

## SOME MORAL ASPECTS OF STATE-TERRORISM

**Debika Mitra**

Junior Research Fellow (Phd Scholar), Dept.of Philosophy  
The University of Burdwan, Burdwan, West Bengal, India  
Email: mitradebika.12@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *There is a lack of universal definition of the term 'terrorism', by nature, it is so complicated and thus it difficult to define. The issue of terrorism causes disruption in security, both national and international level in recent times. Whereas, it seems much harder to apprehend the definitional views on terrorism and apparently it's difficult to understand state-terrorism as well. Social sciences focus on non-state terrorism and explain that the distinctions between state and non-state terrorism are more prominent and informative than its similarities. Some scholars even argue that political violence by states should not be classified as 'terrorism'. As History reflects that among states and terrorist groups have had a long deadly relationship. Simultaneously, it is said that state-sponsored terrorism is as old as the history of military conflict. This present paper try to focus on state terrorism with its relevant aspects followed by definition of terrorism, concept of state-terrorism, moral assessment of state terrorism than by non-state actors and lastly a conclusion is drawn in this way.*

**Key Words:** *Terrorism, State-terrorism, Moral aspect, Wrongness*

### 1. INTRODUCTION:

In recent times, terrorism has become an inalienable part of day-to-day life, which affects the security level of both developed and developing countries. During the period of Cold War, terrorism became a general aspect of foreign policy. Regarding definitional problem of the term 'terrorism', academicians and scholars are yet to reach on a unanimous, comprehensive and universally accepted definition of terrorism. The lack of holistic definition of 'terrorism' is mainly caused by its complicated nature. One of most debated concepts like terrorism, without have a proper definition which raises many problems than solution and preventive steps, to root out of it.

### 2. OBJECTIVES:

To discuss the definitions of 'terrorism' and it's various types; to emphasize the concept of state-terrorism and try to assess moral aspects of state-terrorism whether it is morally wrong or not.

### 3. ABOUT TERRORISM:

To understand terrorism and how to define it are seriously very difficult tasks. It is said that, 'In essence, terrorism is the use or threat of violence against small numbers to put large numbers in fear; or, as well put by an ancient Chinese philosopher: 'kill one, frighten 10000'<sup>1</sup>. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* defines terrorism as "the systematic use of terror (such as bombings, killings and kidnappings) as a means of forcing some political objective. When used by a government, it may signal efforts to stifle dissent; used by insurrectionists or guerillas, it may be part of an overall effort desired political change."<sup>2</sup> These definitions mainly focused on violence which are politically induced, and remains with terrorism; further the element we can add here is the deliberate attacks on non-combatants. Although 'terrorism' is not synonymous to mere political violence, as we all know every actions of violence cannot be regarded as the actions of terrorism. In Bruce Hoffman's word, terrorism is 'the deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change.'<sup>3</sup> Whereas Igor Primoratz defines terrorism as "the deliberate use of violence, and threat of its use, against innocent people, with the aim of intimidating some other people into a course of action they otherwise would not take."<sup>4</sup> Here we can find that Hoffman's definition is lack of targeted non-combatants and in Primoratz's definition we can add that aim of political purpose of terrorism. These above definitions permit us to postulate some main definitional components of terrorism. Those are: the main

<sup>1</sup> Clutterbuck, E. b. (1986). *The Future Of Political Violence: Destabilization, Disorder and Terrorism* .Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 2XS and London : The Macmillan Press Ltd, p-20

<sup>2</sup> *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. (1974). USA: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc, p-904

<sup>3</sup> Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press

<sup>5</sup>Primoratz, E. b. (2004). *Terrorism:The Philosophical Issues*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

purpose of terrorism is terror and political; mainly political violence, its victims are instrumental or immediate, as well as, its primary targets are non-combatants and the consequence of death to damage to or destruction of property, to generate terror and violence.

In this regard, Paul Wilkinson argues that terrorism has five main characteristics<sup>5</sup>: terrorism is essentially intentional and aims to create a atmosphere of extreme fear or terror; It target at a wider audience than the immediate victims of the violence; It primarily involves attacks on civilians randomly; The acts of violence committed are seen by the society in which they occur as extra-normal, in the literal sense that they breach the social norms, thus causing a sense of outrage; and terrorism is used to try to influence communities, social groups' political behavior in different manner.

#### 4. TYPOLOGY OF TERRORISM:

In the contemporary world, it is necessary to consider how terrorism is manifested. The study of historical background on terrorism move towards to analyses of different types of terrorism.

Before entering into the discussion of what state-terrorism is, we would make clear about the conception related to types of terrorism, thus there are four major categories of terrorism, like :

**Nationalist**- When terror is used to acquire the national or political independence or separation or to eradicate colonial powers, to cease of economic exploitation is called as nationalist terrorism. It may be called in another name that is 'Separatist'. Nationalist Terrorists' targets are usually governmental rather than commercial; though they may use forms of kidnapping or intimidation to force money from local or emigrant commercial firms. Motivation of this kind of terror often come out from ideological or religious connotations but essentially, it terrorize to seize power over territory which they claim as theirs own, whether they are in a majority or in a minority.<sup>6</sup> The Palestinians, ETA in Spain, IRA in Northern Ireland etc are regarded as nationalist terrorist groups.

**Religious** – Paradoxically, despite the moral principles of their religions, Religious Terrorist are generally the cruelest and most fanatical of all terrorists towards both themselves and their victims<sup>7</sup>. Terror is used to achieve certain ideologies like, to fulfill their own missions, goals of civilization and inspired by their own interpretation of religious texts and believes, it is named as religious terrorism. Various religious groups regulate this type of terrorist groups, on the basis of its ethnicity or religion. Political motivation is one of the forces behind religious terrorism. For example, Al Queada, Jihad, Hamas etc are familiar name of religious terrorist groups.

**State-terrorism**- State terrorism ('kill one; frighten 10 000') has historically been a weapon of the tyrant.<sup>8</sup> To suppress disagreement among its own population, or supporting such violence in another country by a government, terror is used, is called as state terrorism. It is probably reached its peak in the Soviet Union under Stalin, Hitler terrorized the Jews, Gaddafi publicly hangs dissidents etc are the example of state terror. We can find state terrorism in Latin America, the Caribbean and parts of Africa takes more varied forms. To encourage the foreign governments, they use of diplomatic pressure, economic threats, or even military force to terrorize civilians.

**International terrorism**- When terror is used to oppress a foreign government or to intimidate their own nationals or refugees working abroad, and their activities are crossed the border more than one country and have its worldwide impact is called as international terrorism or cross-border terrorism. According to the U.S. Department of State, "the term international terrorism means terrorism involving citizens or the territory of more than one country."<sup>9</sup>

#### 5. ABOUT STATE-TERRORISM:

The terms 'terrorism' and 'state terrorism' are widely used but little analyzed before. Both these terms are value-laden and ideologically meaningful. As Brian Jenkins, a leading terrorism expert with the RAND Corporation, noted over two decades ago that, "Terrorism is what the bad guys do."<sup>10</sup>The struggle of arriving on a comprehensive definition of terrorism still exists with describing and identifying such actions whether it called as terrorism; same problem we can find on defining state-terrorism as well. We can emphasis on a comment of Alan Ryan's that "'a terrorist state' is logically impossible by virtue of the definition of 'state', and brings up Nazi Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union as obvious counterexamples."<sup>11</sup> Today, the most extended and commonly accepted form of state aggression is State terrorism. Terroristic acts, one hand can be state-generated; on the other hand it can be created by

<sup>5</sup> Wilkinson, P. (2001). *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response (II Ed)*. London and USA: Routledge

<sup>6</sup> Clutterbuck, E. b. (1986). *The Future of Political Violence: Destabilization, Disorder and Terrorism* . Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 2XS and London : THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD,p-21

<sup>7</sup> Ibid ,p-21

<sup>8</sup> Clutterbuck, E. b. (1986). *The Future of Political Violence: Destabilization, Disorder and Terrorism* . Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 2XS and London : THE MACMILLAN PRESS LTD ,p-23

<sup>9</sup> P.Purpura, P. (2007). *Terrorism and Homeland Security: An Introduction with Applications*. United States: Butterworth-Heinemann Publications,p-24

<sup>10</sup> BYMAN, D. (2005). *Deadly Connections States that Sponsor Terrorism*. UK: Cambridge University Press,p-7

<sup>11</sup> Primoratz, E. b. (2004). *Terrorism:The Philosophical Issues*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan,p-115

small, informal newly formed group. Distinction from state violence to that of state-terrorism is, states have normally used violence against their own or external populations as a way of achieving their political objectives and constitutes state terrorism, because 'it is used to instill fear in a wider audience than the direct victim of the violence.'<sup>12</sup>

It is said that, state terrorism taken into consideration mainly because many scholars paid concentration on terrorism by non- state actors rather than state actors. "Some of them do not even agree to that the terrorism by states should be equated with terrorism by non- state actors."<sup>13</sup> It can be apprehend as "An act to be labeled as 'state terrorism', its constitutive elements must be consistent with those of non- state terrorism."<sup>14</sup> Following Walter Laqueur, he has argued that, 'There are basic differences in motives, function and effect between oppression by the state (or society or religion) and political terrorism. To equate them, to obliterate them is to spread confusion.'<sup>15</sup> He also claims that those who argue for the inclusion of state terrorism in studies of terrorism ignore the fact that: 'the very existence of a state is based on its monopoly of power. If it were different, state would not have the right, nor be in a position, to maintain that minimum of order on which all civilized life rests.'<sup>16</sup>

Bruce Hoffman has similar position and argues that there is failure of demarcation between state and non-state violence, and simultaneously equate with the non-combatants who are killed by states and non- state actors would disregard the fact that, even while national armed forces are more responsible for causing more death and destruction than terrorists wanted to create, though there is a fundamental qualitative difference between the two types of violence.<sup>17</sup> He also argues that the basis of this distinction is the historical emergence of rules and accepted norms of behaviour that rule out the usage of certain types of weapons and forbid various tactics and outlaw attacks on specific categories of targets. He adds that 'terrorists' had by contrast 'violated all these rules'<sup>18</sup>.

Following Walter, state terrorism involves the following four key elements<sup>19</sup>: '(a) there must be a presence of deliberate act of violence against individuals; (b) on behalf of state or in conjunction with the state, including paramilitaries and private security agents the actions must be perpetrated by actors; (c) the act or threat of violence is deliberate to stimulate extreme fear in some targeted audience identified with that victim; and (d) the targeted audience is forced to think about to change their behaviour in some way.'

The main causes behind state-terrorism can be found are: Subversion, sabotage, destabilization and fragmentation to achieve its foreign policy or political objectives. Logistics, training weapons, camps and financial assistance have been provided to terrorist groups in the state sponsored terrorism to create terrorist activities.

With the method of terrorism, most of the time non-state actors influence states. Thus State-terrorism is used as method in international relations. It involves both (a) **state sponsorship** and (b) **direct involvement**. When a Government sponsoring terrorist groups, either by providing them with the financial support, or through the training and supply of arms, to supports acts of terrorism it is known as State sponsored terrorism. When states directly make use of terrorism is named as state terrorism.

Distinctiveness of state terrorism is its use of political assassination, of torture and other cruelties against opponents. Such acts are indisputably contrary to the rules of war, as enshrined in the Geneva and Hague Conventions.<sup>20</sup>

There are **four levels of state involvement** can be found: '

- 1) State direction – when terrorists are actively controlled or directed by state and uses terrorism as an substitute to conventional military methods in order to avoid responsibility and pay no attention to the law of armed conflict, it is regarded as state-direction terrorism, e.g., Libya directing the terrorists who bombed the Berlin discotheque (1986);
- 2) State support —when terrorists are does not controlled by a state, although it encourages their activities and supplies active support such as money, equipment training and transport then it is regarded as state-supported terrorism, e.g., Iran giving substantial support to Hezbollah that has become its main tool for carrying out terrorist strategies;
- 3) State toleration — when terrorists are does not actively support or direct by a state, although it makes no effort either to arrest or suppress them, it is regarded as state-tolerated terrorism. e.g., the Taliban regime allowing terrorists in 1994—2001 to use Afghanistan as a training ground and base of operations, and refusing to co-operate in the capture of Osama bin Laden and his associates;

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264715825>

<sup>13</sup> Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid,p-13

<sup>15</sup> Laqueur, W. (1986). Reflections on Terrorism. *Foreign Affairs*, Vol 65 ,pp 86-100

<sup>16</sup> Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge.

<sup>17</sup> Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge.

<sup>18</sup> Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

<sup>19</sup> Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge,p-15.

<sup>20</sup> Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge,p-128

4) State inaction — a state is simply unable to deal effectively with terrorist owing political factors or inherent weakness, e.g., the Lebanon lacking control over a large portion of its southern territory where terrorists operated against Israel.<sup>21</sup>

There are many forms of state-terrorism to achieve policy and order maintaining political opposition and against their own populations, main divisions are: **internal state-terrorism** and **external state-terrorism or across state boundaries**. Internal state-terrorism occurs when a nation's government victimizes its own people. External state-terrorism refers to a nation's efforts in exporting or supporting terrorism against another nation.

## 6. IS STATE-TERRORISM MORALLY WRONG?:

In terms of monopoly, many thinkers define the state on the use of violence and thus terrorism considered as legitimate. Whereas state use terrorism to terrorize its civilians to uphold their laws. State terrorism can be said to be morally worse than by non-state agencies at least four reasons, according to political theorist Primoratz.<sup>22</sup> Following him, let us focus on the moral assessment of state-terrorism. First of all, we know that the discussion of terrorism includes the concept of state terrorism. In this regard, W.Laqueur remarks, "acts of terror carried out by police, states and tyrannical governments, in general, have been responsible for a thousand times more victims and more misery than all actions of individual terrorism taken together." He could have acknowledged that of democracies employed terrorism, not including, in war, although they would not have affected striking asymmetrically very much. He said that asymmetrical fact follows from the nature of the state and the amount and variety of resources that make a small state has at its adjustment. If non-state terrorists and insurgent manage to develop their equipments, improve their organizations, plans, and method of actions, they can step in to the killing, maiming, and destruction. In this context, Primortaz cited the example of 9/11 attack in US, it had been expected that it had emerge from non-state terrorism. He suspected that "media highlighted the attack as "the worst case of terrorism ever" and there is tendency of media to equate terrorism with non-state terrorism."<sup>23</sup>

Second, secrecy, deception and hypocrisy are compound of state terrorism, in which it is bound to be. When terrorism is either perpetrated by its own agencies or by proxy – "a state will be acting clandestinely, disclaiming any involvement, and declaring its adherence to values and principles that rule it out."<sup>24</sup> Or, if it is impractical, even counterproductive to deny involvement, it will present its actions at the level best, to at least to some audience as legitimate acts of war, or acts done in defense of state security. On the other hand, those who involve in non-state terrorism, there is no need to be secretive, deceptive (exception at the operational level), and not to be hypocrisy. Some adhere to amoral view; others follow consequentialism which justifies terrorism under circumstances in this regard.

Third, practically the various international human rights, declarations or conventions and agreements which are arrange the laws and customs of war forbid those actions related with terrorism. The latter provide for immunity of civilians in armed conflict and thus combatant prohibits terrorism. Most of remaining types of terrorism are perpetrated both at wartime and in time of peace and declarations of human right cover them all. In contemporary days, those who are engage in non-state terrorism are not endorser to these declarations and conventions, although all states do so, exception is there. Thus, when a state is involved in terrorism, it acts violate of its own serious international commitments. This particular charge cannot be applied against to those who are resorting to non-state terrorism.

Fourth, on the basis of the argument of no alternative, it is said that, non-state terrorism is often justified, or at least that its wrongness is to be carried off. As an example when a people is bound to foreign rule with oppression, humiliation, and exploitation, in an utterly unyielding and extends power, then a liberation movement may be claimed and effective method of struggle is terrorism. To stop terrorism in such circumstances would be equivalent to cease entirely the prospect of liberation.

Now moving towards Paul Gilbert's view on the moral aspect of state-terrorism, he regarded state terrorism as criminal on the basis of its characteristic. Here questions arise: what makes terrorism criminal is that it is, in its context, in breach of the ordinary domestic civil laws.<sup>25</sup> Why is state terrorism wrong? Two reasons can explain us that state terrorism is morally unfavorable. First and foremost, in general point of view, the criminality of terrorism does not prove as terrorism is morally wrong. Here the pre-assumption is that, killings in time of war may in certain circumstances be morally permissible then it is difficult to see how terrorist acts devoted to similar circumstances may

<sup>21</sup> Värk, R. (2011). TERRORISM, STATE RESPONSIBILITY AND THE USE OF ARMED FORCE. *ENDC Proceedings, Volume 14*, 82 & 83.

<sup>22</sup> Primoratz, E. b. (2004). *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, p-117

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, p-118

<sup>24</sup> Ibid, p-118

<sup>25</sup> Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge, p-132

not be. If the state consider terrorist as criminal then the moral elements of terrorist acts could depend simply on the response of state to them either by military or by legal means.

Although it is hard to see how these acts were morally permissible or not could depend simply and apparently on that, of their agents knowing the responsibility of the state might be. "It is admitted that a moral obligation to obey the law might be adduced as what makes otherwise morally permissible acts impermissible."<sup>26</sup> The moral wrongness we often attribute to terrorism is not a violation of this obligation. Rather it involves acts that are in themselves morally impermissible, save in the exceptional circumstances of war.

About state terrorism, from Gilbert's point of view, we cannot say that the refusal of state's to treat these acts as activity of war as criminal act cannot resolve whether they are rightly as regarded as moral or immoral. He remarked that 'If an act of state terrorism were morally permissible as an act of war then the state should acknowledge it as war. If it does not, it can scarcely secure the justification that acts of war can have.'<sup>27</sup> Secondly, we have already told that the refusal of a state to acknowledge its own activities as war does not need it to treat these activities as criminal, even if they regard as such by the enforcement of laws somewhere else. This is the another reason for rejection of the thought that state terrorism is morally wrong as criminal, that state terrorism may not even take into consideration as criminal. The state may (mainly fascist states) pass law to legitimize their violent acts of oppression against opponents, to allow execution, torture or detention without trial. When the state, remain as terrorist and count as terrorist, it can legalize its own terrorist acts because not to take place as part of an openly acknowledged war and although to serve state policy, violates of rules we, to be expressed in law. When the state involves in legalized terrorism, it protect citizens during peace times, which can be an exception to laws. Therefore, legalized terrorist acts constitute a serious violation of human rights. In the meantime we should take into account an outcome of it, that those who involve in legalised state terrorism cannot being protected from individual punishment on the grounds that ,their acts are 'acts of state'. If their acts were opposed the law then they will be so no more although they are supported by the state.

In regard to the criminality of state terrorism, the vital point is that, in a wider sense, acts of state terrorism are acts of state by any means. Usually, the private act of an individual is regarded as a criminal act of an agent of the state. As Henry Sidgwick puts it 'it seems most simple and logical to lay down that an official acting illegally loses all advantage of his official character, so far as this action is concerned', although there are exceptional cases. Then paradoxically it can be said that those who hold state office and, or for other reasons, set out benefit from the preservation or extension of the state, they do such the private acts of state terrorism. It as an instance of terrorism due to this is additionally wrong with it. Although it is the abuse of state power for private and political, ends so it is inherently tyrannical. Mill maintains that the 'act of a private citizen in striking down a criminal, who by raising himself above the law, has placed himself beyond the reach of legal punishment or control . . . is not of the nature of assassination but of civil war.' State terrorism is, of its essence, something to be opposed.<sup>28</sup>

We can find that, State terrorism always violates international law because of the methods used to instill terror.<sup>29</sup> According to International Law, State terrorism has not been classified as an illegal act. However it engages acts which violate international law to terrorize others through those illegal acts. In this regard, 'state terrorism can be defined with reference to the illegality of the acts it involves, even though we cannot argue that state terrorism itself is illegal.'<sup>30</sup>

Coady's view, 'every instance of terrorism is prima facie morally wrong, but terrorism with state involvement even more so'<sup>31</sup>. All forms and types of terrorism whatever it is, without any doubt, are morally wrong. Although the morality of wrongness can be vary in degrees depends on situations and individuals. State terrorism is immoral than that of non-state of terrorism because of limit less desperate killing and mass destruction. In this regard, Walter Laqueur said, generally police, states and tyrannical governments carry out terrorism, they are responsible for thousand times more victims and much more suffering than all of individual terrorism as a whole.

Whereas from consequentialist point of view, if violence or terrorism can be condemned, it can be condemn unjustified state's behaviour to its opponent. On the other hand, if violence or terrorism by the state can be justified, its success may be as unpredictable as that of the violence or terrorism of the state's opponents. According to V.Held, 'When the security forces of an unjust regime kill or violate to frighten future opposition or shoot randomly into

<sup>26</sup> Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge,p-132

<sup>27</sup> Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge,p-132

<sup>28</sup> Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge,p-134

<sup>29</sup> Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge,p-12

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> C.A.J.Coady. (1985). The Morality Of Terrorism. *Philosophy* 60 , 47-70.

groups of protestors, they involve in terrorist acts.<sup>32</sup> Even quite in a legitimate legal order on ground of violation the human rights of some; the violence or terrorism used by their authority to support against those whom thus mistreat is not more justified than that of their opponents.<sup>33</sup> State support terrorism not only is morally wrong but also it makes more obstructions to counter it. Not surprisingly, state-supported groups are widely depicted as one of the greatest problems for counterterrorism.<sup>34</sup>

## 7. CONCLUDING REMARKS:

The violence and repression by state have long been considered in associated disciplines like, law, history, and political science and among others, philosophy is not an exception. Research on state terrorism applies the concepts, theories, methods, and approaches deliberately of the emergence of terrorism studies are still relatively exceptional. State-terrorism is a multifaceted problem that cannot easily be solved. A legitimate state can engage in terrorism, against its own population as well as against other states to secure its social regime. With the method of terror, weak states often achieve its objectives which they not even think to acquire otherwise. Simultaneously stronger states have the tendency to rule through terror, the weapon of mass destruction. State-terrorism against its own civilians is morally worse than that of terrorism whose target only people beyond its own country's border line. One of the greatest challenges to the international community is to prevent the rise of state sponsored terrorism. In the same way, states must be demoralized to follow the paths which found strategic advantage by supporting terrorism. As passive support motivate terrorist acts and this kind of support difficult to solve in the domain of international relation. Thus, we must remain aware of the inherent and often serious problems and challenges surrounding the usage of the ontological term 'terrorism' as well as 'state-terrorism'. 'Terrorism', either state or non- state, is not the point, but where the particular phenomenon in which the terroristic qualities are involved we must conscious about it. Most often, the term is set out as an offensive label against one's enemies. We must remain cautious to those circumstances in which there is possibility to more productive label and concepts of the term 'terrorism'. And perhaps most importantly, we must keep away from polemics and politically biased analyses, especially where all state violence as essentially terroristic.

Above paper shown that the moral wrongness to exclude state terrorism, as a category of state violence which is based on applications of the various definitions of terrorism. State terrorism involves a deliberate threat or act of violence against a victim by state representatives, intended to tempt fear in some targeted audience, intention to changing existing social order in some way. State-terrorism, whatever types and forms, it has are morally wrong than non-state terrorism. The conclusion can be drawn in this way that either terrorism or its other forms, state-terrorism, state-sponsor terrorism is morally wrong, it can be ended with a quote of Michael Walzer that "every act of terrorism is a wrongful act"<sup>35</sup>.

## REFERENCES:

1. Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting, (Ed)(2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge
2. Laqueur, W. (1999). *The New Terrorism*. NewYork: Oxford University Press.
3. Gilbert, P. (1994). *Terrorism, security and nationality*. London and Newyork: Routhledge.
4. Ahuja, R. (1997). *Social Problems In India (second edition)*. Rawat Publications.
5. Primoratz, E. b. (2004). *Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
6. Edited by Richard Jackson, Eamon Murphy and Scott Poynting. (2010). *Contemporary State Terrorism: Theory and practice*. London and Newyork: Routledge.
7. P.Purpura, P. (2007). *Terrorism and Homeland Security: An Introduction with Applications*. United States: Butterworth-Heinemann Publications
8. Clutterbuck, E. b. (1986). *The Future of Political Violence: Destabilization, Disorder and Terrorism* . Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire RG21 2XS and London : The Macmillan Press Ltd,p-20
9. Wilkinson, P. (2001). *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response (II Ed)*. London and USA: Routledge
10. C.A.J.Coady. (1985). The Morality Of Terrorism. *Philosophy* 60
11. James M. Lutz & Brenda J. Lutz. (2008). *Global Terrorism (Second Edition)*. NewYork: Routhledge.
12. *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*. (1974). USA: Encyclopedia Britannica Inc,p-904

<sup>32</sup> Held, V. (2008). *How Terrorism is Wrong*. USA: Oxford University Press,P-81

<sup>33</sup> Ibid,81

<sup>34</sup> BYMAN, D. (2005). *Deadly Connections States that Sponsor Terrorism*. UK: Cambridge University Press,p-53

<sup>35</sup> Walzer, M. *Terrorism: A Critique of Excuse*,p-238.

13. Held, V. (2008). *How Terrorism is Wrong*. USA: Oxford University Press
14. Walzer, M. *Terrorism: A Critique of Excuse*
15. James M. Lutz & Brenda J. Lutz. (2008). *Global Terrorism (Second Edition)*. New York: Routledge.
16. Värk, R. (2011). *Terrorism, state responsibility and The Use of Armed Force*. *ENDC Proceedings, Volume 14*, 82 & 83.
17. Nicholas Fotion, Boris Kashnikov and Joanne K. Leake. (2008). *Terrorism: The New World Disorder*. London and New York: Continuum
18. BYMAN, D. (2005). *Deadly Connections States that Sponsor Terrorism*. UK: Cambridge University Press
19. Hoffman, B. (2006). *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press.