

## 2 -1 – 1.1 Introduction

Hello.

Welcome to the first week of this course on terrorism and counter-terrorism comparing theory and practice. In the following videos we're going to look at how terrorism has made headlines in the past decades, the definition problem and the essence of terrorism. Let us first have a look at the facts. We hear about terrorism almost every day and it's a truly global phenomenon. Leaving more than 10,000 people dead according to the statistics of the United States State Department. But not all parts of the world are as much troubled by terrorism as others. Let's have a closer look at the exact numbers. For you see Afghanistan, number one on the list, with more than two and a half thousand people killed because of terrorist activities. Closely followed by Iraq, with about the same number of people dead. Pakistan is very high. Nigeria and even Russia, number five on the list, suffered from more than 650 people killed because of all types of attacks. What about other countries? What about the biggest countries in this world? China, India, United States Brazil and European Union.

If we look at European Union, for instance, we see that Europe's law enforcement agencies said that, in 2012 17 people died as a result of terrorist activity in the European Union. That's seventeen too many, but it's a very low number if we compare that to countries like Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iraq. And the same holds for the United States. According to the statistics of the US State Department, 10 US citizens were killed in terrorist activity, all of them in Afghanistan and none of them on US territory. And India, of the biggest countries in this world. They face quite a lot of terrorism and have a pretty high number of people killed because of terrorism. Sadly more than 200 of them were killed in terrorist activities. And China, the biggest country has 15 People killed in terrorist activities in the year 2012. And I'm happy to say that Brazil, the largest country in Latin America, has zero casualties because of terrorism. Let us now have a look at the graph with all the ten countries that I mentioned, and you immediately see the enormous difference between the top five. Afghanistan, Pakistan etcetera and the United States, Brazil, China and the EU. These differences are quite big. Well, let's put it on a map.

The map of terrorism today shows the differences in the impact of terrorism. Well the map was made by the Institute for Economics and Peace, and it combines the number of incidents, fatalities, injuries and property damage. And it's based on the data of the global terrorism data base of Maryland University. What do you see? You see hot, hotspots in South Asia and in Middle East, Russia, Northern Africa, but unfortunately also see that many parts of Asia, Southern Africa, America and European Union are not that frequently troubled by terrorism. In many countries, also the ones where terrorism doesn't happen that often, it ranks high on national political agendas. But the same holds for the international agenda. Large organizations like the UN and NATO and other regional organizations. Have been focusing on terrorism a lot, especially since 9/11.

In many countries, terrorism is considered the biggest, or one of the biggest, threats influencing relationships between countries and between communities. And some may even argue that we live in a post nine eleven world, because of its enormous impact. On relationships on a way of thinking about security. Do you agree?

Well, it's been 12 years. And there are so many other issues that define our age. Think of the economy, the environment, Technological innovations, and so many other social-political issues. A post 9/11 world? I wouldn't call it like that.

So what have we learned? Terrorism is a worldwide phenomenon. But there are enormous regional differences. And terrorism has a great impact on peace and security. And therefore some believe that we live in a post 9/11 world. In the next video, we're going to look at the history of terrorism. The

terrorism before 9/11.

## **2 – 2 – 1.2 History of terrorism**

In the previous video we looked at the facts and the map of terrorism and its victims. In this video we're going to look at the history of terrorism. Non state actors using terrorism. It's not really new. Even in pre-modern days, there were groups and individuals that used political violence against the authorities and elite. Think of a group we now call The Assassins. Who in the late 11th century in the Middle East killed governors, political and military leaders in order to create alliances or as an act of retribution. So nothing new and yes they were to assassinate something or somebody, stems from a group which we now would label a terrorist one. But most descriptions of modern day terrorism starts with the anarchists that are associated with the propaganda of the deed from the French propaganda par le fait. A group or network or movement that was active since the 1870s, 1880s. Another slogan associated with the early, modern day terrorism, is the slogan [FOREIGN], from the internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization that was fighting the Ottoman rule in the late nineteenth, early twentieth centuries. So even more than a century ago there were many different groups using different tactics, slogans and with different political backgrounds, ranging from the extreme left to nationalist separatists. And some killed heads of states and others attacked ordinary citizens. Some acted only in their home town or home region, while others had an international agenda and operated across borders.

So again, terrorism of today is nothing new. Some scholars that have looked into the history of terrorism have tried to find specific characteristics for certain eras or try to discover trends in terrorism. One of them is David Rapoport, he distinguishes four waves in terrorism. Each with its own ingredients, different audiences, sympathizers and supporters, or modus operandi, meaning the way these groups operate. Each of these periods or waves last about a few decades, three or four decades after which they gradually fade out.

The four waves are as follows. The anarchists in the 1880s are the first wave that is followed by an anti-colonial wave from the 1920s on. And this again is followed by a new left wave, what he calls a new left wave. You could also call it the, the red terrorism that started in the 1960s. And then finally, the fourth wave is the religious wave, which according to David Rapoport, started in the year 1979. Let's have a look at each of these waves, starting with the anarchists.

Well, according to David Rapoport that wave started in the 1880s, some say 1870s and it started in Russia. And from there on, it spread to other Parts of the world, Western Europe, America and also Asia. Well its, its founding fathers, you can say, were a number of Russian writers with their doctrine or strategy of terror. Bakunin and Kropotkin were the most famous ones. And they very much used the new technologies, new communication tools of their age, such as the telegraph and mass media in those days, newspapers. One of the most notorious organizations of that era is the Russian organization Narodnaya Volya. the name can best be translated as, the people's will. Well, members of that group killed, amongst others, a Russian tsar and in those days that was definitely breaking news. And according to David Rapoport these People call themselves terrorists and the 1890s has been described as the Golden Age of Assassination. Well it lasted from 1890s on also to the early twentieth century, and some of its victims were the Elizabeth, the Empress of Austria Umberto the first, King of Italy. And a US, a United States President. It was, and here you see a picture of the man President McKinley of the United States who was killed in Buffalo, the state of New York, and this picture is actually one Of the last pictures or the last picture taken of him.

The second wave of terrorism that is distinguished by David Rapoport is the wave of the anti-colonialists. What were their main characteristics? Well David Rapoport says it started in the 1920s. And it can be described as a struggle for self-determination, for independence, to liberate certain parts of the world. Former, well now, now former colonies from their occupiers, French rule, British

rule, etc. And the tactics these groups used were different from those in the previous wave and they used guerrilla tactics which was difficult for the powers, the British Empire, the French to deal with hit and run tactics. And some of these groups were quite successful in managing to, well almost defeat their opposing forces. Also very important is that, according to David Rapoport, these rebels stopped calling themselves terrorists and were beginning to use the term freedom fighters. So, they

were not terrorists. The terrorists were the other party. and they were fighting, they were struggling against what they would call government terror. Among the most well-known organizations of that wave are the IRA. The Irish Republican Army who from the 1920s on and a little bit earlier was fighting for an independent, a free Irish state and also a united one. And then another group that is linked to This anti-colonial wave is the FLN, the Front de Libération Nationale a group of Algerians who managed in the end to fight for an independent Algeria, who were fighting French rule. And then the third organization is Irgun, a militant Zionist group that was fighting the British authorities who at that time were governing what we now call Israel and Palestine. And here you see a picture of one of their most famous attacks, the attack on the King David Hotel in Jerusalem. Who, which at that time was the headquarters of the British mandatory authorities over Palestine.

The third wave of terrorism is what David Rapoport calls the new left wave. Or extreme left terrorism, the Red Brigades, the, the autonomi faction, and other groups that started in the 1960s. Well, some of its characteristics, first of all the Vietnam war that raged from the late 1950s on until the 1970s was a big driver for quite a number of groups especially also in Western Europe and North America. And David Rapoport observes the following. He says that many groups in the developed world including the Weather Underground, a group of students from North America, and autonomi in Germany saw themselves as vanguards for the masses of the Third World. And they probably would add the oppressed masses of the Third World.

Other groups include groups in Latin America, revolutionary groups who used urban guerrilla to fight the authorities, governments and partly were supported by the Soviet Union and its allies. Again don't forget also the context of this wave, of course it's the context of the Cold War. And at the international level, the International terrorism of those days is very much associated with Palestinians and in particular the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the PLO of Yasser Arafat. And the modus operandi the techniques, the tactics, they, the terrorist organizations of those they used were hostage takings and hijackings.

Well, the example of a hostage taking, an example I'm sure that all of you know, is the hostage taking of Israeli athletes during the Olympic Games in Munich in 1972. That event, and in particular also the Hostage taking, was watched by millions around the globe. The organization behind it was called Black September, and unfortunately it ended with all the athletes being killed, partly in an attempt to liberate them. The hijackings of those days were especially aimed at planes. Here you have a number of pictures of them planes from various, mainly western airliners were hijacked. And the main goal was to get attention for a certain cause, or to press free some of the co-fighters of the terrorists. And in those days most of them who had been hijacked in planes managed to get out of it alive as the intention of the terrorists was not to kill these people. But to use them as a tool to create, to get attention or to press governments to do something.

The fourth and last wave distinguished by David Rapoport is what he calls the religious wave, that started in 1979. The year of the Islamic revolution in Iran. The year the Soviet Union invaded and occupied Afghanistan in 1979 was also the year of the storming and occupation of the Grand Mosque in Mecca. Well, David Rapoport shows that there were many different religious groups that produced terrorism since 1979. he mentions Islam, many Islamic group but also the Sikh who from Punjab from their holy center, their holy temple, the golden temple in Amritsar, were for instance fighting the Indian authorities. But it also includes Jewish religious terrorists. Think of the murderer of Yitzhak Rabin who Was killed in 1995 while giving a speech in Tel Aviv. Well here you see the memorial site to Remember that event and to remember the Israeli Prime Minister.

But the religious waves also includes Christian groups think of anti-abortion militants who have killed quite a number of people and it also includes sects. And the most well-known attack of one sect is the attack on the Tokyo subway by the Aum sect. Let me try to pronounce it in Japanese the Aum Shinrikyo sect who was responsible for an attack with unconventional weapons. The nerve gas sarin in which they tried to kill quite a few people. In the end, they managed to kill 12 and injure more than a thousand. Well here you have a picture of that event which according to many, is one of the first and most well know attacks with WMD, weapons of mass destruction. Well, fortunately they

didn't manage to create a mass destruction. But unfortunately quite a number of people were injured and a number, 12 of them killed.

Other characteristics of this wave includes the modus operandi of, of these religious groups. And like in earlier waves, its assassinations of key leaders the military representatives of states, as well as hostage takings, and new is the suicide bombing. it's associated with this wave especially the first attacks by the Lebanese militant Shiite organization called Hezbollah attacks on the US and French military forces in Lebanon. where they used trucks with suicide terrorism, blew up the headquarters of the Americans and the French.

But at the same time I should stress that suicide bombings also happened among non-religious groups. The Kurdish workers parties, a Mao separatists group in Turkey, as well as the Tamil Tigers who were trying to liberate or create autonomy for the Tamils on the island of Sri Lanka, in the state of Sri Lanka. And of course the groups that are associated with this wave include Al Qaeda. That is first mentioned and, and first, for the first time making headlines with its attack on the US Embassies in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi and here you see A picture of the devastation after the attack in Dar es Salaam. Al Qaeda associated with this particular fourth wave of terrorism. So according to David Rapoport, there are four waves of terrorism. That each lasts about a few decades after which they might be still there but attract a lot less sympathizers and supporters and gradually fade out. That leaves us with a very interesting question. If this is true, what would be the fifth wave of terrorism? I'm sure a lot of policy makers would like to know, so they can either prepare for it, or try to prevent any new wave. I'm very interested in your opinion about this. Please help me out by filling in this questionnaire.

In sum, the phenomenon of groups and individuals using terrorism is not new. There are examples of pre-modern times and Modern day terrorism has at least four different waves. In the next video we're going to look at the use of the word terrorism. What does it mean? How has it been used in different times and in different languages?

## 2– 3 – 1.3 Use of the word terrorism

In the previous video we looked at the history of terrorism. And in this video we're going to explore the use of the word terrorism. The English word terrorism is used a lot. And I've mentioned already earlier that, It makes headlines on almost a daily basis worldwide. But of course the term is used in many different languages. Well here are some examples of headlines of terrorist incidents in leading newspapers.

Let's now first have a look at the use of the word terrorism at different times. Certain violent acts or attacks, that we today might label as terrorists were called something else in other times. To give you an example of the attack or assassination of the 25th United States President McKinley in 1901 already referred to it in a previous video. What did the newspapers say the next day? Well, here we have an example of the Philadelphia Record, a journal that doesn't exist anymore. and that refers to this attack by simply stating President McKinley is shot twice by Anarchist. By the way at that time he was still alive. He died only a few days later. And it also reads Washington is stunned by the blow. in addition to that it gives very interesting information. You see a graph an info graph of that age. Showing where he was hit. But you'll, if you read the whole page you will not find the word terrorist. So different times, different words to describe events, which I think today the killing of a US President, who would definitely call a terrorist attack.

And then there are differences in languages. In my language for instance Dutch, the word terrorism is translated as terrorisme. Well as you can hear, it hardly differs from the English word. But I'm sure there are many other languages where terrorism, when translated, sounds very different. And also might have a different meaning. Well here's two questions I would like you to have a look at. What about your mother tongue, if it's not English. How would you translate the English words into your language, and does it still have the same meaning? And in the second question, what about other terms in English that can be used instead of the word terrorism. Well here's a questionnaire to explore these differences. Thank you for filling out the questionnaire. I'm looking forward to learn about.

The translation of terrorism in different languages and the synonyms for terrorism. But that brings me to an important question. How to describe, or define, the term? What does, for instance, the Oxford Dictionary, say about the meaning of the term. And I've used the Oxford Dictionary because, I think, it's the leading one in the English language. Let's have a look. It reads as follows, and I've used the online version. It says, terrorism is the unofficial and unauthorized use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims. It's a great dictionary. But as with all dictionaries, a description of words is an interpretation. And you and I might disagree about the interpretation they give for the word terrorism. Let's go back and have a second look at it. Again, it reads. Terrorism is the unofficial or unauthorized use of violence and intimidation in the pursuit of political aims. Do we agree on this definition? I guess not. I think there's no consensus that this definition is the definition of terrorism. There's also a lack of consensus among scholars, policy-makers, politicians, experts. In fact, there's much dispute about how to define the term. Much disagreement also among scholars. So what did we learn? The English word terrorist. Is used a lot, but it has different meanings in different times, and in different languages and as much dispute about how to define it to him. In fact, there is no generally accepted definition of terrorism. Why is that the case? That we're going to explore in the next video.



## 2 – 4 - 1.4 Why no generally accepted definition?

In the previous video, we discovered that the word terrorism can have many different meanings. And that there's a dispute about how to define the term. In this video, we're going to look into the reasons why it's so difficult to formulate a generally accepted definition of terrorism. And it's difficulties are best explained by Alex Schmid, one of the leading scholars in the field of terrorism and counter-terrorism studies. And he provides us with four reasons explaining difficulties in defining terrorism. Let's have a look at these four reasons.

Schmid notes that terrorism is a contested concept, and political legal social science and popular notions are often diverging. And the second reason is that the definition question is linked to legitimization and delegitimization and criminalization of certain groups. And the third reason why it's so difficult to get to a generally accepted definition is that, there are many different types of terrorism, each with a different form of manifestation. And finally, the fourth reason is that the Term has undergone changes in meaning, in more than 200 years of its existence. Well let us now look at each of these four reasons.

So terrorism is a contested concept.

What does that mean? I think it's best explained by looking at The phrase, one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. Well, here you see six faces of persons that are associated with terrorism or freedom struggle, or other types of political violence by non-state actors. Do you recognize any of them? On the top row, from left to right, you see the face of Yasser Arafat, the leader, or the former leader of the PLO, the Palestinian Liberation Organization, who has been considered a terrorist by some, but who also holds a Nobel Peace Prize. And in the middle you see the face of Abdullah [UNKNOWN], the leader of the Kurdish worker's party, the PKK, from Turkey, who is regarded an arch enemy by the Turkish authorities. He's also in jail, but he's also considered a hero by many people with a Kurdish background. A hero, a freedom fighter. And on the right hand side, you see the face of Osama bin Laden, the former leader of Al-Qaeda. In the row below, you see, first of all the left-hand side, a picture of Che Guevara, a revolutionary left-wing activist, militant, terrorist, freedom fighter. Many labels you could use. In those days, in the 50s and 60s, very few would call him a terrorist. They would maybe label him as a revolutionary, as a rebel. But today, I think many people would label it quite differently if he would do these kind of things today. And then in the middle, you see the face of leader of the Tamil Tigers, you see also the flag with the tiger on it. the former leader, I should say. He has been killed a couple years ago. and he was the leader of an organization that was fighting the Sri Lankan authorities with the aim to create an independent state. Some would say a classical example of separatist nationalist terrorist, others might say freedom fighter. And then on the right hand side, you see the face of Anders Breivik, the man who killed almost 80 people in Norway a couple of years ago. With a right-wing anti-Islam ideology, what is he? A terrorist? A freedom fighter? Something else?

The second reason of Alex Schmid is related to the process of delegitimation and criminalization of certain groups. A good example of this is putting certain groups on lists of designated terrorist organizations. Which means that if you are on such a list, you're considered a criminal organization with a wide range of consequences. It ranges from freezing the assets of the organization to possible arrests of its membership. The United Nations has such a list, and so do amongst others, the United States and the European Union.

Well, here you have the example of the United States and the European Union. Have a look at it. We'll make sure that there's also a list provided on the course dashboard. And you see that it has a wide range of groups. you can see Al Qaeda on it, the earlier mentioned Kurdish Workers' Parties, the Aum Shinrikyo from Japan, as well as the Tamil Tigers. Repeatedly, there's pressure upon Governments and international organizations to put a certain group on a list or to de-list another.

Well, the latter is much less frequent than the lobby of all kinds of groups and politicians to add a certain group on a certain list.

Well, one organization that has been confronted, repeatedly confronted with calls to be put on the EU list of designated terrorist organizations is the Lebanese organization Hezbollah, a Shiite

militant group and political party. People who are in favor of this point at The alleged involvement in violent activities by Hezbollah in and outside Lebanon. They point for instance at a terrorist attack on Israeli tourists in Bulgaria. And also point at the fact that Hezbollah is allegedly involved in all kinds of violence in the Middle East, including Syria. In July 2013, as a result of this pressure, The European Union decided to put the military wing of Hezbollah on its list of designated terrorist organizations.

The third explanation for a lack of generally excepted definition of terrorism is the fact that there are many types of terrorism, each with a different form and manifestation. Well, here you see a list of Europol. European Union's law enforcement agency that distinguishes five different groups, based on ideology. They talk about religious inspired terrorism, which is distinct from ethno-nationalist and separatist terrorism. And then you have left wing and anarchist groups, as well as right wing groups. And then the fifth category is what they call single issue. Certain groups or individual that actually fight for one thing. For instance, that they fight for animal rights or they fight against abortion. A list based on ideology. Well, what about individuals with no clear ideology? Unfortunately, in the Netherlands, we have been confronted with a person who drove this car into a crowd, killing several people. Because he wanted to attack the queen who was visiting a town in the Netherlands. And his last words were, I did it on purpose. William Alexander, who is currently our king, he said, he's a fascist. He's a racist. And I knew the Queen would be there. How to label such an incident? Terrorism or not? And what about states? Why is state terrorism not one of the categories of Europol? We'll come back to that important question later on.

The fourth reason why it's so difficult to define terrorism, is the fact that the word has undergone changes in meaning in the more than 200 years of its existence. The term terrorism has changed its semantic focus several times. And it was originally used to describe the Reign of terror by the authorities after the French Revolution. And the term terrorist was not used in anti-government sense before the end of the 19th century and the early 20th century. And we already gave the example of the assassination of President McKinley. In the newspapers the next day they didn't use the word terrorism. And then today, I think it would be unthinkable that the killing of the United States President would not be labeled as a terrorist act. Now think of the reactions after the attacks on 9/11, here you see a number of examples. The word used in the headlines of the new, newspapers the following day included a wide variety of words: war, attack, infamy. But above all the words: terror and terrorism.

These examples show the changes in meaning of the word terrorism in its 200 years of existence. And it makes sense, because also terrorism itself, the act has changed. The nature and the face of the phenomena are also profoundly different from, let's say, 200 years ago. Why is there no generally accepted definition of terrorism? Alex Schmidt gave four reasons. Terrorism is a contested concept, and it's linked to the delegitimization and criminalization of certain groups. And then there are many different types of terrorism.

And finally, the meaning of the word has undergone changes in more than 200 years of its existence. In the next video, we're going to argue why it's so important to have a definition of terrorism, and look at a number of attempts to arrive at one.

## **2 - 5 – 1.5 Need for a definition, some attempts**

In the previous video we explained why it is so difficult, to arrive at a definition of terrorism, and in this video we're going to explore the need for a definition. And also we're going to look into attempts to arrive at generally accepted definition of the term. So we know it's very difficult to arrive at a generally accepted definition. But still I think we should try. Why, why is it so important to have a definition? Well here are a number of reasons.

We need a definition if we want to arrive at successful international cooperation in the fight against terrorism. Terrorism is a cross border phenomenon, and that means that we have to be able to share data and that means that we have to have some level of agreement. Who are we fighting? What constitutes a terrorist group or not? We already mentioned a problem of the listing of certain groups on a list of designated terrorist organization. It would be nice if we agree on what groups should be on that list or not. That would allow, for instance, the Sharing of data or the extradition of suspects. It's very difficult if country a says this is not a terrorist group. And the other one wants a certain person to be extradited and persecuted in another country. So, a higher level of agreement on the definition would improve international cooperation.

Also from a legal perspective there's another reason why we need some agreement on what is terrorism and what not, and to have quite precise definitions of terrorism. And that is what many human rights organizations call the risk of abuse. A lack of a definition, or proper one, is what they call an invitation to abuse. They say that in countries with no legal definition or rather vague ones it might be very tempting for governments, especially for governments of a more authoritarian nature. To use the label of terrorism to silence all kinds of opposition using terrorism charges to arrest or convict people or protest radicals who have no intentions to use political violence. And human rights organizations, Human Rights Watch for instance repeatedly expressed concern. of the tendency of some governments to re, regard terrorism a wide range of conduct far beyond what is generally understood by that term. And to define terrorism in law using very broad and open ended languages. so there are sometimes definitions of terrorism, but it's so fake that it's very difficult to label somebody a terrorist, heretical, or let's say a democratic protester. Countries make use of that or misuse of that, and a good definition could help to avoid that.

There's also a need for a proper or generally accepted definition of terrorism among researchers. We are very often confronted with different definitions, and try to make sense or give a general picture about developments with regard to terrorism, trends in terrorism. And I gave you the example of the number of casualties in recent years. I showed you data of United States State Department, but I also used Europol, for instance as a source, and the global terrorism database. Well, each of them have a slightly different definition of terrorism, and I added them up to give you a general picture. I think it's okay, for a general picture. But what if I add that? And I would like to make a proper analysis of trends in terrorism. And add more of these data with different sources. How solid are my statements? I think they're problematic, to say the least. The challenge, a lack of definition poses to international corporations, was one of the reasons why Kofi Annan, then Secretary General of the United Nations, actually from 1997 to 2001 tried to achieve a consensus about what is terrorism or what not.

Well let's see how he tried in the end. Unfortunately, how he also failed. He tried to reach consensus about a definition that focused on the targeting and the deliberate killing and non-combatants. For political purposes. But this definition did not gain the support of all member states. Although you might say, well what's harmful about a definition that focuses on the killing of civilians and non-combatants who can't be against them? More or less, it was difficult. And then also in a report entitled *Uniting Against Terrorism* recommendations for global counter-terrorism strategy. You'll find a copy on the course dashboard.

We've tried with the document to send out the moral message that terrorism is unacceptable and unjustifiable. Again, that sounds pretty decent to say, but not all states saw this as a sound basis for moving forward. Why not? Some revive the ideas about foreign occupation, and state terrorism that in their eyes Justified violence that they didn't want as, regard as or being

labelled as terrorism. And also think back at Second World War or a number of countries that face an illegal occupation, it makes sense that people have that in mind. Might be very much against something that is called unacceptable and unjustifiable under all conditions. So a number states were against that. And in the end, the attempt also failed because some states did not want to hear anything. About a suggestion or a definition that did not explicitly exclude state terrorism, meaning the idea that states could be labelled as terrorist. If they used terrorist tactics against other governments or their population or against their own population. So he courageously tried. But unfortunately, he failed. What about state terrorism? What do you think?

Well I guess I'm going to disappoint a few of you because personally, I'm not so much in favour of labelling the violence by state authorities against other countries. Or the population of other countries, or their own citizens as terrorism. We have international law, humanitarian law, and a law of war. And it's rather label, use and misuse of violence by states and war crimes or abuse of power and do not like to call that terrorism. We have a lot of legal instruments, International instruments, that we can use to fight war crimes. Abuse of power. But there are no such legal instruments in the field of terrorism. That's why, I think, we should be very careful to use the term state terrorism, and I prefer not to use it. That means that in this course when we talk about terrorism, we talk explicitly about the use of political violence by non-state actors.

Again, I do understand that many of you disagree. But I hope we can agree to disagree. Let us now move onto academic attempts to arrive at a definition. Well the most often quoted attempt is that of Albert Jongman and Alex Schmid. In the 1980s, they sent out a questionnaire to leading scholars in the field of terrorism and counter-terrorism studies. And they asked them, write down your definition of terrorism. And when these questionnaires came back, they studied them and tried to find key components that many people seem to agree upon. And they arrived at 22 key components. And in 2011, Alex Schmid. Updated this version.

Again, we sent out a questionnaire and looked into the literature regarding the definition of terrorism. Have a close look at it, and take your time. These are 12 core components, and I would like to ask you a few questions about it. Which one do you think are more important? Which ones are less important? Maybe I should explain a few of them, but again have a look it for yourself. For instance, the first one, it says that a core component of definition of terrorism is that a definition should say something about, the fact that terrorism is both a doctrine and a practice. So it's both, both an idea, a doctrine and a practice something that happens on the ground. It should also refer to the context in which terrorism is employed as a tactic. Think of is it a war situation or not a war situation. These kind of context according to Alex Schmid. And others is an important key component of terrorism.

And then it also says that it should say something about the perpetrators, those behind terrorist attacks. Do you agree on that? Do you think that is a core component? Is it number one in your list or one of the last on your list? These kind of things I would like to know. But do you agree that a definition of terrorism should mention that terrorist acts form part of a campaign of violence, so not only one terrorist incident but a series of attacks. Do you think that's an important component or not? That's what I want to know from you. In the questionnaire, we're going to ask you, what are the most important core components? Which three of them do you think should be in any definition of terrorism?

So again, have a close look at these 12 components. And pick your three most important ones. I'm very much interested in your opinion about core elements in a definition of terrorism. And I also have a message for you from Alex Schmid who is the author of the academic consensus definition, that consists of these 12 parts.

So you're seeing that it can be quite difficult to arrive at a satisfactory definition of the concept of terrorism. It's a contested concept, like others, for instance, imperialism is a contested concept. Nonetheless, it is absolutely necessary that we talk about the same. Object rather than use vague

and broad terms. However in each country, the usage differs a little bit. And since you come from many countries, we would be very much interested how. The term terrorism is used in your country. Is it broadly applied, narrowly applied, Loosely applied, or confined to certain groups only?

So your collaboration in this would be very much appreciated. Thank you for filling out the questionnaire.

What did we learn, this video? We looked into the need for a definition. And also focused on two attempts. One by Kofi Annan, then Secretary General of the United Nations. And we looked at the academic consensus definition by Alex Schmidt. In the next video, we're going to focus on the essence of terrorism.



## 2 – 6 – 1.6 Essence of terrorism

The previous video showed a need for a definition of terrorism. And we have discussed several attempts to arrive at a generally accepted definition of the term. In this video we will explore the essence of terrorism.

Well, there is not one definition of terrorism and that's bad but there is general agreement that the phenomenon of terrorism has many different elements. And there's also more or less agreement. That terrorism is an instrument or a tactic of certain groups, be they non state actors or state actors, to achieve certain goals. Use of force is important, an important part of this instrument or tactic. But it's not its goal. Of course there are exceptions. Sometimes it's not clear what a terrorist wants and sometimes the violence in itself seems to be both a method and a goal. we call this expressive terrorism. There's no difference in, between method and goal. It's very unclear.

Well, fear finally, is one of the key components. And spreading fear is more important than spreading death. So it's not primarily about causing casualties. The goal is not many dead, but many afraid. And terrorists sometimes manage to do that with very limited means. Especially in countries that are not that often confronted with terrorism. An example of that is the situation in the Netherlands in the years 2005, 2006. In 2006, according to a public opinion Poll [FOREIGN]. 40% of the Dutch consider terrorism to be one of the two most important problems the country was faced with. And they were more afraid than the British and the Spanish, who had just experienced horrible attacks in Madrid, with 200 people being killed, and the London bomb, with more than 50 people killed. So what happened in the Netherlands that they were so afraid of terrorism? Well, just one attack by one person Killing one other person, the Dutch filmmaker, Theo van Gogh. Well, one could argue that the killer managed to produce a lot of fear out of one single action. I guess too much fear. A well-known scholar that was one of the first to stress that terrorism is not primarily about killing people is, Brian Jenkins. In 1975, he wrote terrorists want a lot of people watching. Not a lot of people dead, and I agree. And I think this statement is still quite interesting today. Whether or not it's still very relevant given changes in terrorism, it's terrorism of today is different than the terrorism of 1975, we will discuss in a later video. Well.

The essence of terrorism is not only that it's not mainly about killing. Another important element is that the direct targets are not or only rarely the main targets. How to explain this? We take for instance the attacks on 9/11. 3000 people were killed, but they were in many ways the indirect targets. The, the terrorist didn't want to kill Those people, they wantd to attract a lot of attention. The main targets were you and I who were watching these horrible pictures of people being killed in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania.

So, the direct targets are not or only rarely the main targets of terrorism. So the violence is not aimed at those who die but those who continue to live. The main target is us. You and me. The terrorist strategy is to kill one or a few and to frighten millions. They want us to overreact, and unfortunately that is quite often the case. Maybe we should try harder not to be afraid, not to overreact. I'm very much a fan of the social movement and slogan, we are not afraid. People posting pictures or cartoons or using banners to express their resilience to terrorism, stating, we are not afraid. Well, here you see a picture using the logo of the London Underground as a reaction to the 7/7 London bombings in 2005. But how hard you and I might try, the impact can, of terrorism, can sometimes be very high. Media are very important in spreading fear. But the same holds for politicians and public figures. And as a result of this spreading of fear. Terrorism and the impact of terrorism can be enormous, it is a big threat. Not in physical terms, although too many people die because of terrorism, but the impact is enormous. The impact can be very high on society, on relationships between communities. It can be very high on the economy and. On politics. There seems to be some level of agreement on the idea that terrorism is a tool, a mechanism, an

instrument to spread fear by the way of using violence. In order to impact politics and society. Well, unfortunately that impact is often enormous as politics and society tend to over react after terrorist

incidents. And by doing so, we help the terrorists. And that's not a good idea. I'm very much a fan of the idea to show resilience to terrorism, and the slogan, we are not afraid.

What are we going to do next week? We will look at the study of terrorism and counterterrorism.

We're going to answer the question, what does, what do academia and think tanks have come up with after 9/11? And why is it rather difficult to study terrorism? See you next week.