

The Relationship Between Terrorism and Liberal Democratic States

Bekir Çınar*

Abstract

This paper examines the relationship between terrorism and liberal democracy because there is a link between terrorism and liberal democracy. In other words terrorism, whether national or international, is operating in liberal democratic societies and has been one of the major problems of liberal democratic governments since the 1960s. Further, one particular aspect of this relationship will be highlighted in this paper, that is, the legitimacy of both liberal democracy and terrorism.

The core discussion revolves around the question; does a liberal government have legitimate authority to put some limitations on 'human rights' and 'basic western values' for the sake of preventing and combating terrorism? If the answer is yes, to what extent does the government do so? So far, we have noticed that many Western liberal governments have changed their counter terrorism laws. In these laws, some argue that there is violation of human rights which is more important than the prevention policies. It is clear that there is no need to limit the western liberal values since these are not a weakness of liberal democracy. The weakness is not using security forces and technological development properly in prevention and combating of terrorism.

Keywords: *Democracy, Terrorism, Human Rights, Prevention Policies, Countering Terrorism and Political System*

* Epoka University, bcinar@epoka.edu.al

Introduction

This paper attempts to examine the relationship between terrorism and liberal democracy concerning the nature of liberal democracy and its link with terrorism, as well as the legitimacy of both liberal democracy and terrorism.

Since September 11, 2001, there have been many new developments in this area. One of these developments is that the perception of terrorism has changed. Second is that governments have formulated new prevention policies, and many parliaments have passed new legislation and amended old laws. Not all of these countries have terrorism, but they have acted in this way as a preventative measure. Third is that people have discussed whether 'democracy' is able to prevent terrorism or is providing a soft environment for terrorism.

Ever since academics started discussing and writing on terrorism, terrorism has always been seen as a 'politically motivated act' due to the malfunctioning of a certain political system where terrorism was/is active. One clearly advocates that terrorism may be a product of a political system. In other words, every political system has the potential to produce a form of terrorism. Since the establishment of the 'nation state' system, several nation states have experienced some form of terrorism within its boundaries. It is also a known fact that nation state systems have been evolving since their establishment and this evolution will continue until it reaches an ideal political system which is identified as the Weberian 'ideal types' political system 'and it is doubtful if any liberal democracy anywhere, anytime, has lived up to these perfect forms' (Hassan 2010).

In this paper, initially, it is stated that 'terrorism is conceived as a form of political communication' (Crelinsten 1989), because a group of people who cannot communicate by democratic tools with the government, may resort to terrorism as a form of communication in any political state including liberal democratic states. Consequently, a form of terrorism is operating in liberal democratic states.

Secondly, the legitimacy of the liberal democratic states and violations of this legitimacy in relation to preventing terrorism will be highlighted. It is important for a liberal democratic government to stay within the boundary of laws when it is implementing its policies concerning the prevention and combating of terrorism. Despite the fact that democratic states are limited and constrained by nature. Therefore, it is not always true that to be lawful means to be legitimate. As a result, and there is an expectation that a liberal democratic government's actions should be both lawful and legitimate. Thus, there is historical evidence that putting limitations on civil liberties has neither prevented nor eliminated terrorism and terrorists. For example,

Turkey is still fighting the PKK; Israel is still fighting HAMAS; and so forth where heavy restrictions have been placed on human rights, especially 'freedom of expression'.

Thirdly, the legitimacy of terrorism and its consequences will be discussed. There is no way to justify terrorism. However, at the same time, what is and what is not terrorism is important. In other words, it is not the case that every violent opposition or extreme form of political violence against the existing political authority, in many case nation states, can be categorised as terrorism.

Finally, a summary will be drawn from this paper.

Terrorism and Liberal Democratic States

It is stated that 'terrorism is more likely to originate in countries that exhibit closed political systems. [...] political openness and responsiveness to citizens matters' (Loayza 2008, 1-16) and is 'the product of political systems' (Cinar 2010, 58), because the political system might have 'created widespread resentment and dissatisfaction among citizens who importantly lack a legal and non-violent means to express their displeasure with the status quo' (Piazza 2008). Liberal democracy, for all its positive benefits, is not a perfect system, and therefore it has potential to produce terrorism too. For example, the UK is known as one of the better western liberal democracies but has had 'an ethnic terrorism' for decades. Further, since 1995, the USA has faced several terrorist activities, in the states and abroad, towards its overseas establishments. Because, as Blomberg and Hess conclude, 'transnational terrorism incidents tend to be associated with higher-income countries' (Hess 2008).

Liberal Democratic States

A state is a clear and widely accepted index of power and the authority given to the state to make and enforce laws over a geographically bounded territory is generally accepted (Berridge Second Ed, 1992, 9). The state commands supreme power in that it stands above all other associations and groups in society; its laws demand the compliance of all those who live within the territory (Heywood 1994, 37).

Liberal democracy is a political system where there is a 'government that recognizes that the individual has rights that exist independently of government and which ought to be protected by and against government' (Government 2002, 16). A longer definition states that it is 'a form of representative democracy where elected representatives that hold the decision power are moderated by a constitution that emphasizes protecting individual liberties and the rights of minorities in society (also called constitutional liberalism), such as freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of

religion, the right to private property and privacy, as well as equality before the law and due process under the rule of law, etc' (Wikipedia 2010).

Liberal democratic states are 'characterised by constitutional government, a system of checks and balances amongst major institutions, fair and regular elections, a democratic franchise, a competitive party system, the protection of individual rights and civil liberties and so forth' (Heywood 1994, 39).

Democracy has meant liberal democracy -- a political system marked not only by free and fair elections, but also by the rule of law, a separation of powers, and the protection of basic liberties of speech, assembly, religion, and property (Fareed 1997).

At the top of the liberal democratic state stand elected politicians who are publicly accountable because they operate within an open and competitive system. Non-elected state bodies like the civil service, judiciary, police, and army and so on, carry out their responsibilities with strict impartiality, and are anyway subordinate to their elected political masters (Heywood 1994, 40).

Liberal democracy is highly respected as one of the better political systems in the world. The system is ruled by people who are democratically elected by the public, and who form a government that serves the people or acts in their best interest. Any political changes should be made by public discussion with a free press and freedom of speech.

Links to Terrorism

It is assumed that the liberal democratic state is the best form of political system that humanity has achieved and there seems to be no room for any kind of terrorism in this system. Despite this, there have been terrorism and terrorist activities in liberal democratic political systems. For example, 'the strong and admirable democratic system in Israel has been the subject of terrorist assault, but has also produced some number of its own terrorists, including the assassin of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin' (Gause 2005). The reason is that liberal democracy has defects, albeit 'ones of incomplete implementation of the twin principles of liberty and equality on which modern democracy is founded, rather than of flaws in the principles themselves' (Blunden 2005).

Since the 1960s, explanations of political violence in European and other liberal democracies have suggested that the cause was an absence of equality in wealth and justice, and also of liberty for minority ethnic groups within the state. The European

States did not consider that injustice, inequality and rights of ethnic communities for some time. This caused political unrest in some European capitals and some people used political violence in order for their voices to be heard. However, criminal enforcement techniques were used to counter the political activities of these groups. This caused frustration owing to an inability to introduce a proposed case for changes effectively into the democratic process (Narveson 1992, 116-169), that lead a group of people to use terrorism as a means of protest, threats, fears and above all a way of communication. As one Humberside police inspector observed 'frustration was one reason why people use political violence against the government' (Private interview, 2003). In another example:

The reversal of democracy explains Algeria's religious violence. This argument is that the closure of political space leads to frustration and frustration leads to armed conflict. This is especially so when such a closure is accompanied by explicit state terror, repression, and general human rights violations (Testas 2002, 161-183).

Moreover, as it is stated 'terrorism constitutes a direct repudiation of liberal and humane values and principles, and that terroristic ideology is inevitably and constantly deployed in a struggle to defame and discredit liberal democracy' (Wilkinson 1977, 80). In short, terrorism is alive in the liberal democratic political system and this system needs to consider its weaknesses and faults which cause terrorism.

According to Martha Crenshaw:

In the case of terrorism that is generated within a democracy, the degree of social, ethnic, and political heterogeneity or fragmentation within the state appears to be a critical variable. Highly contentious polities (sic) and divided societies are likely to be associated with a greater risk of terrorism. They are typically associated with the prevalence of other forms of political violence as well. The instigating factors for violence constitute a complex, dynamic equation that is difficult to solve regardless of regime type. (Crenshaw 2005, 13-18)

Crenshaw draws our attention to terrorism which has been generated within a democracy. This is not because democracies are vulnerable to acts of terrorism, (Sandler 1995, 1-9) but it is the belief of many that democracy is a perfect political system, in reality it is not. It is clear that terrorism is also threatening the very existence of the values underlying liberal democracy. This threat should be prevented, eliminated and combated by the governments of liberal democracy.

However, the threats from terrorism to liberal western democracies today are not directed to their political system or existence, but to their populations and economies. In other words, it is argued that terrorists do not directly target the democracy, but they try to convey their cause to the rulers of the democracy through spreading fear on the public. Terrorists assume that these fears enable the politicians and political institution to correct its faults and create fairer, equal and just society.

Domestic Terrorism

The term 'domestic terrorism' is used to identify the acts of terrorists who are based and act entirely within the state or its territory (Wilkinson(b) 2000, 19-49) without foreign direction and help. Until recently, terrorism was generally understood as domestic terrorism. Within the state, left and right-wing political violence and also ethnic violence are considered as terrorism. Thus, 'terrorism was practiced by a group of individuals belonging to an identifiable organization with a clear command and control apparatus who had a defined set of political, social, or economic objectives. Radical leftist organizations such as the Japanese Red Army, Germany's Red Army Faction (Rote Armee Fraktion). This is commonly referred to as the Baader-Meinhof group and the name was given because Mahler admired the name and action of the Red Army' of Japan (Becker 1981, 122-138). Italy's Red Brigades the birth of extreme left guerrillas was influenced also by some external factors, such as the Vietnam War and the fierce, highly ideological debate over the role and objectives of imperialists forces in the world. China's 'cultural revolution' was another important factor, especially as it offered visible proof of an alternative to the 'revisionist' trend of Moscow and the PCL' (Silj 1981, 139-152), as well as the so-called 'ethno-nationalist terrorist movements' like the PKK, the IRA, and the Basque separatist group, ETA, reflected this stereotype of the traditional terrorist group' (B. Hoffman 2001, 417-428).

Domestic terrorism may be the result of government ignorance, lack of appropriate response to citizens, and use of political discrimination by the state against select ethnic or political groups of individual citizens. For example, one can see that during the 1980s, there was a 'relatively low incident of politically motivated violence in the United State' (Hoffman 1989, 230-240). One of the main reasons may be that its population felt that its demands were met by the government, or at least that the process by which political decisions were made was fair. At a later stage in history, the majority of terrorist activities in the United State involved 'ethnic-separatist or émigré terrorists' (Hoffman 1989, 230-240). This is probably because the immigrant communities in the USA felt that they had been treated differently from the main community.

International Terrorism

The term 'international terrorism' is used to define groups or individuals who are involved in terrorist activities in a country which is not their own. According to Wilkinson, 'the term "international terrorism" is often used so loosely that it implies only that terrorism is a world-wide problem or that most terrorism has some influence, however marginal or indirect, on international opinion and behaviour' (Wilkinson 1977, 173). He also states that 'political terrorism becomes international in the strict sense when it is (i) directed at foreigners or foreign targets; (ii) concerted by the governments or factions of more than one state; or (iii) aimed at influencing the policies of a foreign government' (Wilkinson 1977, 174). Today this term is often used to explain the terrorist activities which are directed against the USA.

It is concluded that domestic terrorism might be a product of domestic politics. Similarly, international terrorism could be a product of international relations and international governance.

After the collapse of the communist bloc, the USA became the sole superpower in the world, and its international policies and relationships have a huge impact on the political and economic development of the world. In some ways, one may even see the world as a country and the USA as its government. The decisions on foreign policies of this assumed government (the USA) may not be recognised as just and fair by many people who become upset. They feel that their unhappiness and demands have not been considered properly by this assumed government and their domestic suffering and injustice in their land derived from the USA foreign and bilateral policies with those states that might be a cause of international terrorism. 'One of the main sources of terrorism is chronically bad governance. ... If we are serious about getting at the roots of international terrorism, we must get serious about fostering development that gives people hope and dignity and improves the quality of their lives. That requires dramatic improvements in governance, and these will not come without increased international incentives and assistance' (Diamond 2002, 14). For example it is stated that 'Bin Laden and his followers declared war on the United States in 1996, ostensibly to secure the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Arabian Peninsula and the broader Middle East' (Blanchard 2010). Consequently, Nawaz Sharif mentioned that 'terrorism was directly linked to Pakistan's foreign policy' (DawnNews 2010) when he was speaking about the Data Darbar attack at a press conference. Further statements have been made by Ramadan:

Tony Blair and his government have obliged civil servants to deny that a link exists between terrorism and British foreign policy. While the invasion of Iraq can

never be claimed as ethical justification for terrorist attacks against innocent citizens in London, it would be absurd to deny the reality of the political connection between the two. The illegal invasion of Iraq, blind support for the insane policies of George Bush, British silence on the oppression of the Palestinians - how could these issues not have a direct bearing on the deep discontent shared by many Muslims toward the west in general, and toward Britain in particular. Even though this is not the sole explanation for terrorism, it is certainly part of the explanation (without arguing that it can be justified) (Ramadan 2007).

Consequently, it is wise to accept that there might be a link between foreign policies of stronger states and terrorism.

Legitimacy of the Liberal Democratic State

Like all other types of state, the liberal democratic state has a duty to prevent terrorism. If there is a form of terrorism, this state has to fight with terrorism. The question here becomes, how does a liberal democratic government prevent terrorism yet fight with terrorism? The response should be that the actions of this type of government have to be 'legitimate (legal)', 'justifiable', 'fair' and just. Therefore, these terms will be discussed in the following part of this paper.

The word 'legitimate' is defined as 'in accordance with the law or rules; lawful; that can be defended; reasonable' (Hornby 1990, 718). Rawls appeals to the 'liberal principle of legitimacy':

Our exercise of political power is proper and hence justifiable only when it is exercised in accordance with a constitution, the essentials of which all citizens may reasonably be expected to endorse in the light of which principles and ideas are acceptable to them as reasonable and rational. This is the liberal principle of legitimacy (Rawls 1993, 217).

When we start to think of responding to terrorism, we face a question of legitimacy: 'what legitimate responses are open to us?' (Narveson (b) 1991, 116-169) As a liberal democratic government. It is necessary to mention that maintaining Western European norms is vital when responding to terrorism. When the states start to use countermeasures, these have to be legal and constitutional and democratically acceptable. Any sort of intervention in the lives of citizens necessitates a strong justification. It seems that two legitimate ways of combating terrorism are open which provide justifications for government actions. The first of these two requires the authority to depend on justice, which in turn is of two sorts: 'absolute justice' and 'relative justice'.

Absolute justice necessitates acting within the pure laws, rules and conventions that are reflections of an ideal world. Relative justice requires flexibility from absolute justice, because of the prevailing conditions. In absolute justice, 'whoever slays a soul, not to retaliate for a soul slain, nor for corruption done in the land, shall be (judged) as if he had slain mankind altogether' (The Qur'an 5:32). The implication of the verse is 'no individual, so long as he is innocent, may for any reason be deprived of his right to life; he may not be sacrificed for the sake of the community' (Nursi 1994, 73). It is also evident that there are similar principles in the writings of Kant, such as the 'Categorical Imperative' (Johnson 2008). Therefore, whether major or minor, any right is a right in the sight of God, and it is considered a fundamental right of humans and cannot be abolished or limited for the sake of another.

In contrast, 'relative justice' means that part or some can be sacrificed for the sake of the whole. In other words, for avoiding a greater evil and maintaining the well-being of the community, a lesser evil should be preferred and the authority should not give any consideration to the rights of the individual in that circumstance. Nevertheless, 'we should, however, point out here that it is wrong to make 'relative justice' the rule where 'absolute justice' is possible' (Nursi 1994, 73). In addition, we should bear in mind Kant's principle that 'humanity in each person must always be treated as an end itself, never simply as a means' (Hill 1991, 196-229).

The second way requires that the government stays within its laws, which means that 'there is no nation that should be used to intervene in the private lives of citizens (unless the requirement to uphold social stability dictates otherwise) or to enforce any particular pattern of behaviour' (Tamar 2005, 62-181). In other words, the government should act lawfully against terrorism. Moreover, the required responses have to be justified and must not result in the erosion of civil liberties, (Terrorism 2000) - hence the European Convention on Human Rights, which requires that even suspected terrorists are afforded basic human rights guaranteed in that instrument. This necessarily has an impact upon their detention and their trial, among other things.

Violations of law and order by the government undermine its legitimacy. The government expects people to obey the rule of law. In return every citizen expects equal treatment from their government. Equal treatment requires that the liberal state not favour particular groups and individuals because of their differences. In addition, the liberal political system is obliged to keep the fundamental rights of people protected against authority. People deserve these rights by virtue of being human beings (Klosko 2000, 10). However, 'the liberal state has the right to use the state's monopoly of legitimate force in order to preserve internal peace and order, to enforce the law, and to defend the community against external enemies' (Wilkinson(c) 1986, 17).

In sum, not every problem in modern democracies has a simple solution. For the last 25 years, terrorism in the liberal democracies of Western Europe, such as Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Spain, have been waiting to be responded to in a manner that is consistent with the democratic Western norms of legitimacy and acceptability (Chalk 1995, 10-44).

Does Government need to Compromise?

Many argue that the state has to compromise the politics of democracy in order to be effective against terrorism (Chalk 1995, 10-44). This is not totally true, because democracy does not only mean civil freedoms but also refers to legitimate and constitutional methods. As long as it does so by legal and constitutional means, the government can legislate against terrorism without compromising political traditions and the civil way of political life. Dealing with terrorism should be in a way that is widely agreed to be in conformity with existing political and judicial principles. Abiding by these principles will strength the commitment of the state to democratic institutions and to control or limit the terrorism.

Netanyahu states that 'the belief in the peaceful resolution of disagreements, in the basic rights of other individuals, and in the law of the land- all these are the building blocks of a democratic education, indeed a democratic world view, which forms an impenetrable wall in the mind of each citizen against participating in political violence' (Netanyahu 1995, 12). He concludes that 'the battle against terrorism should be waged relentlessly, resisting the attempt to glorify or mystify its perpetrators or their causes in any way' (Netanyahu 1995, 22-23). According to him, the state has to defeat terrorism by using all means at its disposal. The question here remains how a liberal democracy does that. Netanyahu gives an answer with which I do not agree, but which is worth stating, that:

The government of free societies charged with fighting a rising tide of terrorism are thus faced with a democratic dilemma: if they do not fight terrorism with the means available to them, they endanger their citizenry; if they do, they appear to endanger the way freedoms which they are charged to protect (Netanyahu 1995, 30).

Is it necessary to put Limitations on Rights?

Limitation of human rights is an important issue in combating terrorism. 'Liberals accept the necessity of restricting individual freedom as being the most effective means to enhance the general level of liberty in society, they are also adamant that

there must be clear limits imposed on state authority and its power over the individual' (Chalk 1995, 10-44). As seen in this quotation, restrictions on individual freedom are only acceptable for enhancing the general level of liberty in society. Independent committees of judicial and legal oversight are required to administrate the limitations to ensure that they are properly enforced. However, combating terrorism should not be used as a pretext for discrimination against any segment of society. Terrorists often claim that they are acting on behalf of ethnic groups, religions, or even entire nations. These claims are untrue, because terrorists generally represent only a minuscule faction of any such group.

Authorities accept that the state 'must sacrifice some of its democratic substance in order to be effective against terrorism' and 'for the sake of upholding those civil and political traditions' (Chalk 1995, 10-44). This seems to be a dilemma of distribution of justice. Obviously we are not talking about the criminal laws which are a necessary and desirable restraint on liberty and seen as an essential tool by the liberal democratic states. We are now talking about extra restrictions of human rights which have been introduced because of terrorist activities. As a result of these restrictions, terrorism has increased in various parts of the world, such as Turkey and Britain.

Is An Act of Terrorism Justifiable?

Is an act of terrorism justifiable? There is no clear answer to this question, because each party has got their own answer for it. In other words, terrorists do not accept that their actions are 'terrorism' and not justifiable. Likewise, Camus assumes that terrorism is justifiable:

He pointed to a specific human impulse, ancient and august, which is the impulse to rebel—the impulse that got its start as an impulse to rebel against God. ...in Ramadan's opinion, the impulse to rebel in Western culture follows directly from the esteem that is accorded to scepticism and doubt. You begin with scepticism and doubt, and you push those attitudes one step further, and you arrive at full-scale rebellion (Berman 2003, 26-27).

This view clearly states that rebellion is natural and justifiable. In addition 'utilitarians' and 'consequentialists' come to similar conclusions. Some of the consequentialists say that if terrorism brings better consequences than its alternatives, it is justifiable (Held 1991, 59-85). Wilkinson, Hare and Kai Nielsin, however, disagree and think that terrorism may not be justified, because according to them 'terrorism always produces results that are worse on consequentialist's grounds than their

alternatives' (Held 1991, 59-85). Alternatively, many scholars, such as Laqueur, Wellmer, Tilly, Closer and Falk, accept that terrorism has sometimes brought political progress and the removal of unwanted political figures.

The requirement of justification itself is bound up with the idea that people have inherent dignity and should be treated with respect. People are entitled to be governed according to principles they could accept, for much the same reasons they are entitled to rule themselves, to have equality of opportunity, and basic rights (Klosko 2000, 3).

From a narrow consequentialist view, it may not be wrong to recognise that some forms of terrorism are justifiable and morally acceptable for the sake of political progress. However, it is right to question whether either the terrorists or the government have tried any other option for making that political progress? Then, they were unable to remove unwanted political situations, injustice, unfairness and suffering of communities. In other words, if the answer for the terrorists, is no, or for the government, is yes, then terrorism cannot be justified. On the other hand, if the answer for the terrorists, is yes, or for the government, is no, and terrorism was chosen as a last resort for making political progress, then terrorism may indeed be justifiable on the basis of the consequentialist approach. However, if basic human rights are threatened and violated by terrorists or governments' forces, then both of their actions are not justifiable, regardless of the consequentialist logic above.

In contrast, theoretically, in certain circumstances, where the state and its institutions violate basic human rights and if political violence and its extreme form, terrorism, brings respect for basic human rights, consequently terrorism may be morally and legally justifiable. In order to clear what base this justification is, one need to provide an answer to this question: 'can terrorism as a considered method to overcome oppression with as little loss of life as possible be, in contrast, less unjustifiable than state terrorism?' (Held 1991, 59-85). The obvious answer is no, because the judgement of justifiability relies on 'political progress' and 'respect for the rights of the human'; it does not rely on 'the loss of life'. Further, one argues that if human rights, such as the right to liberty, personal security, life, property, and respect are being violated by states, can these violations justify terrorism? It is not right to make a judgment on the basis of 'state' as a political unity and 'terrorism' as an extreme use of political violence, because the main argument on the 'justification' are 'political progress' and protecting basic human rights; despite this, 'many theorists still define the state in terms of its monopoly on the use of violence considered legitimate' (Held 1991, 59-85).

Legitimacy, as discussed in this paper earlier, states that in the twenty-first century, none of the liberal democratic governments are able to justify the legitimacy of 'use of violence'. Therefore, if the usage of violence by the state is considered legitimate, that state cannot escape being labeled a 'terrorist state' and in the same manner, the use of violence by terrorists has never been considered legitimate. Therefore, in my view, violations of human rights are never justifiable even if the parties have got reasons and one way the other justified their action in the common ground.

On the one hand, fears of terrorism may be inevitably and continuously degrading people's lives. This may push the liberal democratic state out of the liberal state system. Mistakenly, the state may begin acting in an exceptional manner, such as disregarding its constitution, human rights and the international conventions it has signed. As a result of this process, the state may justify terrorism and become a so-called 'police state' that definitely alienates people and drives them into an active cooperation with the terrorists. If the chain of mistakes continues in the liberal democratic state, the disintegration of the state will be inevitable and the terrorist may defeat the state without any military battle. This is the worst-case scenario. Historically, however, there is no record of a liberal state having been overthrown by terrorism in this fashion. On the other hand, terrorism is therefore not legitimate and is a type of behaviour that cannot be tolerated inside of the laws of any liberal democratic state. However, at least for the terrorists, there are many reasons that make their actions legitimate and morally justifiable in their own eyes. One of those reasons is the liberal democratic states' actions and their ruling styles, since the state is seen as repudiating basic human values and principles (Wilkinson(c) 1986, 81).

Responses to terrorism are also about how authorities see terrorism. In this respect, there are two different schools that see terrorism in different ways. One is that of Wilkinson, who sees the terrorist as a person who 'sacrifices all moral and humanitarian consideration for the sake of political end'; he also defines 'political terrorism as coercive intimidation' (Wilkinson(c) 1986, 51). Some other scholars agree with Wilkinson, among them Netanyahu (Netanyahu(b) 1986, 29-30) and Walzer (Walzer 1988, 238). However, Holmes thinks that 'terrorism per se is morally no worse than many conventionally accepted forms of violence (Held 1991, 59-85). A further argument is raised by Falk who states that unless one is opposed to the 'tactics of potential or actual warfare that rely on indiscriminate violence or that deliberately target civilians', one cannot be sincerely opposed to terrorism (Held 1991, 59-85). Assuming that 'a legal system violates the human rights of those on whom it imposes its will, the violence or terrorism it uses to do so is surely no more justified than the violence or terrorism used against it, and quite possibly, it is less so' (Held 1991, 59-85).

These two different approaches to terrorism indicate that there are huge gaps between the two schools. One sees terrorism as a form of criminal activity, and as coercive intimidation for a political end; therefore it cannot be justifiable. However, the other sees terrorism as a form of political activity for a political solution; therefore it can be justifiable. These differences lead them to find different solutions to the problem.

In general, most scholars agree that terrorism is not morally and legally justifiable. But, as we stated above, terrorism may be justified under special circumstances in some people's eyes. These circumstances are where there are violations of human rights by the legitimate state and terrorists trying to defend these rights. Then, some people may begin to use the liberties guaranteed to them in liberal democratic states to plot bombings in order to make radical change or destroy the state (Wilkinson(c) 1986, 119).

Terrorism versus Liberal Democracy: Countering Terrorism

The question is how? It seems that there is only one way which is 'democratic states must carefully choose their counter-terrorist strategies so as not to undermine their own values' (Jebb 2003, 126-154). The prevention and combating of terrorism policies should be continued within democratic and international norms. Even if national measures can be devised and possibilities for international cooperation exist, constraints are still placed upon democratic states in how they choose to protect themselves and their citizens.

Having experienced terrorists' activities, governments believe that the state 'must sacrifice some of its democratic substance in order to be effective against terrorism' and 'for the sake of upholding those civil and political traditions' (Chalk 1995, 10-44). But there are problems with this approach for governments and the public. First of all, it is not very clear which civil liberties should be limited and to what extent. Secondly, there is no academic research on the relationship between the causes of the terrorist actions and particular civil liberties, proving that the existence of any particular liberty helped the terrorists to carry out their evil actions. Thirdly, there is the question of whether the limitation of that particular civil liberty would actually help authorities to prevent, or combat, any terrorist atrocities. Without clear answers to these questions governments of liberal states could be pushed into unproductive breaches of traditional liberal values. When the traditional liberal values have been broken, the public will have strong government but they will have no more security than before. Hence, after the 11th September 2001, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and some other states were blamed for limiting 'liberal values'

because they have made changes to their laws in order to fight terrorism better. Unfortunately, 'Anti-terrorism measures have done little to ensure Britain is safe and secure from terrorist attack, but much to infringe the civil liberties of those living in the UK' (Liberty 2005). Changes in British anti-terrorism law did not prevent the attacks in London on 7 July 2005, for instance.

The question is this: can all these changes in the law help governments to prevent terrorism? The answer is that they can if the changes are used only for deterring terrorists. In order to deter terrorists, the changes require employing trained people and establishing new security units, which increase the size of the security system and its funding. The changes will help these people to monitor people who might be suspected terrorists or have links with terrorists and to arrest them. They provide more room to manoeuvre which is important in combating or fighting terrorism but they will not by themselves prevent terrorism. Any potential curtailment of liberty can be justified only if it is reasonably estimated to be both necessary for and effective in enhancing public safety (Tamar 2005, 62-181).

Conclusion

There is a link between terrorism and liberal democracy, terrorism being a result of political decisions made within imperfect liberal democracies. Thus terrorism, whether national or international, is operating in liberal democratic societies and it has been one of the major problems of liberal democratic governments since the 1960s.

Terrorism is not justifiable, because it violates others' rights. However, the terrorists believe it to be justified because they think that their rights are being violated. This shows that the core issue is one of rights. For this reason, governments should not violate human rights when implementing counter-terrorist policies. The violation of human rights is more important than the prevention policies.

Now, nearly all western liberal governments have tried to produce a solution to this new form of terrorism. So far, their solution has been about limiting western liberal values and freedom. Some observers (Heymann 2002, 441-456) state that there is no need to limit western liberal values since these are not a weakness of liberal democracy. The weakness is not using security forces and technological developments properly.

Distribution of justice and equality is an important element in the prevention of terrorism. There is a need to dry out the sea, not to kill the fish. Terrorism is the product of a process. One should look at the production process in order to offer an accurate solution. People should believe that liberal democracy is strong enough to

counter-terrorism without limiting liberal rights. 'Freedom for others means safety for ourselves. Let us be for the freedom of others' (Berman 2003, 210).

References

- APSA. 2010. What is Political Science? Last modified 2010, accessed October 13 http://www.apsanet.org/content_9181.cfm
- Becker, Jillian. 1981. "Case Study I: Federal Germany." In *Contemporary Terror: Studies in Sub-State Violence*, edited by David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf, 122-138. London: Macmillan.
- Berman, Paul. 2003. *Terror and Liberalism*. New York, London: W. W. Norton & Company
- Berridge, G.R. 1992. *International Politics, States, Power & Conflict since 1945*. New York, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, Second Ed.
- Blanchard, Christopher M. 2010. *Saudi Arabia: Background and U.S. Relations*. CRS Report for Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Blunden, A. 2010. By Way of an Introduction. Last modified 2005. accessed May 23, <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/us/fukuyama.htm>
- Chalk, Peter. 1995. "The Liberal Democratic Response to Terrorism." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 10-44.
- Cinar, Bekir. 2010. *Can Terrorism be Prevented? Combating Terrorism in a Liberal Democracy*. Epoka University and Euroworld Publishing.
- Crelinsten, R. D. 1989 "Terrorism as Political Communication: The Relationship between the Controller and the Controlled." In *Contemporary Research on Terrorism*, edited by Paul Wilkinson and Alasdair M Steward, 3-23. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- Crenshaw, Martha. 2010, "Political Explanations in Addressing the Causes of Terrorism." The Club de Madrid Series on Democracy and Terrorism. Madrid: *The International Summit On Democracy*, 2005. 13-18 in accessed on 16 December, <http://english.safe-democracy.org/causes/the-club-de-madrid-series-on-democracy-and-terrorism-.html>
- DawnNews. 2010. "Terrorism directly linked to foreign policy, says Nawaz." dawn.com. 3 July 2010. accessed October 20, <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/news/pakistan/metropolitan/16-terrorism+directly+linked+to+foreign+policy+says+nawaz-hs-03>

-
- Diamond, L. 2002. *Winning the New Cold War on Terrorism: The Democratic-Governance Imperative*. IGD.
- Encyclopædia Britannica. 2010. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 2010. accessed October 16, <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/641170/Peace-of-Westphalia>
- Fareed, Z. 2007. "The Rise of Illiberal Democracy." (November/December 1997. accessed May 28, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19971101faessay3809/fareed-zakaria/the-rise-of-illiberal-democracy.html>
- Gause, F. Gregory. 2007. "Democracy, Terrorism and American Policy in the Arab World." University of Vermont. 20-21 April 2005. accessed May 28, <http://www.ndu.edu/inss/symposia/topical2005/gausepaper.pdf>
- Gildin, Hilail. 1989. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Government. 2002. *Academic Standards for Civics and Government*. Guidance, Pennsylvania Department of Education.
- Houndmills, 2007. *Politics*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hassan, Robert. 2007. 'No Future: Liberal Democracy and the Loss of Time Sovereignty', Media and Communications Program, The University of Melbourne, accessed on 28 May <http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/socsi/futures/conference/papers/hassan.pdf>,
- Held, Verginia. 1991. "Terrorism, rights, and political goals." In *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, by Raymond Frey and Chris Morris, 59-85. Cambridge University Press.
- Hess, S. Brock Blomberg and Gregory D. 2008. "From (No) Butter to Guns? Understanding the Economic Role in Transnational Terrorism." In *Terrorism, Economic Development, and Political Openness*, edited by Philip Keefer and Norman Loayza, 83-115. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heymann, P.B. 2002. "Civil Liberties and Human Rights in the Aftermath of September 11." *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 441-456.
- Heywood, A. 1994. *Political Ideas and Concepts*. London: Macmillan.
- Heywood, Andrew. 2003. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Houndmills. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hill, Thomas E. 1991. "Making Exceptions without Abandoning the Principle: or how a Kantian Might Think about Terrorism." In *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, edited by Raymond Frey and Chris Morris, 196-229. Cambridge University Press.
-

-
- Hoffman, B. 1989. "Terrorism in the United State during 1985." In *Contemporary Research on Terrorism*, edited by Paul Wilkinson and Alasdair Stewart, 230-240. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.
- Hoffman, Bruce. 2001. "Change and Continuity in Terrorism." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 417-428.
- Hornby, A.S. 1990. "Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English." *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, Rober H. 2001. "The Evolution of International Society." In *The Globalisation of World Politics*, edited by John Baylis & Steve Smith, 33-50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jebb, Cindy R. 2003. "The Fight for Legitimacy: Liberal Democracy Versus Terrorism." *The Journal of Conflict Studies*, 126-154.
- Johnson, Robert. 2010. Kant's Moral Philosophy. 6 April 2008. accessed May 23, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/>
- Kennedy, Paul. 1989. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict From 1500 to 200*. London: Fontana Press.
- Kissinger, Henry. 1995. *Diplomacy*. London, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Klingemann, Robert E. 1998. Goodin and Hans-Dieter. "Chapter 1 Political Science: The Discipline." In *A New Handbook of Political Science*, edited by Robert E. Goodin and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, 3-49. Oxford University Press.
- Klosko, George. 2000. *Democratic Procedures and Liberal Consensus*. Oxford University Press.
- Leiser, Burton. 1979. *Liberty, Justice, and Morality*. New York: Macmillan.
- Liberty. Liberty. 2005. accessed April 10, <http://www.liberty-human-rights.org.uk/issues/terrorism.shtml>
- Loayza, Philip Keefer and Norman. 2008. "Overview: Terrorism, Economic Development, and Political Openness." In *Terrorism, Economic Development, and Political Openness*, edited by Philip Keefer and Norman Loayza, 1-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriam Webster. Politics. 2010. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/politics?show=0&t=1286998874> (accessed October 13).
- n.d. http://www.wasd.k12.pa.us/district/curriculum/civics/civics_glossary.htm (accessed August 13, 2005).
-

-
- Narveson(b), Jan. 1991. "Terrorism and Morality." In *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, edited by Raymond Frey and Chris Morris, 116-169. Cambridge University Press.
- Narveson, Jan. 1992. "Terrorism and Morality." In *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, edited by Raymond Frey and Chris Morris, 116-169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Netanyahu(b), Benjamin. 1986. "Terrorism: How the West Can Win." In *Terrorism: How the West Can Win*, edited by Benjamin Netanyahu, 29-30. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Netanyahu, Benjamin. 1995. *Fighting Terrorism: How democracies can defeat domestic and international terrorists*. New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.
- Nursi, Said. 1994. *The Letters*. London: Truostar.
- Piazza, James A. 2008. "Do Democracy and Free Markets Protect Us From Terrorism?" *War on Terror, International Politics*. accessed May 23 <http://www.palgrave-journals.com/ip/journal/v45/n1/full/8800220a.html>
- Ramadan, Tariq. 2010. "Blair can no longer deny a link exists between terrorism and foreign policy." *The Guardian Newspaper*. Monday 4 June 2007. accessed October 20 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2007/jun/04/comment.politics>
- Rawls, J. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Sandler, Todd. 1995. "On the Relationship between Democracy and Terrorism." *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 1-9.
- Sandoz, Yves. 2009. "The History of the Grave Breaches Regime." *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 657-682.
- Silj, Alessandro. 1981. "Case Study II: Italy." In *Contemporary Terror: Studies in Sub-State Violence*, edited by David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf, 139-152 . London: Macmillan.
- Smith, John Baylis & Steve. 2001. *The Globalisation of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Second Ed.
- Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2010. Sovereignty. 8 June 2010. accessed October 16 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sovereignty>
- Straumann, Benjamin. 2008. "The Peace of Westphalia as a Secular Constitution." *Constellations*, 173-188.
- Tamar, M. "How Terrorism Upsets Liberty. 2003." *Political Studies*, 2005: 62-181.
- Terrorism. 2000. <http://www.cdt.org/policy/terrorism> (accessed August 13).
-

Testas, Abdelaziz. 2002. "The Roots of Algeria's Religious and Ethnic Violence." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 161–183.

The Qur'an 5:32.

Walzer, Michael. 1988 "Terrorism: A Critique of Excuses." In *Problems of international Justice: Philosophical Essays*, edited by Steven Luper-Foy, 238-. Westview: Boulder and Cole.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. 2010. accessed October 16
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_relations

Wikipedia. "Democracy." Wikipedia. 2010. accessed May 23
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_democracy

Wilkinson, Paul. 2000. "The Strategic Implications of Terrorism." In *Terrorism & Political Violence: A Sourcebook, Indian Council of Social Science Research*, edited by M.L. Sondhi, 19-49. India : Har-anand Publications.

Wilkinson, Paul. 1986. *Terrorism and Liberal State*. London: Macmillan.

Wilkinson, Paul. 1977. *Terrorism and the Liberal State*. London: Macmillan.