

PROBLEMS OF SCIENTIFIC DEFINITION OF TERRORISM AND POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Dragan Tančić¹, Nedeljko Debeljak², Velimir Zekić³

¹LLD, Institute for Serbian Culture Pristina, dragan_tancic@yahoo.com

²LLD, International University, Brcko DC, nedeljko.debeljak58@gmail.com.

³LLM, The waters of the Republic of Serpska, velimirzekic@hotmail.com

Abstract: *In contemporary political and security theories, when studying political propaganda and terrorism, most authors start from the principle that these are predominantly political phenomena, i.e. essential factors of politics and the political process, regarding either internal or the foreign policy front. In fact, we are daily bombarded by the concepts of political propaganda and terrorism, in certain contexts and meanings. On the one hand, there is the daily presence of these terms, but, on the other hand, in the existing scientific fund there is no general agreement in defining the political propaganda nor terrorism. Therefore, scientific research on political propaganda and terrorism requires both scientific definition and scientific explanation, formation of various classifications criteria, etc.*

Keywords: *political theory, security, political phenomena, political propaganda, modern terrorism*

INTRODUCTION

In the methodology of the social sciences a term is understood as a complete idea of an object. Scientific definition of concepts is defined as the scientific process and a procedure of scientific research that involves very precise scientific rules. Therefore, when we scientifically examine the political propaganda and terrorism, one must always proceed from these generally known and generally accepted rules of scientific definition, both in logic and in methodology.

In modern political theories, but also in modern theories of security, when studying political propaganda and terrorism, most authors start from the principle that these are predominantly political phenomena, and essential factors of politics and the political process, either on the inside or on the foreign policy front. For these reasons, we must first ask a few essential questions: what is the policy, what are the political phenomena and political processes? Then follow the issues of defining political propaganda and terrorism as a political and, at the same time, security phenomena. Politics, as a phenomenon and reality, is a social and political phenomenon and process –the process of general public interests management

relying on the power in order to have the form, appearance and disappearance of various social and political orders.

PROBLEMS OF DEFINING POLITICS AND POLITICAL PHENOMENA

Politics, as a phenomenon and reality, is a social and political phenomenon and process – the process of general public interests management relying on the power in order to have the form, appearance and disappearance of various social and political orders. Maurice Deverguer believes that the essence of politics and its true nature is that it is always and everywhere ambivalent, the actual performance state that expresses the deepest political reality, a means of ensuring a certain social order, a certain integration of all in the community for the common good. Klaus Von Beyme believes that politics in ancient political theory was understood as “...the science of the good and just life and the continuation of ethics... Politics was regarded as the” royal science “as the highest of all the practical sciences.” [1] Charles Kegli and Eugene Vitkof emphasize Lasvel’s understanding of politics, after which politics is the study of “who gets what, when, how and why”. [10]

For a definitive determination of the term politics one should start from the the basic concept of politics from which the notion of political science is derived (political science). The essential quality performances of special attributes of politics are evident in the factual existence of certain functions, but also in differences and contradictions, i.e. in its disfunction (because the basic function of politics is to achieve agreement). Therefore, its main function is to eliminate, suppress and overcome differences. Both function and disfunction of politics, as a conscious, purposeful and willing activity, are achieved in real terms and are always aimed changing existing conditions, even when they declare themselves as attempts to preserve them. Politics also means action and active participation through which constant confrontations are carried out, in order to articulate and constitute public interest and to reach its implementation, i.e. its disfunction.

In any case, there is no doubt that political propaganda and terrorism are essential factors of politics, political processes and activities, activities essential policy at all of its properties. By using them, with the cooperation of other elements, one can create, alter and destroy certain social and political regimes - systems. Political propaganda and terrorism are themselves certain activities, activities of certain orientation and intensity of specific, targeted, purposeful influence of both the consciousness and behavior of individuals and collectives, both on the domestic and foreign fronts.

DEFINING POLITICAL PROPAGANDA

Bearing in mind the previous statements relating to the function and dysfunction and policy activities and political phenomena, there is no doubt that political propaganda and terrorism important political phenomena, the important factors of the industry policy. Modern social and political practice of modern communication media have us in an indisputable way point to the ubiquity of political propaganda and terrorism. The daily mentions that the concept of political propaganda and terrorism, in certain contexts and meanings. On the one hand, there is the daily presence of these terms, or, on the other hand, the existing scientific fund, there is general agreement in defining the political propaganda nor ter-

rorism. In the first place we will point out certain agreements and disagreements regarding political propaganda and terrorism.

The absence of consensus in defining political propaganda, we shall document with a number of definitions. According to one author (Barlett) propaganda is "...an attempt to influence the thinking and behavior of the community in order to adopt certain individuals thinking and behavior, while the other author (Princeton) believes that the primary objective odašiljaoca propaganda impact on the attitude of the mass of topics propagate, which are the subject of opinion." [4] Toma Đorđević under the propaganda recognizes "...the operation of individuals or groups in order to - through informative content which are interpreted events or developments in the social and spiritual life of people - into the consciousness of individuals or groups we transpose premeditated influences". [5]

Darko Kukić understands political propaganda as a specific activity to be analyzed in relation to the dominant and alternative value matrix systems and in relation to the basic types of propaganda: diffuse and direct. [12] Klaić under the propaganda understands "...planned expansion of the teachings and principles (religious, revolutionary, etc.). The purpose of the propaganda that people fully understand a new view of the world and to accept it as their own for a long time, unlike the agitation means getting as many people, if only for a short time, in order to achieve a particular political objective." [11] the Oxford Advanced Learner's the term propaganda is seen "... a) publicity with the intention of spreading ideas and information that will persuade or convince people, b) ideas or statements to the public for special (political) purposes, but often presented as completely objective." [14]

When defining political propaganda most authors stress that it is based on a few general principles. In this context, we offer a distinctive classification of the principles of political propaganda, according to the perception J. Domenach. He cites the following principles of political propaganda: a) the principles of simplification; b) the principles of reproduction enemy; c) the principles of exaggeration; d) the principles of orchestration; e) the principles of unity; f) the principles of "transfusion" i, g) the principles of counter-propaganda." [4]

In addition to the principles, we refer to certain methods and techniques as well. Thus, the American Institute for Propaganda Analysis (Institute of Propaganda Analysis) in 1938 defined seven propaganda methods, namely: a) the method of appointment, b) the method of 'lofty goals', c) the method of transfer d) reference to the authority, e) method of comparing politicians to ordinary people, f) methods of spoofing, affairs, g) methods of following, everybody does that ("The Band Wagon").

In addition to methods, in the existing scientific fund there are various classification of propaganda techniques. Here we present but a few general techniques (due to limited space): vertical and horizontal techniques of propaganda; technique of repetition of messages; 3) technique of shock effects in the message recipients; technique of promises and threats, or carrot and stick; technique of direct and indirect advertising; techniques of propaganda through action; and 7) technique of "brainwashing", etc.

DEFINING TERRORISM

The lack of consensus we see also within scientific definition of terrorism. Namely, it is rightly pointed out that terrorism is a complex political and social phenomenon, difficult to formulate. [3] Numerous attempts to define terrorism clearly show this fact. For example,

in the military lexicon the term terrorism is understood as organized and systematic use of violence with the intention of causing fear and personal insecurity among citizens to undermine the authority of the state or achieve some political objectives [21]

Radoslav Stojanović defines terrorism as an act of physical violence against another state for the purpose of influencing its behavior or pressurize ideological and political nature. Terrorism is an act of violence is also applied to people, individuals belonging to certain political, racial, or ethnic groups that have important functions in the hands of certain countries. [20] Q. Professor Saldana believes that terrorism "... in the broadest sense mark-severy crime or transgression, political or social, whose execution or advertising causes general fear, and by its nature creates general risk ("general danger"). In the narrowest sense ("sensu stricto") terrorist attacks are criminal acts carried out solely or principally with the aim of creating alarm (subjective element), with the use of agents capable of causing the state of general danger (objective element). [15]

J. Waterski by terrorism means "the methods of criminal activity through which the perpetrator intends to impose terror and its supremacy, whether in a society or a country in order to save, alter or destroy social ties of public policy [22] P. Juillard as terrorism considers an act of violence that breeds fear or intimidation at the population of a country, and that threatens the life, physical integrity, health, physical and mental freedom of possible victims observed collectively. [9] Serg, and Alder are of the view that terrorism is a manifestation of the political and ideological struggle against imperialism and colonialism. [18]

B. Jenkins defines terrorism as surrogate for war, while H. Hyams under terrorism considers the use of terror by the militant politics as a way to bring down some governments in power or force a government to change its policy. [8,7]. In this, Hyams distinguishes two basic forms of terrorism: direct and indirect. W. Shultz under terrorism considers the use of extra-normal political violence and extra-normal is reflected in different ideological affiliations of those who engage in terrorism. [17]

According to S. Combs, terrorism is a dramatization of the most prohibited types of violence committed against innocent victims, and before the eyes of the public in the hope that it will cause a feeling of fear that will be used for political purposes, while W. Laqueur by terrorism means the use of violence by certain groups for political purposes usually directed against the government, and eventually against other ethnic groups, class, religion or political movements. [2] Jessica Stern defines terrorism as an act of violence or threat of violence against persons who are not in a fight, with the intention to carry out revenge or intimidation or to otherwise affect the audience "[19]. Similarly, Jonah Alexander defines terrorism as "a process of deliberate using of psychological intimidation and physical violence by sovereign states and subnational groups to illegally achieve strategic and political objectives" [6].

Finally, AP Schmid noted that the definition of terrorism is manifested by 22 properties. The status of the use of force and violence occurring in 83.5%, 65% political character, emphasis on causing fear and terror 51%, 47% threats, expectations, psychological effects and reactions 41%, discrimination victims and the wider targets of 37.5% targeted, planned, organized systematic operation of 32%, methods, strategies, and tactics of struggle 30.5% ekstranormalnost, violation of accepted rules that are not respected humanitarian reasons 30%, blackmail, coercion, inducement to obedience to 28%, the desire for publicity 21 5%, stubbornness, impersonality, randomness, non-discrimination, 21%, victims, civilians, noncombatants, people with no connection to the fact 17%, 17% intimidating, emphasis on

the innocence of the victims of 15.5%, the perpetrator - a group, movement, organization 14 %, symbolic nature, show the other 13.5%, the unpredictability of 9%, the recurrence of violence, or 7% of the campaign of violence, crime, criminal character of 6%, the request to third parties 4%. [16]

All of the above is but a general conclusion that terrorism represents a planned act of violence undertaken by certain social groups in order to preserve or seize power, which means that under terrorism we mean only the form of physical and psychological violence that within itself includes social and psychological, or political component. [13]

CONCLUSION

Critical analysis of the existing scientific fund also shows the lack of consensus in their definition, generally speaking, and in particular, from the standpoint that these two political phenomena are especially important factors of politics and political processes. Numerous definitions of these phenomena enable us to identify political propaganda and terrorism within their essential provisions, but almost none of them meets all the essential requirements of scientific definition, i.e. none of them explicitly states all the substantive provisions of political propaganda and terrorism as a whole.

In fact, regarding definition of political propaganda and terrorism, it is necessary to determine the interdependence of concepts and realities, i.e. orientation towards complete scientific definition is necessary, which will point to all the substantive provisions of the phenomena as a whole. Therefore, scientific research on political propaganda and terrorism requires both scientific definition and scientific explanation, the formation of various criteria of classification, etc. Defining or finding the important factors in the definitions, which can occur alone or in the context of other phenomena, without indicating their major relationships, roles, functions, quality and quantity, can not provide sufficient and necessary information about the whole phenomenon.

REFERENCES

- [1] Beyme K.V.: *Suvremene političke teorije*, Stvarnost, Zagreb, II izdanje, 1974.
- [2] Bošković M.: *Transnacionalni organizovani kriminalitet*, Policijska akademija, Beograd, 2003.
- [3] Bueno Aris F.: *Aspectos juridicos del terroismo*, *Rivista de Estudios Penitenciarios*, No. 228/231, 1980
- [4] Domenach J. M.: *La propaganda politique/“Que sais-je?”*, PUF, Paris, 1973.
- [5] Đorđević T.: *Političko javno mnjenje*, Radnički univerzitet “Radivoj Ćirpanov”, Novi Sad, 1975.
- [6] Folk R.: *Veliki teroristički rat*, Filip Višnjić, Beograd, 2003.
- [7] Hyams H.: *Terrorist and Terrorism*, St. Martin s press, Inc. New York, 1975.
- [8] Jenkins B.: *International Terrorism – A New Kind of Warfare*, RAND, Santa Monica, 1974.
- [9] Juillard P., *Les enlevement de diplomates*, *Annuaire francais de Droit international*, 1971.
- [10] Kegli V.Č.; Vitkof R.J.: *Svetska politika – trend i transformacija*, Centar za studije

- Jugoistočne Evrope, Fakultet političkih nauka i Diplomatska akademija, Beograd, 2004
- [11] Klaić B.: Rječnik stranih riječi. Nakladni zavod MH, Zagreb, 1987.
 - [12] Kukić D.: Politička propaganda, Naša riječ: Weling, Zenica, 2004
 - [13] Milošević M.: Terorizam kao krivičnopravna kategorija, Bezbednost, br. 4, 1988.
 - [14] Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, OUP, Oxford, 1989.
 - [15] Saldana Q.: Le terrorisme, Rapport presente a la VI me Conference internationale pour l' Unification du Droit penal, Revue international de Droit penal, Paris, 1936.
 - [16] Schmid A. P.: Political Terrorism, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.
 - [17] Shultz R.: Conceptualizing Political Terrorism – A Typology, Journal of International Affairs vol. XXXII, No. 1., 1978
 - [18] Serge D.V.; Alder J.H.: The Ecology of Terrorism, Survival, vol. XV, No. 4, 1973.
 - [19] Stern Dž.: Ekstremni teroristi, Aleksandrija pres, Beograd, 2004.
 - [20] Stojanović R.: Sila i moć u međunarodnim odnosima, Radnička štampa, Beograd, 1982.
 - [21] Vojni leksikon, VIZ, 1981.
 - [22] Waciorski J.C.: La terrorisme politigue, Pedone, Paris, 1939.