

POWER AND TERRORISM

Ina Raluca Tomescu

Associate Professor PhD , “Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu-Jiu

Abstract:

Essentially, terrorism is the most harmful effect of power. In the sense that it legitimates the most brutal force and its most unscrupulous use. In a situation where the only rule is the one dictated by the terrorist, who can be an individual, a group or a state. Presently, terrorism tends to be generalized, permeating gradually all the spheres of existence.

Keyword: *power, terrorism, security, international relations.*

Terrorism is one of the most complex and also more complicated phenomena of the contemporary world. He is closely linked to the phenomena of power namely their darkest areas of extremes and excesses of power. Therefore, terrorism is extremely difficult to define. If we mean by terrorism all political actions resorting to extreme violence when the term is no longer much help. Therefore, many analysts thought necessary to distinguish between acts of some or others, they are classified as terrorist. Insisted, for example, to distinguish between terrorism and guerrilla urban and other analysts have denounced the state terrorism consisting of extreme means to which recourse certain regimes for subjecting whole populations or expel them by means of terror worse than those of the actors "under- etat" [1].

When it comes to terrorism, we almost always antagonistic poles interpretation: if a pole is qualified as a terrorist act, on the other it can be considered as a heroic gesture. In this interpretation, cultural factors or those related to the type of civilization, values shared by a society have a very big role. But they are not always decisive, but rather a certain relation of forces which ultimately decides the character of an act or another.

We can talk above all about the effect of terrorism on a group, community or society. From this point of view, terrorism means in effect elementary panic generated by an attack of extreme violence against which, at least for now, there is no possibility of defense. Secondly, we talk about terrorism as a political act and thus it from the perspective of those who resort to such acts can be considered as a reaction of despair: a group, a community or an organization feels threatened its very existence and only means of self-defense which it also considers an act of terror possible aggressor or oppressor. Here is how it is possible that a terrorist act can be considered legitimate. And, therefore, many analysts following if a way questionable, which splits and wars just and unjust, propose separating acts, however violent they may be considered by those who commit them as the only possible response of survival or defense, acts of terrorism itself [2].

It has been read, after the attacks of 11 March 2004 in Madrid that day "human life had no price too". It is an analysis of amnesia. A look procession of horrors caused by power struggles throughout history, is to lose sight of the root causes that lead to massacres. Terrorism is not really history than the history of power [3], conquest, consolidating and defending power. But ideology has dominated historically and politically buried the true meaning of terror to destroy the term and divert it from its deep significance. And this for several reasons.

The correlation between terror and power is obviously capable of calling into question the foundations centralism and imperialism are the foundations of the state, whatever its form. Therefore, amnesia is often voluntary, because this correlation is opposite the dominant discourse which is to be redirect power to protect itself from terror. This amnesia is required to be of bourgeoise democracy as a bulwark thanks terrorism is magical wand ballot.

On 11 March 2004 Madrid was not subjected to an attack but rather a bombardment. We can easily recognize all the ingredients strategic doctrine of modern terror Massacre, shock, psychological, media war, propaganda and against propaganda. And the more we find, equally, the political consequences arising from Clausewitz's famous phrase, that war is the continuation of politics by other means. For Spain, the withdrawal of its troops from Iraq.

It said the attack on 11 September 2001 in New York that will change the world, that nothing will be like before this attack. Such statement was undoubtedly marked by emotional but largely is worthy of notice since at least the attitude and the important lines, the whole policy of the United States took a different turn, so that American leaders are determined than ever to intervene, including by force, everywhere in the world where terrorist threat or mass destruction is present, even if they encounter serious resistance from some traditional allies. It can even speak of a war against terrorism, which is already proving extremely difficult and probably lasting, because terrorism is generated by complex causes, some even taking the nature of modern societies [4].

In any case, there was very poignant threat of terrorism so highly practiced by transnational networks have a capacity of mass destruction placed at a limitless hostility towards the West. United States is the state most exposed because it remained the only superpower, advocate a strategy primordiality and must always consolidate its website's leadership. [5] At the same time, expanded areas "gray" at the planet where dozens of conflicts smack concern. We live in a world conducive to the development of asymmetrical conflict where groups operating in the network, in a globalized space, using non-conventional means (terrorism, bacteriological weapons) to hit the states and the civilian population [6].

In September 2001, the United States obtained broad support from the international community, but quasi-stalemate to keep this support, they entered the decision to compel by force of arms, Iraq to disarm, suggesting that solidarity obtained should be primed change a multilateral approach in international relations.

It seems hard to believe that the existence of a superpower in the world identified with the US, could be considered at least a favoring condition of resurgent international terrorism. "From the arms industry, from science to technology, from higher education to popular culture, America enjoys an unrivaled ascendancy over the entire globe," said former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger [7].

On behalf of the mission who assumed not only by the supervisor of international peace and security, and promoter of modeling reality in accordance with the values of democracy and

liberalism, the United States pursue their policy help or interference, with impunity or opposition, maintaining that they agreed alliances and eliminating those that do not serve enough American politics.

Gradually, under American influence, the UN's role was diminished or marginalized, the North Atlantic Alliance by adopting a new strategic concept, whose essence lies in the assumption by NATO of the right to intervene militarily in conflicts that happen outside the Alliance without approval United Nations, sometimes in conflict with the provisions and spirit of the Charter.

On this new strategic concept, a document of American foreign policy is expressed as follows: "the UN where possible, without UN when necessary and not possible" [8]. Thus, with UN approval was attacked Afghanistan in 2002 without UN approval was attacked Iraq in 2003.

With the war in Iraq, the US has defied not only international law, pursuant to building a world of peace and not of war, but also the alliance so natural and almost natural with the European Union, ignoring the position of France and Germany, which opposed war. They were tendentiously characterized by Pentagon chief Donald Rumsfeld as "old Europe" [9], which is not keeping pace with new Europe, Eastern Europe, born of the fall of communism.

US looked, momentarily, by virtue of its status as a superpower dictates of the law, be it international, it is that Europe will be the main partner, but not submitted. Such an attitude may explain the temptation of some European countries or to be integrated into the European Union "to continue uniting in an anti-American or anti atlantic perspective" [10].

Another criticism aimed at characterizing the US as the world superpower, a source fueling tensions between nations and peoples is that it ignores or refuses to accept the agreement vital to the entire international community, which most states have become part. Thus, USA they refused to accept the agreement which stipulates the prohibition of nuclear tests, the agreement on disarmament measures in the field of chemical weapons or ratify that were prohibited personnel mines, while denouncing the Kyoto protocol on measures to reduce emissions causing global warming. Moreover, have not ratified the Statute of the International Criminal Court - considered the most important international legal instrument created after the adoption of the UN Charter - which enshrines an international justice for perpetrators of the worst international crimes affecting peace and security, arguing that American soldiers in operations their should not be judged by international justice, but only one American justice.

President George W. Bush pointed sharply in the positions that the establishment of this Court would constitute an attack on US sovereignty, threatening to withdraw US troops from peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, where they will be under the jurisdiction of the new Court [11].

It can be appreciated that in the consciousness of the majority of the international community, dislike of "leader-ship" goes far beyond sympathy [12]. This may be growing antipathy support of collective negative energy that can be made so easy by extremist forces in the service of international terrorism.

It is interesting to emphasize that American antipathy is fueled by the US presence and its faithful ally, Israel, considered a threat in terms of civilization and their national interests, not only of the Muslim Arab world, but even EU citizens. Thus, a survey of the European Commission, conducted in October-November 2002 on a sample of 165 000 citizens of the 15 Member States at the time shows that half of EU citizens consider that in terms of promoting peace, combating poverty and protecting the environment, the US more harm than good by actions [13].

US must still take into account that one without quotas trust and sympathy of the world countries will not meet the challenges of the contemporary world, especially international terrorism declared total war.

"The political elite American should be convinced to be in solidarity with the international processes because, despite their power, the United States could not prevent the commission of the terrorist attacks of September 11" said in an interview with Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs Igor Ivanov [14].

America must understand that promoting American values, higher in fact, is not from positions of power, arrogance, privileged by their imposition, but through a natural process, accepting their voluntary by the international community. September 11, 2001 not only proved that the world needs America, but in equal measure, America needs the world for peace, security and even prosperity.

"The days have passed national security for America forever. From now on national insecurity and the new reality is the only way we can play is to work with the others and mobilizing them" - said the expert in US foreign policy Zbigniew Brzezinski [15].

Today, most of the actors, whether we are talking about the state or non-state, not define their security and defense strategies based on the perception of another state power that threatens the balance of global power or their own survival and security. The actors interacting with other actors cooperate ally depending on the threats they perceive [16]. Thus, most often, these threats are not solely the result of increased power of another state, but are related and non-state actors; In this sense, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international terrorism, organized crime, and failed states that can contribute to both aggravated mentioned are considered threats to national security, regional and international.

The phenomenon of international terrorism, although it can not associate a powerhouse in terms of Hans J. Morgenthau [17] determined the orientation not only state actors but also political-military alliance's North Atlantic to combat it. Moreover, it threatens the greater because, in the worst case scenario (a terrorist attack with weapons of mass destruction, chemical, biological or radiological) could affect the security not only of the nation but a region or even the entire world.

References

- [1] Walter Laqueur, *The age of terrorism*, Boston, Toronto: Little Brown, 1987.
- [2] Alain Joxe, *Violences politiques et injustices au Proche-Orient. Un concept fourr-tout : le terrorisme*, Le Monde diplomatique, 1996.
- [3] Roxana Dobrițoiu, *Aspects regarding the origins of the powers' separation inside the state in a historical-juridical approach*, Annals of the "Constantin Brâncuși" University of Târgu-Jiu, The Series of Legal Sciences, no.1/2014, p. 86
- [4] Virgil Măgureanu, *Putere și terorism*, în *Sociologie Românească*, Vol. I, nr.1-2/2003.
- [5] Popescu Olivia, *Changing leaders in the context of organizational change*, Communication, Context, Interdisciplinarity - 3rd Edition, Edited by: The Alpha Institute for Multicultural Studies Published by: "Petru Maior" University Press, Tîrgu-Mureș, Vol. 3/2014, pag. 743-747.
- [6] Edgar Morin, Anne-Brigitte Kern, *Terre-patrie*. Paris: Le Seuil, 1993.

- [7] Henry Kissinger, *Are nevoie America de o politică externă?*, București, Ed. Incitatus, 2002.
- [8] Claudiu Vlad, *Terorismul internațional: cauze, soluții posibile*, în *Revista română de drept umanitar*, nr. 3/2001.
- [9] Sorin Purec, *The Origins of the European Nationalism*, *Annals of the „Constantin Brâncuși” University of Târgu Jiu, Letter and Social Science Series*, supliment 1/2015, pp. 229-235.
- [10] Alexandru Antonescu, *Dilema americană*, în revista *Lumea*, nr. 5/2004.
- [11] Dumitru Virgil Diaconu, *Terorismul – Repere juridice și istorice*, București, Ed. All Beck, 2004.
- [12] Popescu Olivia, *Decision making process during organizational change in Romanian companies*, *Globalization and intercultural dialogue: multidisciplinary perspectives*, Arhipelag XXI, Tîrgu-Mureș, vol. I/2014, pag. 338-343.
- [13] Cotidianul Adevărul din 6 martie 2003.
- [14] Cotidianul Adevărul din 9 iulie 2002.
- [15] Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Adevărata opțiune. America și restul lumii*, cit. de Al. Antonescu, *Dilema Americană*, în revista *Lumea*, nr. 5/2004.
- [16] Teodor Frunzeti, *Echilibrul amenințării și echilibrul de putere*, în vol. *Echilibrul de putere și mediul de securitate*, Ed. Universității Naționale de Apărare „Carol I” București, 2011.
- [17] Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politica între națiuni. Lupta pentru putere și lupta pentru pace*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2007.