

Dragana Petrović

10.46793/TKMKP24.178P

<https://doi.org/10.46793/TKMKP24.178P>

Ph.D., Research Associate
at the Institute for Comparative Law in Belgrade

TERRORISM AND TERRORISTS – understanding the structure and way of carrying out activities -*

Summary

„Terrorism is like an elephant at your front door,“ says author Timothy Thornton Ash, „you recognize it when you see it.“ No ideology, no visionary motivation, no goal can justify the energy that feeds this kind of evil. Modern terrorism erases all borders, all walls and consciences... In our modernity and globalization, its „value“ increases enormously, which attracts even more those who believe that this type of violence (extreme, theatrical...) will pay off. . In attempts to completely destroy the established order or its total transformation, terrorists attract the attention of the public to their goals, promote fear and an atmosphere of alarmism. Apocalyptic nihilists, planners and perpetrators of terrorist attacks offer no compromise – which can only result in one – catastrophic images of the massacre of innocent civilians, women and children. Expect reciprocity, ie. hitting one global network with another, an anti-terrorist network, is the only form of response that can provide appropriate results. Unfortunately, the international community (hypocritical, according to the „principle of double standards“) is constantly torn between recognizing the specific nature of the challenges it has been facing in recent years and insisting that its response take the form of a globalized anti-terrorist coalition. Perhaps as an answer to a bunch of questions that arise here – to expect reciprocity in this sense would mean, however, to misunderstand the essence of the challenge, because replacing violence with violence, as someone said these days, would mean „making a deal with the devil“. And maybe this kind of behavior brings us to the edge of the abyss, ruin...

Key words: terrorism, terror, terrorists, belief system.

1. Introduction

Terrorism is a form of complex political violence that appears in very diverse spheres of manifestation. It has been well noted that terrorism has a „chameleon nature“ (A. Roberts). From this perspective, it is suggested that it – depending on the circumstances in which the act is carried out – can fall into various types of crime.¹

Inducing fear and panic is the essence of this „terrorist game“. It's an old, already well-known story: a new era of terrorism is born, but the old one is not over yet. Indeed, in recent years, terrorism has been practiced in an unprecedented manner. By taking the cards „into his hands“ he forced the other side to change the rules of the game. And the new rules are brutal... cruel, because the stakes are cruel.

Terrorism, like viruses, is everywhere. It is no longer a marginal problem, a problem faced by some other countries, and we remain untouchable. In fact, it is believed that there has been a plague, a new kind of disease that is sweeping the world, a disease that cannot be controlled. Its contagiousness will put many potential targets to the test. It opens up questions that we have not faced before.

The distinctly new characteristics of terrorism are the following: terrorism is global, in the sense that borders no longer represent any barrier; deadly, because terrorists have changed their tactics to theatrical violence, choosing as targets places inhabited by civilians and trying to make their attacks cause as many victims as possible in order to undermine the entire social and cultural heritage of the enemy; – he is marked by destructiveness and professionalism in coordinating actions; it is carried out by civilians (without the support of the state), in a way and with the use of means that erase the classic boundaries between terrorism and declared war between states; it relies on the most modern technology of modern civilization in order to use that sophisticated technique to destroy modern civilization, which terrorists see as a threat to their sacred traditions; it is orchestrated by transnational non-state organizations through global conspiratorial networks of terrorist cells located in many countries, involving unprecedented levels of communication and coordination; led by fanatical extremists whose goal is to destroy everything through maximum bloodshed, committing crimes against humanity that require the sacrifice of their own lives in actions that cannot be deterred or prevented by negotiating a compromise solution; it is outside the

¹ D. Petrović, Novi terorizam, sadržaj i izbor reagovanja na međunarodni terorizam, Pravni život, vol. 529. no. 9/2009, p. 561.

established moral and legal norms that are universally accepted and respected for centuries; it is based on the realpolitik principle that the power to destroy is the same as the power to control and change; guided by hatred directed towards a certain goal – the terrorist’s desire to make that goal suffer because of what it is, what it does and because of the values it stands for.²

Undoubtedly, these changes require changes in strategy and tactics, that is, in the fight with him. A new „compass to navigate“ these new global terrains is needed. Unfortunately, we have not yet clearly defined its nature, just as we have not adopted a new name for this new type of harsh international reality. The scale of changes that are happening here is huge, and that is why, as soon as possible, different frameworks for thinking, analyzing and finding appropriate solutions must be formulated in order to trace a path towards a new, safer future. This requires „great vision and knowledge.“

Within this framework, will future terrorists be a more blood-thirsty variant of today’s terrorists in terms of the number of explosions and casualties, perhaps less discriminatory, but still studded with conventional explosives? Or will future terrorists turn to chemical, biological or nuclear weapons to cause mass destruction? Or will the new terrorists be sophisticated electronic warriors who penetrate and sabotage the electronic systems on which modern society increasingly relies?

No one can predict the future development of terrorism with certainty, because the history of terrorist activity does not allow us to „think broad-mindedly and at the same time be cautious“. (M. B. Jenkins)³

2. Different faces of the „power“ of terrorism

Terrorism is a heinous type of tactic, especially now that some extremist groups are indicating that they are interested in escalating its destructiveness. Every political community has a strong interest in minimizing this way of political expression. The question remains whether the fledgling global community is capable of doing so. In other words, the international community has yet to fully understand all the implications of many aspects of globalization. Indeed, the dynamics

² C. W. Kegley Jr.: The characteristics, Causes, and Controls of the New Global Terrorism: An Introduction, *The New Global Terrorism, Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, 2003, pp. 1-3.

³ *Ibid*, p. 5.

of global exchange in the field of economy, finance, investment and information can overcome the ability of each nation-state to control its economic destiny. Globalization also includes global population flows, pollution and disease factors, criminal associations, as well as transnational terrorist organizations. These exchanges, positive, neutral and negative, limit the ability of existing national and international organizations, many of which are based on the principles of national sovereignty, to regulate or correct them.

Benjamin Barber observes that we would never tolerate such an imbalance within our national political community. As citizens of our countries, we understand, despite our differences, that a capable government plays an indispensable role in ensuring security and common welfare, regulating market failures and protecting the most vulnerable categories of its population. And yet, when faced with the consequences of relative global anarchy, we find it difficult to transcend state boundaries, even as global powers penetrate and threaten our sovereignty. No country, no matter how powerful, can effectively respond to the problems of global terrorism alone⁴

In the opinion of this author, no one can answer with certainty the question of when and in what way the global security regime will emerge. On the one hand, conservatives such as Edmund Burke view the political order organically, as something born out of a series of decisions made in response to immediate problems, each building on and building on the success of previous experience. In contrast, from Moses and Solomon to the Age of Enlightenment, the legend of the lawgiver, the intelligent creator who „brings political order“ to a broken community, spreads.

We need these metaphors to understand the challenges we face, as we will be forced to make thousands of decisions about the problems we encounter every day, many of which go in the direction of more effective global security. And yet, this process needs time to build up faith in its optimal usefulness, and it seems that there is neither time nor faith in sufficient quantities.⁵

Not even the most intelligent people of our time have understood where this world is going and how destructive any policy and unlimited force, fear and threat are for us.

With this, we have already touched on one of the basic assumptions for understanding the issue in question, the problem of defining

4 D. Held, *Bringing International Law Bear on the Control of the New Terrorism in the Global Age*, *The New Global Terrorism*, pp. 259-260.

5 *Ibid.*

terrorism, which essentially reflects on the extremely negative results in international criminal-legal cooperation in the fight against it.

Why is it so difficult to define terrorism?

There are few words that have forced themselves into our everyday vocabulary like this one. Like the word Internet, the word terrorism has found itself in widespread use, without actually knowing what it actually means. These inaccuracies also arose as a result of its imprecise use in the media, which tries to convey some complex message to us in a limited time or space, by simply labeling the most diverse forms of violence as – terrorism (for example, bombing a building and assassination against the president, or the massacre of the population by some military unit, or the poisoning of the population with some product from the supermarket, or the intentional contamination of medicines in some drugstore, etc. are called by the same name – terrorism).⁶

There are few words that have forced themselves into our everyday vocabulary like this one. Like the word Internet, the word terrorism has found itself in widespread use, without actually knowing what it actually means. These inaccuracies also arose as a result of its imprecise use in the media, which tries to convey some complex message to us in a limited time or space, by simply labeling the most diverse forms of violence as – terrorism (for example, bombing a building and assassination against the president, or the massacre of the population by some military unit, or the poisoning of the population with some product from the supermarket, or the intentional contamination of medicines in some drugstore, etc. are called by the same name – terrorism).⁷

6 Confusion arises with conventional vocabulary that is reflected even in the title of this Chapter. Who wants to defend any position other than catching and punishing terrorists? Explicit use of the word terrorist narrows our perception of people who act in horrific ways. They are terrorists, therefore, perpetrators of evil. Plain and simple. Implicitly, this term encourages us to think neutrally and in the present tense, to focus on individual actors while ignoring both the past and the future in terms of detail. As Christopher Hitchens has noted, this label obscures reality and impoverishes language and makes all talk of war and revolution and politics banal. This approach, of course, implies that we are able to distinguish between an act of terrorism and other violent tactics; otherwise, terrorism becomes just a rhetorical weapon with which we attack groups that use violence for purposes we disagree with. Debates about the definition of terrorism can be a form of intellectual masturbation – it brings pleasure, but does not bear fruit. And yet we should make efforts to save the matter from the hands of polemicists. P. C. Sederberg: *Global Terrorism: Problems of Challenge and Response, The New Global Terrorism, Characteristics Causes, Controls*, 2003, p. 268.

7 D. J. Whittaker, *The Terrorism reader – second Edition*, New York, 2003, pp. 4-5.

Hoffman's understanding of terrorism is that it is essentially political in nature and a calculated process. This author describes changes in the meaning of this term, changes in how terrorist organizations see themselves, changes in their behavior models, regardless of whether it is domestic or international terrorism. In a pejorative sense, this term is often confused with guerilla warfare, or with a common type of criminality. In Hoffman's opinion, a degree of intellectual ferocity and altruism should be added to those characteristics that describe a terrorist.⁸

If we consider all these clear guidelines, then why is it difficult to define terrorism? Maybe because the very meaning of this term has changed significantly over the last two hundred years.

From this brief reference, it can be assumed that there are a number of different problems that obstruct efforts to create an analytical and useful definition of terrorism. First, there is the understandable but confusing tendency to mix explanations, justifications, and rebukes with many definitions. Second, the confusion between action (terrorism), actor (terrorists) and effect (terror) adversely affects our ability to distinguish between terrorism and the larger class of violent behavior of which it is a part. Finally, the option to focus on different subtypes of terrorism (for example, air piracy, suicide bombings) does not explain what it is about those subtypes that motivates individuals to become terrorists. While we might be able to formulate a specific policy response to specific terrorist activities, we would be forced to suspend the search for a greater general understanding and strategy.⁹

In the context of the basic obstacles to international cooperation in the fight against terrorism, we will focus on the difference between the term „terror“ and the term terrorism.

2.1. Terror and terrorism

Uniqueness of the respective problem is reflected, among other things, in the fact that here, the question of a more precise definition of the term „state terrorism“ appears as highly controversial.

Some authors believe that state terrorism is only terrorism that is undertaken against another state. Of course, in the context of the overall considerations about terrorism, there is no general agreement about these two forms of violence against the population or part of the population of a certain country. Since even here, one clear and

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid, p. 4.

precise answer is not possible, it is more reliable to indicate the possible connections, their infinite multiplicity in forms of expression (who is whose variant), what are their reach, i.e. effects and similar or simply, for the purposes of our topic, it is necessary to point out a clear distinction between terror and terrorism.

Therefore, there is no consensus regarding the connection between terror and terrorism. Most authors often explain the terror in a historical context, (eg France under Robespierre or Russia under Stalin). Some view terrorism as a more organized form of terror, while others emphasize that terror is a mental state and terrorism is an organized social activity. The most polarized views are those that claim that terror occurs without terrorism and that terror is the key to terrorism.

The suffix – ism added to the word terror indicates its systematic character, either on a theoretical level, where this suffix indicates a political philosophy, or on a political level, where it indicates a model of action or an attitude. Svojevremenost odnosnog problema ogleda se, pored ostalog, i u tome, što se ovde, kao veoma sporno pojavljuje pitanje preciznijeg određivanja pojma „državnog terorizma“.

The term terror initially referred to a certain historical period characterized by political executions, such as during the French Revolution from May 1793 to July 1794. The terror of the Committee of Public Safety headed by Robespierre was firstly aimed at traitors to the monarchy in order to soon extended to Republicans. During this period of the reign of terror, at least 300,000 people were arrested and 17,000 were officially convicted and executed, while a large number died in prisons without ever reaching a trial.¹⁰

As a reaction to Robespierre's actions, the agents and guerrillas of the revolutionary tribunals were called terrorists, and this name spread to the whole of Europe, and it „set foot“ on the soil of England in 1795. Jacobin terrorists were called anarchists, while the term terrorists was used for emigrants and their monarchist followers. In exchange for the term patriots. Thus, by the end of the 10th century, the term terrorist, originally used to describe violent behavior in the name of a revolutionary state in the Restoration era, was now

10 D. Petrović, *Moderni koncept terorizma: krivičnopravni aspekt*, Kragujevac, 2006, pp. 69-74; V. Kešetović, *Terorizam u savremenim uslovima (zbornik radova)*, Banja Luka, 2002. Those in the order who supported the draconian measures of Robespierre began to fear for their lives and conspired to dethrone him. Attention is drawn to the fact that they could not accuse him of counter-terrorism, because they themselves accepted it as a legitimate form of government, so they accused him of terrorism, which has an illegal and unacceptable character. Thus, Robespierre and his allies were convicted and sent to the guillotine in July 1794.

associated with anti-state violence under the influence of the Russian terrorists of the 1880s and the anarchists of the 1890s. This term acquired a completely different meaning in the 20th century under the influence of wars of national liberation and revolutionary aspirations of students and ethnic minorities in industrialized countries.

Terrorism does not only produce terror. Terror, for most observers, is not its main result. Psychologists define the psychological state, the essence of terror, as extreme fear or anxiety. Although terrorism represents a real and not an imaginary danger, it is still a vague, incomprehensible, unpredictable and unexpected category of threat. Terrorism affects both the social and individual structure and destroys the framework of rules that the members of a society rely on and believe in.¹¹

According to T. P. Thorton, terror – not terrorism – is only a symbolic act directed at political behavior through „amoral“ means that involve the use or threat of violence.¹² In this direction, the position of Q. Saldan and H. Donnediev de Fabres is interesting, who believe that terrorism can be carried out by an act that includes the use of certain means capable of causing terror (fear), i.e. general danger, while its consequence consists in general danger (danger commun) according to the interpretation of H. Hyams, the meaning of the word presupposes the use of terror by militant politics as a way to overthrow a government in power, or to force that government to change its policy.¹³

For P. Wilkinson, terror represents „the use of intimidation for the purpose of coercion by revolutionary movements, regimes or individuals, with political motives“, and terrorism „the systematic implementation of organized terror, either by a state, movement or faction, or by a small group of individuals „. In reflections of this kind, he goes further and points out that „political terrorism can be synthetically defined as coercive intimidation. As such, it implies the systematic use of killing or destruction, or the threat of killing or destruction, with the aim of terrorizing an individual, group, community or government , in order to make concessions to the demands of the terrorists' policy.“¹⁴

11 D. Petrović, op. cit., p. 75.

12 T. P. Thorton, Terror as a Weapon of Political Agitation, International War, Edit by H. Eckstein, Frer Press, New York, p. 73.

13 D. Jakovljević, Terorizam s gledišta krivičnog prava, Beograd, 1997, p. 44.

14 P. Wilkinson, Terrorism and the Liberal State, Macmilian, London, 1977, p. 44, 49, 52.

Terror is an integral part of many common types of crime. An act of terrorism has a similar goal to an act of intimidation: the immediate victim is less important than the overall effect on a group to which the act was directed. Terrorism, although it leaves behind individual victims, is in fact an attack on society itself. Terror is a natural phenomenon and terrorism is its conscious exploitation. Terrorism is violent, designed to manipulate the will of victims and the general public. The degree of fear is determined by the very nature of the crime, the manner of its execution and the rigid callousness and indifference to human life.

This terrible fear is the source of power for terrorists and through this fear they send appropriate messages to society. Intimidation is based on threats, which are carried out from time to time to ensure credibility.

It goes without saying that terror is a product of terrorism. But who exactly is being terrorized here? The immediate victim of a terrorist bombing may be dead before he even has a chance to be terrorized. Potential victims, for example, in the position of hostages when individual hostages are killed in front of him, they are the ones who suffer the most terror.

Terror can cause four types of reactions. First, it can inspire enthusiasm to remain consistent in commitment to a movement or cause. Second, the lowest level of negative response is worry. Third, the middle level of reaction is fear of the unknown and incomprehensible. The highest level of response is despair, an extreme form of fear.¹⁵

2.2. Political terrorism

Political terrorism is usually defined as the systematic use of violence, or the threat of violence, to achieve a political goal. It is a continuous policy involving organized terror by a state, or a movement or faction, or a small group of individuals. It differs from political terror, which is carried out through isolated acts of violence or occurs in the form of extreme, indiscriminate and mass violence. This kind of terror is neither systematic nor organized, and it is very difficult to control it.

Political terrorism can appear in three forms: revolutionary terror, sub-revolutionary terror and repressive terror.

Revolutionary terror involves the use of systematic tactics of terrorist violence to bring about a political revolution. It has four main

¹⁵ J. Richard Thackrah, *Dictionary of Terrorism*, London, 2003, p. 265-265.

attributes: first, it is always carried out by a group, so it is not an individual phenomenon, regardless of the fact that groups can be very small. Second, both the revolution and the use of terror for its purpose are always justified by some revolutionary ideology or program. Third, there are leaders who are capable of mobilizing manpower for terrorism. Fourth, alternative institutional structures are created, because the revolutionary movement needs to silence the existing political system and therefore has to form its own political bodies.¹⁶

Revolutionary terror is part of the revolutionary strategy and is manifested by acts of socially and politically unacceptable violence. There is also a pattern of symbolic and representative selection of victims or targets of terrorist attacks. Revolutionary movements deliberately carry out these acts of terrorism in order to achieve a psychological effect on a certain, specific group in order to change their political attitudes.

There are sub-types of revolutionary terror and they are: pure terror organizations in which terror is the exclusive and only weapon, revolutionary and people's liberation parties and movements that use terror as an auxiliary weapon, guerilla terrorist organizations that advocate short-term terrorism that lasts only as long as the revolutionary insurgency, organizations that propagate their grand goals and that use terror to achieve long-term revolutionary goals, and international terrorist organizations that are motivated by revolutionary goals.

Sub-revolutionary terrorism is terror used for political reasons, which does not involve revolution or repression of the ruling structure. While revolutionary terrorism is aimed at complete change, so far the goals of sub-revolutionary terrorism are of a limited character, e.g. forcing a government to implement its position on an issue, warning or punishing just one government official, or retaliating for a particular government action that terrorists saw as particularly threatening.

Repressive terrorism represents the systematic use of terrorist acts of violence for the purpose of achieving repression, subjugation, eradication or restraint of some political groups or individuals, or the shape of their behavior that the repressor considers undesirable. Repressive terror relies heavily on the services of specialized agencies whose members are trained to torture, deceive and kill. This apparatus of terror is directed against certain opposition groups, but later it can also be directed at wider groups, for example, at members of ethnic or religious minorities.

¹⁶ Ibid.

Political terrorism, therefore, represents the systematic use of killing and destruction, or the threat of killing and destruction, in order to terrorize individuals, groups, communities or governments that should comply with the political demands of terrorists. Terror is often used in a political context and this distinguishes it from other acts of violence.¹⁷

3. Who are these people, where do they come from, what do they really want?

In the nature of human life, there are four factors that, by themselves, stand out in order to explain the expansion of terrorism. 1) increasing population 2) increasing disparity in wealth and privilege 3) escalation of religious extremism and 4) modernization of technology and easy access to it. The first three factors relate to the perception of the threat, and the fourth to its implementation.¹⁸

Broad categories of theories and diagnoses about the sources of terrorist attacks have been scattered in analyzes of the September 11, 2001, attacks. These theories range from the simple to the most complex and are often intertwined. Thus, one of them advocates that these attacks were an act of evil. By associating the attacks with the existence of evil on earth, we disqualify ourselves, because this explanation requires an appeal to religiosity, or to religious sources to eliminate the source of the problem. Prayer is the primary refuge.

According to another theory, terrorists represent nihilists who will destroy all of humanity. As with anarchists whose actions are ends in themselves, nihilism can only be answered by eliminating true believers, or by persuading them one by one to change their belief system.

Still others advocate the view that the attacks constitute criminality. The individuals who carried out these attacks are socially

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Despite the arguments that the planet earth can support even a larger population, it seems to people that this is not true, because they think that the existing living space is getting smaller and smaller. The logical, linear progression of this thinking leads to the following explanations: more people – less space per person, more interaction – more opportunities for conflict, more conflict – more preparations for conflict. Robert Frost once remarked, „Good fences make good neighbors.“ But as the population grew, it became impossible to build so many fences. The encroachment into our backyard of an increasing number of neighbors competing for limited resources produces anxiety that surfaces, sometimes in the form of terrorist acts. L. D. Howell: *Is The New Global Terrorism a Clash of Civilizations? Evaluating Terrorism' Multiple Sources*, *The New Global Terrorism*, pp. 177-178.

deviant, motivated by base instincts, of limited intelligence, unable to act within socially established rules. If terrorist actions are considered criminal, then they will be eternal and can only be controlled, but not eliminated. They will forever remain on the margins of society, demanding constant police control and a police state.

Many considered these to be acts of primitives, acts undertaken by the uncivilized against the civilized. The very act of attack was so abhorrent, says one US official, that even some in the uncivilized world now realize they were on the wrong side. The paradigm of barbarism has the characteristic of dividing the world into „them against us“. It provides the goals and justification for immediate action that serves the purpose of the paradigm. If the problem is that there are uncivilized people out there, the solution is to civilize them, or, in a word, eliminate them by capturing, imprisoning, or killing them to eliminate the threat of future cataclysms. This explanation, however, does not explain the motivation for war. War is not fought against the uneducated or the primitive. It is not fought against hooligans, even extremely successful ones. It is fought against entities and enemies.¹⁹

Is terrorism – a new kind of war!?

At the beginning of the XXI century, we face the existence of a new world with many turning points behind us and of course, terrible trials ahead. The most critical turning point relates to the way the war is waged. Terrorism, certainly a new phenomenon, gained primacy. Traditional warfare systems and star wars have lost their relevance. War, this unique and greatest flaw in human character, began with sticks and stones, grew into a war with explosives, escalated into airspace, then space, only to return to earth in the form of bombs on human bodies. But while the war with sticks was being fought with the nearest neighbors, the war of terrorists is creeping into the farthest corners of this planet of ours.

What does terrorism really mean? Terrorism is a war waged beyond the control of states. It is more than mere destruction, it is an act of violence intended to achieve far wider results than mere victories and defeats which for many mean the loss of life, human rights and human well-being. The contours of these new wars are clear in many respects, as the range of social and political groups participating in them no longer fits the pattern of classic interstate wars. The violence sown by terrorist aggressors is no longer carried out by state agents (although it happens that the state or some of its subjects still support them). Violence is directed against citizens and political

¹⁹ Ibid.

goals are combined with horrific crimes and massive human rights violations. Such a war is usually not started due to state interests, but rather religious identification, fanaticism, fanaticism, etc. The goal is no longer to conquer territories, as in previous wars, but to gain political power by generating fear and hatred. War itself becomes a form of political mobilization in which the goals of extremists are promoted through violence.²⁰

Immanuel Kant wrote two hundred years ago that we are inevitably next to each other. Violent challenges to legal order and justice in one place in the world leave consequences in many other places, and are felt everywhere. In thinking about these questions and their implications, Kant could not have guessed how real and deep his concerns would become.²¹

Unfortunately, since Kant's time, global connectivity and vulnerability have grown rapidly. We no longer live, if we ever did, in a world of isolated (autarchic) societies. On the contrary, we live in a world of national communities whose destinies overlap, and the paths of states significantly cross. In our world, people and borders are not only connected by acts of violence, but also by the very nature of everyday problems and processes. From the movement of ideas and cultural assets to the fundamental questions raised by genetic engineering, from the conditions for achieving financial stability to environmental degradation, the destinies of all of us are intertwined.

If we are to rescue the concept of terrorism from polemicists, as well as address the concerns of those who believe it is an empty rhetorical category, we must identify those characteristics that distinguish terrorism from other violent tactics used within, or between, political communities. Two characteristics, both arising from well-established rules of war, seem to constitute sufficient grounds for their true distinction. The best-known types of behavioral restraints in warfare relate to the selection of targets and the means to attack those targets. To be more specific, the targets of a violent attack should be soldiers, and the weapons used against these targets should be extremely selective.

²⁰ Historian Frederick H. Hartmann noted that war planning and its implementation were guided by three basic postulations: finance, strategy and development, and tactics. He further notes that law and laws play a critical role. In his work *The Relations of Nations*, he cites the 1914 provisions on the conduct of war on the land of the USA, where Article 10 states that the aim of war is: to bring about the complete submission of the enemy in the shortest possible time and by lawful violence. Allowed violence? It is hard to think that war can be like that. But still it is. In wars, some weapons were used and some were not. Civilians were treated differently than soldiers. Soldiers were taken as prisoners and were not killed on the spot at any cost. *Ibid*, p. 176.

²¹ D. Held, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-254.

4. Content and origin of beliefs

The activities of terrorist organizations are based on a subjective interpretation of reality that differs from the perceptions of the government and society with which they confront. Their activities are not guided by consistency and reason based on actual perception of reality. One of the goals of terrorist organizations is to convince their audience to see things as they see them. An important aspect of the struggle between governments and terrorists concerns the definition of that conflict. Each side wants to interpret things according to its own standards of political legitimacy. Belief systems consisting of dominant images, symbols and myths contribute to the creation of perceptions (or misperceptions) that influence actions and expectations. The content and origins of terrorist beliefs influence how terrorists decide and adopt their strategies, how they respond to government policies, and the outcomes of terrorist challenges.

Belief systems can be drawn from a number of sources. The political and social environment in which a political organization operates represents one set of sources. This category can also include general cultural factors (history, tradition, literature, religion) that each member of society adopts through the pattern of socialization and formal ideology that are accepted at the time of maturation, and which are consciously adopted.

The origin of beliefs can also be internal. The circumstances in which terrorists operate are full of stress and uncertainty, making certain beliefs relevant and adequate, and terrorists persist in them and find it difficult to change them.²² An important element in the belief system is an image that can be a mental portrait of the terrorist himself or some other person. Images are often stereotyped and fall into predetermined and strict categories that simplify reality.

²² Both the mental stress and the ideological commitment inherent in terrorism support the terrorist's reliance on a set of beliefs that do not allow for flexibility and openness. What appears to be a reasonable conviction to the terrorists is an illusion of voluntary choice for the rest of society. They have a high opinion of themselves, as morally superior, more sensitive and elevated. They do not see themselves as terrorists, but consider that word as a label assigned to them by their enemies. After the global changes in values that occurred as a result of anti-colonial struggles, „freedom fighters” or „national liberation front” are the names they accept for themselves. Many terrorists define their role as that of a self-sacrificing person, who is ready to die for their beliefs. Revolutionary terrorists view their enemies as a vastly more powerful force than themselves, with many more choices, and that they have no choice but to take the path of terrorism as a response to repressive government actions, rather than as a choice of their own. D. Petrović, General characteristics of the basic concept of terrorism, *Strani pravni život: teorija, zakonodavstvo, praksa*, vol. 64, no. 4/2020, pp. 147-160.

Dehumanization and deidentification of the enemy occupy a dominant place in the thinking of terrorists.

Most left-leaning revolutionary terrorists do not see themselves as aggressors, but as victims. They consider themselves representatives of the oppressed class, workers and peasants, who are unable to help themselves. They think that they have a mission, that they are the ones who are enlightened in the mass of the unenlightened, who have been chosen by the Almighty and who, unlike the mass, recognize and accept the danger. For them, fighting is a duty and an obligation, not their business

Two other aspects of terrorist beliefs about the nature of conflict are intriguing. The first represents the tendency to define the struggle in a legalistic sense. They do not see their actions as „murders“, but as „execution after trial“. They call their victims „traitors“. Another aspect of the terrorist view of combat is their military representation and symbolism.²³

For terrorists, victims among the „enemies“ do not represent individuals, but are representatives of an enemy group (if terrorists even acknowledge that innocent victims exist, they then blame the government for refusing to comply with their demands or ignoring warnings). They almost always refuse to accept responsibility for the violence committed. Any activity that is in the service of the goal can be interpreted as a success. One cannot speak of a failure if the violence leads to their goals getting closer.

A significant source of terrorist convictions is the social and political environment from which they originate. The historical context also plays a very important role. Ideology is a powerful weapon of influence – an international factor that transcends the boundaries of nations, although it can be interpreted differently in different circumstances. The primacy of political ideas in motivating terrorism contributes to finding similarities between terrorist groups from different cultural contexts. In certain cases, terrorism reflects the social reality in nationalist groups – individuals have already been socialized into certain patterns of thinking in which terrorism is not only an acceptable category, but also feasible and productive (Basque resistance to the Spanish government, Armenian resistance to the Turks, Irish Catholic bitterness directed towards the British, etc. have become integral parts of their culture).

²³ Although terrorists appeal to popular support and believe that mass revolution is their goal, little attention is paid to the development of beliefs about the role of popular support. A good example of this is the example of the Basque terrorist organization – ETA, which undoubtedly enjoyed popular support. Ibid.

As for ideologies, they were not invented by terrorists. They are more action-oriented than philosophizing. The fact that nationalism and national liberation have been the greatest source of political legitimacy in the post-colonial world has contributed significantly to the growth of terrorism. As we know, ideologies such as Marxism, Leninism, Trotskyism, Maoism, Castroism and Chegevarism, as well as fascism itself, contributed to the development of the terrorist doctrine. Although the individual violence associated with terrorism is frowned upon by Marxists, many modern terrorists feel an obligation to assist the forces of historical progress by using violence.

„Some analysts argue that many terrorists are, in fact, ambivalent“ regarding the use of violence. Internal conflict may explain why it is necessary for terrorists to believe that they have no choice and that the enemy bears ultimate responsibility for the violence.²⁴ For many terrorists, the neutralization of guilt is very important. A person who has become a terrorist will most likely feel guilty for their violent activities, so it is necessary for them to maintain the belief that someone else is responsible and that their actions exceed normal standards of moral behavior.

Once established, belief systems are resistant to change (eg, terrorists deny that there are innocent victims, contrary to evidence). Terrorists rely only on sources of information they trust. Certain types of image can help terrorists avoid confronting the complex value system embedded in political decisions. The model of „bad conviction“ or „evil intent“, which is characteristic of the enemy, points to the fact that he will never be benevolent. When kidnapping hostages, terrorists make decisions that involve immediate consequences. Not only do they accept personal risk, but they also take upon themselves the fate of the entire organization to which they are so passionately committed.

The importance of association in terrorism has long been known and accepted. Tendencies towards grouping and solidarity, which are present in all primary groups, lead to the rejection of differences in opinion and the internationalization of group standards and norms.

The members of the organization must be completely subordinated to group standards and must accept, not only a set of certain political beliefs, but also a system of social and psychological principles.

Despite the pressures to unite, there are differences among terrorist organizations (eg, factionalism was known among the Palestinian

²⁴ The structure of the terrorist belief system, portraying all-powerful authority figures who are hostile to small, powerless victims, may reflect their early relationship with their parents, especially between sons and fathers. Their beliefs may reflect feelings of inferiority, low self-esteem and helplessness. Ibid.

parties). Factions of terrorist organizations do not agree on the question of what are the best ways to fight to achieve a common goal. The circumstances in which a terrorist group operates, which is isolated from society, under constant threat and danger, which lacks reliable information and channels and which relies on strict, inflexible convictions – point to the fact that the ability of terrorists to adapt to the reality of the situation is limited. Likewise, terrorists are not capable of adequately considering the consequences of their actions. Understanding their belief system allows governments to anticipate terrorists' communication sensitivities. Forcing terrorists to accept that they were wrong in their beliefs and leaving them no other means of communication than threats can lead to their emotional breakdown and the resolution of the crisis.²⁵

Characteristics: A terrorist is basically a sociopath, ie. he or she feels no guilt for killing or injuring innocent civilians or members of the security forces. It is difficult to define the profile of a single terrorist because they are very different from each other in their values and in relation to their goals and the cultures they come with. Many theories consider terrorists as individuals with clear and distinctive characteristics. Cross-section of rural and urban terrorist guerilla groups shows that most of them are unmarried men between 22-24 years of age, with university education. Female terrorists tend to be more supportive than operational (exceptions are women in organizations such as Bader Meinhof, the Red Army Faction in Germany, and occasionally women in the Irish Republican Army, the Japanese Red Army, and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine). Terrorists usually come from wealthier, urban, middle-class families, many of whom enjoy considerable social prestige. Like their fathers, most of the older terrorists were trained in certain professions and practiced them before committing themselves to terrorism. Regardless of whether they turned to terrorism as university students or later, many were indoctrinated with anarchist or Marxist ideologies while still at university. It can be said that they are physically very fit, intelligent, have some education, but most of them have not finished schooling and are the children of educated parents who belong to the middle class.²⁶

25 D. Held, op. cit., pp. 253-256

26 Teroristi – operativci su mlađe osobe – ovde sada imamo fenomen druge generacije terorista. Postoji i tradicija regrutovanja dece u paravojne strukture u veoma ranom dobu. To vrše i same porodice prenoseći tradiciju svojih uverenja da je nasilje jedini metod borbe na sledeće generacije. D. Petrović, General characteristics of the basic ..., pp. 151-155.

Terrorists live in a fantasy world and in the initial stages it can be said that they are waging a fantasy war, and eventually they start to believe their own propaganda. They have a desire to promote change by threatening or using violence as a result of frustration – they feel that in no other way will they achieve the goal (weapons symbolize force and terrorists are petted and cared for).²⁷

The goal of terrorists is to draw the public's attention to their goals, to provoke a reaction from the government in order to undermine their public confidence, as well as to promote fear and an atmosphere of alarmism. A terrorist carries out actions as a result of frustration, feeling that the use of a weapon is the best way to convey a message. It functions the way an individual functions under stress.

5. Different control strategies

Providing a broader framework for understanding, some preliminary thoughts on general conditions and specific factors affecting the relevance of alternative responses are offered here. Here we will only indicate the general course of action, emphasizing (once again) the fact that the enemy represents something more than a group of terrorists, that is, although terrorists resort to terrorism as a tactic, they also possess an ideological foundation, a political program and a broad base of support and sympathy.²⁸

1. Enemy support base. Punitive measures may be most effective against isolated fringe groups, but an enemy with a broad base of (well, even passive) support presents another problem. Efforts to suppress or even destroy a widely supported group can only make their base even more compact, with a greater degree of solidarity with even more new supporters. Unfortunately, the regime begins to realize that it cannot eliminate it only after years of hard fighting, as the cases of South Africa and Palestine illustrate. Proposition 1.1: The less support the enemy has, the more likely coercive tactics will be effective. Proposition 1.2: The relevance of negotiation strategies increases as the enemy's base of support expands.

2. Time, space and terrorist threat. When the challenges of terrorism become chronic and operations become more dispersed, then the war on terrorism will become a war without end, and the targets of attacks will multiply endlessly. The potential for violence to escalate

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid, pp. 275-278.

increases along with the „expected and unexpected cost“ that comes with the use of coercion. The alternative to survival in a continuous state of war must be expressed in efforts aimed at negotiations and compromise, as a supplement, perhaps even a replacement for war actions. Proposition 2.1: As the terrorist threat becomes more diffuse in terms of time and place, the relevance of responding to attacks through negotiation increases.

3. The spread of the terrorist threat. One of the tactical dilemmas we face when facing a terrorist threat is how to balance the demands of defense, destruction, recovery, and negotiation. Terrorism attacks sensitive targets, and their list is essentially unlimited. Improving defenses against one type of attack (eg, hijacking an airplane) can reorient attacks on some other highly vulnerable target, and this continues for as long as the attacker has the ability and interest to attack.

Proposition 3.1: The more diffuse the potential targets, the more emphasis should be placed on response and corrective measures.

4. Ideological beliefs of the enemy. Groups that want the total destruction of the established order (nihilists) or its complete transformation (saviors) may oppose any call for negotiations that the regime may possibly agree to. Bruce Hoffman outlines some significant differences between secular and religiously based ideologies. He believes that religiously motivated attackers are more inclined to view their struggle in a totalistic sense, to view violence as a sacred act, and that is why they can resist the calculated decisions of politicians. Conversely, more pragmatic aspirations for social justice, greater autonomy within established political communities, even the pursuit of independence when it does not threaten the existence of the state, offer a greater chance of reaching a negotiated solution. Extremist rhetoric can obscure opportunities for compromise. However, after a number of years of unsuccessful struggle, attitudes are changing.

Proposition 4.1: A sincere establishment of a totalitarian ideology precludes negotiation and compromise in advance. Proposition 4.2.: Insincerely based ideologies leave the door open for pragmatic transformations. Proposition 4. 3: Inconsistent ideologies promote disintegration through betrayal and sabotage. Proposition 4.4: Ideological beliefs that reflect concrete goals (eg, greater autonomy, political role, material compensation) create opportunities for compromise.

5. Characteristics of the enemy organization: internal stability, competition with other groups, group size and the nature of group leaders are internal factors that influence the enemy and the type of demands he defines. As groups become larger and more diverse, their internal stability decreases and different program requirements arise.

Proposition 5.1: The increasing complexity of the enemy organization creates the possibility that the regime through negotiations will influence it to eventually either transform or disintegrate.

Also, by rewarding nonviolent means of achieving the enemy's goals, the regime may encourage him to abandon terrorism altogether.

Proposition 5.2: The declining importance of terrorist tactics in the enemy's overall strategy creates the possibility for it to transform. The political content of negotiations: Any regime considering negotiations must first calculate the real – direct cost of compromise and the subsequent risk – that negotiations may act to encourage other groups to engage in terrorism. He must also consider how the concessions will be reacted to by the wider base of support.

Proposition 6.1: The greater the concession offered by the regime, the greater internal political resistance it will generate. Isto tako, „umereni elementi“ među teroristima suočavaju se sa istim rizicima u odnosu na radikalnije elemente u njihovoj koaliciji.

Proposition 6.2: Negotiation strategies that encourage the transformation or disintegration of more moderate elements of terrorist movements tend to increase violence by the remaining radical elements.

As we have already hinted, another, essential factor is extremely important, and that is – the framework for negotiation. In addition to the political and cultural framework, the success of negotiations is also influenced by the type of scenario: first a truce, then talks, or a truce begins when negotiations begin, until first concessions, then a truce. The third debatable area would concern the definition of the agenda for the negotiations.

Proposition 6.3: Expect negotiations to be difficult and frustrating, as terrorists want to expand the negotiable list and the regime wants to narrow it.

There is no doubt that the new response to this type of challenge is a counter-effect. The counter-effect is of particular importance. In the same way that revolutionary forces hope that the application of government repression will increase support for their cause, so terrorist attacks have the effect of solidifying the public in their antagonism against terrorists, which further undermines the credibility of their cause. In democratic countries, where all individuals have equal and broad opportunities to satisfy justice, any public act of terrorism will have the effect of a counter-blow. E.g. terrorist campaigns in Germany, Italy, France, Spain and Northern Ireland have been accompanied by an increase in general support for stricter state countermeasures. Support for terrorist causes survived only among

smaller groups, Catholic minorities in Ireland and militant Basques in Spain.²⁹

6. Conclusion

Terrorism is a form of complex political violence that appears in very diverse forms of manifestation. In a combination of different aspects, it escapes with its threatening nature, in contents and methods with increasingly rich opportunities for progress in the direction of a harsher, more brutal, more uncertain future. Here, we are facing the violence of individuals or interest groups, the dominance of irrational aspirations, the irreparable destruction of the legal system of a state or international community. For many, terrorist activities are shrouded in mystery, with unknown motives, obscured to a significant extent by certain intertwined and wrong impressions and individual cases and assessments, which certainly cannot be a „true barometer“ of their presence and danger, but can provide a true assessment of its specific gravity. Let us emphasize that terrorism is neither a movement nor a political direction, but a special form of violent political struggle with its rationalized and systematic extreme use. When you

29 This analysis has implications for the future of international terrorism of the kind used by al-Qaeda against the US, whose campaign began in 1993 with the bombing of the World Trade Center, well before the events of 09/11/2001. International terrorist campaigns require worldwide base support. Al Qaeda needs Islamic communities that share its fundamentalist visions to provide recruits and money, as well as sympathetic governments to provide shelter and logistical support. Much of the Muslim and Arab world has emigrated to the West to escape poverty, intolerance, political instability and repression in their own countries. Only a small part of the newer wave of these emigrants has sympathy for these groups, while the rest reject them. They can certainly financially and politically support Palestinian nationalism, but not Islamic attacks on the US. On the contrary, they fear such attacks because anti-Western campaigns and violence in the name of Islam threaten their own status in Western societies. Islamic militant terrorists could only hide for a few months in Islamic communities in Western countries, as was the case with the Al Qaeda hijackers who hid in Germany and the US. But not for a long time. As for the risk of terrorist attacks from overseas countries, it still exists, but it has been greatly reduced. The most vulnerable targets of future attacks are those closest to terrorist support bases – terrorists will attack those enemies who are first at hand. This includes US civilians and military officials in countries such as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and Indonesia, as well as the governments and officials of Islamic countries perceived to support the West. The short-term strategy emphasizes security measures and strengthening intelligence on these regions. The best long-term strategy refers to the use of development and education strategies to prevent corruption and open up alternatives for future generations in the most isolated and impoverished parts of the Islamic world. D. Held, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

insist on the former, you insist on distinguishing between extremism and terrorism, precisely because all terrorism is extremism, but all extremism is not terrorism..

References

- Baudrillard, J., *The Spirit of Terrorism*, Telos, no. 121, Fall 2001, TelosPress, NY, 2001.
- Bell, B., *Terrorist Scripts and Live Action Spectacles*, *Columbia Journalism Review* (May-June), 1978, pp 47-50.
- Held, D., *Bringing International Law Bear on the Control of the New Terrorism in the Global Age*, *The New Global Terrorism*, pp. 259-260.
- Howell, L. D., *Is The New Global Terrorism a Clash of Civilizations? Evaluating Terrorism' Multiple Sources*, *The New Global Terrorism*, pp. 177-178.
- Jakovljević, D., *Terorizam s gledišta krivičnog prava*, Beograd, 1997, p. 44.
- Jenkins, B. M., *International Terrorism*, Crescent Publication, Los Angeles, 1975.
- Kegley Jr. C. W., *The characteristics, Causas, and Controls of the New Global Terrorism: An Introduction*, *The New Global Terrorism, Characteristics, Causes, Controls*, 2003, pp. 1-3.
- Kešetović, V., *Terorizam u savremenim uslovima (zbornik radova)*, Banja Luka, 2002.
- Litvinenko, A., Felshtinsky, Y., *Blowing up Russia: Terror from within*, Gibson Square, London, 2007.
- Petrović, D., *Moderni koncept terorizma: krivičnopravni aspekt*, Kragujevac, 2006, pp. 69-74;
- Petrović, D., *Novi terorizam, sadržaj i izbor reagovanja na međunarodni terorizam*, *Pravni život*, vol. 529. no. 9/2009, p. 561.
- Petrović, D., *General characteristics of the basic concept of terrorism*, *Strani pravni život: teorija, zakonodavstvo, praksa*, vol. 64, no. 4/2020, pp. 147-160.
- Sederberg, P. C., *Global Terrorism: Problems of Challenge and Response*, *The New Global Terrorism, Characteristics Causes, Controls*, 2003, p. 268.
- Simeunović, D., *Terorizam*, Beograd, 2009.
- Thotron, T. P., *Terror as a Weapon of Political Agithation*, *International War*, Edit by H. Eckstein, Frer Press, New York, p. 73.
- Wievorka, M., *Sociétés et terroisme*, Fayard, Paris, 1988.

Whittaker, D. J. The Terrorism reader – second Edition, New York, 2003, pp. 4-5.

Wilkinson, P., Terrorism and the Liberal State, Macmillan, London, 1977, p. 44, 49, 52. J. Richard Thackrah, Dictionary of Terrorism, London, 2003, p. 265-265.

Dr Dragana Petrović, naučna saradnica
Instituta za uporedno pravo u Beogradu

TERORIZAM I TERORISTI

– razumevanje strukture i načina ostvarivanja aktivnosti -30*

Rezime

„Terorizam je kao slon na vašim kućnim vratima“, kaže pisac Timothy Thornton Esh „Prepoznate ga čim ga ugledate“. Energija koja pothranjuje ovo svojevrsno zlo nijedna ideologija, vizionarska motivacija, nijedan cilj ne može da opravda. Moderni terorizam briše sve granice, sve zidove i savesti... U našoj savremenosti i globalnosti, njegova „vrednost“ se enormno uvećava, što još više privlači one koji veruju da će im se ta vrsta nasilja (ekstremnog, teatralnog...) isplatiti. U pokušajima potpune destrukcije ustanovljenog poretka ili njegove totalne transformacije, teroristi privlače pažnju publike na svoje ciljeve, promovišu strah i atmosferu alarmantnosti. Apokaliptični nihilisti, planeri i izvođači terorističkih napada ne nude kompromis – što može da rezultira samo jednim – katastrofalnim slikama masakra nevinih civila, žene i dece. Očekivati reciprocitet, tj. na jednu globalnu mrežu udariti drugom, antiterorističkom mrežom je jedini oblik reagovanja koji može da pruži odgovarajuće rezultate. Nažalost, međunarodna zajednica (licemerna, po „principu duplih standarda“), je neprestano razapeta između priznanja specifičnog karaktera izazova sa kojim se poslednjih godina suočava i insistiranja na tome da njen odgovor uzme oblik globalizovane antiterorističke koalicije. Možda kao odgovor na gomilu pitanja koja ovde iskrsavaju – očekivati reciprocitet u ovom smislu, značilo bi, ipak, pogrešno razumeti sustinu izazova, jer bi zamena nasilja nasiljem, kako neko reče ovih dana, značilo „sklapanje nagodbe sa đavolom“. I možda nas bas takvo postupanje dovodi do ruba ponora, propasti...

ključne reči: terorizam, teror, teroristi, sistem ubeđenja.

30 * This paper is a result of the research conducted at the Institute of Comparative Law financed by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovation of the Republic of Serbia under the Contract on realisation and financing of scientific research of SRO in 2024 registered under no. 451-03-66/2024-03/200049.