

A Legal Responses to Global Terrorism for the Attainment of World Peace

Sunday Didam AUDU^{1*} Eteete Michael ADAM²

1. Department of Political Science, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, NIGERIA

2. Department of International Law and Diplomacy, School of Law and Security Studies Babcock University, Ilishan- Remo, Ogun State

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the response by the legal regime of International as well as Municipal Law to the malady of terrorism and in what ways the regime of law can contribute to improve world peace and security. It is quite clear that terrorism has acquired a global and pernicious reputation. Significant among remedies proffered that may grant relief to humanity from the scourge of terrorism is the utility of the legal framework on Anti – terrorism as panacea to this global crisis. This work therefore undertakes a critical exegesis of the framework of laws related to terrorism. In several countries including the US, Australia, United Kingdom and others, in addition to the legal Anti-terrorism initiative by the United Nations Security Council and the African Union, there are specific laws against terrorism. This work looks at the imperative of strengthening the legal framework of Anti – terrorism globally. The methodology of analytical criticism is adopted for the purpose of this study. The work concludes with recommendations including the imperatives for strengthening of the institutional framework of law against terrorism as panacea for world peace.

Keywords: Terrorism, Anti – Terrorism Legislation, Global Peace and Security

1. Introduction

Terrorism arises from the usage ‘terror’ which in its simplest connotations implies the act of creating fear or to frighten others into a state of anxiety. It can also be viewed as the creating of a state of fear through violence for the purpose of intimidating populations, groups or even the government to succumb to the demands of the attacker.

Violence aimed at inspiring fear and intimidating populations is not a new phenomenon. References to ‘terrorism’ in law and politics can only be found in more recent times and the word ‘terror’ that followed the French revolution in 1789¹. Terrorism, anywhere in the world, is an unacceptable way of behavior. It involves activities such as kidnappings assassinations, bombing, random killings, and hijackings. It is often used for political and mostly non-military purposes, most typically by groups too weak to mount open assaults. According to United Nations (UN) report, “almost no week goes by without an act of terrorism taking place somewhere in the world, indiscriminately affecting people who just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.”² The worst terrorist act so far recorded in recent times was the attack on the US September 11, 2001 (hereinafter referred to as 9/11). That singular act gave the world a rude awakening, never experienced hitherto, to the fact that terrorism has become a threat to security nationally and internationally. The seeming irrepressible explosion of terrorism in most parts of the world has given rise to several questions. Amongst such includes the unavoidable question of the existence of efficient laws to curb terrorism: is it the problem of absence of effective enforcement of existing laws? Or is the crisis of terror clearly transcending of the scope of legal remedies? What other societal considerations can effectively aid in the fight against terrorism? In the view of this there is need to examine the legal framework put in place to address this malady. This paper therefore has the following objectives:

- a) to examine the various definitions of terrorism and what constitute terrorist acts
- b) to identify previous legal instruments, that is, conventions, protocols, or treaties that were in place and how they addressed terrorism.
- c) to analyse international law, especially resolutions by international organs, and the war against terrorism after the events of 9/11, and to scrutinize the legality of certain actions of the US, and
- d) to evaluate the success or otherwise of the various legal responses to terrorism globally.

To achieve these objectives, the paper is divided to four parts. The first addresses the problem of definition of what actually constitutes terrorism and at what point it becomes a criminal act. The second part, which will take a larger part of the discourse, will review the various international laws and prescriptions they have made to address or deter terrorism. The third part, which is also the concluding section, will briefly evaluate the achievements of the legal responses and make recommendations and the last part addresses the question of

¹ John F. Murphy. Defining International Terrorism: A Way out of the quagmire.’ *Israel Yearbook on Human Rights*, vol.19,1989, 13,14.

² UN Action to counterterrorism, 2008, <http://www.un.org/terrorism/htm>

effectiveness of the legal prescriptions and to what extent it has achieved world peace. Even though a considerable part of the discussion here will focus on legal responses after September 11, 2001, it is not within the scope of this work to isolate terrorist cases and analyse them vis-à-vis the international legal provisions to be examined

2. Finding a Definition for Terrorism

Finding a definition of terrorism has proved controversial and the international community has been slow to formulate a universally agreed, legally binding definition of this crime. The first legal responses to terrorism and attempts to define the word can be traced to the 20th century. One commentator dates ‘the first organized international legal attempt to grapple with the problem of defining terrorism’ to the International Conferences for the Unification of Penal Law, a series of events convened in various European capitals throughout the 1920s and 1930s¹. Since then lawyers, academics, national legislatures, regional organizations and international bodies, such as the UN, have produced a bewildering array of definitions. For the UN especially, the attempt has been unsuccessful due to difference of opinion between members about the use of violence in the context of conflicts over national liberation and self-determination.² To further highlight the complexity, a study carried out for the US Army in 1988 identified a total of 109 different,³ and the number would be far higher today.

Goldstein and Pevehouse define terrorism as political violence that targets civilians deliberately and indiscriminately⁴. Traditionally, the purpose of terrorism is to demoralize a civilian population in order to use its discontent as leverage on national governments or other parties to a conflict. Terrorism is in addition seldom mindless; rather, it is usually a calculated use of violence as leverage. However, motives and means of terrorism vary widely; having in common only that some actor is using violence to influence other actors. Also terrorism is a shadowy world of faceless enemies and irregular tactics marked by extreme brutality⁵.

Despite decades of efforts, with even greater focus after 9/11, attempts to develop a generally accepted legal definition of terrorism have failed. In the meantime however, the international community adopted a series of sectional conventions that define and criminalize various types of terrorist activities. In addition, since 1994, the United Nations General Assembly has condemned terrorist acts using the following political description of terrorism:

Criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes are in any circumstance unjustifiable, whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological racial, ethnic religious or any other nature that may be invoked to justify them⁶.

Going by this description, it raises question and also challenges the political position of some questions such as whether the actions of the States themselves can be characterized as ‘terrorist’, and whether the violent actions of national liberation movements merit the label.

2.1 The Need to Define Terrorism in International Criminal Law

In the quest to find a definition for legal purposes, several opinions have been advanced. The importance of this is summed up by Ben Saul who says that “A combination of pragmatic and principled arguments supports the case for defining terrorism in international law.”⁷ While emphasizing the need to appropriately define terrorism for international legal purposes, Carlos Daiz-Panigua states:

Criminal law has three purposes: to declare that a conduct is forbidden, to prevent it, and to express society’s condemnation for wrongful acts. The symbolic, normative role of criminalization is of particular importance in the case of terrorism. The criminalization of terrorist acts expresses society’s repugnance at them, invokes social censure and shame, and stigmatizes those who commit them. Moreover, by creating and reaffirming values, criminalization may serve, in the long run, as a deterrent to terrorism, as those values are internalized⁸.

¹ Geoffrey Levitt, ‘Is “Terrorism” Worth Defining?’ *Ohio Northern University Law Review*, Vol,13, 1986,97.

² C.F. Diaz Paniagua *Negotiating Terrorism: The Dynamics of Four UN Counter –Terrorism Treaties,1997-2005.*(New York: City University of New York, 2008), p47

³ Alex p Schmid and Albert J Jongman, *Political Terrorism: Anew Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Databases, Theories, and Literature*, 1988,p5

⁴ Joshua S. Goldstein and Jon C. Pevehouse “international Relations” 9th ed. Longman, New York, 2006, p207

⁵ Lutz, James M. *Global Terrorism*. Routledge, 2004. Benjamin, Daniel, and Steven Simon. *The Age of Sacred Terror*. Random, 2002. Kushner, Harvey W. *Encyclopedia of Terrorism*.Sage,2003

⁶ UN General Assembly Resolution 49\60 “Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism”, December 9,1994, available at <http://www.un.org/document/ga/res/49/a49r060.htm>

⁷ Ben Saul, “Defining ‘Terrorism’ to protect Human Rights,” *Sydney Law School Legal Studies Research Paper, No 08-125*,2008,p1

⁸ Diaz, p.41.

2.2 The Effects of Terrorism

Terrorism poses a common effect which is fear to the populace of the world. It is on this view that Goldstein and Pevehouse says that the primary effect of terrorism is psychological. In part the effectiveness of terrorism in capturing attention is due to the dramatic nature of the incidents, especially as shown on television news. Terrorism also gains attention because of the randomness of victims. Although only a few dozen people may be injured by a bomb left in a market, millions of people realize “it could have been me,” because they, too, shop in markets. Attacks on airplanes augment this fear because many people already fear flying. Terrorism thus amplifies a small amount of power by its psychological effect on large population; this is why it is usually a tool of the weak. However, al Qaeda’s attacks follow a somewhat different pattern, planned less to create fear than simply to kill as many Americans and their allies as possible—and ultimately to touch off apocalyptic violence that al Qaeda’s followers believe will bring about God’s intervention. The psychological effect is aimed at Muslim populations worldwide rather than at Americans.¹

2.3 The Sectoral Approach Definition

In order to elaborate an effective legal regime to prevent and punish international terrorism, rather than only working on a single, all-encompassing, comprehensive definition of terrorism, the international community adopted, what Andre Gioia describes as a “sectoral” approach aimed at identifying offences seen as belonging to the activities of terrorists and working out treaties in order to deal with specific categories thereof.² The treaties, as further explained will focus on the wrongful nature of terrorist activities rather than on intent. These conventions work with the assumption that some offences can be considered in themselves as offences of international concern, irrespective of any ‘terrorist’ intent or purpose. Following this approach, the international community has the following sectoral counter-terrorism conventions, open to the ratification of all states:

- The 1963 Convention on Offences and Certain other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft.
- The 1970 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft
- The 1971 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Act Against the Safety of Civil Aviation.
- The 1979 Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material
- The 1988 Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation.
- The 1988 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the safety of Maritime Navigation.
- The 1988b Protocol for the Suppression of unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the continental Shelf.
- The 1991 Convention on the Marking of Plastic Explosives For the Purpose of Identification.
- The 1997 International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.
- The 1999 International convention for the Suppression of the Financing of terrorism.

Andrew Byrnes analysed the sectoral conventions and treaties, all of which are described by the United Nations as part of its panoply of anti-terrorist measures and observed that they share three principal characteristics:

- a) they all adopted an “operational definition” of a specific type of terrorist act that was defined without reference to the underlying political or ideological purpose or motivation of the perpetrator of the act. This reflects a consensus that there were some acts that were such a serious threat to the interest of all that they could not be justified by reference to such motives;
- b) they all focused on actions by non-State actors (individuals and organisations) and the state was seen as an active ally in the struggle against terrorism. Here, the question of the state itself as terrorist actor was left largely to one side and
- c) they all adopted a criminal law enforcement model to address the problem, under which states would cooperate in the apprehension and prosecution of those alleged to have committed these crimes.³

Byrnes further notes that “this act-specific approach to addressing problems of terrorism in binding international treaties has continued up until relatively recently. Although political denunciation of terrorism in all its forms had continued apace, there had been no successful attempt to define ‘terrorism’ as such in a broad sense

¹ Joshua S. Goldstein and Jon C. Pevehouse “international relations: Terrorism” 9th ed. Longman, New York, 2006, p207-208

² Andrea Gioia, “The UN Convention on the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism” in Guiseppe Nesi, ed., *International Cooperation in the Counter Terrorism: The United Nations And Regional Organisations in the Fight Against Terrorism*, 2006, p.4

³ Andrew Byrnes. “Apocalyptic Visions and the Law: The legacy of September 11.” A professorial Address at the ANU Law School for the Faculty’s ‘Inaugural and valedictory Lecture Series’, May 30, 2002, p.11

that was satisfactory for legal purposes”.¹

3. International Legal Instrument against Terrorism

The international community has worked on two comprehensive counter-terrorism treaties. The first is the League of Nations’ 1937 Convention for the prevention and punishment of Terrorism that never entered into force. The second is the proposed Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism, which has not been finalized yet.

3.1 The Proposed Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism

In 1999 the UN Security Council unanimously called for better international cooperation in fighting terrorism and asked governments not to aid terrorists. The 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon by the terrorist al-Qaeda, the most devastating terrorist attack in history, prompted calls by UN political leaders for a world “war on terrorism.” Since 2000 the United Nations General Assembly has been negotiating a Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism. The definition of the crime of terrorism, which has been on the negotiating table since 2002, a part of it reads as follows:

1. Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person, by any means, unlawfully and internationally, causes:
 - a) Death or serious bodily injury to any person;
 - b) Serious damage to public or private property, including a place of public use, a state or government facility, a public transportation system, an infrastructure facility or the environment; or
 - c) Damage to property, places, facilities and systems referred to in the paragraph 1(b) of this article, resulting or likely to result in major economic loss.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373, adopted unanimously on September 28, 2001, is a counter-terrorism measure passed following the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the us, in the Resolution the United Nations Security Council declared that:

“acts, methods and practices of terrorism are contrary to the purposes and principles of the united Nations and that knowingly financing, planning and inciting terrorist acts are also contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations”.

It further required all states to “limit the ability of terrorists and terrorist organizations to operate internationally” by freezing their assets and denying them safe haven, and that UN Security Council has power to require a state to “surrender persons for trial where there is a threat for international peace and security” (emphasis added). The Security Council then set up a Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) to monitor the implementation of resolution, adopted under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, and are therefore binding on all UN member states.

3.2 Analyzing the Legal Responses

The developments in the Resolutions marked a shift in international law, as the latter was presumed to be valid only if the concerned state had voluntarily signed the international treaty; whereas here the Security Council imposed the resolution on all member states. According to the press release, the “meeting, which began at 10:50p.m., adjourned at 10:53p.m.” and thus lasted 3 minutes. There is no record of the meeting, and although the United States is widely credited with initiating Resolution 1373, it is not known who really was responsible for its passage.²

In what looks like a sharp reaction to the provisions of the Resolution 1373 and the America’s suspected overbearing influence in passing it, Greenwood maintains that for any analysis of the law relating to the events of 9/11- the hijacking of aircrafts and crashing them into buildings killing people were crimes under the ordinary criminal law of the United States. He further asserts the fact that international law recognizes the jurisdiction of US court to try the perpetrators and anyone who assisted them. That fact however, he argues, does not require other states to cooperate in enabling such a trial to take place³. Greenwood further more highlights three problems associated with doing otherwise: First, he states that there is no duty under international law to surrender a defendant to stand trial in another state. Such a duty extradite arises only where there is a treaty of extradition in force between states concerned. While a state may choose to surrender someone for trial (if its own domestic law permits) even in the absence of an extradition treaty, it is not under an obligation to do it. Incidentally, many states have no extradition treaty with the US. Secondly, for many states there would be a serious legal obstacle to surrendering someone wanted for the 9/11 attacks and killing of several thousands. That

¹ Ibid.

² “Security Council Continues Sanctions against Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda Organisation, Taliban,” United Nations, 2002. Available at <http://www.un.org/news/press/docs/2002/sc7274.doc.htm>

³ Christopher Greenwood, International law and the War against Terrorism, International Affairs 78,2,2002,p.302.

act in US laws is murder, and the US has retained the death penalty for that offense. And thirdly, the sheer horror of the events of 9/11 has led some observers to question whether, irrespective of the death penalty issue, anyone accused of perpetrating those crimes could receive fair trial in the US¹.

4. Anti- Terrorism Legislation in Some Countries

While highlighting key insights gained in a conference on fighting terrorism, Owens reveals the fact that certain countries of Europe and South America have had a history of dealing with terrorist issues². For example, the United Kingdom (because of the Irish Republican Army), and in Latin America (that has a long history of contending with terrorism in a context of guerilla warfare). In view and in response to the growing threat of international terrorism, countries that have had a similar experience like them have individually and collectively responded to terrorism through their legal systems by introducing anti-terrorism legislation. Without delving into history, a few legislations will be cited, especially those enacted after 9/11.

4.1 The United Kingdom Anti-Terrorism Legislations

The United Kingdom introduced the following legislation:

1. The Anti-terrorism, crime and Security Act in 2001. This act was formally introduced into the parliament November 19, 2001 two months after the September 11, 2001 attacks in America. It received royal assent and went into force on December 13, 2001. On December 16, 2004 the Law Lords ruled that part 4 was incompatible with the European Convention on human Rights, but under the terms of the Human Rights Act 1998 it remained in force.
2. The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005. This Act was intended to deal with the law lords' ruling of 16 December 2004 that the detention without trial of nine foreigners under part 4 of the Anti-Terrorism, crime and security Act 2001 was unlawful, being incompatible with European (and, thus, domestic) Human Rights Laws
3. Terrorism Act 2006. This Act created new offences related to terrorism, and amended existing ones. The Act was drafted in the aftermath of the 7 July 2005 London bombings, and like its predecessors some of its terms have proven to be highly controversial. These include prohibiting Encouragement of terrorism (Section 1), the disseminating terrorist publications (Section 2), Preparation of terrorist acts (Section 5), Training for terrorism (Section 6) Attendance at a place used for terrorist training (Section 8), and many more. Penalties vary between certain numbers of years' to life imprisonment.

4.2 The United States Anti-Terrorism Laws

The US passed the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 after the 9/11 attacks, as well as a range of other legislation and executive orders. The USA PATRIOT (a contrived acronym for Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act of 2001 (commonly known as the "patriot Act") is an Act of the U.S. Congress and signed into law by President George W. Bush on October 26, 2001.

The provision of the Act;

- a. dramatically reduced restrictions on law enforcement agencies' ability to search telephone, email communications, medical, financial, and other records;
- b. eased restrictions on foreign intelligence gathering within the United States;
- c. expanded the Secretary of the Treasury's authority to regulate financial transactions, particularly those involving foreign individuals and entities; and
- d. broadened the discretion of law enforcement and immigration authorities in detaining and deporting immigrants suspected of terrorism- related acts.

The Act also expanded the definition of terrorism to include domestic terrorism, thus enlarging the number of activities to which the USA PATRIOT Act's expanded law enforcement powers could be applied. Critics of the Act, however, have shown some concern and over time have sought to revise various sections to enhance civil liberty protections.

4.3 The Australian Anti- Terror Enactments

Australia has passed several anti-terrorism acts in 2004 three acts Anti-terrorism Act, 2004, (No 2) and (No 3) were passed. The Attorney-General, Philip Ruddock, introduced the Anti-terrorism bill, 2004 on March 31. He described it as "a bill to strengthen Australia's counter-terrorism laws in a number of respects- a task made more urgent following the recent tragic terrorist bombings in Spain." He said that Australia's counter-terrorism laws

¹ Christopher Greenwood, p. 303-304.

² Dallas D Owen. Introduction to the Conference Report, "law vs. War: Competing Approaches to Fighting Terrorism ." July 2005, p. 1. available at <http://www.carlisle.army.mil/ssi>

“require review and, where necessary, updating if we are to have a legal framework capable of safeguarding all Australians from the scourge of terrorism.” The Australian Anti-Terrorism Act 2005 supplemented the powers of the earlier Acts. The legislation in Australia allows police to detain suspects for up to a year. The Australian Anti-Terrorism Act of 2005 included a “shoot-to-kill” clause. In a country, with entrenched liberal domestic traditions the measures have been controversial and have been criticized by civil libertarians and Islamic groups.

4.4 The Organization of African Unity (Now AU) Conventions on Anti-Terror

Prior to 9/11, the OAU had domesticated the international treaties and conventions against terrorism by establishing various conventions and protocols among her member states. Nevertheless, after 9/11, the following were established:

1. The Dakar Declaration against terrorism adopted by the African Summit meeting, held in Dakar, Senegal, in October 2001
2. The plan of Action for the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism adopted by the Intergovernmental High Level meeting of Member States of the African Union, held in Algiers, Algeria, in September 2002;
3. The protocol Relating to the establishment of the peace and security Council of the African Union adopted by the inaugural Summit of the Union in Durban, South Africa, in July 2002; and
4. The protocol to the OAU Convention on the prevention and Combating of Terrorism adopted by the Third Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the African Union, Addis-Ababa, 8th July, 2004 .

In Article 2 of the protocol to the OAU convention on the Prevention and Combating of Terrorism, States Parties undertake to:

- (a) review their national laws and establish criminal offences for terrorist acts as defined in this convention and make such acts punishable by appropriate penalties that take into account the grave nature of such offences;
- (b) consider, as a matter of priority, the signing or ratification of, or accession to the international instruments listed in the Annexure, which they have not yet signed, ratified or acceded to; and
- (c) implement the actions, including enactment of legislation and the establishment as criminal offences of certain acts as required in terms of the international instruments referred to in paragraph (b) and that States have ratified and acceded to and make such acts punishable by appropriate penalties which take into account the grave nature of those offences;

However, Article 3, in reference to Article 1 that describes what constitutes terrorism, states that:

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 1, the struggle waged by peoples in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces shall not be considered as terrorist acts, political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other motives shall not be a justifiable defense against a terrorist act.

5. Implications of the Legal Responses to Terrorism on International Cooperation and World Peace

At this point it will be good to consider the importance of law in resolving certain issues like terrorism. Law governs war as it does most human endeavors. International law governs the interaction among nations and consists primarily of “conventional” and “customary” law¹. Conventional law is enacted by treaty or other explicit agreement among nations. Customary law, on the other hand, is derived from an interpretation of treaties or agreements, declarations of international bodies such as the General Assembly of the United Nations, or the statements and actions of governments and their officials. Customary laws can also be defined as mere manifestations of accepted traditional international practice². It is important to understand that international law, in terms of national security, is not a body of law created by legislatures and enforced through a court system. Rather, international law is generally established by agreement among the parties who will be bound by it, much like private parties entering into a contract. Although legal forums such as the international court of justice do exist, their enforcement mechanisms are limited. Consequently, a country willing to accept the political and diplomatic consequences of their action may act according, relatively unrestrained. It is likely that nations will violate the dictates of international law when those dictates endanger on conflict with the pursuit of their fundamental interests, including national security.

This at the same time creates a dilemma; in their desire to combat terrorism in a modern political

¹ Louis Henkin, *International Law: Politics and Values*, 1995, 38-39; quoted in Lawrence T. Greenberg, Seymour E. Goodman, and Kevin J. Soo Hoo, *Information Warfare and International Law*. Washington D.C.: National Defence University press, 1998, Chapter 1,2.

² David J. DiCenso, “IW Cyberlaw: The Legal Issues of Information Warfare,” *Airpower Journal* vol.xll, no.2. Summer 1992: 92.

context, countries often face conflicting goals and courses of action between (1), providing security from terrorist acts, that is, limiting the freedom of individual terrorist, terrorist group and support networks to operate unimpeded in a relatively unregulated environment; and (2), maintain individual freedoms, democracy and human rights. Efforts to combat terrorism are complicated by a global trend towards deregulation, open borders, and expanded commerce. In democracies such as the United States, the constitutional legacy within which policy must operate are viewed by some to conflict directly with a desire to secure the lives of citizens more effectively against terrorist activity. A majority, however, strongly holds that no compromise of constitutional rights is acceptable.

6. Conclusion

Looking at the developments, it can be observed that international law has met with little success in eliminating international acts of terrorism. Competing definitions of terrorism and war yield different diplomatic, legal, and military consequences. The definition a policy maker chooses is a key consideration. The United State defined the 9/11 attacks as acts of war, and responded accordingly, rather than as crimes outside a war context. There is also the need to be concerned in finding a balance between applying the law and upholding human rights ideals. With conventions, protocols, and resolutions by various international organs, the quest continues towards a lasting legal solution to the challenge of global terrorism.

Recommendations

1. Efforts should be made to avoid generalizations and find an all- encompassing legal definition of terrorism that will address the criminality of the act while preserving fundamental human rights.
2. Diplomacy could be used to help create a global anti- terrorism coalition. Even though it may not always be effective against determined terrorist or the countries that support them; however in most cases, diplomatic measures are considered least likely to widen conflicts. Bryan w. Ellis suggest that diplomatic pressure must be applied on states that hold a passive view towards those involve in terrorism within their borders and would encourage extradition of the offenders. In addition to diplomatic pressure, a nation's refusal to cooperate with a reasonable investigation could be met with sanctions against the nation¹.
3. The media should give balanced reports to the public on terrorist activities. This has a great influence on public opinion and may impact not only on the attitudes of populations and the actions of governments but also on the actions of groups engaged in the terrorist acts. This may also help to mobilize public opinion in other countries to pressure their respective governments to take action against terrorism.

¹ Bryan W, Ellie, "The International Legal Implications and Limitations of Information Warfare: what are our Options?" *The US War College Strategy Research Project*, April 2001.p.13.