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Charles Townshend, *Terrorism*¹

In 2017 the University of Lodz Publishing House started to publish „*Krótkie Wprowadzenie* (A Short Introduction) series of “books that change the way of thinking”, as the editor notifies on the cover. These are small textbooks (21x13 dm) of hundred and tens to ca. two hundred pages of text. They concern different fields of expertise and their authors are Oxford scientists who bring readers into a world of knowledge and different scientific disciplines in a way that is easily accessible. In the United Kingdom *A Very Short Introduction* (VSI) series being issued from 1995 by the Oxford University Press has more than 500 titles now, which have been very successful worldwide. Until now, they have been translated into 25 languages. Now it is time for a Polish translation, although in the second half of the 1990s and in 2000 Prószyński i S-ka Publishing House decided to edit the VSI. Several books of the series, as far as I remember, got printed, dedicated to religious studies and other chosen fields of humane sciences.

Care for the merits of the present Polish edition of the series provide scientist from the University of Lodz. I recommend particularly volume five written by a British historian, Charles Townshend, *Terrorism*. Professor Townshend is a British historian with particular expertise on the historic and political consequences of British imperialism in Ireland and the Middle East, so on the territories where British presence was accompanied by huge activity of organizations using terrorism as a method of political activity. These organizations stayed active even after the British had left the region. Professor Ryszard M. Machnikowski, a well known political scientist at the University of Lodz with expertise on terrorism, current military conflicts and international security, has translated the book into Polish. This 201-page long book was accompanied by the professor’s introduction *Current faces of terrorism*. Before I go to the description of the content of this valuable book, it is worth quoting translator’s comment: *Townshend punctures in the pages of his book several unnecessary – but still present in people’s minds, not only laymen – myths on terrorism. It should sadly be admitted that they are quite often spread by numerous commentators sitting long hours in TV studios. His work allows to look closer to the phenomenon, get to know it inside out despite the fact that the first edition appeared in bookstores already in 2002 and reader of the Polish version got second completed and corrected edition issued in 2011, so more than five years ago* (pp. 9–10).

The book consists of seven chapters on various topics linked to terrorism and each of them starts with a motto or a maxim by famous people known from history or still living.

---

In chapter 1, *Problem with terrorism*, the author raises such issues as: disputes about terrorism definition, terrorism and war, process of terror origins and development of the phenomenon, strategies of terror, terror and politics, terror and women. He notices that terror is a separate form of political activity to undermine the state ability to ensure security to its citizens, and this causes the need to justify such activities. There is more than 200 definitions of terrorism. In the 1980s two researchers, Alex Schmid and Albert Jongman, compared more than 100 existing back then definitions of terrorism with respect to the presence of key words. The most common words were: force and violence (more than 83%), political nature (65%), fear (51%). What is interesting, in ca. 5% of definitions there were such words as unpredictability or incalculability which are common in definitions formulated in the last two decades. Confusion about the terrorism term is present in media and in scientific literature. It applies to both definitions and language. What is terrorism for some, for others it means struggle for national independence. Israeli and Palestinian conflict is a good example here. Arab world, or even more – Muslim world, perceives Palestinian organizations not like terrorists but as fighters for freedom.

Terrorism is a political not psychological phenomenon. Words like terrorism, terrorists unequivocally have negative connotations, while those who use it question legitimacy of such understanding. They call themselves warriors, fighters, partisans and guerillas. The last word also causes chaos because guerilla fights run on military logic. Guerillas engage military forces of a country, no matter the scale of their activities is. Their goal are mainly military forces of the adversary. So, it is war which defines guerilla activities. At this moment, it is worth citing Henry Kissinger, the former US Secretary of State 1973–1977, who said *guerillas win when they do not lose, regular army loses when it does not win*. The sentence reflects best the difference between guerillas and regular army of its own country or some other country, which guerillas have conflict with.

The nature of terrorism is negation of fight understood in military terms. Its goal are non-fighting people, vulnerable, civilians. In case of terrorism we deal with fight carried out by the weak who use violence, because of their weakness they cannot take up an open fight. The fight can escalate and then such kind of fight we call asymmetric war, waged by parties with uneven forces. This asymmetric factor is something that makes terrorism different from symmetric wars, i.e. clashes of more or less even forces. Term of asymmetric wars, which was to assist in defining terrorism and clear any doubts, caused even more confusion. It is often abused because not every asymmetric conflict is the same as terrorism. Townshend totally omitted in his works the concept of asymmetric war. There was also no comparison between terrorism and south American guerilla, which was the name for guerilla troops fighting with authoritarian regimes, not for terrorist organizations.

---

Introducing readers into a strategy of terrorism, the author describes the phenomenon from a historical perspective, although it avoids any chronology and clouds the whole picture. One cannot also agree with the author, who, referring to the logic of terrorism, says that for the first time it was presented so clearly in the „Philosophy of a bomb” by Johann Most (the correct name should be Johann not Jonathan), an anarchist treatise of 1880 (p. 33). It was Mikhail Bakunin, regarded as the author of anarchism idea, followed by a German apologist named Most, who had created the idea of violence. He was the author of such slogans as the pleasure of destruction is a creative feeling and the basis for anarchists’ activities is the realization of revolutionary ideology in a non-revolutionary situation. His compatriot and colleague Sergey Netchayev was the author of the famous Catechism of revolutionary, ideological treatise constituting a basis for revolutionary activity, which is described at present as anarchist terrorism. Peter Kropotkin, the third of Russian anarchism ideologists, claimed, inter alia, that moderation is not good for violence.

One cannot forget other German terrorism precursors and theoreticians of the 19th century. One of them, Wilhelm Weitling, described terrorism as a combination of revolutionary awareness and criminal abilities, briefly said terrorist equals revolutionary plus criminal. On the other hand, Karl Heinznezn, in his terrorism doctrine justified the need of mass killings for a good cause.

In the second chapter – Crusaders and conspirators – Townshend touches some very interesting issues, one may think very far away from each other. He tries to distinguish „good terrorists” from bad ones. The term good terrorist refers to revolutionary terrorists from the 19th century fighting against oppressive states. In case of fighters for freedom the author tries to give some features distinguishing them from terrorists. The most important thing is that they carry out terrorist attacks extremely rarely to gain political aims. From the historical point of view none of the organizations appealing only to terror did not succeed in liberation. Terrorism as such is a negative phenomenon and its use causes very often unexpectedly catastrophic consequences for terrorists. A good example are activities of the so called good terrorists in the 1970s, who belonged to Movimiento de Liberation Nacional-Tupamaros, MLN-T, which caused the end of liberal Uruguay. In spite of some unpredictable events in many cases the thesis that violence liberates from the inferiority complex, despair and impotence, makes fearless and restores self-esteem, by Frantz Fanon (1925–1961), a participant of the Algerian War, during which both sides used terror against the opponent and against the so called traitors, who had been avoiding the fight, who were against any violence or who had been supporting the opponent, seems to be accurate.

3 There is another definition formulated by and Indian Muslim theologian, philosopher and poet Muhammad Ikbal (1877–1938) which is associated with this definition, for whom bolshevism plus God is almost Islam.

4 Those who are interested in anarchist terrorism are recommended to see: A. Pawlowski, Terroryzm w Europie XIX I XX wieku, Zielona Góra 1980; W. Potkański, Terroryzm na usługach ugrupowań lewicowych i anarchistycznych w Królestwie Polskim do 1914 roku, Warszawa 2014.
Moving on to the description of international terrorism, the author gives no definition of the phenomenon, nevertheless, he writes that it has appeared with Carlos’ career (p. 49). But capture under the photograph on p. 46 informs: idea of international terrorism was born together with Chicago Haymarket attack of 4 May 1886, when the police started to scatter anarchists’ gathering (many of whom had been former immigrants from Germany) and was attacked with a bomb. Definitely participation of German immigrants in the event cannot lead to its description as international terrorism, to which Ilich Ramirez Sanchez, alias Carlos, known as Carlos the Jackal, brought a new dimension. Many authors acknowledge hijacking of the El Al Israeli aircraft from Rome to Tel Aviv by members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine on 23 July 1968 as the beginning of international terrorism. The aircraft was hijacked to Aliens. It is worth citing definition of international terrorism formulated in 1986 by the UN Commission of International Law. International terrorism is (...) taking up, supporting and enhancing by the state authorities to terrorist acts in other countries, or tolerating by the authorities any activities to carry out terrorist attacks in other country. During the Cold War era terrorist organizations were supported by different countries, including the USSR and the US. It seems though, that currently division between domestic terrorism and international terrorism makes no sense because of network of relationships, excluding maybe the US where different groups with no important international ties are active.

Trying to answer the question Whether terrorism can be even worse in the future? the author is of the opinion that such risk is probable to grow with technology capabilities of terrorists. In the past they have already used chemical weapon and are able to get components to it in the future. Nevertheless, super terrorism in the form of weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear one, which strikes fear among the public is more like journalist fantasy, not a real threat. Nevertheless, its usage by some countries seems possible.

In chapter three – Rules of terror – the author introduces a very interesting topic of spreading fear in France during the French Revolution. In 1793 Jacobins instituted the reign of terror to defend revolution against aristocracy and royalists, although the most victims were ordinary people. The uprising in Vandee was suppressed bloodily and became for Jacobins a symbol of counter revolution and extermination of civilians is a good example of it. Not so long further the French Revolution devoured its own children. The members of the National Convention Maximilien Robespierre, Louis Saint-Just and Georges Danton were guillotined. Cruelty and violence on a mass scale during the French Revolution created a model of terror for those who wanted to keep the old order (so called white terror) and for those who wanted to overthrow it. This way red terror (for example of Bolsheviks) and black terror (nationalist, for ex. Hitlerian). So, the terms terror and terrorism should be divided. Terror means using violence by stronger state organs against weaker citizens and terrorism means the other way round – using violence by weaker citizens against stronger state organs.
Townshend identifies terrorism of a free coverage which shall include activities of Latin American death squadrons, supporting counterterrorist activities of the state. There goes next ultra terrorism, which happens (…) in a situation when formerly significant group feels like abandoned and betrayed by a country. This sense of betrayal appears when local people face negotiations between insurgents and a state, what happened in French Algeria in the fall campaign carried out by the FNL (Front de Liberation Nationale), and, to a much lesser extent, in the North Ireland during „the peace process” (p. 72). By the end of the struggles with the Algerian FLN quite active was l’Organisation Armee Secrete, OAS. It was created in March 1961 and it was against Algeria’s independence. Local people became its target. Using scorched-earth tactics it wanted to cause a mutiny of French settlers there, which it failed, in the end. It moved terrorist activities to France organizing few unsuccessful attacks on President Charles de Gaulle. In case of Northern Ireland loyal organizations as Ulster Volunteer Force, UVF have not attacked representatives of the British government or British targets but concentrated on Irish-republican (catholic) targets. Their activity was called volunteer terrorism. If Townshend had written his book after 2011, he would have called many groups which were established during the Arab spring this way.

Chapter 4 – Revolutionary terrorism – has been divided into four subchapters. The first two are: Two centuries of terrorism: century I and Two centuries of terrorism: century II. They present a phenomenon of terrorism from a historical perspective, starting from Russian anarchists called terrorists-revolutionaries. They embraced, for example, members of National Will organization, called nationals (rus. Narodniki) who wanted to provoke an outbreak of revolution to preserve existing order and build a stateless society country on it. Anarchists called their activities „propaganda via actions”. There is also a Polish mark here. Polish socialist, Józef Piłsudski used to call such activities „armed acts”, syndicalists used a name of „direct action” or reprise indivinduelle (fr.) – individual retaliation. As targets for attacks revolutionary terrorists chose heads of state and top officials. In the period of 1881–1914 there were seven effective terrorist attacks carried out on rulers (including the tsar of Russia, presidents of the US and France, king of Italy and Austro-Hungarian heir to the throne). While describing revolutionary terrorism one can add two Polish accents – one is a killer of tsar Alexander II, who was a Polish student from Podlasie region, Ignacy Hryniewiecki. He died from wounds caused by explosion of a bomb tossed on March 13, 1881 directly at the emperor’s feet. Hryniewiecki’s decapitated head was put into a jar filled with spirit and exhibited in the hall of the Petersburg police station as a warning. The second Polish accent is connected to Bronisław Piłsudski, Józef’s elder brother, who took part in an unsuccessful conspiracy to murder tsar Alexander III in 1887. For that action he was sent to Sakhalin, where he was doing 

5 Since 1904 Piłsudski was heading the Combat Organization, a fraction of the Polish Socialist Party, which had been carrying out attacks on Russian targets in the Kingdom of Poland area. More details in Polscy terroryści by Wojciech Lada, Kraków 2014.
research into Ainu people, indigenous people of the southern part of the island and next ethnographic research into other peoples of Japan.6

In the author’s opinion revolutionary terrorism is responsible for rebirth of political violence after World War II when anti colonial liberation movement was under way. Terrorism was a significant element of it. The example organizations are Vietmin and Vietcong responsible for death of more than 20 000 people. A vital role in a revolutionary terrorism played Latin American factor (title of the next chapter). A consistent place took Ernesto Che Guevara, Abraham Guillen, who wrote The strategy of urban guerillas (1966), Regis Debray, author of The Revolution in Revolution (1967) and Carlos Marighella, author of the Mini manual of urban guerilla (1969). In case of the Latin America the source of revolutionary terrorism were mass social movements carrying out guerilla operations. These operations were moved to cities creating the urban guerilla. The best known guerilla organization was active in the most democratic country in Latin America – Uruguay. It was, mentioned already, the Tupamaros movement. Finally, its activity led to a less liberal and just country, what made its members to go underground and finance its activities from bank robberies.

Tupamaros guerillas were looked up to for West Germany youth. Reasons for this particular interest should be looked for in conditions, Uruguay fighters struggled in. Successes of the guerillas in the second half of the 1960s were also not meaningless. That was the time when non-parliamentary youth opposition in the Federal Republic of Germany was very active. Tupamaro victories appeared to be only interim and in the final result they turned against not only the organization itself but also against the Uruguayan democracy. Nevertheless, the Latin American guerilla was an inspiration for many extreme left terrorist organizations in Europe. There is more on these organizations in the last sub-chapter – Terrorism of fractions. One can find short descriptions of Italian Brigate Rosse, BR, there and German organization Baader-Meinhof, i.e. Rote Armee Fraction, RAF. Finally, leftist terrorists in Europe were defeated by state institutions.

Another motivation for some terrorist groups is a national and separatist ideology. This is what chapter 5 – Nationalism and terror – is about. Nationalist movements were much more immune to counterterrorist operations and their own destruction. The author gives examples of the Sri Lankan Liberation Tigers of Tamil Elam, LTTE and Armenian nationalist organizations, being heirs to the Dashnak movement of the 19th century.7 Separated subchapters are devoted to the Irish Republican Army,

---

6 In October 2013 a monument by B. Piłsudski in Shiraoi on the isle of Hokkaido was opened. In Yokohama lives grandson Kuzuyasu Kimura.

7 The name comes from the name of a Dashnaktsutyun town. An armed group of members of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation occupied the Ottoman Bank on August 26, 1896. The purpose of the raid was to dictate the ARF’s demands of reform in the Armenian populated areas of the Ottoman Empire and to attract European attention to their cause and, last but not least, to restore peace in the country and “cutting criminal human indifference”. Otherwise, they threatened to blow up the building of the bank together with its personnel and its financial assets. Other Dashnak operations were two unsuccessful attempts on the life of the Sultan Abdulhamid II.
IRA, basque Euskadi ta Askatasuna, ETA and Zionism as the ideology and policy of terror, which drew the Jews to their own sovereign Israel country. Both IRA and ETA, using the experiences of anti-colonial and Latin movements, appreciated the role of media. They realized that without TV and radio broadcast and press coverage they were not able to achieve projected goals. If they were active nowadays, they would use undoubtedly social media for their goals. Cyberspace would be the main area of contacts with public.

In the 1970s and 1980s in many regions of Europe there have separatist terrorist organizations been established. Their goal was to get autonomy for a particular region or splitting it off from the country. All those groups referred to leftist ideologies and stressed their reluctance to the West, particularly to the US. Terrorist activities of the then many terrorist groups was a result of sui generis political vogue for imitation of violence by already existing separatist organizations, which activities were limited to one or several series of attacks. They embraced groups active in Alto Adige Region in Italy, in Brittany, in Corsica, in the Canary Islands, in the Molucca Islands or in the Swiss Jurassic Highland.

Comparing activities of terrorist groups motivated by different ideologies it turns out that terrorism used by organizations of nationalist nature can in some cases succeed. For it makes the sides of the conflict to conclude political agreement. The activity of Israeli Irgun Cwai Leumi, Ecel in the 1940s made British to retreat from Palestine. It was the same with Cypriots from Ethniki Organosis Kiprijon agoniston, EOKA, the French were made by the FLN to leave Algeria, the UK and IRA signed in 1998 the Good Friday Peace Agreement which resulted in expressing by IRA regret for civilian victims of its activities and the process of its arsenal reduction started. The period of peace came, however, it did not last long. After the Agreement was written, there has a new IRA fraction been established, the Real IRA, RIRA. In March 2009 RIRA conducted an attack on a British military base in Massereene, Antrim County (24 km north of Belfast). Two soldiers were killed back then and several were wounded. Later on, there were next attempts of attacks. It turned out that terrorist campaign which had been started long before, was very difficult to stop.

Fighting for religion and faith is the obligation of the community, there is no other obligation, apart from the faith itself, more important than the fight against the enemy that destroys our way of life and our religion. These words come from Kitab al-Iman by Taki ad Din ibn Tajmijja (1263–1328) and are the motto of the sixth chapter of the book – Religious terror. Townsend claims that the last decade of the 20th century caused a change in perceiving religion motivated terrorism. Activity of Islamic fundamental organizations using violence has been noticed then. For them terrorism is a way of struggle to implement requested social changes and introducing Allah rule over the world, i.e. global hegemony of Islam. Muslim radicals use violence against infidels and those of their faith who do not share the one and only right beliefs. Those are treated as traitors.

Violence has accompanied religion since ancient times, although back then foreign peoples’ raids or hostile civilizations’ raids were not motivated by religion. Temples
were destroyed, statues of gods were destroyed or taken away as spoils of war. Pagan religions were able to incorporate into their pantheons gods of the conquered peoples. It is only monotheist religions that abandoned this tradition, fighting fiercely paganism and idolatry. Changes in the attitude of people of different religions to violence over the years were presented in a book by K. Armstrong Fields of blood, reading of which I strongly recommend. On page 126 Townshend cites Bruce Hoffman’s opinion, who (...) pointed out that none of the eleven well known terrorist groups active in 1968 cannot be qualified as „religious”. According to him (...) first modern groups of such character appeared in around 1980. One cannot, however, agree with this opinion because in 1968 in the US there was established Jewish Defense League (JDL) by rabbi Meir David Kahane, organization combining Jewish orthodoxy and racist beliefs on Jewish superiority over other nations. Rabbi Kahane perceived himself as a religious guide of the Jewish nation showing the best path to salvation. Strict subordination to divine rights was exactly the best way to salvation. From the moment of its establishment until 1976, JDL had carried out attacks in the US (including on Polish consulate in New York), in which seven people were dead and 22 were wounded. Jewish „purity of race” was one of the main points in the rabbi’s program and his supporters. Their group was called „Kach”, which means „only this way” in Hebrew. This description refers to realization of the rabbi’s idea of how to deal with Palestinians to clean the Land of Israel (Erec Izrael) of non-Jewish inhabitants. It should be added that after the Six-Day War in 1967, when Israel seized east Jerusalem, in Israel started to assert different extreme religious organizations coming from Haredi Judaism movement.

In the 1960s in India there was established the most radical and fundamental organization of the Hindu religion believers, Shiv Sena, which appreciated using violence. At that time, the religious and nationalist concept of Hindutva developed and it was very popular in the 1980s. Since the 1920s there has been popular a very active Sikh organization Shiromani Akali Dal, SAD, in India, which regarded Islam and Hindu religions believers as enemies. That is the reason why it is very hard to agree with the opinion that in 1968 there was no terrorist organizations of religious nature at all. At that time in underground there was active al Ilkvan al-Muslimin (the Muslim Brotherhood) in Egypt, whose members found shelter in Saudi Arabia. It is most probable that the Polish issue contains wrongly formulated sentence that The longest chapter – Inside Terrorism – in the work of Bruce Hoffman’s Rand Corporation, the head of the study group on terrorism is dedicated to religion (p. 126). Rand Corporation is an American neoconservative think tank, to which Hoffman is linked, Inside Terrorism is the title of his book, Religion and Terrorism is its longest, 50-page long chapter.

9 A. Krawczyk, Terroryzm ugrupowań fundamentalistycznych na obszarze Izraela w drugiej połowie XX wieku, Toruń 2007, pp. 154-203.
10 B. Hoffman, Inside Terrorism, Columbia University Press 2006. Correct sentence could sound:
A very similar title – *Religion and violence* – has one of the subchapters of chapter six. Townshend seems to argue with Hoffman and other authors, for whom religious terrorism is totally transcendental not of political nature. Indeed, it is very hard to agree with the thesis because terrorist organizations motivated by religion have in reality political aims. Referring to the ancient history (Zealots) or to the Middle Ages (Assassins) has also got not much sense because religious organizations of that time had also political aims (fighting in Roman rules in Palestine in case of Zealots, the Seljuq Sultanate and Crusaders in case of Assassins).

In the next subchapters the author briefly describes implications of religion in politics, touches on Messianism, Millenarism, suicidal terrorism and fundamentalism. It is a pity that in the part devoted to the last phenomenon concentrating exclusively on Islamic fundamentalism giving only a few words to fundamentalism in Judaism and mentioning briefly the Aun Shinrikyo movement.

Fundamentalism, as already been said, is present in all monotheistic religions as well as in Hinduism and Buddhism. The term was formed in the US in the 19th and early 20th centuries. It meant radical protestant movements going beyond the general stream of Protestantism with its ideology. Dwight L. Moody (1837–1899) was regarded as the forefather of American fundamentalism and the founder of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago (1886), which aim was to get cadres ready to fight for the faith. The most important goal Moody had set was to save people’s souls. This is why he was ready to cooperate with each and every Christian. He was also taking care of social reforms. Graduates of his institute were to be missionaries of the poor. He claimed that atheistic ideologies would lead to the world’s destruction. In his opinion situation worldwide was worsening day by day, that is why people should turn to God. In 1910 Presbyterians\(^\text{11}\) from Princeton formulated the concept of infallibility of the Holy Bible\(^\text{12}\) and announced a list of five basic dogmas: 1) infallibility of the Holy Bible, 2) Jesus’s birth of the Virgin, 3) absolute reality of his miracles, 4) atoning by the Christ for people’s sins on the cross, 5) physical resurrection of the Christ. In the years of 1910–1915 brothers Lyman and Militin Stewart, oil millionaires from California, financed a series of 12 booklets under the common title *The Fundamentals. The Testimony of the Truth* consisting of 90 articles. Their authors, leading conservative Protestant theologians, explained the rules of the faith in an easily accessible way. The 12 booklets were published in 3 million pieces each and were sent free of charge to vicars, preachers, heads of Sunday schools, professors and students of theology in the US.

\(^{11}\) Presbyterians next to Quakers, Methodists, Baptists and others are included into a group of dissenters beliefs, which means branch of Protestantism which does not belong to Anglican Church.

\(^{12}\) The *sola Scriptura* rule (“only the Book”) says that the Holy Bible is the first and final Book, solely sure and infallible. To this rule the so called Biblical Quranism is linked which rejects any dogmas and views not justified by the Bible authority.
The project was symbolic because it was recognized as the official beginning of a fundamental movement worldwide.\(^\text{13}\)

In the last chapter of the book the author presents possible reactions of a country to a terrorist threat, citing a Walter Laqueur’s question\(^\text{14}\) he had asked: *whether a democratic society is able to nip terrorist violence without sacrificing values key for its system?* (p. 147). He answers that the victim of terrorists becomes not only democracy itself, which structures had not been changed, but its liberal values. Factors influencing the weakness of democracy in view of terrorist threats are freedom of movement, freedom of association, multitude of targets for a potential terrorist attack limits coming from accepted legal systems protecting human rights, high value of human life and free media. At this point it is worth citing the words of terrorists from 2015: *Your human rights are our weapon, and we love death as you love life.* Western societies agreed to limit their civil freedoms in the name of sense of security. Nevertheless, together with development of powers of state institutions’ responsible for security, the situation has not improved. Since September 11, 2004 the world has not become more secure, on the contrary – it has become more endangered by terrorism.

Townshend claims that the most appropriate reaction on “pure terrorism”, i.e. a method used in a conflict and not one of the war tactics, is to ignore it, because risk of death following terrorist attack is much smaller than in a car accident. The best public answer to terrorism should not be showing fear. Unfortunately, reactions of states are quite often inadequate to the threat. The best example of the global war with terrorism announced by the US in 2001 was its attack together with three of its allies on Iraq on March 20, 2003, which caused in consequence death of thousands of people and creation of a new demon in a form of the Islamic State. Also disproportionate to a threat was the US attack on Afghanistan, which has triggered anti-Western psychosis in Muslim world instead of Al Qaida destruction. The current presence of NATO forces in Afghanistan has not brought stabilization in the country and Talibs still control its vast territory. This is a reason why response to terrorist threats should be proportionate to their scale. Probably the worst reaction to terrorism is imitation of terrorists. Such methods are used for many years by special services of Israel, which try to eliminate the most dangerous terrorists in covert operations and army destroys housing compounds belonging to families of assassins. According to Benjamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, retaliation not only prevents terrorism but also it is able to defeat it. It also happens that it is the state authorities who manipulate the fear caused by real or imaginary terrorist threat, example of which was the American politics between the 9/11 attacks and military incursion into Iraq on 2003. Acting back then *Patriot Act* had a broad public support according to a thesis by Ronald Creslinsten: *The majority of people will sacrifice its freedom in exchange for security if it is scared enough*

---


\(^\text{14}\) American historian and publicist, author of books related *inter alia* to terrorism issue and author of *Ostatnie dni Europy. Epitafium dla Starego Kontynentu,* Wrocław 2008.
Townshend points out differences between antiterrorism and counterterrorism. Antiterrorism is associated with application of defensive measures to recognize terrorist threats and to prevent them, so it regards all preventive undertakings. Counterterrorism embraces the whole sphere of offensive terrorism countering, and hence to engage military forces and security forces to liquidate terrorist organizations and eliminate their individual members. In reality both terms are currently interchangeably and some authors use the term anti/counter/terrorism. Every country threatened by terrorism has its own strategy of combating it. Special forces are inter alia serve this purpose. The European Union strategy is based on preventing (for example deradicalization, cutting off financial means and logistic support), securing (people, property and infrastructure), prosecuting (investigations and law suits) and reaction (neutralizing and minimizing results of terrorist attacks), regarding human rights.

Antiterrorist operations carried out by states should be better calculated and more precise than terrorist actions. Principle rules of fighting with terrorism should be an anticipation strategy, in other words preventive activity to strike at terrorist cells before they carry out an attack, and strategy of proportionate retaliation after terrorist attack, which was not able to prevent, was carried out. To implement effectively the anticipation strategy appropriate measures operational sources are crucial. Both strategies are perfectly implemented by Israeli special services.

The author touched also some sensitive international matters, which did not allow to define the term act of terrorism for a long time. In the end the differences have been overcome but avoiding the term terrorism to omit controversial problem of political motivation. Neutral terminology used in a convention largely failed in its purpose, since it is very hard to establish what an act of terrorism is, without taking into account ideology, ethnic lines or religion of their perpetrators or supporters. Furthermore, state sponsoring of terrorists can be added as well, what is a subject to firm critique of the US, which counted Iraq, Iran and North Korea to a group of “rogue countries” after the 9/11. It was also Sudan, Syria and Libya which were listed as countries supporting financially terrorism. During the Cold War the USSR was accused of sponsoring, supporting and even training of terrorists.

Additional advantage of the book by Charles Townshend are photographs and lists of literature linked to individual key words, separately to each chapter and also annex bibliography of chosen topics related to terrorism. There is a combined index of names, organizations, geographic names and the most important key words in the end. It is worth stressing communicative style and narration of the work which make reading it interesting and comprehensible. This book I would particularly recommend to officers at the beginning of their career in countering terrorism departments. Short introduction into a matters they are going to cope with, will certainly be a valuable input into their knowledge. In other words, it is worth devoting one weekend to reading the book, and there is some time left for one’s own reflection on it.