

ON TERRORISM AND ITS TYPOLOGIES

LECH CHOJNOWSKI¹

ABSTRACT

The article refers to selected aspects of knowledge about terrorism and its typology. The introduction explains the etymology of this concept and highlights the problem of diversity in the definition of terrorism. The next part cites several definitions of terrorism, which, in the author's opinion, reflect the essence of this phenomenon. The difference between terrorism and terror, which are two terms that should not be used interchangeably, is also explained. The next part of the article illustrates the source of the problem which makes it impossible to agree on a commonly accepted definition of terrorism by giving an example of the wording of the Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism. Then, the inherent feature of terrorism is explained, which is its asymmetry. The last part of the article concerns a typology of terrorism. It presents in a synthetic way various categories of terrorism, distinguished according to such criteria as: actors, motives, strategic (final) goals, close (closer) goals, type of actions, nature of the object of attacks, international implications, and means and methods used

¹ Assoc. Prof. Lech Chojnowski, Ph.D., Pomeranian University in Słupsk, Słupsk, Poland; correspondence address: ul. Kozińskiego 6–7, 76-024 Słupsk, Poland; email: lech.chojnowski@apsl.edu.pl

by terrorists. The article ends with a concise summary of the considerations on the theoretical aspects of terrorism undertaken in it.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: 21.01.2020 Accepted: 24.05.2020

Keywords

terrorism, terror, violence, asymmetric threats, typology

INTRODUCTION

The terms *terror*, *terrorism* and related terms have spread in all the languages of the world. Although they are derived from Latin, from the words *terror* ('fear', 'terror', 'horror'), *terreo* ('scare', 'terrify') and *terribilis* ('terrifying', 'terrible', 'arousing fear'), modern languages have acquired its meaning indirectly through the French word *terreur*, which is the equivalent of Latin *terror*. The explanation of this term was found in the first dictionary of the French Academy published in 1694. Its understanding at the time was composed of two meanings: 1) referring to the psyche, meaning 'fear, horror, great scare, violent disturbance of the mind caused by the image of current evil or visions of future danger'; 2) referring to the bodily sphere, meaning the external expression of the body as a consequence of the feeling of fear.²

In an attempt to explain the meaning of the term *terrorism*, it is worth noting that many authors of publications in the field of terrorism emphasize the multiplicity³ and diversity of definitions of this concept, which in turn leads to difficulties in defining its importance clearly. Diversity and ambiguity of the definition of terrorism cause that its various elements are used selectively or are completely omitted, depending on the author's attitude to specific events or related processes involving intimidation caused by the use

² J. Waciórski, *Le terrorisme politique*, Paris 1939, pp. 24–25, [qtd. in:] A. Pawłowski, *Terroryzm w Europie XIX–XX wieku*, Zielona Góra 1984, p. 9.

³ Some authors provide rough numbers of definitions. *PWN multimedia encyclopedia* mentions about 100 definitions (*Multimedialna encyklopedia powszechna PWN*, B. Działoszyński (ed.), Warszawa 2008, entry: "Terrorism"); Hołyst also mentions over 100, and at the same time emphasizes that other authors point out as many as 200 (B. Hołyst, *Terroryzm*, vol. 1, Warszawa 2009, p. 48).

of acts of rape and violence. For these reasons, often the same act of violence by some is seen as a heroic national-liberation act, and by others as a brutal terrorist attack. Moreover, in mass media in many cases the term *terrorism* is used as a mental shortcut used to describe phenomena characterized by violence, no matter against whom and for what purpose it is used.

Undoubtedly, objective difficulties in defining terrorism result also from the changing nature of this phenomenon over the course of human history, both before the appearance of the word in dictionaries and lexicons and after its dissemination. Discrepancies in the definition of terrorism occur among authors of publications regarding this phenomenon as well as in documents and legal acts of a national and international character. Not only does the diverse understanding of terrorism complicate the analysis of this phenomenon, but also, more importantly, it hinders the undertaking of coordinated actions to fight it, especially in the international dimension.

1. ON ATTEMPTS TO DEFINE TERRORISM

When attempting to solve the problem of defining terrorism, one of the most famous of its researchers, Alex P. Schmid, in his 1984 publication, devoted more than one hundred pages to the presentation and analysis of more than one hundred different definitions of terrorism and on their basis he proposed his own version. Then, he sent it to around 200 analysts dealing with political terrorism with a request to respond to its content. About a quarter of the recipients responded to the request of the researcher, completing the questionnaire specially developed for this purpose. Taking into account the remarks and comments received, Schmid again formulated the definition of terrorism, which this time took the following wording: "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 process between terrorist (organization), imperiled 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".⁴

The definition of terrorism proposed by Schmid has a relatively detailed character, it takes into account the full spectrum of violence and rape committed in order to raise anxiety and fear directed against indirect targets; to achieve individual, criminal or political goals set by their perpetrators.

Difficulties in defining terrorism clearly mean that the authors try to determine the characteristics of this phenomenon which may be useful in assessing such events in terms of their eligibility as terrorist activities. Albert Pawłowski, author of one of the first Polish cohesive publications on terrorism, concludes the analysis of political terrorism in the period from the 1880s to the 1980s with the thesis that despite some separate regularities characteristic of terrorism in particular time intervals of the analyzed century, it indicates the following common features⁵:

- 1) terrorist action is a tactic or a way of acting, usually of small and hidden groups, and sometimes individual people, but also mass organizations, in pursuing political goals, undertaken due to the lack of a different room for maneuver;
- 2) the action of terrorists is always based on the use of direct rape directed against a specific human or group of people; or indirect, aimed at inducing the desired reaction of people;
- 3) the terrorist act has a violent and spectacular character, ensuring its media notoriety, thereby increasing the power and reach of its perpetrators;
- 4) terrorism is dominated by the "indirect strategy", which is based on targeting attacks not directly against the addressees whose attitude is of importance to terrorists, but against intermediate targets, i.e. their types of substitutes;
- 5) the goal of terrorism is a change in existing political relations, which at the time of the perpetrators' actions is a more or less precise postulate;
- 6) the causative factor of terrorism is fear – not on the part of the ruling elites, but the broad social masses – as well as the horror of the situation resulting from the perception of the strength and capabilities of the perpetrators or their organization;

⁴ See A.P. Schmid, A.J. Jongman., *Political Terrorism. A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, & Literature*, New Brunswick (US) and London (UK) 1988, p. 28.

⁵ A. Pawłowski, *Terroryzm...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 23–24.

7) terrorists usually display deep commitment, often to the extent of self-denial and self-annihilation, to “the cause”, at the same time disregarding universally recognized values, especially human life, resulting in massacres of random people.

On the basis of these characteristics, Pawłowski defines terrorism as “a tactic of action of politically committed people based on the use of spectacular physical means against the personal and material rights of other people, in order to draw attention to themselves and bring their ideas to public attention, or to make third parties feel compelled to behave in accordance with the objectives of terrorists”.⁶ Although this definition has a concise form, it well captures the essence of terrorism, limiting its understanding only to political activities. At the same time, it explicitly treats terrorism as a tactic of action to achieve the political goal.

The attempt to formulate a universal definition of terrorism was also undertaken by another well-known terrorist investigator, Bruce Hoffman. Hoffman notes that according to the currently most widely accepted use of this term, it is inherently associated with violence or threat of violence used to induce long-term fear and terror of a specific population (the so-called “target audience”), which are used to achieve or facilitate political goals set by terrorists. Terrorism in this understanding is undoubtedly a political concept, associated with the pursuit of gaining power, its achievement and carrying out political changes. This goal is achieved by planned activities, calculated and carried out with premeditation.⁷

Summing up his extensive discussion to define terrorism, Hoffman states that it is “the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change ... Terrorism is designed to create power where there is none or to consolidate power where there is very little ... Through the publicity generated by their violence, terrorists seek to obtain the leverage, influence and power they otherwise lack to effect political change on either a local or an international scale”.⁸ The adoption of the assumptions formulated by Hoffman narrows down the phenomenon of terrorism only to the political sphere, at the same

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 24.

⁷ Hoffman B., *Oblicza terroryzmu*, translated by H. Pawlikowska-Gannon, Warszawa 2001, pp. 12–13.

⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 42.

time excluding from it criminal deeds, sometimes described as criminal or economic terrorism.

Attempts to at least partially solve the difficulties in defining terrorist activities are associated with a clear distinction between the concepts of terrorism and terror. Despite their common source, they do not mean the same phenomenon, although they are often used interchangeably.⁹ According to this approach, which is reflected in dictionaries and lexicons, “[t]error is the rape and violence of »stronger« state organs in the face of »weaker« citizens, and terrorism is the rape and violence of »weaker« citizens against the »stronger« state organs”.¹⁰ In this approach, *terrorism* means “variously motivated ideologically, planned and organized actions of individual people or groups, undertaken in violation of existing law in order to extort from state authorities and society specific behaviors and services, often violating the welfare of outsiders; these actions are carried out with all ruthlessness, by means of various means (psychological pressure, physical violence, the use of weapons and explosives), in conditions of publicity and deliberately created fear in society.”¹¹ On the other hand, *terror* is described as “violence and cruelty or threats of their usage to people in order to intimidate them”.¹² Although the above definitions are general and very imprecise, they may be useful at least for the categorization of terrorism depending on the nature of the entity using terrorist methods for achieving the assumed goals.

The exemplary definitions cited in subsection overlap in many respects. Although they differ in their degree of detail, they do not, in fact, cause the different understanding of the concept of terrorism, except for the difference in the perception of the objectives of terrorist activities. Some authors limit these goals only to the political sphere (Pawłowski and Hoffman in the examples cited), while others extend this scope to individual and criminal goals (e.g. Schmid). Clarification and resolution of this issue should facilitate the formulation of a commonly accepted definition of terrorism. Another important issue in this respect is the clear distinction between terrorism and terror, which should not be used interchangeably.

⁹ Hołyst, among others, points out the tendencies to distinguish between the concepts of terrorism and terror. See B. Hołyst, *Terroryzm...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 52–55.

¹⁰ *Multimedialna encyklopedia powszechna PWN*, *op. cit.*, entry: “Terrorism”.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² *Multimedialny słownik języka polskiego PWN*, Warszawa 2008, entry: “Terror”.

2. INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF VARIOUS DEFINITIONS OF TERRORISM

Taking international anti-terrorist actions effectively requires a clear definition of terrorism in acts of international law. Such attempts were made at the forum of the United Nations. The impossibility of adopting a common definition of terrorism is due to the position of certain groups of UN member states, according to which national liberation movements, regardless of the means of struggle, cannot be regarded as terrorist organizations and their actions as terrorism. In this case, the purpose of the struggle justifies the use of rape and violence in order to arouse anxiety and fear, which in other situations would be regarded as terrorist activities.

An example of such an approach is reflected in the Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism adopted in 1998 by the Member States of the League of Arab States. According to Article 1 of the Convention, terrorism means “[a]ny act or threat of violence, whatever its motives or purposes, that occurs in advancement of an individual or collective criminal agenda and seeking to sow panic among people, causing fear by harming them, or placing their lives, liberty or security in danger, or seeking to cause damage to the environment or to public or private installations or property or to occupying or seizing to jeopardise national resources”.¹³

Although the above definition does not arouse controversy, since it does not deviate from the generally accepted way of describing terrorism, Article 2 of the Convention introduces a provision according to which the struggle of people, including armed struggle against foreign occupation, aggression, colonization and hegemony, aimed at gaining freedom and self-determination, in accordance with the principles of international law, will not be considered a crime. At the same time, it is added that this condition does not apply to any act violating the territorial integrity of any Arab state.¹⁴ It seems that the above-mentioned example of defining terrorism, which recognizes a specific act of rape and violence as a terrorist activity depending on the objective in the name of which it is carried out, will effectively prevent acceptance of the universally recognized content.

¹³ *The Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism*, signed at Cairo on 22 April 1998, Article 1.

¹⁴ *Ibidem*, Article 2.

3. TERRORISM AS AN ASYMMETRICAL THREAT

The phenomenon of terrorism is considered as an asymmetric threat, and a conflict in which this method is used is also similarly determined (asymmetric conflict). Terrorism is conducted among the society, who, regardless of their will, is an ally of terrorists and at the same time an obstacle for the other side (usually the state or the occupant), thus eliminating the disproportions (asymmetry) of the parties' sides. The intimidated society, in order to free themselves from the constant feeling of danger, puts pressure on the centre of power, which is in line with the expectations of terrorists. Especially favorable conditions are created by highly developed societies, whose level of security is high, and the degree of loss risk acceptability is low. In addition, the extensive infrastructure of these societies and the typically large population centres on the one hand prevent the survival of the population in the event of their destruction, and on the other hand are a relatively easy target for terrorist attacks. The presence of extensive infrastructure also expands the possibilities of using attack techniques (e.g. in cyberspace), which is impossible in an environment deprived of it. The battlefield in a terrorist-led war is society, and people as well as civilian means and infrastructure are used as a means of combat (e.g. a plane with its passengers). Society has become an element used by terrorists as a direct target of their attacks, thus hindering the operation of their opponents. In addition, the society provides logistical support and the ability to conceal and mask terrorist activities, as is the case in classic guerrilla activities. In this way, society has become a decisive resource and tool for the terrorist struggle, which allows to compensate for the asymmetry of the forces of the parties to the conflict.

The asymmetry of terrorism also applies to the risk relation resulting from terrorist attacks and the effects they cause. The risk understood as a possible loss as a result of a terrorist attack is disproportionately low in relation to the emotional effect caused, which translates into specific actions of the state. Causing the death of ten or tens of people can intimidate tens or hundreds of millions of people. Disproportions result from the elusiveness, unpredictability and randomness of this type of threats that may affect everyone regardless of ethnic, national, state and social status, and the lack of a sense of control of such phenomena. In addition, the feeling of widespread danger is reinforced by the media coverage of terrorist attacks, with its strength increasing not only depending on the number of the victims and the scale of material losses, but also depending on the degree of ruthlessness,

brutality and a certain kind of innovation, which causes that further areas of society's functioning cease to be free from such threats.

4. TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM

Scientific research of complex phenomena, which terrorism undoubtedly is, requires systematization and categorization of extensive empirical data related to it. This purpose is served by typology, or classification (division) of phenomena and objects according to types based on their essential features. Typology allows one to allocate items or phenomena to the appropriate groups or categories, thereby compressing the extensive knowledge associated with them in the form of a set of categories or types. Reduction in the number of variables obtained in this way makes it easier to identify the relations between the elements, and thus it facilitates inference and hypothesis.

Difficulties in systematizing the category of terrorism result from the mutual penetration and overlap of various aspects of this phenomenon, as well as the lack of full knowledge of the motives and goals of various terrorist organizations. That is why in the literature on terrorism diverse typologies of this phenomenon are made, and many authors propose their own versions thereof. Most often, the types of terrorism are distinguished according to: actors, motives (sources, causes), strategic (final) goals, close (closer) goals, type of actions, nature of the object (purpose) of the attacks, international implications, and measures and methods used by terrorists. The usefulness of individual categories depends on the objectives of a given analysis of terrorism. Selected typologies of terrorism are presented in Tables 1–7.

The basic typology of terrorism is based on the character of its actors, according to which the following are distinguished: 1) state terrorism, or state-run terrorism, for which some authors use the term *terror*, thus distinguishing it from terrorism related to the non-state actors' activities, 2) terrorism sponsored or motivated by the state, and 3) non-state terrorism, used by organizations and movements not related to state structures (Table 1).

TABLE 1. TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM BY ACTORS

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
State-run terrorism (terror)	Used by the state to eliminate opponents of the prevailing regime or force the obedience of society; according to some sources, it is referred to as terror, i.e. the violence of the “stronger” state organs against “weaker” citizens; “reign of terror”.
Terrorism sponsored (motivated) by the state	It refers to terrorism supported (diplomatically, by means of intelligence, financially, materially, and also in the field of arms) by the state that uses terrorist organizations in the fight against internal and external opponents; such a practice was used in a wide range in e.g. Iran, Libya, and North Korea.
Non-state terrorism	Used by non-state terrorist organizations; reflected in the definition of terrorism as rape and violence of “weaker” citizens against the “stronger” state organs.

Source: Own elaboration.

The second basic typology of terrorism results from the division of this phenomenon according to the motives of its actors. According to this criterion, terrorism motivated by political, criminal, and individual objectives is distinguished (Table 2). It is worth noting that some authors do not qualify spreading terror through violence and rape for criminal or personal purposes as terrorism. In their opinion, terrorism is associated only with political activities. This standpoint is presented, among others, by Hoffman, according to whom terrorism is a political concept related to power and political change.¹⁵ Among Polish authors, similar beliefs are shared by e.g. Szlachter, who defines terrorism as “a form of political violence”¹⁶, and by Bolechów, who uses the term *terrorism* as a synonym for the term *political terrorism*.¹⁷

¹⁵ B. Hoffman, *Oblicza terroryzmu, op. cit.*, pp. 12–13.

¹⁶ See D. Szlachter, *Walka z terroryzmem w Unii Europejskiej – nowy impuls*, Toruń 2007, p. 24.

¹⁷ B. Bolechów, *Terroryzm w świecie podwubiegunowym*, Toruń 2003, p. 21.

TABLE 2. TERRORISM TYPE BY THE MOTIVE OF TERRORIST ACTIVITY

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
Political	Aimed at achieving the political goals set by terrorists.
Criminal	The use of acts of violence and rape (e.g. blackmail, kidnappings for ransom) by criminal organizations, especially organized crime, to obtain direct material benefits; also used by terrorist organizations to obtain funds for the proper fight related to achieving political goals.
Individual (idiosyncratic)	Run for idiosyncratic reasons (of an individual nature); its sources may be connected with the psychological anomalies of terrorists.

Source: Own elaboration.

Another typology of terrorism is based on the criterion of strategic (final) goals of the political organization or terrorist movement (Table 3). Taking as its basis the broad understanding of terrorism, this typology applies only to political terrorism. According to this criterion, one can usually distinguish the following types of terrorism: 1) liberation, aimed at achieving political subjectivity, which, depending on the specific circumstances, may be of national-liberation, anti-colonial or of separatist character; 2) revolutionary, whose aim is to make violent and radical political changes, often identified with leftist organizations; 3) reactionary or anti-revolutionary, striving to maintain the traditional socio-political order, opposed to revolutionary movements, usually identified with right-wing movements; 4) religious, involving the use of religious grounds to achieve political goals, but also directed only by a religious imperative; and 5) millenarianism¹⁸, motivated by lofty but completely unrealistic goals related to the establishment of a better world order, without countries, in which a classless society lives like one big family; associated with the anarchist and extremely leftist movement.

¹⁸ The term *millenarian (apocalyptic)* refers to the mystical-religious belief in the return of Christ, foretold by the Apocalypse, and his millennial reign, full of human happiness and justice. See. A. Pawłowski, *Terroryzm...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 115–116.

TABLE 3. TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM BY THE FINAL STRATEGIC GOALS OF THE ORGANIZATION OR TERRORIST MOVEMENT

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
Liberating	Directed at obtaining the right to self-determination; depending on conditions it may take the form of: national-liberation, anti-colonial, ethnic-national, or separatist terrorism.
Revolutionary (subversive)	The aim is to bring about a rapid change in the socio-political system, which would take place with the widespread participation of society; identified in particular with leftist terrorism; disseminated mainly in industrialized countries; also used by right-wing movements to establish a conservative dictatorship.
Reactionary (anti-revolutionary)	Identified mainly with extreme-right movements, based on the desire to preserve the traditional socio-economic order and protect the associated privileged social groups, directed against revolutionary movements, e.g. in West Germany, Italy, as well as Turkey and Japan.
Religious	Motivated by religious reasons; associated with fanaticism and religious fundamentalism; the main characteristic is religious imperative: acting in the name and at the command of God; it is characterized by much more violent acts of violence, carrying more victims than "civil" terrorism, connected with major religions of the world, as well as with cults and sects; examples: Jewish (e.g. Sicarii), Islamic (e.g. the Assassins, organizations related to the Iranian revolution), Hindu (e.g. Thugs), Christian (e.g. Christian Patriots), sects (eg Aum Shinrikyō); since the 1990s, the dominant form of terrorism.

Millenarian (anarchistic-leftist)	Associated with armed utopians, taking up the fight with the help of terrorist methods and means, in the name of lofty but completely unrealistic goals that determine their strategic defeat; millenarians were convinced of the extremely bad world order, of human ability to create a better type of society, and of the possibility of defeating the state by causing a general social rebellion; they were in favor of social revolution, as a result of which the state would be liquidated with its institutions, and people would live in a classless society like “one big family”. Within this movement, an anarchist and extremist leftist movement can be distinguished.
--------------------------------------	---

Source: Own elaboration.

The type of close (closer) goals and their relationship to strategic (final) goals is a criterion for another division of terrorism (Table 4). According to it, the following types of terrorism can be distinguished: 1) direct, i.e. aimed at achieving the assumed strategic goals, 2) indirect causation, constituting a certain (intermediate) stage or phase in achieving strategic goals, and 3) terrorism as a form of propagating specific ideas through an act, usually used in the initial stage of achieving the strategic goals set by terrorists.

TABLE 4. TYPOLOGY OF POLITICAL TERRORISM BY THE NATURE OF CLOSE (TACTIC) GOALS OF TERRORIST ACTIVITY

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
Direct	Terrorist attacks achieve strategic goals, meaning overthrowing the existing status quo in favor of the forces represented by terrorists.
Indirect causation	Acts of terrorism aimed at forcing a change of course in government policy (e.g. concessions), without a desire to take power by a terrorist organization; harassment of power through violence.

Propaganda through action	Terrorist attacks are aimed at stirring up the masses – they are a kind of “detonator”; the purpose of terrorist attacks is: to inform a wide range of recipients about the existence of a specific organization, to encourage accession to it, and to incite, directly or indirectly, social uproar that will lead to upsetting the existing order.
---------------------------	--

Source: Own elaboration.

Within another typology of terrorism, the following types of terrorism can be distinguished: 1) repressive, aimed at forcing specific behavior of the individual or community, 2) defensive, focused on defending a specific socio-political order, and 3) offensive, i.e. attacks being part of the fight to change the prevailing socio-political system (Table 5).

TABLE 5. TYPOLOGY OF POLITICAL TERRORISM ACCORDING TO THE CRITERION OF THE TYPE OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
Repressive	Based on the means of repression used by the state or by a revolutionary or national liberation movement in relation to society, in order to enforce its specific behavior (obedience).
Defensive	A form of defense, in order to preserve the existing state of affairs, e.g. directed against the occupying forces (anti-revolutionary, anti-occupation).
Offensive	A type of struggle with the existing regime or social system, in order to overthrow the regime or change the political system (revolutionary, national liberation).

Source: Own elaboration.

The division of terrorism by the character of a direct object of a terrorist attack leads to the identification of the areas endangered by the attacks (Table 6). Destructive terrorist attacks may be aimed directly against: 1) life and health of a human or a group of people, selected or accidental; 2) objects or technical infrastructure, to cause significant material damage or disrupt

the functioning of society; 3) symbolic objects, constituting, for a specific person or group, a value as a symbol of individual or collective identity.

TABLE 6. TYPOLOGY OF POLITICAL TERRORISM BY THE CHARACTER OF THE IMMEDIATE ATTACK OBJECT

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
Personal	The target of the attack are specific persons or members of selected groups, their life and health (killings); individual or collective.
Objective (economic)	Attacks are directed against the property (ownership) of selected individuals or groups to cause economic damage.
Symbolic	The targets of attacks are symbols of individual or collective identity of specific groups, which constitute their fundamental value, e.g. destruction of religious objects.

Source: Own elaboration.

The internationalization of terrorism has contributed to the need for the typology of this phenomenon by its impact on international relations, according to which it is possible to distinguish national, international and transnational terrorism (Table 7).

TABLE 7. TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM BY THE INFLUENCE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Types of terrorism	Characteristics
National (internal)	Terrorism caused by local (national) sources, which are the responsibility of a given state; it may include attacks carried out outside the state or with foreigners in order to gain international recognition of the cause for which the fight is being conducted and to obtain international support.

International	Terrorist activity that goes beyond national borders, or has international implications that undermine international relations; there are difficulties in defining terrorism in international law.
Transnational	Terrorism affecting the international environment, but without direct links with the structures of the state; it crosses national borders beyond the control of state institutions.

Source: Own elaboration.

A typology of terrorism that proves particularly useful from the perspective of direct counteracting terrorist attacks is the typology according to means and methods used by terrorists, including: abduction of means of communication (aircraft, ships, trains, buses) along with passengers as hostages; attacks on the life, health or freedom of government officials or famous people; kidnapping persons and holding them hostage, including persons from countries other than the terrorist area (e.g. journalists, clergy); the use of explosives and small arms in public places; contamination with radioactive or poisonous materials of areas, objects and means of passenger transport (e.g. the Tokyo metro station 1995); or the recent use of trucks to drive into large gatherings of people.

CONCLUSION

The issue of terrorism is complex and the lack of unambiguous and widely accepted definition makes it difficult to analyze this phenomenon. It can be assumed that this term is usually used to describe any acts of intimidation by the use of rape and violence. Ambiguity in the definition of terrorism occurs not only in literature in this field but also in the acts of national and international law, not to mention the arbitrariness of applying this concept in mass media eagerly reporting on such events.

The various faces of terrorism mean that the analytic typology of this phenomenon has to be extensive and has to take various criteria as its basis. Most often terrorism is divided according to: actors (state, state-sponsored, non-state), motives (political, criminal and individual), political goals (liberation, revolutionary, anti-revolutionary, religious, millenarian), closer objectives and their relationship to final objectives (causative direct, indirect causation, and as propaganda by activity), type of terrorist activity (repressive, defensive and offensive), nature of the attack (personal, objective

and symbolic), or influence on international relations (domestic, international and transnational).

The typology of terrorism presented in the article shows a very large diversity of this phenomenon, which undoubtedly translates into difficulties in formulating a universal, generally accepted definition of this concept. Although the efforts undertaken in this area did not lead to the agreement on the universal definition of terrorism, these attempts contributed to a precise description of the phenomenon, with all its diversity.

The author hopes that the presented theoretical considerations on terrorism will improve the understanding of the essence of terrorism, its complexity and diversity, and thus will allow for more effective prevention of this phenomenon. It seems that widespread recognition of all acts of intimidation through the use of rape and violence as terrorist activities, regardless of the political purpose of their perpetrators, would facilitate an effective fight against terrorism.

REFERENCES

1. Bolechów B., *Terroryzm w świecie podwubiegunowym*, Toruń 2003.
2. Hoffman B., *Oblicza terroryzmu*, translated by H. Pawlikowska-Gannon, Warszawa 2001.
3. Hołyst B., *Terroryzm*, vol. 1, Warszawa 2009.
4. *Multimedialna encyklopedia powszechna PWN*, B. Działoszyński (ed.), Warszawa 2008.
5. *Multimedialny słownik języka polskiego PWN*, Warszawa 2008.
6. Pawłowski A., *Terroryzm w Europie XIX–XX wieku*, Zielona Góra 1984.
7. Schmid A.P., Jongman A.J., *Political Terrorism. A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, & Literature*, New Brunswick (US) and London (UK) 2005.
8. Szlachter D., *Walka z terroryzmem w Unii Europejskiej – nowy impuls*, Toruń 2007.
9. *The Arab Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism*, signed at Cairo on 22 April 1998.

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS:

L. Chojnowski, *On terrorism and its typologies*, "Security Dimensions", 2020, no. 33, pp. 22–39, DOI 10.5604/01.3001.0014.2667.

Licence: This article is available in Open Access, under the terms of the Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0; for details please see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the author and source are properly credited. Copyright © 2020 University of Public and Individual Security “Apeiron” in Cracow