



TECHNIUM
SOCIAL SCIENCES JOURNAL

Vol. 25, 2021

**A new decade
for social changes**

www.techniumscience.com

ISSN 2668-7798



9 772668 779000

The role of radicalism and extremism in political terrorism

Emir Muhic

University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Criminalistics, Criminology and Security Studies /
Doctorand

emirmuhic@fkn.unsa.ba

Abstract. The world changed significantly and abruptly after September 11, 2001, when the largest terrorist attack in the known history of mankind was carried out. The attack marked a new era in the use of violence and fear to secure specific political goals. However, as time goes on, conventional killer forms of terrorism are no longer as effective and efficient as before, and other, unconventional forms of violence are being used. As one such novelty, political terrorism is emerging whose goal is not to kill, but to spread fear among targeted communities and groups. Political terrorism has its place in the post-conflict, transitional societies and nations as those in the Balkans, where it is not possible to conduct kinetic activities due to the threat of sanctions. Therefore, aggressive actors resort to the use of fear to achieve political goals, but this would not be possible without two very important socio - political factors: radicalism and extremism which provide support to political actors who strive to create ethnically and nationally 'pure' territories without entering into open conflict and war. Also, radicalism and extremism are weapons of support for political terrorism that rejects the use of conventional violence and kinetic measures, but creates a hostile environment and climate that forces victims to submit or leave their homes. Violation of democracy, human rights and freedoms, as well as making a normal way of life impossible - is the main goal of political terrorism, which could not be achieved without radicalization of a critical mass of followers of aggressive politics and its actors.

Keywords. radicalisation, extremism, terrorism

1. Extremism and radicalism

The modern world has become anything but moderate. Today, there is a trend in the extremism of human society, where there is a significant deviation from moderation and Aristotle's 'golden rule'. When viewed etymologically, extremism comes from the Latin *extremus* which translates as extreme, unacceptable and intransigence. Extremism corresponds to the idea of a limit or restriction, and therefore we often talk about extremism as a behaviour that is the maximum allowed limit with a tendency to cross that line (Đorić, 2012). Extremism in its essence always has a certain political idea and ideology and specific methods, measures, ways and activities by which a political goal is reached. These methods, measures, ways, activities and methods are transformed from verbal, non-kinetic violence into physically manifested violence. Extremist political ideologies oppose the fundamental values of society and the principles of democracy and universal human rights by advocating ethnic, political, social, economic and religious supremacy (Trip, Bora, Marian, Halmajan, & Drugas, 2019). Simply put, extremism can be viewed as an extreme in a certain idea and a thing that is

significantly 'right' or 'left' of the original idea from which it originated in a normal, democratic world that valorises man and his choices in accordance with certain normative rules.

However, when we talk about the role of extremism in a politically specific environment, it enables the initiation of an inert mass that is ready for anything just to get out of political monotony and ideologically fabricated inferiority. Also, extremism occurs when a person or group decides that fear, terror, and violence are justified means to achieve ideological, political, social, and other goals (Angus, 2016). An essential item within the extremism is the pursuit of a goal at all costs, regardless of restrictions on rights, freedoms, or even the destruction of human lives. Extremism then serves as a medium for the spread of aggressive and hostile ideas and narratives, which allows extremism to manifest in the material world through its destructiveness, making it terrorism. Of course, on that path to terrorism, elements such as radicalism, fanaticism, lack of free will and the like are also included.

In the case of a material manifestation of extremism, then the prefix 'violent' should be added to it, because it can be expressed both verbally and non-verbally through behaviour and kinetic action. Violent extremism as a form of behaviour serves to limit others and their forms of behaviour, the will of individuals and communities, and ways of thinking. In view of the above, extremism itself serves as a means of terrorizing and committing violence against targeted communities that are an obstacle to achieving a certain political and social goal, whereby extremism presents an extension of radicalism.

Radicalism, like extremism, strives to change the *status quo*, through a direct change of material reality. Radical as a process can be a significant problem for an individual, group, community, state or the whole world. The very idea of radicalism is the cessation of one state and the emergence of another that once existed, so the radicalism can be presented as a process of developing extremist ideologies and beliefs (Borum, 2011). Like extremism, radicalism is not necessarily a negative change. Radical change from one state to another can also be associated with positive things such as the cessation of totalitarianism and a return to democracy and the rule of law.

While before 2001 the term 'radicalization' was used informally in the academic literature to denote a shift toward more radical politics (usually not referring to Muslims), by 2004 the term had taken on a new meaning of the psychological or theological process in which Muslims moved toward extremist views (Kundani, 2012). However, before the terrorist activities of Arab-Muslim organizations, radicalism was linked to the ideas of the radical left and right, whose terrorism was much more deadly. Left-wing radical and extremist organizations such as the German *Baader-Meinhof*, the American *Weather Underground*, the Italian *Red Brigades* (Brigate Rosse), the Basque *ETA* (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna) and other far-left organizations sought or still strive for a certain change in material reality which meant a return to the previous state, the opposite of that which exists at a given moment.

Authors such as McCauley and Moskalneko (2008) view radicalism in two ways: functional and descriptive. From a functional point of view, radicalization is defined as increased preparation for intergroup conflict and emphatic engagement in it, and from a descriptive point of view, radicalization refers to a change in beliefs, feelings and behaviours that justify intergroup violence and demand for sacrifice in defence of one's own group (McCauley & Moskalenko, 2008). On the other hand, Schmid (2013) conceptualized radicalization as an individual and group process, with politically polarized political actors and groups renouncing dialogue, agreement, and tolerance, and using either nonviolent pressure and coercion, or various forms of political violence, including violent extremism (terrorism and war crime).

From the above it can be concluded that radicalization is a process by which a group and community is formed in such a way as to approve, want and commit violence that certain political, religious or ideological actors justify, and to become extreme in their thoughts and actions. Special attention in modern times should be paid to political actors who incorporate both religion and ideology in their activities. Today, it is not possible to separate politics from religion, and in a specific environment it becomes exactly what Marx called opium for the masses.

2. Terror, terrorism and society

The term terrorism has its roots in the times of the Jacobin dictatorship (1793-1794), which left a significant, bloody mark on human history. In the post-revolutionary times, the new France was to establish a new regime and cleanse the ranks of the subversive elements that threatened the return of the monarchy. Maximilien Robespierre, one of the leaders of the French bourgeois revolution and later a victim of his own policy, believed that terrorism was necessary for the French Republic to survive its 'childhood', and that terror was 'just justice, fast, sharp, inflexible; hence it is an emanation of virtue; it is not so much a special principle as it is a consequence of the general principle of democracy applied to the most urgent needs of our country' (Robespierre, 1794). In the terror of the Jacobins, over forty thousand people died, and almost all the leaders of the revolution met the same fate - the guillotine. The struggle for power and the achievement of political goals almost conditioned the destruction of the human lives that were labelled and classified as enemies of change and the system.

Terrorism as a form of political violence should be distinguished from other forms of political violence such as: hunger strike, blockades, sabotage, lynching, hate crimes, torture, revolutions, guerrilla warfare and others (Schmid, 2013). The purpose of terror and terrorism is a policy that cannot be reached by conventional and permissible means.

The democratic system of rights, obligations, freedoms and equality is threatened by actors striving to seize power and create an authoritarian and totalitarian state. Terror as a means to an end seeks to control the human mind through fear and other negative emotions associated with it. As the best means of governing the mind and body of man is the fear that paralyzes him and makes him powerless to resist the aggressive, and the aggressive actor who carries out his arbitrariness through terrorism. Terror and terrorism are not just car bombs, truck attacks on pedestrians in crowded city streets or massacres in cinemas, but also the non-kinetic action of political actors obstructing state and social power, imposing their own will to limit normal life. Terrorism itself is recognizable to everyone, and does not represent random 'violence' in a particular community or society. Due to the above, terrorism is a social phenomenon that manifests itself in objective reality and has a clear distinction from other real phenomena (Alispahić, 2007). It clearly distinguishes from other phenomena that cause fear, such as natural disasters and accidents, and allows fear to be identified and classified on the basis of only one factor, and that is fear that serves political purposes. Also, terrorism is a phenomenon that does not stagnate, but is in constant motion and produces a wide range of social changes through the use of violence and calls for violence. So, in other words, terrorism is a social, political phenomenon, a dynamic one, which takes place in the social and political system and establishes and realizes relations with that system(s) (Alispahić, 2007).

However, there is one significant problem in science that relates to the definition of terrorism. It is a huge and significant problem, and there is often controversy over whether something is terrorism or not because there is no clear definition of it. On the other hand, the lack of a clear and objective definition allows states to classify certain events or acts as terrorism or not, depending on political and social circumstances. Consequently, a particular political

actor or actors will intend to undertake low-intensity kinetic operations or preparations, which overall will not be classified as terrorism, although they should be. The main reason for this is the dilemma of classifying Russia's cyber operations as an act of terrorism or war (Jasper, 2020), which is why the very concept of understanding terror and terrorism as something undertaken by state actors, not just radical and extremist organizations.

As an example, we have a definition by the American FBI which reads: acts of terrorism are defined as violent, criminal acts committed by individuals and / or groups for further ideological purposes arising from: a) domestic influences, such as political, religious, social, racial or environmental or b) are associated with certain foreign terrorist organizations or nations (sponsored by the state). NATO (2020) defines terrorism in its documents as the unlawful use or threatening use of force or violence, the use of fear and terror against an individual or property in an attempt to coerce or intimidate a government or society, or to gain control of the population for political, religious or ideological goals.

On the other hand, authors like Schmidt (2011) define terrorism as a method of struggle in which accidental or symbolic victims serve as an instrumental target of violence, and their common, group characteristics determine them as a potential victim. In addition to the above definitions, there are an infinite number of them, which in each, special, unique and specific way interpret what terrorism is in relation to the time, place and goal, as well as the act and act of terrorism itself. However, what all definitions of terrorism have in common is illegal violence that serves a political purpose, targeting civilians, citizens and infrastructure.

Considering the time, place, circumstances, and other elements, certain authors such as Shultz (1978), Schmitt (2011) and others, recognize three types of terrorism: revolutionary, sub-revolutionary, and repressive, however, these types of terrorism can also be abused by state governments and their subordinate services and agencies that, in accordance with state policy, label certain actors as terrorists and others as freedom fighters. Likewise, authors such as Wilkinson (1974) classify terrorism on three different levels: political, criminal, and state-sponsored, which can also be international and domestic depending on the place of action.

In addition, according to certain authors, there are two ways of seeing the roots, causes and conditions of terrorism itself. Halkides (1995) identifies non-state terrorism that has two schools of understanding, liberal and conservative, and state terrorism that has been embraced by the radical school. The liberal school understands the roots and causes of terrorism as a reaction to colonialism, political repression by foreign powers and oppression of minorities, while the conservative school relies on the role of extremists and fanatics who seek to change the political situation. The opposition to the liberal and conservative schools lies in the radical school of understanding, which considers liberal and conservative perceptions to be the head and tail of a coin, while the followers of radical teaching hold that the real essence of terrorism is terrorism and oppression by the great powers such as the United States and its allies (Halkides, 1995). Given the liberal, conservative and radical, it is necessary to synthesize these ideas and reach a broader understanding of terrorism and terror, which is intertwined with the repression of colonial powers, oppression of minorities, poor social and economic policy, with fanatics, radicals and extremists who, by striving to change the political situation, become targeted by the great powers who at a given moment want to be the *world's policemen*.

Therefore, the lack of a clear and uniform definition of terrorism allows each organization (international, educational, security, etc.), agency or service (intelligence, police and others) to have enough room for maneuver in political, social and military terms. Therefore, any organization, agency or service, based on the typology and classification of terrorism, can decide to help a certain actor or group because it has transformed from a classic terrorist organization into so-called 'freedom fighters' or vice versa. Therefore, political actors who

advocate aggression against certain groups or communities, national, ethnic, religious or political, may present themselves to the world as 'fighters for the freedom and rights of their people, community or group.' Such actors are a significant majority with a monopoly of power in a certain territory and the territory they are fighting for, and by spinning reality and using propaganda and indoctrination, they try to present themselves as victims whose kinetic action will be 'justified' or even viewed favourably by the international community. Aggressive actors often say they are threatened and will be forced to use force (using red herring fallacy), in which they present themselves as victims, while the actual victims are portrayed as extremists, fanatics, savages and others to dehumanize them. The classic red herring fallacy and the creation of a new narrative is made possible by the possession of material and technical means that serve propaganda purposes. Old age terrorists and terrorist organizations have used propaganda to intimidate through depictions of executions and decapitation, but modern, new age terrorists in fine suits and white salon gloves, use propaganda to portray 'themselves' as victims who are threatened by their political rivals or minorities who they want to ethnically cleanse from a certain space, in pursuit of expanding their *lebensraum*.

Modern terror and terrorism is moving more and more away from the liberal and conservative school whose actors are non-state, and more and more it is entering the domain of a radical school which considers and classifies the actors of terrorism as state. Today, more than ever, the state and state actors who possess power and resources are becoming the main perpetrators and creators of terror and terrorism, aided by the radicalization of the masses and the extreme idea of their own superiority and supremacy. As wars become inefficient, costly and dangerous to the aggressive actor, silent genocide against minorities is best conducted through terror and terrorism.

3. State and violence

3.1. Political violence and terrorism

Political terrorism and political violence are becoming a growing problem around the world. Given the traditional, instrumentalised view of terrorism as an anti-state activity, it is sometimes difficult to understand and comprehend terrorism as an activity of the state directed towards society, its own or someone else's. Therefore, the state itself, its institutions and think tanks under its auspices, and various organizations themselves define what terrorism is and what is not, what is radical or extreme, and what is not. The state or the state ruling set and the elite will never recognize extremist tendencies or radicalization as a way of recruiting critical mass and using it for their own purposes.

What cannot be done in a conventional and kinetic way, such as violence against certain groups, is possible through the unconventional actions of political actors by creating an environment and climate that turns abnormal and extreme ideas into something completely new and desirable, radically changing the way of life. With the help of the newly created environment, narratives and tendencies, state-sponsored, political violence becomes the norm and official narrative to be followed by political parties. Violence against a specific group will be justified by politicians and the ruling elite who use the same for their private *statebuilding*. According to Jalata (2010), political violence has always been involved in the creation and maintenance of structures, institutions and organizations of hierarchically privileged in a society, and those in power get to define terrorism themselves or deny their involvement in the acts of political violence or terrorism.

According to Schulz (1978), political terrorism is defined as the threat or use of unconventional forms of political violence, which to varying degrees, seek to achieve certain political goals that can be short-term and long-term. Also, the state terrorism from which

political terrorism and violence stem can be defined as the use of force and violence organized by the state or the threat of using force to achieve a certain political goal. The state, as an abstract organism made up of institutions of power controlled by certain political actors, entities or parties, can sponsor violence against a target group and protect perpetrators, presenting their violence as self-defence or even 'protection of the state from fanatics and extremists'.

Political goals as such are multiple, but the primary ones are the creation of ethnically, religiously or ideologically pure territories through non-violently produced fear - terror, but also through kinetic, violent activities that multiply the state of terror. Terrorism has been used and will continue to be used as an instrument of political 'subversion' (Solan, 1986), regardless of who it is aimed at - its own citizens or the others. In achieving political goals, the state widely uses political violence both within the state against its own citizens, minorities or political opponents, and outside the state in the field of diplomacy, covert proxy warfare or financing of terrorist or militant organizations around the world. Due to the above, we come to a close relationship between the state and terrorism, i.e. state sponsorship of terrorism. According to Cohan (2002), state-sponsored terrorism can be represented on a four-part continuum ranging from active to passive support: a) the state actively sponsors, controls or directs terrorist activities, b) the state achieves activities by providing training, equipment, money and/or transport, c) the state tolerates terrorists acting as such within its borders without trying to arrest or expel them, although it does not actively support them (by refusing to expel or arrest the terrorists, the state 'allows' them to continue their activities) and, d) due to political factors or inherent weakness of leaders, the state is simply unable to deal effectively with terrorists; therefore there is inactivity. This suggests the characteristics of perpetrators of terrorism, firstly, they are an integral part of the state apparatus that has many privileges and benefits and secondly, the actors can be seen as a paramilitary formation controlled by the intelligence service where ideology and state policy are the main factors contributing to the creation of a 'new' terrorist. According to certain authors such as Alispahić (2019), paramilitary formations as part of the state apparatus serve for political violence and terrorism in those situations when the state must have 'clean hands'. The close connection between the state and the seemingly non-state, pseudo-terrorist, radical and extremist organization makes it much easier for an aggressive political actor and the state to deal with the opposition, enemies or ordinary citizens.

A special feature in the development of political terrorism and political violence is the role of extremism and radicalism, which simultaneously serve to mobilize 'indecisive' masses, but also to maintain the morale, strength and will of political fanatics and followers of the political actor. Likewise, radicalism and extremism help keep an aggressive, violent political actor in power, creating a cult of personality and an idolatry. Historically, the role of a strong leader has always been associated with radicalism and extremism, which as elements of certain socio - political changes require a person who personalizes the basic ideas of the movement, especially the violent ones. There are many examples of this in history, from Stalin, Hitler, Mao, to the Balkans executioners and The Hague convicts such as Radovan Karadžić, Slobodan Milošević and others. These actors created a cult of personality that allowed ideas of hatred towards others to spread like wildfire through social strata within a dominant, majority community or society as a whole. In an extremist and radical environment, every idea is transformed into an idea of extremes which significantly changes the current order of things and norms within a society. Calls for murder, ethnic cleansing, and genocide of one minority group or group in general, are portrayed as something that must be done for a community from which an aggressive political actor comes to survive because it is allegedly threatened by another ethnic, religious, or political community.

In modern times, the world has completely forgotten about radicalism and extremism that serves political purposes, and sees it as something completely normal, perhaps even desirable in certain circumstances when it comes to left-wing or right-wing extremism in relation to the country or territory in which happen. The extreme ideas, such as those from the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia, which came from the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Croatia, are coming to light again. Ultranationalist ideas such as the ideas of the so-called 'Greater Serbia' or 'Greater Croatia', which have their roots in the 18th and 19th centuries, are horrific and revolting examples of political extremism and radicalism that re-emerge again in the 21st century. The reason for the emergence of political extremism and radicalism in the new, modern age is the lack of strong international mechanisms of prevention and sanctions that would act proactively against aggressive political actors. However, the political terrorism of the new age is significantly more deadly than the conventional terrorism. Conventional terrorist actors often did not have a strong political, legal and legitimate stronghold, they operated mainly within a single region and were perceived by the whole world as a significant threat that must be neutralized, which eventually happened. On the other hand, aggressive actors such as politicians and other powerful people from the state elite are not perceived globally and conventionally as terrorists or as terrorist threats, which leaves them enough room to spread radical and extremist ideas calling for the destruction of other communities. They pose a threat in a particular micro or meso environment such as a city, entity or state, not to all citizens, but to a particular ethnic, national or religious group and community.

The localized action of aggressive political actors allows them to carry out violent activities against others without being detected or sanctioned by the international community. The initial neglect of political violence against minority groups allows the aggressive actor to diversify and intensify their activities, which move from the domain of verbal to physical violence. Calls for physical violence were made possible due to the demonization and dehumanization of dissidents or opponents, and over time it grows into kinetic activities of killing and expulsion.

3.2. Radicalism and extremism as a path to violence

Authors such as Azinović and Jusić (2016) note that radicalism is one of the main drivers of violence for political purposes. When it comes to radicalism, we often talk about Muslim radicals and the way they are recruited through the role of a strong authority that seeks and demands deep loyalty to the members, group and ideology. On the other hand, nationalist and political groups, groups and communities also act in the same way. An ideology based on the centuries old ideas of a 'great' ethno-state, aided by religious officials and their deliberately misinterpreted religious teachings, as well as falsified history, makes it possible to better swallow the words of a political elite that seeks to steal and alienate resources (natural, industrial, financial and other) of the community or state that is being attacked.

Also, extremism as an extreme in some idea is associated with Muslims and terrorist organizations from the Middle East, however, being extreme is not a matter of religion or territory in which someone lives. Extremism is becoming an increasing problem around the world when it comes to identities and the politics associated with them. Identity and politics based on the extreme ideas that are far left or far right on the political level are equally devastating for all, both followers of the idea and those against whom it is directed.

Azinović and Jusić state (2016) that the family is the main factor for preventing radicalization, however, when it comes to radicalization and extremism for political and state purposes, then there is no alienation of the individual and going to a certain isolated group, but a mass movement based on following the aggressive policy of official state structures and elites.

Radicalism and extremism in the political ideas and attitudes of the official state political ruling elite do not differ much from the radicalism and extremism of conventional terrorist groups such as ETA, IRA, Al-Qaeda and others. In both cases, the goal is to change the narrative and objective reality in order to create a new reality in which a particular group is labeled as an enemy. In the past, it was often said that terrorism is a disease that threatens the whole world, but in modern times terrorism changes its form and mode of action, and is therefore often neglected because it does not fall in the category of conventional and violent forms of achieving a political goal.

The world's focus on right-wing extremism as a form of terrorist threat has become too shabby, ridiculous, and unnecessary. Today, the extreme right serves as a *honeypot* for the state security agencies that, in addition to infiltrating these groups, also created them. When it comes to the US and European Union countries like Germany, extreme right-wing organizations are just a police trap for discarded social cases that are naive enough to think that a right-wing, nationalist spirit exists. The radicalism and extremism of the state cannot be viewed on the simple, binary spectrum of the left and right, but the said radicalism and extremism are a mixture of both left and right ideology, united in order to acquire certain, currently necessary resources.

3.3. Radicalisation and extremism of inert groups

In order for the ruling political structure to achieve its political goals, it is necessary for the internal masses to be *activated*. This activation is done through various active measures and methods such as indoctrination and propaganda through the media. Today, in the age of technology and information, social networks and the Internet are significant means of creating new social narratives and new realities. The radicalization of young people for the purpose of political terrorism, terror and violence is almost similar to that carried out for the purpose of conventional terrorism undertaken by the terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda or ISIL. However, the goal of political actors who advocate terror and violence against minorities (ethnic, religious, political) is to spread hatred and intolerance through quasi-patriotism in order to achieve their goals of destroying the other and the different. In certain areas of the world such as the Balkans, political radicalization and religious radicalization are clearly intertwined and exist in a symbiosis, serving each other as support in the state machinations and aggressive, hostile activities towards other states and their citizens.

Circumstances that make an individual more susceptible to influence may include the loss of loved ones, a job, a home, or a way of living; these circumstances have been termed 'thawing' in social psychology (McCauley & Moskaleiko, 2017). The 'thawing' is a driver for entering a new tribe that provides refuge, comfort and a new purpose. A large number of members of terrorist groups such as Al-Qaeda or ISIL came from the Western European countries such as Belgium, Austria, Germany, France and others (Rekawek, et al., 2018), and the reason for this is in extensive alienation and labelling of young Muslims who are not well accepted by their community and state (Hellyer, 2007). Alienation, rejection, labelling and stigmatization push towards religious fanaticism, radicalism and extremism, but what about political-ideological radicalization based on nationalism, fascism, xenophobia and other isms, and whether even then there is labelling, rejection or something else? Of course there is. Religious radicalism associated with rejection from society because of one's ethnicity, religion and skin color cannot be compared to radicalism and violence resulting from the unification of several individuals, groups and communities into one unitary group to destroy certain so-called opponents - political, ethnic, religious or ideological.

In today's time, the democracy and civil rights and freedoms, which are receding, also serve as a system of the majority for the repression of the minorities. The so-called 'jihadization'

or Islamization of the world is often referred to, but the resumption of the Crusades, which has its base in the Eastern Balkans countries such as the Republic of Serbia or the Visegrad Group states, is largely ignored. These countries, especially the Republic of Serbia, are trying to 'finish the unfinished' from the nineties and the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina through political measures and activities. What could not be achieved with grenades and tanks during the war, is achieved today in a time of apparent peace with the help of high politics and its proxy nationalist organizations that serve to do dirty work.

The target of the Republic of Serbia and its ruling political elite is not only Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also Montenegro, which is experiencing significant internal political and social changes and which survived the coup attempt in 2016. The spirit of political radicalism and extremism, which turns into terrorism and terror, is slowly but surely creating new boundaries of reality in which state - political terror and terrorism is the normative way of governing, and discrimination against others is a part of life.

In order for the political leadership of an aggressive state to carry out measures of terror against minorities, the inert mass of the majority is activated through strong narratives about depriving them of their freedoms, rights, destroying culture, tradition and religion. Of course, such narratives evoke strong emotions of fear and anger among the inert majority, which is ruled by an aggressive political actor through fear but also hope. The relationship of fear and hope is the key to maintaining power. According to Massuma (2005), the fear of terror emerged during George W. Bush's reign after 9/11 to 'calibrate social anxiety'. Managing the emotions of society, especially fear, provides great opportunities for social manipulation that eventually turns into extremism and radicalism of the wider social masses, and as Walzer (2005) says, 'the state exploits our fear, but it does not experience it itself'. The fear that is produced is directed at the wider masses and it does not touch the state, military, political, economic and other elites (Enroth, 2017), which is why these elites can provide hope in addition to fear. And it is precisely this hope that lies in the actions and measures that an aggressive political actor will take.

Broadly speaking, aggressive state actors themselves fabricate specific situations that affect them to encourage the 'static' and inert ones. A satisfactory state in society, without a clearly defined enemy, does not suit the ruling elite, and it is therefore necessary to produce a state in a society in which hatred and intolerance are smouldering. When that happens, the insane masses are ready to commit crimes against their first neighbours and friends. And in order to accelerate this, the role of state propaganda is significant. The father of propaganda himself, Edward Bernays (1928) says: 'Conscious and intelligent manipulation of organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in a democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society form an invisible government that is the true ruling force of our state'. By ruling the mind and body of the wider social masses, whatever is radical and extreme becomes normal and necessary.

Propaganda itself has two key goals: a) to form a critical action mass that can lead to change through various actions - purposeful changes and b) to form the mood of a difficult and inactive mass that will be in favour of change or will be at least neutral in the expectation that 'it won't get worse' (2019). With the help of these two directions of action, the masses become insane fanatics who agree to everything that is 'served' to them by the political elite.

3.4. The red herring fallacy and labelling the victim

Political radicalism and extremism lurking in the Balkans, especially in the Bosnian entity of the Republika Srpska and the Republic of Serbia, threaten to turn the state of peace into a new era of crusades. The radical and extreme policies of the ruling set of the Republika Srpska and the Republic of Serbia threaten peace in the entire Balkans. Activities such as the

2016 coup attempt, the arrest of Bosnian citizens accused of alleged crimes against Serbs, the undermining of the integrity and sovereignty of the states of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, and the glorification of convicted war criminals and a renewed call for genocide present already complete process of radicalization and extremism. Also, the issue of genocide in Srebrenica has been challenged by various radicals and extremists who have two narratives - the first that the genocide never happened and the second - it will happen again if Bosniaks seek a single and common state of three equal peoples. The paradox of genocide that 'never happened' and the threat that it will happen again are nothing more than a denial of the past and promises of a bloody future for all those who are not of the same ethnicity, ideology and religion.

Extreme and radical political ideas and activities such as denial of genocide can also be promoted with low-intensity terror. The said terror may be carried out through the exclusion and neglect of other ethnic, political or ideological minorities imposed by law. Things such as the 'protection of language and script' carried out by certain political actors in Republika Srpska serve as an extreme way of repressing the non-Serb population. When it comes to 'protection of language and script', the Republika Srpska government aims to prevent the Bosniak and Croat minorities from feeling part of the RS by imposing the Cyrillic alphabet and the Serbian language, in an effort to provoke their exodus in order to create an ethnically pure territory. It should be noted that Bosnia and Herzegovina, as a state that consists of two ethnic groups, the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republika Srpska, inhabited by three, equal and constituent peoples, who use arbitrary Latin or Cyrillic alphabet, could run into a crisis in the case of legal majorization of only one people and one alphabet and language on the territory of one of the entities. And it is exactly what aggressive politics wants to do. Since the aggressive political actor has power, he abuses it in order to expel the powerless under the guise of the law and prevent them from living a normal life.

The silent political terror that lies in seemingly harmless things, radically changes the territory in which it takes place. Instead of equality of all citizens, some become privileged and almost untouchable, while others are pushed and placed in the category of the oppressed. Many authors will find fertile ground for radicalism and extremism in the group of the oppressed, but the reality is quite different. The extremism and radicalism of the oppressed is specific to territories under the invasion of great powers (an example of the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq). The extremism and radicalism in those cases is classified as such by the aggressor and the conqueror who does not want to recognize the right of the attacked to defend themselves and labels them as the terrorists, extremists and radicals who fight against a foreign occupier. Usually a stronger actor has the power to create a new objective reality in which the truth is only what he wants it to be.

4. State and terror

The state, or rather its ruling elite, has always had a monopoly on force, coercion and violence, and as such it can carry out terror against any individual or community and to the extent that it so desires. On its part, the state is an organization with a multitude of legitimate coercion whose task is to protect its basic functions and to enable their practical implementation (Muhić, 1999). In the times of crisis and social problems, the state turns to more aggressive enforcement of legitimate coercion, in order to protect its basic functions, however at some point, the said legitimate coercion ceases to be legal and legitimate due to its aggressiveness, and comes into the domain of terror. Sometimes the state believes that it protects its basic functions, however, on the other hand, it violates the basic human rights of individuals, groups

or communities. Likewise, the state sometimes intentionally violates human rights because it perceives the individual or community as a threat.

State power and coercion is an integral part of a democratic state in the protection of society, however, too much of this force and coercion turns a democratic state into an authoritarian and totalitarian one. In that conversion, state force and coercion become terror and terrorism allowed by the state, which citizens begin to perceive as an integral part of life. The methods of state terror and terrorism include the imprisonment and liquidation of political enemies and disobedient allies, restrictions on the freedom and human rights of all citizens, media control and strong state propaganda in the hands of the state elite that glorifies their totalitarian regime. Terror and terrorism of the state and its political elites are today labelled as repression. According to Simeunović (1989), repression as a complex form of political violence is a characteristic of every state, and it is also a way of regulating social conflicts and ensuring respect for valid laws, and sometimes religious, customary and moral norms through state coercion. Repression is closely related to extremism (Denoeux & Carter, 2009). Also, certain authors (Denoeux & Carter, 2009) view the above as a response of the population to the violence and arbitrariness of the state, but the range of observations should be expanded beyond that.

Although in certain cases, the action of the oppressed falls into the category of extremism, the aggressive action of the state should also be seen as extremism. State extremism, as an extreme, is the excessive, unnecessary and immoral use of force and coercion against citizens, political rivals or specific communities. In today's time of the growing role of the state in human life, it is necessary to take a stand against the absolutism of the state and its elite. Given the connection between the state as a pseudo-organic creation and the ruling elite that makes up the 'brain' of the state itself, a sign of equality can be placed between the two elements. As Louis XIV long ago said 'the state is me', so today the political elite is actually the state. They enact the laws, rules and norms that dictate the behaviour of all of us, and dictate and determine what is moral, immoral, permissible or impermissible.

State terror is not just an unnecessary and illegal restriction of freedom of movement, speech or the arrest of ideological or political dissidents or even the assassination of them. Today, political, i.e. the state terrorism has a tendency to initiate ethnic cleansing, genocide and war as its manifest forms. The state has always been of great importance in international relations (Buzan, 1983), however, the role of politics and political actors today in the post-industrial, neo-capitalist world, transcends the state as an organism that was once the alpha and omega of security studies. Politics as a discipline, and even the science of governing the state, has become too corrupt and financially oriented. It is precisely because of this that the aggressive political actors tend to create conflict in order to obtain the resources that the other group possesses.

Today we have much evidence of state and political terror against our own citizens or ethnic and other minorities - countries like Israel, China, Russia and the like, which do not valorise Western democratic systems, and constantly repress certain minorities (Palestinians, Uighurs or political opposition). At the time of the aggression on Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former FRY (now the Republic of Serbia) used paramilitary formations to terrorize and liquidate the non-Serb population in Bosnia and Herzegovina in order to ethnically cleanse certain territories and pronounce them 'centuries-old' Serbian territory. The Hague verdicts against former generals, presidents, intelligence chiefs and others who were part of the leadership of the Belgrade war machine point to the role of the state and its leadership in carrying out terror against those who do not belong to the same ethnic, religious or political community. There are radical and extreme tendencies in destroying the opponents of the 'system' in the example of the People's Republic of China, which has been carrying out terror

and genocide against its Uighur minority for many years. Uighurs, as an ethnic minority in China, are frequent guests of so-called 'educational camps', i.e. concentration camps. The Uighurs, residents of Xinjiang province, mostly Muslims, pose a 'major threat' to the communist system because of their religion and ethnicity, as they are not members of the majority Han culture. Consequently, the Chinese authorities have taken measures to bring them to the 'right path' through torture, killing, abuse and other forms of physical and psychological violence. The Chinese authorities consider the beliefs, cultures and traditions of certain ethnic and religious groups - 'unhealthy thoughts'.

Chinese, anti-Uyghur, genocidal policies are based not only on torture and killing, but also on restricting the reproductive abilities of Uighur women (Banks & Wilson, 2020). Due to the fear of the dominant urban Han Chinese of an increasing trend of the natal growth among Chinese minorities (mostly Uighurs), measures were taken to severely punish those who do not respect the policy of one child or two children in rural areas. Since the Uyghurs as a minority were entitled to two children, each subsequent child was considered a misdemeanour and the Chinese government prescribed fines for such breach of the law.

Due to the sharp increase in the birth rate of the Uighur minority, stricter sterilization measures have been taken, with Chinese authorities' plan to subject over 80 percent of women of childbearing age in rural areas to 'birth control measures with long-term effect' (Zenz, 2020). The Chinese government's fear of the Uighur minority 'threatening' its birth rate has been resolved through concentration camps where any 'subversive' thoughts are confronted and fought against. Given the nature and purpose of these *educational camps*, only the Chinese communist authorities can decide when a person is sufficiently 'educated' in terms of love for China and the Communist Party (Muhić, 2020).

Due to the above, it is necessary to pose the question whether the state and its ruling elite have the ability to use the law in order to deny certain rights, and whether there are certain mechanisms to fight the state's extreme and radical policies that have turned into terror and terrorism. The answer to the above is reflected in the importance of an aggressive state for the world economy, and in that whether the world powers have similar attitudes as an aggressive state and, accordingly, prevent or allow terror and terrorism.

Conclusion

Extremism and radicalism in modern times no longer belong to the domain of Islamic terrorism and jihad, but to the domain of political and state terror of one national or ethnic group. An ethno-nationalist policy is emerging on the world stage again, seeking to seize resources from other ethnic groups in order to eliminate those who are 'different'. This ethno-nationalist policy is becoming more and more aggressive in its activities, and it aims to label certain individuals and groups as the 'enemies' of the society, nation and state. Labelling individuals, groups and communities as 'enemies' serves to mobilize inert masses who have not previously perceived these elements as a threat or an enemy. It is in this new perception that the greatest danger of extremism and radicalization lies, which actually serves as a weapon of aggressive politics. The extremism and radicalism of the masses are the ticket to the state and political terror and terrorism. The events of the nineties in the former Yugoslavia are very good proof of the importance of political radicalism and extremism in the conduct of terror. Aggression, war, genocide, crimes, destruction and killings are becoming an integral part of the socio - political reality. The terror against minorities expressed through assassinations and killings, ethnic cleansing, and ultimately genocide, cannot be achieved without two factors: the radical and extremist policies of the state leadership and the extremism and radicalism of the majority of society and the nation.

State and political terror and terrorism neither can arise nor survive without the radical and extreme politics of the state and political elite, which in aggression finds a way out of the state and social problems. Radicalism and extremism associated with the 'conventional' terrorism of ideological or religious organizations is increasingly becoming a thing of the past, and a modern state controlled by its political leadership chooses radicalism and extremism as a way to secure certain benefits and resources, thus trying to 'save' the state. The so-called saving of one's own state actually conceals the saving of one's own political position and the creation of a totalitarian regime in which there is no place for the Western values, systems and democracy, but only for repression. The repression of a particular ethnic, national or ideological group and community does not mean that others from the majority of the population are safe from it. After the end of the conflict with minorities, the aggressive political actors will find a new target in their own followers, whom they will terrorize.

The intoxication of the masses with radicalism and extremism cannot bring them any victory or fulfilment, but only prepares them for the future experience of terror by those who revived and initiated them. The fight against radicalism and extremism of political actors who use terror and terrorism to achieve their goals is not possible if certain international mechanisms that will work against the new totalitarianism do not get involved. International measures against political terror and its radicalism and extremism must be rapid, effective and strong so as not to leave enough room for the future political - terrorist elite to develop and spread radicalism and extremism among the wider masses. Extremism and radicalism as abstract phenomena cannot be eradicated, however, it is possible to stop those who intend to spread it and use it as a means of absolute power.

References

- [1] Alispahić, B. (2007). *Terrorism: What is it?* Sarajevo: The Institute for Research of Crimes Against Humanity and International Law.
- [2] Alispahić, B. (2019). *Methodology of Work of the Intelligence and Security Services*. Sarajevo: Faculty of Criminalistics, Criminology and Security Studies, University of Sarajevo.
- [3] Angus, C. (2016). *Radicalisation and Violent Extremism: Causes and Responses*. NSW Parliamentary Research Service.
- [4] Azinović, V., & Jusić, M. (2016). *New call for the war in Syria and BH contingent of foreign fighters*. Sarajevo: Atlantska Inicijativa.
- [5] Banks, J., & Wilson, J. (2020). *CCP's crimes against the Uyghur people - Final letter*. National Security and Foreign Affairs Task Force, House Republican Study Committee, Washington D.C. <https://freebeacon.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/UyghurLetter-Final.pdf>
- [6] Bernays, E. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: Horace Liveright.
- [7] Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into Violent Extremism I: A Review of Social Science Theories. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 7-36.
- [8] Buzan, B. (1983). *People, States and Fear: National Security Problem in International Relations*. Brighton, Sussex: Wheatsheaf Books.
- [9] Cohan, J. A. (2002). Formulation of a State's Response to Terrorism and State-Sponsored Terrorism. *Pace International Law Review*, 78-110 .
- [10] Denoeux, G., & Carter, L. (2009). *Guide to the Drivers of Violent Extremism*. USAID. Preuzeto od https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadt978.pdf
- [11] Đorić, M. R. (2012). Theoretical determination of extremism. *Kultura polisa*, p. 45-62.
- [12] Enroth, H. (2017). Fear as a Political Factor. *International Political Sociology*, 55-72.
- [13] Federal Bureau of Investigation. (01. 04 2020). *Terrorism*. <https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism>

- [14] Halkides, M. (1995). How not to study terrorism. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, 253-260.
- [15] Hellyer, H. (2007). *Engagement with the Muslim Community and Counter-Terrorism: British Lessons for The West*. The Saban Center for Middle East Policy at Brookings.
- [16] Jalata, A. (2010). Conceptualizing and Theorizing Terrorism in the Historical and Global. *Humanity and Society*, 317-349.
- [17] Jasper, S. (2020). *Russian Cyber Operations*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- [18] Kundani, A. (2012). Radicalisation: the journey of a concept. *Race and Class*, p. 3-25.
- [19] Massuma, B. (2005). Fear (The Spectrum Said). *Positions*, p. 31-48.
- [20] McCauley, C., & Moskalenko, S. (2008). Mechanisms of Political Radicalization: Pathways Toward Terrorism. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, p. 415-433.
- [21] McCauley, C., & Moskalenko, S. (2017). Understanding Political Radicalization: The Two-Pyramids Model. *American Psychologist*, p. 205-216.
- [22] Muhić, E. (2020). *The Intelligence and Security Service and its relation with the special war (master thesis)*. Sarajevo.
- [23] Muhić, F. (1999). *Theory of the state and law*. Sarajevo: Editio Iuristica.
- [24] NATO. (2020). *Counter-Terrorism Reference Curriculum*. NATO. https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/6/pdf/200612-DEEP-CTRC.pdf
- [25] Rekawek, K., Matějka, S., Szuc, V., Beňuška, T., Kajzarová, K., & Rafay, J. (2018). *WHO ARE THE EUROPEAN JIHADIS? FROM CRIMINALS TO TERRORISTS AND BACK? GLOBSEC*.