and ethical degradation as well serves to this goal.

Dostoyevsky in his book Demons writes: „...We get into the people straight. You know, we already are a lot powerful. Ours are not only those that kill and make fires, shoot or bite. Those are only a barrier. I cannot imagine anything without discipline. I am not a socialist, but a cheater..! Listen, I counted them all: teacher that makes fun of the kids God and their cot is ours. Lawyer that advocates educated murderer by saying he is more mature than his victims, and therefore to obtain money he had to kill, is ours. Students that killed the peasant to try the feeling are ours. The jury freeing criminals are all ours. Attorney shaking at the court he is not liberal enough, is ours, ours...." (Dostojevskij, 1967, p. 361 book character Verchovensky).

And using the words of other novel character, Peter Sergejevich, relating to the society degradation and power overtake – being the main aims of anarchists – nihilists, Dostoyevsky says:"... so it really depends on you and your personal belief you hopefully confirm in tomorrow already. That is the reason you associate yourself in a single organization – free bunch of people of same thinking to share energy and support and notice each other while aiming for the same goal. You are meant to renew the battered and inactively stinking stuff; you always remember that, as pep. All your steps led to the destruction, state, and morality. We, being chosen to take power, we take clever ones with us, but we will drive on the silly ones. Do not be confused by that. We need to bring up a generation to be worth freedom...We organize ourselves to inspire others, it would put shame on us not to overtake that what became lazy and even scolds at us." (Dostojevskij, 1967, p. 519).

The ancestor of modern terrorist organizations as a political party wing was Socialist Revolutionary Party foundation and namely its armed wing named Fight Organization (BO). Leader of this organization has become Boris Savinkov, intellectual and a direct participant of terrorist actions.

Russian terrorists were heavily influenced by nihilist perception of the world and Bakunin's opinions about revolution. He wished for Russia to become a strong dictatorship. He called for dictatorship not in contrary but along his passion for destruction. His follower Nechayev announced that there is a need to come close to the „wild environment of crimes, this real and only revolution world of Russia" (Camus, 1995, p. 163). We can find similar notion of fanatics as in the opinions of modern suicide bombers. Concurrently when comparing we can see several important differences. French philosopher Albert Camus evaluates the attitudes of Russian group of terrorists from the organization of socialist revolutionaries: „their being is based on the paradox that mix general awe for life with despite for life of his own, that borders the will to pay the highest price... terrorist action is decorated mainly by the sacrifice of the terrorist." (Camus, 1995, p. 170-171).

However, these people usually do not actually accomplish their actions, because of possible casualties – innocent people and children in particular. Such background was the reason for rejection of the bomb attack targeted at Gen. Dubasov travelling by train from Moscow to Petersburg.

Modern terrorism era started in the second half of the 1960s in the 20th century preceded by terrorist actions performed after the Second World War. Armed fighting against institutions and colonial officers was at the centre. Middle East had its famous action – Jewish organization Irgun put bombs into the seat of the British occupation mandate – King David Hotel in 1946.

In 1954 armed fight for independence in Algeria started. One of the leaders of the organization of the Front for the national liberation in the capital Alger

Jacef Sádí claimed that one shoot in the city is the same as attack in the countryside. People led by him put bombs into cafes, in the stations or in the places with higher movement, especially in the European part of the city. Driving cars in the night through the European neighbourhood they shoot people using machine guns.

In the second half of the 60s many people, mainly university students were influenced by the book „Guerrilla warfare" written by Ernest Guevara. Idea of guerrilla warfare was spread in the big cities areas of Western Europe by left-oriented students. They were as well strongly affected by Mao-Ce-Tung ideas about the importance of armed fighting and anti-Americanism as well, especially given the engagement of the USA in the Vietnam War.

Their terrorist actions were as well connected with the aims of Palestinian terrorist organizations. The most well-known youth terrorist organization in Western Europe was Red Army Fraction (RAF) led by Ulrika Meinhof and Andreas Bader. The chosen targets of terrorist actions were politicians of Western Germany, judges and industrialists. RAF members were trained in the training sites of Palestinian terrorist groups in the Middle East. They even cooperated in some mutual actions.

The most well-known action was the Air France plane hijack in summer 1976 to Uganda. It was mutual action of PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) and RAF. It was the same in action in October 1977 that was personally managed in the Middle East ordered by a part of RAF leadership. Its aim was to free ten members of the organization from jail in western Germany. After the action was stopped by German anti-terrorist unit, three members of the RAF leadership committed suicide by hanging themselves.

Similar type organizations was Direct action in France, Communist fight cells in Belgium and GRAPO in Spain having an aim of socialist state creation and blocking Spain from joining NATO. In Italy there were Red brigades. Terrorist organization ETA in Spain fights for independent Basque region and is more an ethno-separatist organization.

IRA fighting for Brits to leave the Northern Ireland mainly using bomb attacks finished its operation at the beginning of the 21st century. Successful peace process led to its de-mobilization. However, part of its members was not satisfied and created an organization called the „Real Irish Republican Army." They still recall themselves by armed actions.

In recent history terrorist organizations has created international terrorist network together with mainly Palestinian organizations such as al-Fattah, PLO, or group Black September that attacked Israeli sportsmen at the 1972 Olympics in Munich and other organizations.

At the end of 1970s and in the 1980s those organizations from those operating at the Middle East started to force through that criticized power

makers based on religious arguments. They sought inspiration in the texts of Koran and the preachers of the religious authorities. The influence of the Islamic revolution of Iran and unsuccessful USSR operation in Afghanistan caused by Islamic oriented guerrilla groups was strong.

In the environment of Palestinian radicals the counterpart for groups formed by secular ideology in the 80s. These organizations were HAMAS and Islamic jihad. In Lebanon the great factor of its internal policies has become Hezbollah, founded with Iranian support and help. In Algeria, there is Al-Jamaa Islamiya and Salafi group for preach and fight. Groups such as Al-Jamaa Islamiya were formed based on the militant Islam in the whole Muslim world. It is well Afghan and Pakistani Taliban that represent Pashtuns of radical confession that live both on Afghan and Pakistani side of the border.

In South Asia, on the island of Sri Lanka LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam) was until recently operating that used terrorist attacks as a part of its military operation and beyond it. It was the first organization to use suicide attacks of men and women that were included into special units called Black Tigers. Only later, at the beginning of the 90s the Palestinians started to use suicide attacks as well.

Among well-known ethno-separatist terrorist groups there are as well PKK (Kurdish Workers Party) operating in the eastern Turkey and armed groups of Chechen commanders active in the northern Caucasus and Islamic movement of Uzbekistan operating in the area of Fergana valley. For all of these movements (except PKK) the ideological base is militant Islam.

In 1985 the line was crossed when sect of the „Highest truth" (Asahara being the idea leader) attacked people in the Tokyo subway using chemical sarin gas. The sect made the gas in their own laboratories.

Fundamental turn in the terrorism development was 9/11 2001, when groups supported by al-Káida prepared and organized terrorist attacks on the WTC buildings in New York causing a death of 3000 people and on Pentagon, as well as unsuccessful attempt to attack White House by plane. Such amounts of atrocities, non-direct mass killing was aimed to cause shock and threaten people not only in the US but through the television channels invoke fear and worries in other countries as well. Success of this attack with great number of deaths and large material loss was achieved at relatively low cost.

REFERENCES

Bonanate, L., 1997. Mezinárodní terorismus. Columbus, Praha. s. l0.
Camus, A., 1995. Člověk revoltující. Český spisovatel, Praha. s. 164-167, 172-178.
Crenshaw, M., 1995. Terrorism in Context. Pennsylvanie, State University Press. s. 5-8.
Dostojevskij, F. M., 1967. Diablom posadnutí. Tatran, Bratislava. s. 361, 519.

Glucksmann, A., 2003. Dostojevskij na Manhattane. Esej o globalizovanom nihilizme. Agora, Bratislava. s. 72, 73-74, 101, l03, 107.

Kassel, W., 2008. Terrorism and the International Anarchist Movement of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries. Studies in Conflicts and Terrorism. pp. 240-241.

Miller, M. A., 1995. The Intelectual Origins of Modern Terrorism in Europe. Terrorism in Context. Ed. M. Crenshaw, Pennsylvania State University Press. s. 44, 48.

Pomper, P., 1995. Russian Revolutionary Terrorism. Terrorism in Context. ed. M. Crenshaw, Pennsylvania University Press. p. 87, pp. 98-99.

Samson, I., 2002. Medzinárodný terorizmus. Implikácie pre Slovensko. SFPA Bratislava. s. 9-12, 22-28.

Schmid, A. P., Jongman A., Price E., (ed.) 2011. The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research. Routledge London. pp. 39-98.

Schmid, A. P., 2008. Global Terrorism. Vol. I., SAGE, London.

Sprinzak, E., 1998. From Theory to Practice: Developing Early Warning Indicators for Terrorism. Washington D. C. USIP. p. 37.

Jozef Klavec, docent and security analyst, since 2013 he is on the position "docent" at the Department of Political Sciences at the University of Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. To his current professional interests belong the specifics terrorism, security questions, themes that are related to the conflict regions around the World.

Doc. PhDr. Jozef Klavec, PhD.
Katedra politických vied
Fakulta sociálnych vied, Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
Bučianska 4/A
917 01 Trnava
Slovak Republic
E-mail: klavec.j@gmail.com