



## **THE ROLE AND CHALLENGES OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM**

**Dr. Kabir Mato\* & Ndigwe-Anazodo Princess Vivian Ngozika\*\***

Department of Political Science and International Relations,  
University of Abuja, Abuja-Nigeria

### **Abstract:**

*The paper examines the role which the United Nations organization plays in its bid to curbing global terrorism and the problems or challenges that are hinged in the whole process. The paper adopts the secondary instrument of data collection and findings show that, the United Nations as a global political organization has been contributing its own quota in the fight against terror. The paper concludes that some member states especially the United States is not doing enough to deal with the issue as they continue to undermine the Palestinian cause, which continues to pave a way for more organizations to fighting Israel and its citizens. The paper recommends that the UN should restructure both its reporting on terrorism and on human rights to examine the overall patterns of violence involved. It can look beyond the immediate actors involved to provide much better estimates of the civilian casualties, the broader causes of such violence, and their economic and social costs among other things.*

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Challenges, Problem, Role, United Nations & Fight

### **Introduction:**

International efforts to eliminate terrorism started years before the United Nations was established. Terrorism has been of great concern to the international community as early as 1937, when the League of Nations prepared a draft convention for the prevention and punishment of terrorism. The draft convention viewed terrorism as "All criminal acts directed against a State and intended or calculated to create a state of terror in the minds of particular persons or a group of persons or the general public." Although this convention never came into existence and the definition ignores acts against civilians, rather than against the State per se, it did serve as a point of reference for later discussion of terrorism when the United Nations and regional intergovernmental organizations dealt with the issue from a legal and political perspective (Hoffman, 1998). Countering this scourge is in the interest of all nations and the issue has been on the agenda of the United Nations for decades. For better understanding of the topic under study, there is a need for conceptual clarification.

### **Material, Method and Conceptual Clarification:**

The material used in this research work is derived from library research, which is exclusively the adoption of books, journals, newspapers and reports among others to establish facts about an existing reality. The methodology used is the secondary method of data collection.

Albeit many interpretations have been proposed, there is no consensus definition of the term "terrorism. This in part derives from the fact that the term is politically and emotionally charged. Cobban (1984) has identified different interpretations of the concepts as can be seen below:

The concept of terrorism signifies "Government intimidation during the Reign of Terror in 1795 France." The general sense of "systematic use of terror as a policy" was first recorded in English in 1798

In 1988, a more academic interpretation of the concept was provided which states that: "Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic,

criminal or political reasons, whereby - in contrast to assassination - the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators (**Cobban, 1984:147**).

In the US and European perception, terrorism is seen as a premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents. For the Europeans, terrorism is an act (s) which may seriously damage a country or an international organization and committed with the aim of seriously intimidating a population (Cobban, 1984).

#### **Classification of Terrorism:**

There are numerous types of terrorism but the process has been classified as follows:

**State Terrorism:** Some acts of political violence are clearly acts of terrorism. Most people would agree that politically motivated planting of bombs in market places, massacres of “enemy” civilians, and the routine use of torture by governments are terrorist acts (Martin, 2010). Terrorism is often carried out by non-governmental groups and individuals, but officials of some governmental regimes have been discovered to be involved in the inhuman acts, both in its direct activities, and in sponsorship (Emesowum, 2008). State terrorism also refers to as “terrorism from above” is committed by governments and quasi-governmental agencies and personnel against perceived enemies. State terrorisms can be directed externally against adversaries in the international domain or internally against domestic enemies (Martin, 2008).

**Dissident Terrorism:** Dissident Terrorism or “terrorism from below” is committed by non-state movements and groups against governments, ethno-national groups, religious groups and other perceived enemies. Example – **Boko Haram** (Hoffman, 1998).

**Religious (Extremism) Terrorism:** Religious extremism is a central attribute of the New Terrorism. It has become a binding ideology for many extremists, in part because it provides an uncomplicated sense of purpose and a clear world-view. Terrorism in the name of religion has become the predominant model for political violence in the modern world (**Chailand, 2007:68**).

#### **Emergence of Modern Terrorism and the Role of United Nations in Fighting Terrorism:**

In the 19th century, powerful, stable, and affordable explosives were developed, global integration reached unprecedented levels and often radical political movements became widely influential. The use of dynamite, in particular, inspired anarchists and was central to their strategic thinking. (**Chailand, 2007:68**). Terrorism is not a simple challenge, and the classic definitions of terrorism sharply understate the true range of problems the UN faces. The United Nations has long reacted to the threats included in the narrower definition of terrorism, and it is only natural that the UN took new action after the events of September 11, 2001. The Security Council adopted three important resolutions, **1368, 1373 and 1377** after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon (Chailand, 2007).

These resolutions affirmed the right of self-defense, found terrorism to be a threat to international peace and security, and stressed the accountability of the supporter as well as the perpetrator of terrorist acts. They obliged member states to limit the ability of terrorists and terrorist organizations to operate internationally by freezing assets of terrorist-affiliated persons and organizations and denying them safe

haven, among other things. They also set forth a Ministerial Declaration on International Terrorism (Chailand, 2007:68).

#### **The United Nations' (UN) Response to "9/11" Attacks:**

Security Council Resolution 1373 is a good example of such UN action. It requires all states to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including freezing funds and other financial assets. The resolution also obliges all states to improve border security, clamp down on the recruitment of terrorists, intensify information sharing and law enforcement cooperation in the international campaign against terrorism, and deny terrorists and their supporters any assistance or safe haven (Hoffman, 1998).

The Security Council has established a Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) to oversee implementation of Security Council Resolution 1373, and much more is involved than word and good intentions. Member states sent these reports to the CTC in December 2001 stating the steps they are taking to fight terrorism. These reports included progress in seven critical areas: legislation, financial asset controls, customs, immigration, extradition, law enforcement and arms traffic (Hoffman, 1998).

The General Assembly adopted two antiterrorism resolutions that condemned the "heinous acts of terrorism" in Washington, Pennsylvania, and New York. The General Assembly continued its work on the negotiation of international terrorism conventions. Former Secretary General Kofi Annan repeatedly condemned terrorism acts, as in a speech he delivered on 12 September: "All nations of the world must be united in their solidarity with the victims of terrorism, and in their determination to take action, both against the terrorists themselves and against all those who give them any kind of shelter, assistance or encouragement"(Hoffman, 1998).

The various agencies of the UN also took new actions. Agencies like the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and the International Maritime Organization (IMO) adopted resolutions committing members to take measures to limit terrorists' ability to act. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which is affiliated with the UN, adopted a resolution addressing measures to protect against acts of nuclear terrorism. It is developing a program to coordinate assistance to member states in an effort to improve security of nuclear facilities and of nuclear and radioactive materials (Zadka, 2003:42).

All of these actions, however, follow up on long-standing UN efforts to fight terrorism. The three resolutions passed after "9/11" augmented nine other Security Council and multilateral resolutions. The first of these multilateral resolutions dates back to the Tokyo convention of 1963, which dealt with the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft that was signed in December 1970. These international efforts to deal with the threat of hijacking began nearly four decades before the attack on the World Trade Center. Other measures have included a convention to protect diplomats from terrorism signed in 1973, one on taking hostages signed in 1979, and one to suppress terrorist bombings signed in 1997. The Security Council passed resolutions 1267 and 1333 in 1999 and 2000, (respectively) which imposed targeted or "smart" sanctions against the Taliban in Afghanistan. It acted years before the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon (Zadka, 2003:42).

#### **The UN and Broader Challenges of Terrorism:**

The UN's most important role may well lie in the role it can play in dealing with the broader definition of terrorism, and the need to protect civilians against all acts of extremist violence and asymmetric warfare, including the use of weapons of mass destruction. The UN has long played such a role through its human rights and arms control activities and through a wide range of multilateral conventions such as the

Vienna convention on the physical protection of nuclear material in March 1980. At a broader level, the UN has long made efforts to eliminate the misunderstandings between cultures through organizations like UNESCO, and efforts to address the causes of terrorism by fighting world poverty. It has indirectly addressed some of the most dangerous emerging threats, such as biological terrorism, through the activities of organizations like the World Health Organization.

### **The Challenge of Poverty:**

The second major area that the UN must address is the broader causes of terrorism, and the key causes are poverty and overpopulation. The UN has long made efforts to address the problem of poverty and the need for new forms of foreign aid. The scale of the problem continues to increase, however, and this will have inevitable consequences in terms of international violence. Even if one could ignore all of the cultural and political tensions that divide the world, sheer demographics almost ensure that new terrorist and asymmetric threats will continue to evolve deep into the 21st Century. In 1940 -- the world had about 2.3 billion people. In 1950, at the time of the Korean War, that number had risen to 2.6 billion. Today, the figure is 7.3 billion -- nearly three times the population. By 2050, even conservative estimates put that figure at 9.1 billion (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

Much of this population growth has occurred in productive and stable nations. In broad terms, the world is a much better and wealthier place, and more nations develop than fail. At the same time, however, the World Bank calculates that at least one-third of the world's countries, with 30-40% of the entire population of the world, living below the poverty line.

Some 40% of the world's population lives in economies where the average per capita income is less than \$800. We are talking about a total of 2.4 billion people out of 6.2 billion in the world. Under these conditions, it is almost inevitable that cultural, religious, and ethnic differences interact with massive social changes like hyper urbanization and sharp national and regional differences in wealth to produce continuing threats. There are gross imbalances in economic development within regions. For example, the World Bank estimates that the entire Middle East and all of Africa experienced no real growth per capita income in the two decades between 1980 and the year 2000. The citizens of the US are part of a small number of high-income countries that have an average per capita income of some \$26,000 a year. In contrast, South Asia has an average income of \$440, Africa \$490, East Asia \$1,010, and the Middle East \$2,160 (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

While much of the world will improve over the coming decades, at least 600 million to one billion people will be born into dire poverty between 2000 and 2015. At least three billion people will live in poverty by 2015. This total will be more than 500 million people higher than today. Unfortunately, it is the poorest states that generally have the highest birth rates, and US Census Bureau projections make it all too clear that these basic trends may not change by 2050 unless the international community takes far more effective action than it has taken in the past. More will be involved than poverty. Many -- if not most -- of the world's poor will be socially dispossessed, unemployed, and driven into over-crowded and hyper urbanized cities (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

The number of such urban poor doubled from 390 million in 1980 to 760 million in 2000, and nearly 22% of all the people in the world's poorest cities now live in cities of over one million. This figure may reach 30% by 2015. Many cultures and societies will be under continuous shock. At the same time, vast improvements in global

communications already ensure that virtually all of these people are all too well aware of the growing gap between their poverty and wealth of the industrialized world. They will be all too aware of the wealth of other states, and how much they have or have not done to help them. There are no magic answers here. The UN cannot work miracles, and it is a grim reality that foreign aid is virtually always wasted on nations whose governments and economies are not organized to help themselves (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

Even humanitarian assistance sometimes solves today's tragedies at the cost of making tomorrow's tragedies worse in states with rapidly growing populations. States with failed governments and failed economies will continue to fail their people. No organization, however, is better suited to address the causes of violence and bridge the gap between rich and poor states than the UN. No other organization can do more to catalyze a systematic effort to encourage poor states to reform, and wealthy states to help. No effort to fight global or local terrorism can succeed in the long run if the UN does not act to deal with the sources of violence.

### **The Challenge of Technology:**

Finally, a UN strategy to deal with terrorism and asymmetric warfare must look far beyond the immediate tactical challenges of dealing with Al Qaida and the Taliban. It must consider several major ongoing changes in technology that pose emerging threats far more serious than the world has had to deal with in the past (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

The first of those changes according to Kurlansky (2001:224) is the growing threat of biological terrorism and asymmetric warfare. Advances in biotechnology, advanced food processing, and pharmaceuticals are steadily increasing the ease with which both terrorists and states can manufacture lethal biological agents and do so all over the world. At the same time, a broader process of proliferation is increasing the threat from other weapons of mass destruction. The Anthrax attacks on the US, and the recent outbreak of Hoof and Mouth Disease in the UK, have already shown us that we do not fully understand the effects and risks of relatively well-known biological agents. We have little practical experience with militarized agents and none with deliberate large-scale attacks with infectious diseases and efficient militarized strains and agents.

In many cases, our current methods of detection, disease control, and treatment may be ineffective, and this is particularly true if the attack uses a mixture of different agents and is spaced and sequentially timed to deceive or disrupt effective response. The full impact of the proliferation of genetic engineering may be a decade or half-decade away, but the once esoteric equipment needed to make dry, storable biological weapons which have the lethality of nuclear weapons has already proliferated through much of the world. At the same time, nature is also an enemy. Progressively more lethal strains of diseases are already emerging throughout most of the developing world (Halide and Ukhani, 2015).

The World Health Organization and the CIA both warned of a continuing threat to the West from natural causes long before Anthrax was used in a terrorist attack in the US. A National Intelligence Council study, issued in January 2000, warned that twenty well known diseases--including tuberculosis (TB), malaria, and cholera--have reemerged or spread geographically since 1973, often in more virulent and drug-resistant forms. Furthermore, at least 30 previously unknown disease agents have been identified since 1973, including HIV, Ebola, Hepatitis C, and Nipah virus, for which no cures are available. As Britain and Taiwan have learned at immense cost, biotechnology can attack agriculture as well. Even moderate outbreaks of natural disease can easily

cost billions of dollars and have a powerful political and social impact (Halide and Ukhani, 2015)

The UN needs to fundamentally rethink its approach to the Biological Weapons Convention so that it takes full account of these emerging threats, and to fully account for the risk of terrorist and proxy attacks using biological weapons. It needs to fundamentally rethink its approach to world health so that it is prepared for the use of such weapons and does not rely on banning the unbannable. The UN needs to help member states rethink internal security planning, public health, response, and defense efforts to deal with the broad range of CBRN threats. There may well be a need for integrated response plans that can rush capabilities from one country to another, and deal with any kind of outbreak of human and agricultural disease. Efforts to stockpile vaccines and antibiotics develop common travel and quarantine procedures; develop common warning and public health approaches could prove critical in treating and containing an emergency. Cost-effectiveness would also be a critical issue.

The second such change is the related threat of chemical and nuclear terrorism and asymmetric warfare. The UN needs to take a new look at related forms of terrorism and asymmetric warfare. There are other threats from chemical and nuclear weapons. While so-called "fourth generation" chemical weapons remain so secret that governments will not talk about them even in broad terms, some developing nations already are developing them, and doing so in ways that are not covered by chemical weapons. At some point in the next two decades, they too will be common knowledge. No major advances are taking place in the ease with which fissile material can be manufactured, but there is still the issue of the Russian stockpile, and the emergence of new risks like Pakistan. Moreover, every other aspect of nuclear weapons manufacturing is becoming more commercially available from triggering devices to the ability to make and test high explosive lenses (Kurlansky, 2001:224).

These emerging threats will interact with changes in international transport and trade. Longrange ballistic missiles, and the steady commercialization of the technology for cruise missiles and drones, are a threat in itself. So, however, is commercial shipping. Any shipping container can be equipped with GPS to explode just before it goes through customs. Most shipping containers are never really inspected, and no commercial screening device can as yet reliably detect a biological agent – and even amounts less than 100 kilograms can produce massive amounts of damage. Once again, UN agencies need to examine what can be done over time to set new international standards for protection, detection, and prevention. More generally, much of the UN debate over the CW, ABM Treaty, BWC, and CTTBT have avoided coming to grips in detail with the threat of asymmetric attacks and terrorism, and has a heritage of focusing on large-scale war fighting between the military forces of states. The same has been true of the debate over export controls. A comprehensive review of how to change arms control agreements and export controls – one looking at the changes in all aspects of CBRN technology and delivery options – is needed to develop a more effective UN strategy

Third, advances in conventional technology and weapons add to the threat. As the recent US Quadrennial Defense Review has warned, terrorists and states are acquiring access to a wide range of more conventional technologies that can be used to support asymmetric warfare and terrorism. These include secure communications, satellite phone systems, satellite imagery, highly effective anti-ship missiles and advanced mines, GPS location and triggering devices, advanced man portable surface-to-air missiles, robotic crop dusters and UAVs, and a host of other systems. Steady advances in the global dissemination of these technologies are changing the

technological map of terrorism and asymmetric warfare. The UN effort to deal with conventional arms transfers has become dated. It needs to be reshaped to consider the new systems that can be used for terrorism and asymmetric warfare (kurlansky, 2001:224).

Fourth, advances in information systems, and the steady integration of world trading and financial systems, are steadily increasing vulnerability to cyberterrorism and cyberwarfare. Constant attacks by crackers and cybercriminals have already become routine, but states and terrorist groups have the potential to use such technology to do far more damage. No one has to attack a nation or physical target directly and visibly as was done in attacking the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Indirect attacks on information systems can be just as damaging to an economy, government, and the social order (kurlansky, 2001:224).

This form of asymmetric warfare is often a matter of personal skill, almost an art form. A small terrorist group may be as effective as a state, although sustained mass attacks remain an attractive form of state asymmetric warfare. At the same time, direct physical attacks on key information, trading, and financial systems are also possible. Here, a combination of technology, engineering, and cost-considerations has acted to create more and more dependence on critical utilities, facilities that house critical communications gear and node in networks, and places where large numbers of skilled human beings interface with such systems. Wall Street and nuclear power plants are just two examples of such critical infrastructure (kurlansky, 2001:224).

Furthermore, the problem of insuring against all of the risks of terrorism and asymmetric warfare and the future role of states in ensuring the viability of what has become a global insurance business – is becoming a challenge in itself. Insurance must deal with both information systems and virtually every form of major terrorist or state-driven asymmetric physical attack, and it is unclear that any one nation can afford to secure its national insurance industry against such risks. These are threats that industrial states now give far more attention than developing states (Jeffrey, 1999:6).

The fact is, however, that attacks can come from any state or movement, and developing states are gradually moving towards a dependence on information systems and international infrastructure where far more people will be dependent on a given system and in nations where governments will have far fewer resources to protect them. This is yet another area where the UN must look towards the future. A dedicated UN effort to deal with cyberwarfare, back by clear commercial standards for data protection, liability, recovery capability and other defense measures could be equally critical.

Fifth, advances in global transportation systems create yet another mix of vulnerabilities. Critical as information systems are, they are only part of the story. Global dependence on key transportation systems like jet aircraft, container vessels, and tankers may not involve the kinds of radical advances in technology discussed earlier, but it does involve the integration of much more mundane technologies into steadily more complex, economically important, and time sensitive economic sub-systems (kurlansky, 2001:224).

This dependence is projected to grow steadily and do so indefinitely into the future. As we saw all too clearly on September 11th, however, virtually every major transportation system we depend on for international commerce can be transformed into a weapon. So can any interference in the growth and flow of such systems. The UN needs to begin to examine the long-term aspects of this form of globalism. It needs to look at the international vulnerabilities that will emerge over the next five to ten years,

and at medium look at ways to ensure that international transportation systems and infrastructure do not become too vulnerable. The most cost-effective systems in pure market terms will sometimes be the most fragile ones, the ones most difficult to substitute for and repair. There may well be a case where security and redundancy must be given higher international priority (Jeffrey, 1999:6).

**Major Problems:**

Some of the major lingering problems of the United Nations organization in its bid to fight global terrorism are as follows:

**Political Division:** There is a political division in the UN because of its members' inability to agree on a definition of "terrorism." This is because many formerly decolonized states refuse to consider people's right to struggle against foreign occupation a terrorist act. Since the UN leaves it to each country to define terrorism, it can get in the way of governments to fight it; governments can also use it an excuse to impinge on their citizens' rights.

Nor does the tree-chart maze of UN counterterrorism bodies, competing for turf and funding, inspire confidence: the Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate; Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, which Annan set up in the Secretariat; the Counter-Terrorism Center, a unit within the task force, with overlapping mandate and separate funding; the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the Office on Drugs and Crime in Vienna. And that's not counting a myriad of independent agencies whose work concerns air, road, maritime traffic, public facilities and communications (Weinberg, 2008:43).

**Lack of Coordination Strategy:** Annan's effort in 2006 to coordinate the different counterterrorism programs failed because the General Assembly couldn't agree on the coordination strategy. Some UN experts, such as Edward Luck, have lamented the Counter-Terrorism Committee's lack of power and resources and have argued for establishing an independent global counterterrorism organization (Weinberg, 2008:43).

The UN does face many critical problems in transforming its resolutions, and the efforts of its agencies, into effective actions. Far too often international reality is very different from international rhetoric and UN resolutions. The world is deeply divided over who is a terrorist and what actions is really terrorism. Some nations use their support of violent extremists as a political weapon; others legitimately support movements and causes that use terrorist methods in asymmetric warfare. Some states seek to use counterterrorism to win political leverage, and defeat their enemies by labeling them as "terrorists" (Weinberg, 2008:43).

Furthermore, the UN cannot resolve every debate over who is a terrorist and what is terrorism. There will always be those who will claim that some acts of violence against states and civilians are justified, and that another man's terrorist is their freedom fighter. There will always be those who claim that there is a universal standard for defining terrorism – which consists of the actions of their enemy – and that the UN should act on the principle that, "one man's terrorist is another man's terrorist." The UN cannot act effectively against terrorism, the use of terrorist and extremist groups as state proxies, or asymmetric warfare in the many cases where there is no international consensus on action. Other national sensitivities are involved. Nations are far more willing to try to deal with international terrorism than politically sensitive internal security threats and state terrorism. Internal security is the crown jewel of state secrets, and few nations are fully open in exchanging data on terrorism when the security of their regime is directly involved. As is the case with every other challenge the UN faces,



however, these problems do not mean that the United Nations can give up (Jeffrey, 1999:6).

The events of "9/11" have also dramatized another major problem within the international community. It is all too clear that legal and illegal immigration present unique problems in terms of counterterrorism and law enforcement, but that the massive levels of human migration are inevitable. Today, immigration is still seen largely as a national problem, and not as a global economic and security problem.

Few industrialized nations have attempted to fully analyze the trade-offs between the need for additional labor to compensate for their aging work force, the cultural impact on their society, and the need to preserve human rights and tolerate cultural diversity. No real standards exist to protect both the immigrant and restrict the movement of the terrorist. It may well be impossible to develop anything approaching a common international strategy to dealing with immigration, human rights, and security, but the UN must try. It already is all too clear that purely national series of efforts is unlikely to meet either security or human needs and is likely to exacerbate tensions between "north" and "south" and between the West and the Islamic world.

#### **Conclusion:**

In recent years, the United Nations has strengthened its antiterrorist agenda. Its criminalizing of terrorist financing and its outreach work to member states in providing the resources needed for them to adopt and enforce antiterrorist legislation are the most significant recent UN initiatives. The world body's list of Al Qaeda affiliated organizations that require asset freezing is a positive model for member states.

Nevertheless, the UN's many weaknesses on the counterterrorist front impede its ability to become a more effective antiterrorist force in the international community. In general, the world body's consistent failure to overcome anti-American and anti-Israel sentiment within its walls contributes to a legitimization of Palestinian terrorism against Israeli civilians. More specifically, the lack of an agreed upon universal definition of terrorism, and the UN's restriction of its terrorist list to Al Qaeda affiliated organizations, serve to ignore and condone other terrorist groups and terrorist activities. Whichever course the UN chooses, it will certainly have to allocate additional resources for its counterterrorist agenda.

#### **Recommendations:**

In order to deal with the problems and challenges confronting the United Nations efforts to deal with global terrorism, the following recommendations are useful: One, the UN needs to restructure its approach to human rights. One part of this effort should be for the UN to reexamine the laws of war. Secondly, the UN should rethink its approach to war crimes. Thirdly, it should restructure its approach to human rights. And finally, the UN should reexamine the issue of how nations are dealing with immigration, refugees, and international labor mobility in the light of the new threat from terrorism.

Two, the UN must continue to evolve a better and more workable international approach to terrorism.

Three, the UN cannot arbitrate every internal structure or international source of violence. It can, however, restructure both its reporting on terrorism and on human rights to examine the overall patterns of violence involved. It can look beyond the immediate actors involved to provide much better estimates of the civilian casualties, the broader causes of such violence, and their economic and social costs. It can encourage NGO's to be less parochial in taking either a "counterterrorism" or "human rights" approach, and it can encourage member states to look beyond the forms of

international terrorism that most threaten them today and examine the overall level of global violence and future risks.

**References:**

1. Chaliand, G (2007 – P.68) “The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to al Qaeda” Berkeley: University of California Press.
2. Cobban, H (1984 – P.147) “The Palestinian Liberation Organisation: People, Power and Politics” Cambridge: University Press.
3. Halidu, A and Ukhani, E (2015). “Issues in International Relations” Garki Abuja: True Image Global Resources.
4. Hoffman, B (1998).” Inside Terrorism” New York: Columbia University Press.
5. Jeffrey, R (1999 – P.6) “Bounding the Global War on Terrorism” New York: Oxford University Press.
6. Kurlansky, M (2001 – P. 224) “The Basque History of the World: The Story of a Nation”. New York: Penguin.Weinberg, L (2008 – P.43) “Global Terrorism: A Beginner's Guide” New York: Oneworld.
7. Zadka, S (2003 – P 42) “Blood in Zion: How the Jewish Guerrillas Drove the British Out of Palestine” London: Brassey Press.