

## NEED FOR A GLOBALLY AGREED UPON DEFINITION OF TERRORISM

PONNLE SOLOMON LAWSON

Department of General Studies, Federal Polytechnic, Ede, Nigeria

E-mail address for correspondence: [papaosha@yahoo.com](mailto:papaosha@yahoo.com)

---

**Abstract:** Globally, terrorism is known to involve the use of violence and threats to intimidate or coerce, especially for political purposes; it is a criminal act that influences an audience beyond the immediate victim. It is out of place that despite the destructiveness of this cruel and evil crime, there is yet to be a globally agreed upon definition for it and this poses a problem for the entire international community. This paper states different definitions of terrorism as given by international organisations, states and individuals. It goes further to analyse the different features common to the various definitions of terrorism. Further to this, the paper highlights the obstacles to having a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism and finally states the benefits of having such an agreed upon definition of terrorism.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Globally Agreed Upon Definition, Violence

---

### INTRODUCTION

Modern terrorism has become an increasingly visible and disturbing feature of the contemporary international scene. On every single day, acts of terrorism take place around the world for a variety of motives, whether the terrorists style themselves as separatists, anarchists, dissidents, nationalists, Marxist revolutionaries or religious true believers; what marks them as terrorists is that they direct violence against persons and property with the goal of terrorizing the wider audience than the immediate victims, thereby attempting to gain political influence over the larger audience. An expert in radical Islamic activity, Jason Burke states that there are multiple ways of defining terrorism, and all are subjective. Burke goes ahead to state that most define terrorism as 'the use or threat of serious violence' to advance some kind of 'cause'; some state clearly the kinds of group ('sub-national', 'non-state') or cause (political, ideological, religious) to which they refer; others merely rely on the instinct of most people when confronted with innocent civilians being killed or maimed by men armed with explosives, firearms or other weapons. None is satisfactory, and grave problems with the use of the term persist (Burke 2004: 22).

Absence of a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism makes nonsense of the term as 'the meaning of terrorism is embedded in a person's or nation's philosophy. Thus, the determination of the 'right' definition of terrorism is subjective (Griset and Mahan, 2007: xiii). Accordingly, the peculiar semantic power of the term, beyond its literal

signification, is its capacity to stigmatize, delegitimize, denigrate, and dehumanize those at whom it is directed, including political opponents. The term is ideologically and politically loaded; pejorative; implies moral, social, and value judgment; and is "slippery and much-abused." In the absence of a definition of terrorism, the struggle over the representation of a violent act is a struggle over its legitimacy. The more confused a concept, the more it lends itself to opportunistic appropriation (Saul, 2006: 3). So, if this is all the term "terrorism" could be used to represent by different people and groups, then, there is need to have a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism.

This paper is divided into four segments. The first segment states different definitions of terrorism as given by international organisations, states and individuals; the second segment analyses the different features common to the various definitions of terrorism; the third segment highlights the obstacles to having a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism; and the final segment states the benefits of having such an agreed upon definition of terrorism.

### **Definitions of Terrorism**

As at present, there is yet to be either an academic or an international legal consensus regarding the proper definition of the term "terrorism" (Williamson, 2009: 38; Schmid, 2011: 39). The international community has been slow to formulate a universally agreed upon, legally binding definition of this crime against humanity. The definitional problem of terrorism is not new; it arose since the laws of war that bothers on 'lawful and unlawful combatants' were first codified in 1899 (Rupert, 1997). The 1977 Protocol Additional to Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, as the 1899 one, contains many ambiguities that cloud the issue of who is or is not a legitimate combatant (Gardam, 1993: 91). It then follows that labeling a resistance movement a terrorist group depends on the perspective of the state as to whether the members of a resistance movement are considered lawful or unlawful combatants and their right to resist occupation is recognized (Khan, 1987).

Different definitions are used by various government agencies and legal systems. The term 'terrorism' as it were is used to refer to violence or other harmful acts. In 1999, Walter Zeev Lanqueur, an expert in terrorism succeeded in counting up to a hundred definitions of terrorism and thus concluded that the 'only characteristic generally agreed upon is that terrorism involves violence'. Along the same line, Record (2003: 6) reports that one 1988 study by the United States Army found more than one hundred definitions of the word "terrorism" exist and have been used.

Very many definitions of terrorism include only those acts which are intended to create fear or terror; which are perpetrated for an ideological goal (as opposed to a madman attack), and deliberately target non-combatants. For avoidance of doubt about the above position, it is pertinent at this very point to cite some definitions of terrorism. Though, the United Nations is yet to agree on a definition of terrorism but its short legal definition, as proposed by Schmid refers to an act of terrorism as the 'peacetime equivalent of a war crime'(United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2005). A United Nations panel in March 2005 described terrorism as any act 'intended to cause death or serious bodily harm to civilians or non-combatants with the purpose of intimidating a population or compelling a government or an international organization to do or abstain from doing any act' (UNIFEED, 2005). The General Assembly resolution 49/60 adopted on December 9, 1994, contains a provision describing terrorism as criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them (UN General Assembly, 1994). This definition according to Cassese (2002: 449) contains a provision which 'sets out an acceptable definition of terrorism'. The European Union employs a definition of terrorism for legal and official purposes. This is set out in Article 1 of the Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism of 2002. This provides that terrorist offences are certain criminal offences set out in a list comprised largely of serious offences against persons and property that given their nature or context, may seriously damage a country or an international organisation where committed with the aim of seriously intimidating a population; or unduly compelling a government or international organisation to perform or abstain from performing any act; or seriously destabilising or destroying the fundamental political, constitutional, economic or social structures of a country or an international organisation.

There are other definitions of terrorism by countries and individuals. The United States has defined terrorism under the Federal Criminal Code. Chapter 113B of Part I of Title 18 of the United States Code) defines terrorism as 'activities that involve violent or life-threatening acts that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State and appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce 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; and which occur primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States if domestic and which occur primarily outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States if international (Findlaw Guide: Title 18). In the United Kingdom, acts of terrorism is defined by the Terrorism Act 2000 as the use of threat of action where the action falls within subsection (2); where the use or threat is designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public; and where the use or threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause. According to the Act, an action falls within this subsection if it involves serious violence against a person; if it involves serious damage to property; if it endangers a person's life, other than that of the person committing the action; if it creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or a section of the public; or if it is designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system. This Act defines terrorism so as to include not only violent offences against persons and physical damage to property, but also acts 'designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system.' This latter consideration would include shutting down a website whose views one dislikes. However this and any of the other acts covered by the definition would also need to be designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public, and be done for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause. The latter three terms are not defined in the Act.

Coming to the definitions of terrorism by individuals, Zagraevsky (2011) characterizes terrorism as 'the dirtiest weapon of weak against the strong.' In the words of Meisels (2008), terrorism is 'the intentional random murder of defenceless non-combatants, with the intent of instilling fear of mortal danger amidst a civilian population as a strategy designed to advocate political ends.' According to Ganor (2005), terrorism is 'the deliberate use of violence aimed against civilians in order to achieve political ends.' Khan (1987: 945) simply refers to terrorism as 'sprouts from the existence of aggrieved groups.' As for Schmid and Jongman (1988: 28), terrorism is 'an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by semi-clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal, or political reasons, whereby in contrast to assassination, the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (imperilled) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought.' Gibbs (1989: 330) defines terrorism as 'illegal violence or threatened violence directed against human or nonhuman objects, provided that it was undertaken or ordered with a view to altering or maintaining at least one putative norm in at least one particular territorial unit or population; it had secretive, furtive, and/or clandestine features that were expected by the participants to conceal their personal identity and/or their future location; it was not undertaken or ordered to further the permanent defence of some area; it was not conventional warfare and because of their concealed personal identity, concealment of their future location, their threats, and/or their spatial mobility, the participants perceived themselves as less vulnerable to conventional military action; and it was perceived by the participants as contributing to the normative goal previously described by inculcating fear of violence in persons (perhaps an indefinite category of them) other than the immediate target of the actual or threatened violence and/or by publicizing some cause. Definitions of terrorism are almost endless and citing more would make this paper longer than necessary.

### **The Common Features of the Definitions of Terrorism**

Common to the definitions of terrorism are violence; psychological impact and fear; political goal characteristic; deliberate target of non-combatants; and unlawfulness or illegitimacy.

As regards violence, Laqueur (2003: 151) argues that 'the only general characteristic of terrorism generally agreed upon is that terrorism involves violence and the threat of violence.' However, the criterion of violence alone does not produce a useful definition, as it includes many acts not usually considered terrorism such as war, riot, organized crime or even a simple assault. Laqueur goes ahead to state that property destruction that does not endanger life is not usually considered a violent crime but some have described property destruction by the Earth Liberation Front and Animal Liberation as terrorism. For violence to qualify as terrorism, it must affect a target audience beyond the immediate audiences as part of the attempt to gain political objectives of the organization involved (Lutz and Lutz 2004: 11).

As per psychological impact and fear, definitions of terrorism points to a fact that a terrorist attack is carried out in such a way as to maximize the severity and length of the psychological impact. Each act of terrorism is a "performance," a product of internal logic, devised to have an impact on many large audiences and that terrorists attack national symbols to show their power and to shake the foundation of the country or society they are opposed to. This may negatively affect a government's legitimacy, while increasing the legitimacy of the given terrorist organization and/or ideology behind a terrorist act (Juergensmeyer 2000: 125-135).

In relation to the political goal feature of terrorism, Juergensmeyer goes ahead to note that something all terrorist attacks have in common is their perpetration for a political purpose. Terrorism is a political tactic, not unlike letter writing or protesting, that is used by activists when they believe no other means will affect the kind of change they desire. The change is desired so badly that failure is seen as a worse outcome than the deaths of civilians. This is often where the interrelationship between terrorism and religion occurs. When a political struggle is integrated into the framework of a religious or "cosmic" struggle, such as over the control of an ancestral homeland or holy site such as Israel and Jerusalem, failing in the political goal (nationalism) becomes equated with spiritual failure, which, for the highly committed, is worse than their own death or the deaths of innocent civilians.

Also common to the definitions of terrorism is the deliberate targeting of non-combatants. This is commonly held as the distinctive nature of terrorism as it lies in its intentional and specific selection of civilians as direct targets. Much of the time, the victims of terrorism are targeted not because they are threats, but because they are specific "symbols, tools, animals or corrupt beings" that tie into a specific view of the world that the terrorist possess. Their suffering accomplishes the terrorists' goals of instilling fear, getting a message out to an audience, or otherwise accomplishing their political end (Juergensmeyer 2000: 125-135).

As per unlawfulness or illegitimacy, a number of the definitions of terrorism, particular official ones by governments is characterized by a criterion of unlawfulness or illegitimacy (US Department of Justice, 1999). This is to distinguish between actions authorized by a "legitimate" government (and thus "lawful") and those of other actors, including individuals and small groups. Using this criterion, actions that would otherwise qualify as terrorism would not be considered terrorism if they were government sanctioned. For example, firebombing a city, which is designed to affect civilian support for a cause, would not be considered terrorism if it were authorized by a "legitimate" government (FindLaw Guide: Title 18). This criterion is inherently problematic and is not universally accepted, because it denies the existence of state terrorism, the same act may or may not be classed as terrorism depending on whether its sponsorship is traced to a "legitimate" government; "legitimacy" and "lawfulness" are subjective, depending on the perspective of one government or another; and it diverges from the historically accepted meaning and origin of the term. For these reasons this criterion is not universally accepted.

In a nutshell, Hoffman (1998: 32) observes that on one point, at least, everyone agrees that terrorism is a pejorative term. It is a word with intrinsically negative connotations that is generally applied to one's enemies and opponents, or to those with whom one disagrees and would otherwise prefer to ignore. 'What is called terrorism,' Brian Jenkins has written, 'thus seems to depend on one's point of view. Use of the term implies a moral judgment; and if one party can successfully attach the label terrorist to its opponent, then it has indirectly persuaded others to adopt its moral viewpoint.' Hence the decision to call someone or label some organization 'terrorist' becomes almost unavoidably subjective, depending largely on whether one sympathizes with or opposes the person or group or cause concerned. If one identifies with the victim of the violence, for example, then the act is terrorism. If however, one identifies with the perpetrator, the violent act is regarded in a more sympathetic, if not positive (or, at the worst, an ambivalent) light; and it is not terrorism.

### **Obstacles to a Globally Agreed Upon Definition of Terrorism**

There is no doubt that there is yet to be an agreed upon definition of terrorism, and that having one still looks elusive. Difficulties arise from the fact that the term "terrorism" is politically and emotionally charged (Hoffman, 1998); difficulties arise also as a result of the fact in an aphorism "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." This is reflected when a group that uses irregular military methods is an ally of a state against a mutual enemy, but later falls out with the state and starts to use the same methods against its former ally. For example, during World War II, the Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army was allied with the British, but during the Malayan Emergency, members of its successor, the Malayan Races Liberation were branded terrorists by the British (Malayan People's Anti-Japanese Army, 2007). The former president of the United States, Ronald Reagan and

others in the American administration like the CIA frequently called the Afghan Mujahideen (the Taliban and Osama bin Laden recently killed by the US Navy Seals in Pakistan) freedom fighters during their fight against the Soviet Union (The National Archive Learning Curve, Zeidan, 2004). And just twenty years later when a new generation of Afghan men were fighting against what they perceived to be a regime installed by foreign powers, their attacks were labelled terrorism by the then president of the United States, George Bush (The White House-Presidential News and Speeches). Today, the Taliban is on top of the international terrorist lists (Zeidan, 2004). Groups accused of terrorism usually prefer terms that reflect legitimate military or ideological action (Ramachandran 2004, Perry 2005). In the National Post published in January, 2006, Humphrey Adrian writes that a leading terrorism researcher Professor Martin Rudner, director of the Canadian Centre of Intelligence and Security Studies at Ottawa's Carleton University was quoted as defining "terrorist acts" as attacks against civilians for political or other ideological goals, and in line with the above assertion goes on to say that there is the famous statement: 'One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter.' But that is grossly misleading. It assesses the validity of the cause when terrorism is an act. One can have a perfectly beautiful cause and yet if one commits terrorist acts, it is terrorism regardless. Another argument in support of the above aphorism is that, when some groups are involved in a "liberation" struggle, they are labelled terrorist by the Western governments or media. Later, these same persons, as leaders of the liberated nations, are called statesmen by the same Western governments or media organizations. Quick examples that come to mind are Nobel Peace Prize Laureates Menachem Begin and Nelson Mandela (Seto, 2002). Recently, Julian Assange, the Wikileaks whistle blower was referred to as a terrorist by Joe Biden, the current vice president of the US, the story may change in no distant time as it did in the cases of Begin and Mandela. Sometimes, states that are close allies, for reasons of history, culture and politics, can disagree over whether members of a certain organization are terrorists. For example for many years some branches of the United States government refused to label members of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) as terrorists, while it was using methods against one of the United States closest allies, Britain, that Britain branded as terrorist attacks. Currently, the Palestinians are viewed as freedom fighters by the United Nations, struggling against the unlawful occupation of their land by Israel, and engaged in a long-established legitimate resistance, but Israel sees them as terrorists. Also while Israel also regards the Hizbullah of Lebanon as a terrorist group, most of the international community sees it as a legitimate resistance group, fighting Israel's occupation of Southern Lebanon (Zeidan, 2004).

The definitional problem of terrorism is equally due to a fact that many times, the term "terrorism" is confused with such term as "extremism" and as such is mistakenly interchangeably used. However, there is a significant difference between the two. Terrorism essentially, is threat or act of physical violence; extremism involves using non-physical instruments to mobilise minds to achieve political or ideological ends. For instance, Al Qaeda is involved in terrorism while the Iranian revolution of 1979 is a case of extremism. In 2007, a global research report known as An Inclusive World asserts that extremism poses a more serious threat than terrorism in the decades to come. As a result of this, media outlets wishing to preserve a reputation for impartiality are extremely careful in their use of the term. Further to this, a global agreed upon definition of terrorism that is all-inclusive and unambiguous is almost impossible because of the difficulties that lie in the fundamental values at stake in the acceptance or rejection of terror-inspiring violence as means of accomplishing a given goal. The obvious and well known range of views on these issues are what makes an internationally accepted specific definition of what is loosely called "terrorism," a largely impossible undertaking. That is why the search for and internationally agreed upon definition may well be a futile and unnecessary effort (Bassiouni, 1988)

The above highlighted points are some of the main obstacles to a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism.

### **Benefits of Having a Globally Agreed Definition of Terrorism**

According to Paniagua and Fernando (2008), for an effective legal regime to be created against terrorism, there would be a need to formulate a comprehensive definition of that crime that, on the one hand, provides the strongest moral condemnation to terrorist activities while, on the other hand, has enough precision to permit the prosecution of criminal activities without condemning acts that should be deemed to be legitimate.

A globally agreed upon definition of terrorism would protect the state and deliberative politics; differentiate public and private violence; and ensure international peace and security law (Saul, 2008: 1). A definitional problem of terrorism does not allow for consensus adiem, that is, the meeting of the minds among the global actors as per what makes terrorism. Without a definition, what pays one actor will continue being deprivation to the other. Without a definition, any definition that is agreed upon in, say, English-speaking countries would be biased towards countries that do not share their ideas. Virtually all serious attempts to define the term have been sponsored by governments

who instinctively attempt to draw a definition which excludes bodies like themselves and because of this; most groups called terrorists deny such accusations. Virtually no organisation openly calls itself terrorist. Many groups call all their enemies terrorists and the word is very loosely applied and very difficult to challenge when it is being used appropriately, for example in war situations or against non-violent persons. The definitional problem allows governments to apply a different standard of law to that of ordinary criminal law on the basis of unilateral decision.

Also, a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism would officially criminalize the act globally; this would declare that the conduct is forbidden, must be prevented, and would express society's condemnation for the wrongful acts. This global criminalization of the act of terrorism would invoke social censure and shame, and would further stigmatize those who commit them; it may further serve, in the long run, as a deterrent to terrorism across the globe. To globally prevent, condemn an act like terrorism and to punish terrorist activities, a precise global definition is required (Paniagua and Carlos, 2008: 46).

One other benefit of having a globally agreed definition of terrorism is that it helps states to enact domestic legislation to criminalize terrorism and punish terrorists. The principle of *nullum crimen sine lege* requires, in particular, that states define precisely which acts are prohibited before anyone can be prosecuted or punished for committing those same acts. This would undoubtedly provide an inter-subjective basis for the homogeneous application of the treaty's obligations on judicial and police cooperation and would be of particular importance in extradition treaties because, to grant an extradition, most legal systems require that the crime be punishable both in the requesting state and the requested state (Paniagua and Carlos, 2008: 47).

Finally, having a globally agreed definition of terrorism would make war against terrorism less costly. The war against terrorism is costly because of the current preponderance of the political over the legal value; and the major cause of this is that terrorism has no agreed upon definition, it leaves the war against terrorism selective, incomplete and ineffective (Zeiden, 2004).

## CONCLUSION

In view of the preceding arguments, it can be simply concluded that seeking an agreed definition of terrorism is necessary at this point in time when different actors see it from different perspectives and when their minds are not likely to meet on what terrorism really is. It would not be adequate to leave definition of terrorism to the unilateral interpretations of states. There is no doubt a globally agreed upon definition of terrorism can plausibly retrieve terrorism from the ideological quagmire. Anywhere in the world, for to law to admit a term, an advance definition of the term is essential on grounds of fairness; so also is the term "terrorism."

## REFERENCES

- Bassiouni, M. C (1988) 'A Policy-oriented Inquiry of 'International Terrorism' in: M. C Bassiouni (ed.) *Legal Responses to International Terrorism: U.S. Procedural Aspects*, Boston and London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, pp. xv – xv
- Burke, J (2004) *Al Qaeda: the True Story of Radical Islam*. London: Peguin Books, p. 22.
- Cassese, A (2002) *International Law*. London: Oxford University Press, p.449
- FINDLAW for Legal Professional, Title 18: Crimes and Criminal Procedure, <http://codes.lp.findlaw.com/uscode/18>.

- Ganor, B (2005) 'The Relationship between International and Localized Terrorism,' Jerusalem Issue Brief, Vol. 4, No. 26, <http://www.jcpa.org/brief/brief004-26.htm>.
- Gardam, J.G (1993) *Non-combatant Immunity as a Norm of International Humanitarian*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, p. 91
- Gibbs, J.P (1989) 'Conceptualization of Terrorism,' *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, p. 330.
- Griset, P.L and Mahan, S (2007) *Terrorism in Perspective*. London: Sage Publication Inc., p. xiii
- Hoffman, B (1998) *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press, p. 32
- Gibbs, J.P (1989) 'Conceptualization of Terrorism,' *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 54, p. 330.
- Humphrey, A. "One official's 'refugee' is another's terrorist'", *National Post*, January 17, 2006.
- Juergenmeyer, M (2000) *Terror in the Mind of God*. California: University of California Press, pp. 125-135.
- Khan, A (1987) 'A Theory of International Terrorism,' *Connecticut Law, Review*, Vol. 19, p. 945. <http://caselaw.lp.fndlaw.com/cascode/usecodes/18/parts/i/chapters/113b/toc.html>.
- Laqueur, W (1999). *The New Terrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-2.
- Laqueur, W (2003) 'Postmodern Terrorism' in C.W. Kegley (ed.) *The New Global Terrorism*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, p. 151.
- Lutz, J.M and Lutz, B.J (2004) *Global Terrorism*. London: Routledge, p. 11.
- Malayan People's Anti Japanese Army. (2007) in *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <http://concise.Britannica.com/ebc/article-9371060/Malayan-People's> Anti Japanese-Army.
- Meisels, T (2008) 'The Trouble with Terror: the Apologetics – A Refutation,' <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/~uctyho/MeiselsTheTroubleWithTerror.html>
- The National Archive; Ronald Reagan <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/USAreagan.htm>
- The White House-Presidential News and Speeches: The President discusses Progress in war on Terror. Feb. 9 2006, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020128-13.html>.
- Official Journal of European Communities (2002) 'Council Framework Decision on combating Terrorism,' <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2002/jul/rameterr622en00030007.pdf>.
- Paniagua, D and Carlos, F (2008) 'Negotiating terrorism: The negotiation dynamics of four UN counter-terrorism treaties, 1997-2005,' *Ph.D. dissertation*, City University of New York, July 2008, pp. 46-47.
- Perry, A (2006) 'How Much to Tip the Terrorist?' *Time Magazine*, September 26, 2005.
- Ramachandran, S (2004) 'Death behind the Wheels in Iraq,' *Asian Times*, November 12, 2004
- Record, J (2003) 'Bounding the Global War Terrorism,' *Strategic Studies Institute of the US Army War College Monograph*, p. 6
- Rupert, T (1997) 'The Martens and the Laws of Armed Conflict,' *International Review of Red Cross*, No. 317, pp. 125-134.

- Saul, B (2008) 'Defining Terrorism to Protect Human Rights,' *Sydney Law School Legal Studies Research Paper*, No. 08-125, p. 1
- Saul, B (2006) *Defining Terrorism in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 3.
- Schmid, A.P (2011) *The Definition of Terrorism*. Oxon: Routledge, p. 39.
- Schmid, A.P and Jongman, A.J (1988) *Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Databases, Theories, and Literature*. Amsterdam: Transaction Books, p. 28
- Seto, T.P ( 2002) 'The Morality of Terrorism,' <http://llr.lls.edu/volumes/v35-issue4/seto.pdf>
- Williamson, M (2009) *Terrorism, War and International Law: The Legality of the Use of Force against Afghanistan in 2001*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, p. 38
- UNIFEED (2005) 'Story: UN Reforms,' <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/49/a49r060.htm>
- United Nations General Assembly (1994) 'Measures to Eliminate Terrorism,' <http://www.statewatch.org/news/2002/jul/frames622en00030007.pdf>.
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2005) 'Definition of Terrorism,' [http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism\\_definitions.html](http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html).
- United States Department of Justice (1999) 'Terrorism in the United States 1999,' <http://web.archive.org/web/20080709091840/http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terror99.pdf>
- Zagraevsky, S (2011) '365 Reflections on Human and Humanity,' [http://zagraevsky.com/365\\_engl.htm](http://zagraevsky.com/365_engl.htm).
- Zeidan, S (2004) 'Desperately Seeking Definition: The International Community's Quest for Identifying the Specter of Terrorism,' *36 Cornell International Law Journal*, pp. 491-492.