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In the world today, there is a growing trend in violence, both domestically and internationally, in the form of terrorism. It is present in our everyday lives and in every part of the world – some more than others. Terrorism takes on many forms and has had an impact on all our lives in one way or another. Whether it affected us directly with the loss of a loved one or an incident we were a part of, or indirectly by heightened security at the airports causing delays, sudden drop in a stock values we own, or emotionally by the countless reports and images displayed by the media, terrorism has affected us all and shows no signs of going away anytime soon.

Globalization and terrorism

Globalization is not merely a trend or a fad but rather an international system. It took the place of the old Cold War system and, as it has its own laws and logic, which might influence, directly or indirectly, politics, environment, geopolitics and the economy of any country. Globalization has its own technologies: computerization, miniaturization, digitization, satellite communication, optic fiber and Internet, which reinforces the defining perspective of globalization. Once a country enters into the system of globalization, its elites begin to internalize the perspective of integration and try to fit in a global context.

While defining the Cold War was the explosive force of projectiles, defining the extent of globalization is speed – speed of commerce, travel, communication and innovation. Formula Cold War era mass equation – Einstein’s energy, \( E = mc^2 \). Globalization is equivalent to Moore’s law, which states that microprocessors performance will double every 18 to 24 months, while the price will halve. In the Cold War, the most frequent question was: “Whose side are you?” In the system of globalization, the most common question is: “How are you connected?” In the Cold War, the second question was that frequency “that the missile weight is yours?” and the system of globalization: “What speed is your modem?” (FRIEDMAN, 1999).

Because of globalization terrorism has changed the nature of time in this changing world. Between 1968–1989 the incidents of terrorism were rare, approximately 1.673 per year. Between 1990–1996 there has been an increase of 162% compared to the Cold
War an increase of 4.389 per year. This percentage increase in terrorist acts is approaching 200% or even more taking into account the alarming growth of global conflicts. More alarming is that the new acts of terrorism are directed against citizens and not against governments (Coker, 2002). Secondly, globalization encourages religious fundamentalism. 40 years ago there was no single religious terrorist movement worldwide. In the 80’s only two of 64 known terrorist organizations in the world were animated by religious faith. Most terrorist groups are trans oriented, but some like Al-Qaeda are really global. The assassins responsible for the death of the Afghan weapons trafficker, Ahmed Shah Masood were Algerians with Belgian passports, who had visa to enter Pakistan, issued in London. Masood’s death shows how radical Islam does not reject globalization.

Al-Qaeda (in Arabic: “base”) is not a terrorist organization in the traditional sense, with a well-defined hierarchy, but rather a decentralized global network of Islamic extremists. They are united by a common purpose: the Arab world and ultimately, the whole world “paganize” and to impose a theocracy under Islamic law. The main enemies are considered to be the world’s great powers – the U.S. and its allies, the guise that they destroy the Muslim world. They see their role in fighting against regimes in the Middle East, traditionally Islamic, but under Western influence. In addition to demonstrate the vulnerability of the West and its lifestyle, through terrorist attacks carried out in “enemy territory”, thus obliging States to stop exporting Western values and patterns of behavior. Islamists from the suicidal attacks of 11 September 2001, building on the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon has become clear that the threat posed by Al-Qaeda is for Western nations. What distinguishes the Islamic terrorist network it is global and decentralized. Unlike past international terrorism, Al-Qaeda depends little on state sponsorship it supported financially by the business and various shade foundations. Recruiting new followers knows no national boundaries, but is worldwide, although concentrated in North Africa and Southeast Asia. Groups and Al-Qaeda followers are spreading in all regions of the world, making the network very flexible and mobile in its actions. Once, in 2001, the control center in Afghanistan was destroyed by U.S. Military, ideological approaches and preparation take place mainly on the Internet. Chair and technical knowledge needed to attack are available online. In principle, anyone can act on behalf of Al-Qaeda.

The organizational structure of project type and using the most modern technologies, it creates challenges our fight against terrorism. Already this is not enough to eliminate elements of leadership or capture of the heads of terrorist groups. A strategy that probably would have more success in the prevention of new terrorist cells
would be that they lack proper political terrain spread through calm down spirits in the hot spots around the globe.

In terms of its organizational resilience and flexibility, its structure and communications, al-Qaeda is not unlike a successful, smart company – or even a venture capital firm. It has a clear message, a charismatic leader, a firm purpose and is not afraid to delegate.

The post 9/11 al-Qaeda has thus shown itself to be a remarkably nimble, flexible and adaptive entity. It appears almost as the archetypal shark in the water, having to move forward constantly, albeit changing direction slightly, in order to survive. Al-Qaeda’s main challenge is to promote and ensure its durability as an ideology and a concept. It can do this only by staying in the news and launching new attacks. In the post 9/11 environment, terrorism’s power to coerce and intimidate, to force changes in our normal behaviour, and to influence our policies and affect how and on what we spend money, has increased enormously (Hoffman, 2003).

Expressive violence of the attack at the World Trade Center had meaning for both victim (anxiety and humiliation) and for your attention (status, prestige, recognition and reputation in the Islamic world). Also choosing a target, the World Trade Center, a global icon, it shows how globalization expressive violence now greater symbolic force than ever (Coker, 2002).

Globalization, as a surge in entry and neoconservatism as inducement to action, has come to dominate the political scene and overshadow alternative proposals. However, the relief initially confused at the end of the Cold War got some accents of unrest on the condition the West, especially in the sphere of moral and cultural. There have been questions raised regarding the long-term sustainability a Western cultures that seem to have lost moral pointer, which led to the formulation of the question whether the defeat of communism was indeed the victory of democracy (Brzezinski, 2007).

**Terrorism and war against terrorism**

Terrorism is one of the most complex and also the most complicated phenomena of the contemporary world. When it comes to terrorism, we almost always, two antagonistic poles of interpretation: if a pole is an act qualified as terrorist, the other may be regarded as a heroic gesture. In this interpretation, or cultural factors related to the type of civilization, the values shared by a given society have a very large role. But they are not always decisive, but rather a relation of forces which in the end decide whether an act or another (Magureanu, 2003).
Terrorism has multiple faces and may be hiding under the name of a religion, philosophy, politics, or any other name. Terrorism is a way of life. It may be a part of the history of human civilization and culture. Defining terrorism is most important in order not to be changeable between “terrorism” and “the warrior of freedom”. The scholars have their own definition of terrorism based on their point of view and field, or they define it as the ruler’s outlook. Anyway, how divers those definitions, but the might is the rulers’ definition who enforce their definition to be accepted by the people either using military, political, economic, technology or cultural power. Terrorism may be derived from religious doctrine or motivated by any other beliefs. Terrorism may be come to the true when the terrorists regard themselves as the victim of a repressive and hypocritical regime that never takes care of them, for instance: the IRA, EPTA, and some groups of terrorists in Latin America, and the intifada movement of the Palestinians (PRAJA, 2003).

Terrorism is an unconventional battle tactics used to achieve purely political goals that are based on acts of violence, sabotage or threat made against a State, organization or social group against civilians having the specific purpose of producing effect psychological generalized fear and intimidation. The ultimate objective is to apply pressure on the entity in question to determine to act in accordance with the wishes of terrorists, if that objective can not be achieved by conventional means.

In a study of terrorism, Alex P. Schmid and Albert J. Jongman (Schmid, Jongman, 1984), analyzes the content to 109 definitions of terrorism next finding frequency of the concepts used:
- violence and force (occurring in 83.5% of definitions)
- political reasons (65%)
- fear, emphasis on terror (51%)
- threat (47%)
- psychological effects and anticipated reactions (41.5%)
- discrepancy between the targets and victims (37.5%)
- shares intentional, planned, organized and systematic (32%)
- method of combat strategy and tactics (30.5%).

On September 11 the United States have experienced a traumatic event that affected the people at both collectively and individually. The feeling of safety he was shaken and the territorial integrity of America has been violated more than Pearl Harbor, where soldiers were killed defending their homeland, while the World Trade Center victims were civilians who had to be protected by the state (Soros, 2006).

Said about the attempt of 11 September 2001 in New York that will change the world and nothing will be like before this attempt. Such statement was undoubtedly
marked emotional, but in good measure is observable whereas the attitude and the important lines, the whole policy of the United States took a different turn, so that American leaders are more committed than ever to intervene, including by force, everywhere in the world where the threat of terrorism or mass destruction is present, even if facing a very serious resistance from some traditional allies. There is even triggering a war against terrorism, which is already proving extremely difficult and probably lengthy, because terrorism is generated by complex cases, some even taking on the nature of modern societies (Magureanu, 2003).

Fight against terrorism has proved harmful to the Bush administration because it has unforeseen adverse consequences: invasion of Iraq has turned into a disaster. In reality, terrorists must be addressed by means other than war. By its very nature, war involves innocent victims. When leading a fight against terrorists who are hiding, the chances of innocent victims there are even greater. Terrorism is terrible because it leads to death or mutilation of innocent people on behalf of political causes. The war against terrorism evokes a reaction from those who fall victims similar to those that had an attack of September 11. As a result, more people are willing to risk life and attacking them today than there were Americans on 11 September 2001 (Soros, 2006).

Fight against terrorism can not be interpreted as a single order countries or regions. This is a global phenomenon with global consequences and in this regard requires a holistic approach. Cooperation should be extended for many plans: defense policy, financial control, international flow of information, financial control, migration, border management, and even murder.

Anti-war, war of the XXI century, has penetrated into spirits, it was accepted, because the United States fear for their security planning, security of supply for their energy, but doubt their military, their military forces and their information. This no doubt refers to both the legitimacy of measures taken to ensure control of the people inside, as the effectiveness of costly military effort undertaken since 2001 (Durandin, 2007).

The effects of terrorism on human rights

Since terrorism has become a global threat, the question relating to human rights has become pervasive at all levels of society.

Attacks of September followers war offered an extraordinary opportunity and access to social solidarity and patriotism has been used to build an American nationalism that could form the basis for a different imperialistic behavior and internal control. Most liberals, even those who until then criticized American imperial practices, the Administration supported war launched against terrorism and were prepared to sacrifice
some civil rights, to serve the cause of national security. Accusation of being devoid of patriotism was then used to suppress the critical accents or any idea that does not respect this approach. The press and political parties have placed the current. And this leadership has allowed the U.S. to develop a so repressive legislation that would frighten anyone might want to resist-what is most important law “Homeland Security and Patriot Acts” (which contained provisions for maintaining internal security). Were introduced draconian restrictions of civil rights. Prinsons were illegally held in prison in Guantanamo, there were numerous raid and hold suspects in a way that could make jealous of those of the Gestapo or the people of Lavrenti Beria. Many of those arrested were held months without access to a lawyer in the office and to make known what they were detained. Police can detain, arbitrarily, on any person even suspected of “terrorism”, and this had to be included soon antiglobalization even militants, who until September 11 not know who is Osama Bin Laden. Techniques of surveillance have become draconian, the FBI could have access to the recordings of books on loan from public libraries, was informed of the sale of books, Internet connections, knew almost everything about the students or faculty of individuals, whether they were foreigners or Americans, to be informed about the clubs and diving sports (HARVEY, 2003).

In the atmosphere of fear and anger generated by the attacks of September 11, the neoconservative has the opportunity and launched into force. Not long after, neoconservative Bush II administration and the premises were transformed into military doctrine and policy official. Immediately after September 11 doctrine has been poured on domestic policy. Fear of terrorism propagated on all channels, created a new political culture in which moral certainty is dangerous near the threshold of social intolerance, especially against those with origins or an appearance that could give the suspect. Apart of the “citizen” who control the immigrants and even some academics (particularly those with pro-Arab views on the Middle East issue) reflect, in turn, enhance moralizing anxiety. Even civil rights have come to be regarded by some as an impediment to the establishment of an effective national security (BRZEZINSKI, 2007).

Establishing a necessary legal framework, which have a preventive role and respect while human rights in the fight against terrorism, for example related to anthrax panic of 2001 (which, ultimately, could not be made on account of terrorism outside the United States), led to the establishment of a law which required bioterrorism regulations regarding recording and recording by companies wishing to export products in the United States. United States state that regulations are not onerous and costly, but more foreign firms argue otherwise. The rules are at best an additional cost associated with sales to the United States.
To effectively combat global terrorism, a closer cooperation between secret services, which until now have operated only at national level. Along with the fight against Islamic terrorism, and have promoted dialogue with representatives of moderate political Islam, to beat together hostile views and prejudices.
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