

## Study of the Problems Associated With Producing a Satisfactory Definition of Terrorism and Analysis of the Main Characteristics of Terrorism

### Author's Details:

Meliadis Miltiadis<sup>1</sup>, Sipitanou Afroditi<sup>2</sup>, Chalaris Michail<sup>3</sup>

International Hellenic University – Hellenic Fire Academy, MSc in Analysis and management of manmade and natural disasters, Greece, [mmeliadis@gmail.com](mailto:mmeliadis@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> International Hellenic University – Hellenic Fire Academy, MSc in Analysis and management of manmade and natural disasters, Greece, [sipitanou.afroditi@gmail.com](mailto:sipitanou.afroditi@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> International Hellenic University – Hellenic Fire Academy, School of Fire Officers, Military Nursing Academy (SAN), MSc in Analysis and Management of Manmade and Natural Disasters, and MSc in Oil and Gas Technology, Hellenic Fire Corps, Greece, [chalarismichail@gmail.com](mailto:chalarismichail@gmail.com) (Corresponding author)

### Abstract:

*In this paper, an attempt will be made to analyze the term Terrorism. This term is a rather difficult, complex and multidimensional, and for that the definitions for it vary as we will see below. In addition, a deepening of the main features of terrorism will be carried out as well as the problems and the reasons why it is difficult to have a precise definition of the term terrorism. Terrorism is a term widely used, especially this period of human history but not precisely defined. Initially, a historical review of terrorism will be presented. Additionally, several definitions of the term Terrorism are recorded and analyzed. This analysis is purely bibliographical and is directly related to the need of identifying the difficulty of understanding the different approaches of terrorism, its definitions, the beliefs that it supports and how is used through ages from different groups. Terrorism has up to 100 definitions and can be used in order to support different agendas. Moreover, the main approaches of terrorism defer depending the era, the area, the cultural and historical understanding of people, its purposes and how authorities want to use it. Finally, in this paper the principal difficulties of identifying terrorism are noted down as also a general conclusion of the phenomenon of terrorism.*

**Keywords:** Terrorism,

### 1. Introduction

The phenomenon of terrorism follows the evolution of man. It's one global phenomenon and although it counts many centuries of life is very difficult to define it. It is sometimes characterized as tactics or strategy, sometimes as criminal activity or sacred duty and sometimes as a legitimate reaction to oppression and the humiliation of human being. Every effort definition of the phenomenon is characterized by subjectivity as it depends on the angle someone "see" the phenomenon. In the next four chapters of this paper, a comprehensive effort is being made to analyze the phenomenon of terrorism and the difficulty in defining it. Moreover, is worth to mention that the phenomenon of terrorism is not a static one but evolves just like the human being and the societies in which he lives. It is developing, renewing and following technological developments. Of course, some of its features remain the same and serve as reference points for defining a terrorist act.

### 2. Historical Review of Terrorism

Terrorism or the threat of committing a terrorist act is

not the recent trend observed in recent years. Instead, it has been for thousands of years now, and many believe it exists since the birth of human civilization. The word terror has been combined with the concept of violence either in its individual dimension or in its state-imposed enforcement.

But what is the term terrorism? Nowadays this term is used so often that someone is reluctant to find the right definition of it without another person, group, community, or even state, to regard our definition as a mistake and to define something completely different. The phrase "you understand terrorism when you see it" [1] proves that every man with his own eyes sees and defines terrorism in a different way. Today, most people have a vague idea, impression or attitude about what is just terrorism, but lacking a certain precise and truly explanatory definition of the word. This ambiguity has been instigated, in part, today by the modern media, which in their effort to translate a frequently complex and complex message within a short period of time, lead several times to the classification of violent acts as "terrorism" [2].

The phenomenon now known as terrorism was born thousands of years ago. As a precursor to modern terrorist movements, we can mention the Sicari and the Zealots Jewish movements that acted during the Roman occupation in the 1st century of the Middle East with purely national religious motives. Still, a well-known terrorist organization with religious motives that acted in the 11th century was the Assassins who stabbed their victims, mainly politicians or bureaucrats who refused to adopt the religion of Islam. Finally, the Thugees, an Indian religious movement that ran from the 18th to the 19th century, shook its victims as an offer to the Hindu deity of horror and the Kali disaster [3].

From the time when the Assassins appeared until the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup>-century terror and barbarity were the main components of warring situations and conflicts. Until the creation of the new nation with its treaty Westphalia in 1648, the kind of central power that terrorism as a phenomenon is trying to influence, there was little. The ability to communicate was limited and the causes that could cause terrorism actions such as religion, ethnicity led to open conflicts and revolutions. Until that time the kingdoms and princes became states, they had enough power to impose power and stifle activities such as terrorism.

Historically, the French Revolution gave us the terms "terrorism" and "terrorist". The English term terrorism comes from the "regime de la terreur" (status of terror) prevailed in France between 1793 and 1794. The scheme was originally designed to stabilize power and power of the newly-established government, protecting it from any "subversive" data. The members of the Public Security Committee and the National Assembly which imposed the "terror policies" were termed, terrorists. The term that is, it was initially positive. Robespierre saw the status as vital and directly related to the future of the French Republic. The new definitions of citizenship and nationality, the result of the French Revolution helped to bring out new folk terrorism against the oppression of state power.

In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the emergence of radical political theories and the improving weapon technology has led to the creation of small revolutionary one's groups that attacked the governments of the nation states. Anarchism with "propaganda of deed" gathered several fans and hit some key blows, killing chiefs States. A characteristic follower of the "propaganda of deed" theory is Carlo Pisacane who recognized the usability of terrorism to convey the message to the public, draws the attention of governments and to win the support of the people for this purpose.

Many nationalistic organizations in Ireland and the Balkans followed his view, adopting terrorism to achieve their goals.

The first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is marked by the two World Wars that have resulted in the flourishing of nationalist movements and the disruption of the international order. State-sponsored terrorism is emerging just before the outbreak of the First World War, culminating in the years of the Second World War, mainly thanks to totalitarian movements such as the Nazis, the Italian Fascists, and the Stalinist Russians. During the cold Terrorism is presented as a regular choice for nationalist rebels or revolutionary movements around the world. In the Middle East, Asia and Africa various nationalist movements resisted European efforts to continue colonial enterprises after the fall of the Axis forces. In decades 1960 and 1970 organizations with national, nationalist, ideological and political beliefs were created. Organizations such as IRA, ETA, Palestinian Liberation Organization used the hijacking and kidnapping of a chief-adviser as the most appropriate medium for publicity in its era globalization.

In the mid-1990s, terrorism re-emerged with statehood grant. There were attacks against the US and Western targets in the Middle East. Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon have been designated as countries terrorists. In recent years, it has come back to the fore terrorism with religious motives. It all began in 1979, when the revolution which Iran has shaped in Islamic democracy has led it to use and to support terrorism as propaganda for its ideals, beyond its borders. The spread was rapid and a lot was created quickly religious movements such as that of Aum Shinriky who is responsible for her release of Sharin toxic gas on Tokyo Metro in 1995 or that of Al Qaeda, responsible for the terrorist attack on the twin towers of New York on 11 September 2001. Since then, terrorism in the United States has been combined with Al Qaeda. Because of the fear of new lethal attacks President Bush declared the war on terror with his aim contain, anticipate and combat such attacks as well as the extinction of every terrorist trail on the planet.

David Rapoport is one of those who distinguish "four waves" of terrorism. Each has its own features, different audiences, supporters and allies, or mode of operation. Each of these periods lasted for some decades. In the 1880s, the "Anarchist Wave" appeared, lasting about 40 years. His successor, the "Anti-Colonial Wave" began in the 1920s and until 1960 had largely disappeared. At the end of the

1960s, the "New Left Wave" rose, scattered largely in the 1990s, leaving only a few active groups. The fourth or "Religious Wave" began in 1979. The revolution was the primary goal of each wave, but the revolution was translated differently in each period.

His main question was "why did the "Anarchist Wave" begin at the end of the 19th century?" The most important reasons were doctrine and technology. Russian writers, especially Nechaev, Bakunin and Kropotkin, have created a doctrine or a terror strategy, a legacy for their successors to use, improve and transmit. Changes in the form of communication were the second reason. The Telegraph, the daily mass newspapers, and the railroad flourished during this period. Narodnaya Volya, the first terrorist group in the first wave, inherited a world where traditional rebels seemed obsolete or obsolete [3].

In the "Anti-Colonial Wave", the revolutionaries were identified as terrorists and not as rebels, using the concept of the term by the French Revolution. They sought political goals, with the prospect of awakening the consciousness of the world. Terrorism was strategic, not the purpose. The tactics of the second wave differed in some cases, compared to the first one. Bank robberies were less frequent, and it was realized that the murders of prominent political figures were often counterproductive. The IRA appeared in the 1920s and terrorist groups developed around the world. "Anti-colonial" terrorist campaigns were critical to understanding the evolution and development of modern and modern terrorism. Thus, the basis for the transformation of terrorism in the late 1960s was laid by a mainly local phenomenon, a problem of global security [2].

The agonizing war of Vietnam created the psychological conditions for the emergence of the third wave or "New Left Wave". Many teams in the "developed world" for example, the RAF in West Germany or the Red Brigades in Italy saw themselves as pioneers for the masses of the Third World, where there was a great deal of hostility towards the West. When the Vietnam War ended in 1975, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was the heroic model. The term "international terrorism" revived to describe the activities of the "New Left Wave". The objectives chosen were international in scopes, such as the massacre at the Munich Olympics (1972) and the abduction of the Ministers of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (1975). The hijacking was the most modern tactic of this movement and blows at foreign embassies began. The third wave began to decline in the 1980s [3].

The "Religious Wave" began in the 1980s decade. In

past waves, religious identity has always been significant, but in this wave, it has acquired a very different meaning, as it provided the justification and organization for the establishment of the "New Order of Things". Islam is the most important religion in this wave. Three events in the Islamic world were dramatic a political turning point for the new wave. The Iranian Revolution was the first. Protests on the road unmasked the Shah's army and revealed that religion had more political influence and resonance than the prevailing revolutionary trend. Later in Afghanistan, Muslim resistance forced the Soviets to flee. Religion has now shown the possibility that it can ouster a secular superpower. The third fact was that, in 1979, it was the beginning of the new century, according to the Muslim calendar and tradition said that a redeemer would come. This tradition affected the Iranian Revolution. The killings and hostages, common practices of the third wave continued, but "suicide attacks" were the most impressive, deadly and innovative tactics of this wave. The fourth wave led to the creation of an organization, with a purpose and method of recruitment pioneering in the history of terrorism, known to all of us as "Al Qaeda," led by Saudi leader Osama Bin Laden. This organization sought and continues to seek to create a "united state" for all Muslims that once existed and be governed by Sharia, the Islamic Law [2], [3].

### 3. The main approaches of terrorism

According to Kaplan [4], "reasons for action are the purposes it is meant to serve". Such reasons are the terrorist organization's aims (e.g., the change of a political system). The pursuit of the reasons is a public characteristic to all supporters since each of them benefits from the pursuit and promotion of the organization's aims and no supporter can be excluded from obtaining these benefits [5]. In order to define what terrorism is, it should initially study it, understand it and then give it a definition of what it is. Today there are three main approaches to the study of terrorism.

1. Macro-sociological
2. Psychological
3. Psychosocial

Terrorism and the ensuing "war on terror" have affected societies around the world, attracting researchers from various disciplines such as political science, psychology, economics, physics and anthropology [6]. Looking at the principles of

academic research on terrorism, before (40) to (50) years, it is remarkable that what was once a marginal subject for social science has evolved into a comprehensive "study of terrorism" [7].

Researchers who study and support the *macro-sociological* approach view terrorism as a reflection of various dysfunctions or contradictory tendencies in the social system. In general, terrorism has been linked to several of the so-called "root causes" that have promoted other types of political violence, such as riots and demonstrations, revolutions, civil wars, and international armed conflicts. Some of the root causes are poverty, globalization, injustice and inequalities, authoritarian and oppressive regimes or cultural and religious practices. The majority of analyzes take an economic dimension, linking it to increased economic integration, the development of international trade and interdependence. From this point of view, globalization involves liberalization, the abolition of state restrictions on trade and foreign exchange, as well as the reduction in controls on capital, labor, knowledge, and technology [8]. On the contrary, opponents of globalization see it as a negative process, increasing the sovereignty and control of developed nations, to the poor and less developed. As Douglas Kellner observed, globalization is a pretext for global capitalism and imperialism and is condemned as yet another form of capital and market rationalization in more areas of the world [9]. According to these scholars, globalization has increased inequalities and social polarization in the nations' interiors, but also among them. Many theories of terrorism focus on the role of poverty or political chaos in weak states. However, recent research has revealed a paradox: both destitute and wealthy individuals become terrorists [10], while some of the most chaotic states do not "produce" terrorists [11]. Although several studies have failed to show that poverty and inequality are directly linked to terrorism, it is obvious that economic deprivation increases demands for political change. Economic inequalities usually lead to political upheaval and could be a call for groups to resort to terrorism as a way of achieving their desired goals. Distinguished politicians and scholars have argued that poverty and lack of education foster terrorism despite the rich evidence that most terrorists come from the middle class and are usually academically educated. It is a fact that the perception of the connection between religious extremism and terrorism is particularly popular within the middle class and generally the public. On the other hand, there are many statistical analyzes that reject the link between religion and

terrorism. However, by adopting a deeper analysis, we conclude that both approaches are oversimplified [12].

The macro-sociological approach attempts to interpret terrorism as a rational act and terrorists as rational actors who want to achieve certain political goals and their terrorist attacks are the means to achieve these goals, as a result of the cost-benefit analysis [13].

The most popular *psychological* explanations of terrorism include disturbed or psychopathological personalities. Some researchers have tried to analyze terrorists from their propensity for violence or the inability to control their aggressive impulses. However, impulsive aggression is not a common feature of terrorism. According to this approach, some common psychological characteristics of terrorists are lack of compassion for their victims, dogmatic psychosis or simplistic or utopian perception and worldview. However, it is generally accepted that there are no psychological or psychopathological characteristics that separate terrorists from the general population. Probably the team's dynamics, with particular emphasis on collective identity, which explains the psychology of terrorists [14]. Contrary to the prevailing popular view, terrorists are not crazy. Indeed, terrorist groups are removing emotionally unstable individuals, as they pose a risk to their safety. According to this approach, it is eventually group, organizational and social psychology, with a particular emphasis on collective identity rather than individual psychopathology, which is the foundation of terrorist psychology [15].

According to the third approach, neither the individual psychology of terrorists nor the social environment provides a full explanation as to why individuals are involved in terrorism. For this reason, more and more researchers are turning to a psychosocial approach. Therefore, terrorism is presented as a policy of political influence and the psychological qualities of terrorists are explained as a result of many different social processes [16].

Social psychologists describe one's environment as the place where the behavior of a person is influenced by the social tendencies in which he lives, as well as his psychological predispositions. But first of all, it is a sphere of social influence, an area where people try to influence the behavior and beliefs of other people. For this reason, the *psychosocial* view is not consistent with the widespread interpretation of terrorist attacks as a direct result of any social or psychological

determination but is treated as a set of social and interactive processes. But psychology also plays a crucial role in understanding terrorism. A comprehensive understanding of this complex phenomenon requires a complex multidisciplinary approach, incorporating knowledge from the political, historical, cultural, economic, ideological and religious scientific fields. Interpretation of terrorism at the level of individual psychology is inadequate and does not answer the question of why people are involved in terrorism. There is a multitude of individual motivations. For some, revenge is a primary motivation, others are the sense of power that empowers the powerless, others are the feeling that they are at the center of attention [9].

According to the psychosocial approach, the psychological characteristics of individuals are interpreted as a result of many processes of socialization and social interaction [16].

#### 4. Definitions of Terrorism

In this chapter, bibliographic research of the definition of "terrorism" from different sources will be made. There is no lack of proposed definitions for terrorism. Every academic and expert, every defense official and politician, would be happy to offer his or her own definition, which by nature reflects his or her worldview and, often, political stance.

The quest for a satisfactory definition of terrorism, described by Nicholas J Perry as the search for the 'Holy Grail', is one pursued by the law and various other branches of the social sciences. To define terrorism, however, assumes that such a phenomenon exists. As a concept, terrorism has oscillated in meaning, reflecting ideas contextually specific to the time period and location to which it is being applied [17].

Terrorism is a social construct, its meaning shaped by the subjective perspectives of the categorizer [18]. These, in turn, are influenced by the society and circumstances in which the categorizer finds themselves in, varying upon the historical and political context in which they live. Consequently, attempts to understand terrorism have spawned a vast array of different methodologies, paradigms, and branches of knowledge. Certain branches of 'terrorism studies' may be conceptualized as cultural anthropology, viewing 'terrorists' as natives that need to be studied [19].

A universal definition today remains a dreamless dream because different bodies, organizations, government agencies, organizations, communities and groups of citizens adopt different definitions to

better fit their particular roles and preferences [20]. One of the most remarkable and interesting issues around this particular field is the famous saying "when someone is termed a terrorist, someone else calls him a fighter of freedom", that is, the same way of action is described in a different way, with different approach, by different observers and with completely different perceptions<sup>1</sup>.

In the English Dictionary "Oxford English Dictionary" there is the following definition. Terrorism: The unlawful use of violence and intimidation, especially against civilians, in the pursuit of political aims. Origin Late 18th century (in reference to the rule of the Jacobin faction during the period of the French Revolution known as the Terror). The Merriam-webster web dictionary gives this definition: "the systematic use of terror especially as a means of coercion". The Cambridge web dictionary gives the definition: (threats of) violent action for political purposes.

The United Nations (UN), in its Security Council Resolution 1566, condemns terrorist acts by indirectly defining them as "criminal acts, including those against civilians, committed with intent to cause death or serious bodily harm or condition with a view to causing a terrible state of affairs to the general public or a group of persons or individuals, intimidating a population or forcing a government or an international organization to take or abstain any act which constitutes an offense falling within the scope of existing international conventions and protocols on terrorism and in no case justified on grounds of political, philosophical, inter-ethnic, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature" [21].

The European Union defines terrorism as "criminal acts aimed at intimidating populations, compelling states to comply with the perpetrator's demands and/or destabilizing the fundamental policies, constitutional economic or social structures of a country or an international organization" [22].

In 1983, the US State Department has formulated one of the most widely known and generally accepted definitions of terrorism, and this is "*premeditated and politically motivated by violence, civilian targets by sub-national groups or secret agents they usually aim to influence an audience*" [2], [8], [23]. From the same country, the FBI has defined terrorism as "*the use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate*

<sup>1</sup>Tofangsaz, H. Terrorism or not terrorism? whose money are we looking for? Journal of Financial Crime, 22(3), 378-390. doi: 10.1108/JFC-02-2014-0005, 2015

or force a government, the civilian population or any part thereof to promote its political or social goals". Finally, the US Department of Defense defines terrorism as "the illicit use - or threat of use - of force or violence against persons or property to incite or intimidate governments or societies often to achieve political, religious or ideological goals" [2].

The United States Congress defines "terrorism" as "activities that involve violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that is a violation of criminal laws of the United States ... [and] appear to be intended to intimidate a civilian population, to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or to affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping".

In the United Kingdom, Paragraph 1 of the Counter-Terror Law, adopted in 2000 and amended in 2006, defines terrorism as "the use or threat of action with political motives, which involves serious violence against a person, serious property damage and serious danger for the health and safety of the public" [24].

Walter Laqueur uses a simple and broad definition that "terrorism is the illicit use of force, to achieve a political goal, targeting innocent people" [1].

Tore Bjorgo believes that "terrorism is more a set of combat methods than an identifiable ideology or movement, and involves the premeditated use of violence against civilians, in particular, in order to achieve a psychological effect of fear on indirect rather than immediate goals" [25].

It is important to note that Alex Schmid and Albert Jongman examined 109 definitions of terrorism and resulted in the 22 most frequently used data listed in the following **Error! Reference source not found.**[26].

**Table 1:** Frequency of occurrence of "definition data" of terrorism (Schmid and Jongman, 1988)

A/A	Element	Percentage (%)
1	Force, Power	83.5
2	Politician/Politics	65
3	Terror, Fear	51
4	Threat	47
5	Psychological effects and expected reactions	41.5
6	Target victim differentiation	37.5
7	Deliberate, planned, systematic, organized action	32
8	The battle method, tactical strategy	30.5
9	Regularity, in violation of accepted rules, without humanitarian constraints	30
10	Forcing, extortion, induction of compliance	28
11	Aspect of publicity	21.5

12	Abusive, impersonal, random character, without distinction	21
13	Citizens, civilians, neutral, foreigners as victims	17.5
14	Intimidation	17
15	Innocence of victims	15.5
16	Group, movement, organization as a perpetrator	14
17	Symbolic view, showing to others	13.5
18	Unpredictability, unpredictability, unpredictability of the occurrence/existence of violence	9
19	Secret, covert nature	9
20	Repeatability: serial or expeditionary nature of violence	7
21	Criminal/Criminality	6
22	Requests for third parties	4

Terrorism is the deliberate use of violence against civilian targets by a non-state actor to achieve political aims [27].

Last but not least, is worthy of reference for understanding Walter Laqueur's definition of terrorism, "the controversy over a detailed and complete definition of terrorism will continue for a long time and there will be no remarkable contribution to understanding " [28].

### 5. Principal difficulties in defining terrorism

Today, even within the academic sphere, there are a large number of dissimilar definitions of the term "terrorism". Even extensive literature searches carried out with keywords such as "terrorism", "terror", "terrorist" and the other derivatives gave them a multitude of definitions. Searches have given a large number of petitions, but unfortunately, the majority of them have been published for different purposes and not for deepening scientific research [20].

The difficulty of finding a definition that addresses issues of cultural, ethnic and religious perceptions that is not couched in inflammatory rhetoric is problematic because "Even if there were an objective, value-free definition of terrorism, covering all its important aspects and features, it would still be rejected by some for ideological reasons.." [29].

As Sebastian Wojciechowski, stated: "we put definitional pressure on our ability to articulate this sense that special outrage is appropriate for these offenses, just in order to see whether we can make coherent sense of this pattern of moral responsibility" [30]. Furthermore, at his paper states down some key difficulties in defining terrorism which is the following ones:

- Being unable to, or having difficulty in, distinguishing terrorism from the more or less

related phenomena or processes, such as terror, guerrilla warfare, the war for national independence, irredentism, separatism, etc.

- Decision-making centers (e.g. politicians) or opinion-forming circles (e.g. media) intentionally applying the notion of terrorism, terrorist, etc. in order to influence public opinion and discredit a certain individual or formation, to justify some activity, use a red herring or win popularity.
- Avoidance of the notion of terrorism/terrorist. In some cases, this concerns the members of terrorist organizations, who do not perceive themselves as terrorists and use the notions of a fighter, partisan, liberator, ‘God's servant’, etc.
- Taking political advantage of the fact that there is no universal definition of terrorism.
- The attempts to explain the essence of terrorism by means of more or less related notions of ‘radicalism’, ‘extremism’, ‘acts of terror’, ‘terrorist acts’, ‘policies of terror’, etc
- Another difficulty we encounter in our attempts to present terrorism in a comprehensive and thorough manner is its evolution
- The problems with the definition of the notion can also involve personal ambitions, sympathy or emotions.
- A terrorist attack and the methods and means of operation applied in the course of an attack can be varied and manifold which is a significant obstacle to successfully defining the notion.
- The doubts, discussions or disputes concerning the notion of terrorism conducted on an international stage, including international organizations, are of fundamental significance.
- In the opinion of some experts, terrorism escapes an unambiguous definition as the notion is too comprehensive.
- The fact that there are numerous definitions of the notion even within a single state and its structures make it more complicated to define terrorism and simultaneously illustrates the complexity of the matter.
- Another related problem concerns the laconic character, imprecision or polemic nature of many definitions applied [30].

As was written in the previous chapter Schmind and Jongman create a list with the most frequently used data about terrorism. Wojciechowski suggest limiting

this list into five key issues in order to narrow down the considerations that have to be taken into account to have a well-structured answer of what is “terrorism” [31]. Those five key issues are:

1. **Who?** – Who is the initiator, organizer, sponsor or executioner of the attack/attacks?
2. **How?** – How was the attack prepared, conducted, executed?
3. **Why?** – Why has a terrorist attack come about? This is a question about the sources, reasons, motives, etc.
4. **Who/what was the target?** – Who/what did the instance of terrorism concern? This is a question about the subject(s) – object(s) of the attack.
5. **What is the outcome?** – This is a question about the consequences.

### Conclusions

In this paper, an attempt was made to analyze key questions which are: what is terrorism and why it is so difficult to define it. At the beginning of this paper, a historical review was made, as also the main approaches of terrorism were noted down.

At the next chapter there stated down various definitions of Terrorism and it was more than clear that their different approaches, views, and beliefs of what is terrorism and this depends from who defines it, why he defines it like that and what is his goals. In the final chapter, the principal difficulties in defining what terrorism are noted down as also an approach to minimize the key issues of how to define the term terrorism.

One of the most important key issues that are exported from this paper is not only to define “terrorism” but to understand it, in order to figure out, in a reasonably sophisticated way, what to do about it. Terrorism is a complex and variable phenomenon. It occurs in many different forms in different parts of the world in order to achieve various goals. It happens in democracies, authoritarian regimes, and new governments, developed, less developed and developing economies. Terrorism itself varies from region to region, from time to time, but also in the nature of ideology and the specificity of its goals. Finally, they differ in how they use violence [8].

To sum up, we would like to note down that whether can respond fully and adequately such a question, we believe that it is summed up in the phrase of the American journalist I. F. Stone and may be most appropriate answer: “If you expect an answer

to your question during your life, you have not asked a big question”<sup>2</sup>.

## References

- i. Laqueur, Walter. *Terrorism*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1977
- ii. Hoffman, B. *Inside Terrorism*. 2nd edn. (New York: Columbia University Press), 2006
- iii. Rapoport, D. C. *The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11*. *Anthropoetics* 8(1), 2002
- iv. Kaplan, A., “The Psychodynamics of Terrorism,” *Terrorism*, 1, 237-254, 1978
- v. Pittel, Karen; Rübhelke, Dirk: *Characteristics of Terrorism*. Economics Working Paper Series, No. 09/103, ETH Zurich, CER-ETH - Center of Economic Research, Zurich, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3929/ethz-a-005751080>, 2009
- vi. Kuznar, L. *Rationality wars and the war on terror: Explaining terrorism and social unrest*. *American Anthropologist*, 109(2), 318-329. doi:10.1525/aa.2007.109.2.318, 2007
- vii. Crenshaw, M. *Terrorism research: The record*. *International Interactions*, 40(4), 556-567. doi: 10.1080/03050629.2014.902817, 2014
- viii. Richardson, L. *The ROOTS of Terrorism*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, LLC, 2006
- ix. Krueger, A. B., & Maleckova, J. "Education, Poverty and Terrorism: Is There a Causal Connection?". *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(4), 119–144, 2003
- x. Von Hippel, K. "The Roots of Terrorism: Probing the Myths". *Political Quarterly*, 73 (Suppl. 1), 25-40, 2002
- xi. Underwood, L. J. *Religion and terrorism: Religious perspectives on terrorism. The root of all evil. Religious perspectives on terrorism* (pp. 1-12). Retrieved from [www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com), 2013
- xii. Crenshaw, M. *Theories of terrorism: instrumental and organizational approaches*. Londres: Frank Cass Publishers, 2001
- xiii. Keohane, R., & Nye, J. "Globalization: What's New and What's Not? (and So What?)". *Foreign Policy*, 118(2), 104-119, 2000
- xiv. Post, J. M. *Terrorism and right-wing extremism: The changing face of terrorism and political violence in the 21st century: The virtual community of hatred*. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 65(2), 242-271. Retrieved from [www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com), 2015
- xv. Post, J. M. *The new face of terrorism: Socio-cultural foundations of contemporary terrorism*. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23(4), 451-465. doi:10.1002/bsl.658, 2005
- xvi. De La Corte, L., Kruglanski, A., De Miguel, J., Sabucedo, J. M., & Déaz, D. *Seven psychosocial principles to explain terrorism*. [Siete principios psicossociales para explicar el terrorismo] *Psicothema*, 19(3), 366-374. Retrieved from [www.scopus.com](http://www.scopus.com), 2007
- xvii. Perry, N.J. *The Numerous Federal Legal Definitions of Terrorism: The Problem of Too Many Grails* 30(2) *Journal of Legislation* 249 Google Scholar, 2004
- xviii. Anderson, D. *Shielding the Compass*. 3 *EHRLR* 233 Google Scholar, 240, 2013
- xix. Hülsse, R., and Spencer, A., 'The Metaphor of Terror: Terrorism Studies and the Constructivist Turn' 39(6) *Security Dialogue* 571-573, 2008
- xx. Bruce, G. *Definition of terrorism - social and political*. *Journal of Military and Veterans Health*, 21(2), 26-30, 2013
- xxi. UN Security Council (2004). *Vote n.1566* <http://www.un.org/press/en/2004/sc8214.doc.htm> (Access date 28/4/2019, 22:10)
- xxii. TE-SAT. *European Union Terrorism Situation and Trend Report 2014*, Euro-pol, 2014
- xxiii. Sinai, J. *How to Define Terrorism*. *PERSPECTIVES ON TERRORISM*, 2(4), 9-11, 2008
- xxiv. Grozdanova, R. 'Terrorism' - too elusive a term for an international legal definition? *Netherlands International Law Review*, 61(3), 305-334. doi:10.1017/S0165070X14001351, 2015
- xxv. Bjorgo, T., Gupta, D. K., Maleckova, J., Horgan, J., Post, J., Merari, A., & Silke, A. *Root causes of terrorism*. Routledge,

<sup>2</sup>Booth, K. "The Human Faces of Terror: Reflections in a Cracked Looking-glass". *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 1, 2008, p.67



- 2005
- xxvi. Schmid, A. P., & Jongman, A. J. *Political terrorism: A new guide to actors, authors, concepts, databases, theories and literature* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988
- xxvii. Ganor Boaz. *The Counter-Terrorism Puzzle: A Guide for Decision Makers*. Herzliya: Interdisciplinary Center, 2003
- xxviii. Blackburn, J., Davis, F. F., & Taylor, N. C. *Academic consensus and legislative definitions of terrorism: Applying Schmid and Jongman*. *Statute Law Review*, 34(3), 239-261. doi:10.1093/slr/hms041, 2013
- xxix. Laqueur, Walter. *The Age of Terrorism*. Boston; Little, Brown and Company. pp. 149-150, 1987
- xxx. Wojciechowski Sebastian. *WHY IS IT SO DIFFICULT TO DEFINE TERRORISM? POLISH POLITICAL SCIENCE YEAR-BOOK VOL XXXVIII 2009 PL ISSN 0208-7375*, 2009
- xxxi. Wojciechowski Sebastian. "Selected Issues of the Studies on Terrorism", *The Modern Terrorism and its Forms*, 2007

Certification of Qualifications & Vocational Guidance (EOPPEP). He has been President of the Association of Greek Chemists and Dean of the Fire Officers Faculty of Hellenic Fire Academy. From 2009 to 2012, he served as State Executive Secretary of Labour Inspectorate in Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Welfare. Michail is a graduate of Hellenic National Defence College and of School of Further Education & Professional Training of Hellenic Fire Academy.

### Author Profile



Fire Brigadier **Michail Chalaris** is a Chemist, Ph.D. He is serving in the Fire Service of Greece since 1995 [2nd B.Sc, Fire Academy of Greece, Athens (1996)] and he has experience in the area of firefighting and in the confrontation of CBRN Threats and Technological accidents. He is currently Professor(part-time) at Hellenic Fire Academy, Military Nursing Academy (SAN) and Professor in MSc "Analysis and Management of Manmade and Natural Disasters" in the course Technological disaster and environmental emergencies, in MSc Oil and Gas Technology in the course Hazard Identification & Risk Management. He is also a tutor at the National School of Public Administration and Local Government (ESDDA) and a certified trainer by the National Organization for the