Some facts and figures

US Department of State 2012:

- almost 7,000 terrorist attacks worldwide
- more than 11,000 deaths
- more than 21,000 injuries

Top countries hit by terrorism (from same source):

• Afghanistan: 2,632 deaths

• Iraq: 2,436 deaths

Pakistan: 1,848 deathsNigeria: 1,386 deathsRussia: 659 deaths

Other countries

• EU: 17 deaths

• USA: 10 deaths (zero on US territory)

India: 231 deathsChina: 15 deaths

• Brazil: 0

Still terrorism is high on political agenda, despite the relative small numbers of casualties in most countries.

History of Terrorism

- Terrorism is not new
- · Assassins and the 11th century
- Anarchists: Propaganda of the deed, in 1870s, 1880s
- Many different groups, tactics, backgrounds, slogans

Waves in terrorism

Identified by David Rapoport. The four waves are:

1. Anarchists: 1880s

2. Anti-Colonial Wave: 1920s3. New Left Wave: 1960s4. Religious Wave: 1979-?

The First Wave: Anarchists

- started in Russia, spread to Europe, America, Asia
- doctrine of strategy of terror by Russian writers as Bakunin and Kropotkin

- new technologies and communication tools: telegraph, newspapers
- notorious: Narodnaya Volya, killed Russian tsar
- · called themselves terrorists
- 1890s: golden age of assassination

The Second Wave: Anti-colonialists

- struggle for selt-determination
- against British and French colonial rule (amongst others)
- guerrilla tactics (hit and run)
- · called themselves 'freedom fighter', not terrorist
- example: IRA, FLN (Algeria), Irgun (militant Zionist against British rule)

The Third Wave: new Left Wave

- Vietnam War was big driver, especially in Western Europe and America
- · Context of cold-war
- international terrorism: PLO
- · tactics: hostage takings and hijackings
- main goal to get attention for a cause or free co-fighters, not to kill

The Fourth Wave: Religious Wave

- 1979 revolution in Iran
- 1979 USSR occupied Afghanistan
- 1979 storming and occupation of Grand Mosque in Mecca
- 1979 start of new era on muslim calendar
- Islamic, Sikh, Jewish, Christian were all used as motivation for terror
- · Modus operandi:
 - assassinations
 - · hostage takings
 - suicide bombings
- Hezbollah: fighting US and French military forces in Lebanon, suicide bomb attacks on military headquarters
- Al Qaeda

Use of the term 'Terrorism'

- 1901, shooting of **US President McKinley**: no mentioning of terrorism. "Shot twice by anarchist" "Washington stunned by blow"
- different in languages

Defining terrorism

Four reasons why:

- Terrorism is a "contested concept"
- 2. Linked to delegitimisation and criminalisation
- 3. Many types of "terrorism" with different forms and manifestations
- 4. Changes in meaning in more than 200 years of its existence

1. Contested Concept

• one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter

2. Delegitimisation and criminalisation

Adding political groups to the list of terrorist organisation, with far reaching consequences. This can be used as a political tool to get rid of an enemy group. Or asked to delist a certain group.

Hezbolah was added to the EU terrorist group in July 2013.

3. Types of terrorism

Categorisation by Europol:

- 1. Religiously inspired
- 2. Ethno-nationalist and separatist
- 3. Left-wing and anarchist
- 4. Right-wing
- 5. Single-issue

Why is 'state terrorism' not among the Europol categories?

4. Changes in meaning

- Semantic shift in 200 years
- Terrorist was not used in anti-government sense before late 19th early/20th century

Need for a definition

Why is it so important:

- arrive at successful international cooperation
- sharing data and extradition: judicial measures
- absence of definition is invitation to abuse, to deal with political opponents
- Research, make it possible to compare different reports

Kofi Annan tried, Secretary General of the Un (1997-2006) tried to achieve a consensus on the definition of terrorism. His attempt:

"Deliberate killing of civilians and non-combatants for political purposes."

Moral message: terrorism is unacceptable and unjustifiable

Rejected because:

- idea of foreign occupation and state terrorism as justification
- problem with "under all conditions"
- rejection against the idea that state could act in a terrorist way, the definition does not explicitly exclude states

We have international law, humanitarian law and the law of war. Rather label use and misuse of violence by states as war crimes or abuse of power. There are international legal instruments that we can use to fight war crimes, these instruments are missing in the field of terrorism.

Academic attempts

- 1988: Albert Jongman and Alex Schmid: collecting many definitions and out of these distilated 22 key components
- 2011: Alex Schmid updated the definition and following the same procedure came with a list of 12 key components

These 12 key components, it should:

- 1. say something about a **doctrine** and/or **practice** of violent action
- 2. refer to the **context** in which terrorism is employed as a tactic
- 3. contain the concept of **physical violence** or the threat thereof
- 4. say something about threat-based communication processes
- 5. mention that terrorism instills **fear**, dread, panic or more anxiety
- 6. say something about the direct victims
- 7. point at the fact that the **direct victims** are not the **ultimate target**
- 8. say something about the perpetrators
- 9. mention that terrorism is predominantly political
- 10. refer to the intent of acts of terrorism
- 11. contain the motivations to **engage** in terrorism
- 12. mention that terrorist acts form part of a campaign of violence