Varieties of Terrorism
extended to the experience of the terrorized

Introduction
This note endeavours to clarify the variety of ways in which terror is deliberately caused or experienced. The purpose is to provide a reminder -- which should not be necessary -- that the phenomenon of "terrorism" also exists outside the specific domains in which "anti-terrorist" security measures are taken. Ironically it could be argued that the official focus on the more narrowly defined forms of "terrorism" is one of the most effective means of obscuring other forms of terrorism to which far more people are exposed. Typologies and taxonomies of "terrorism" seldom make any reference to such other forms of terrorism and should therefore be considered incomplete in the acknowledgement of the variety of ways in which people are intimidated. It is worth recalling that the prime objective of "terrorism" is inducing a climate of fear. And yet it is precisely such other, more widespread, forms of "terrorism" which are characteristic of any "breeding ground" for "terrorists" in the narrower sense. It could be argued that many of these other varieties of "terrorism" are not "serious", and some may even be understood as negligible since they imply no threat of death. But the question is whether they give rise to commensurate fear -- as perceived and experienced by those exposed to such intimidation -- or whether such fear is to be devalued and demeaned in comparison with that associated with the more narrowly defined forms of terrorism. It is useful to reflect on how it is that the most powerful nations in modern civilization have invested so much in countering the narrower form of terrorism, whether in terms of funds, human resources or intelligence. And yet relatively little is effectively invested in the response to the forms of terror that many experience on a daily basis. It is almost as though resources are allocated in highly visible response to an elusive enemy as a means of avoiding any response to far more frequently experienced forms of terror in the daily lives of many. The systematic counter-terrorist security measures might even be said to be engendering more terror than those deliberately undertaking occasional conventional "terrorist" actions. It is also worth recalling that it is not only the prospect of physical violence that causes fear but also various forms of contextual or structural violence. Fear is an unpleasant feeling of perceived risk or danger, real or not. Fear also could be described as a feeling of extreme dislike to some conditions/objects, such as: fear of darkness, fear of ghosts, etc [more]. Inability to guarantee sufficient food or water, especially for vulnerable dependents, may engender deep existential fear on a daily basis.

Engendering terror through intimidation
Nature-related terror
- Intimidation by natural disasters (floods, earthquakes, volcanoes, hurricanes, etc)
- Intimidation by wild animals (man-eaters, sharks, bears, snakes, etc)
- Intimidation of animals (abuse of work animals, cruelty to animals, vivisection, torture, etc)
Contextually-induced terror

- Intimidation by accidents (explosions, traffic, etc)
- Intimidation by economic disaster (financial collapse, factory closure, etc)
- Intimidation by doom-mongering (asteroids, aliens, epidemics, end-times scenarios, nuclear winter, etc)
- Intimidation through display of force (weaponry, small arms, missiles, battleships, etc)
- Intimidation through health threats, by physicians, pharmaceutical companies, etc (obesity, smoking, diet, cancer, etc)
- Intimidation by withholding vital aid to those in need
- Intimidation by limiting access to basic needs (food, shelter, medicine, etc)
- Intimidation by threat of change to status quo

Politically-induced terror

- Intimidation by "terrorists" (suicide bombing, kidnappings, etc)
- Intimidation by liberation movements
- Intimidation by political activists (animal rights, etc)

Militarily-induced terror

- Intimidation by "legitimate" conventional warfare (bombing, fire-bombing, search and destroy, etc)
- Intimidation by the threat of weapons of mass destruction (nuclear warfare, etc)
- Intimidation by targeted assassination

Institutionally-induced terror (through abuse of power and authority)

- State-sponsored terror (rogue states, etc)
- Intimidation by tyrants and dictators
- Intimidation by military superiors
- Intimidation by security personnel (prisons, secret services, security "contractors", etc)
- Intimidation by government officials (bureaucratic harassment, taxation, etc)
- Intimidation by secret services (and rogue agencies)
- Intimidation by corporate executives (dirty tricks, etc)
- Financial intimidation (bankers, loan sharks, etc)
- Intimidation by priests and priesthoods (hell fire, mortal soul, fear of God, sexual abuse, etc)
- Intimidation by incompetent or irresponsible professionals
- Intimidation by scientists and physicians (human experimentation relating to tolerance of radioactivity, biochemical agents, etc)
- Intimidation by service and shop personnel
- Intimidation by teachers
- Intimidation by legal harassment

Socially-induced terror (groups)

- Intimidation by street gangs (bullying, torture, etc)
- Intimidation by labour unions
- Intimidation of proprietors (racketeering, etc)
- Intimidation by organized crime
- Intimidation by ethnic groups
- Intimidation by opposite gender
- Intimidation by cults
- Intimidation by community or peer sanction (ostracism, shunning, etc)

Socially-induced terror (individuals)

- Intimidation by kidnappers
- Intimidation through death threats
- Intimidation by stalkers
- Intimidation by students
- Intimidation by the physically advantaged of the physically or mentally disadvantaged (carers, hospices, etc)
- Intimidation by the mentally advantaged of the physically or mentally disadvantaged (carers, hospices, etc)
- Intimidation of pedestrians by drivers
- Intimidation by landlords (bullying, loss of tenancy, etc)
- Intimidation by neighbours
- Intimidation by competitors and rivals
- Intimidation by criminals (serial killers, sociopaths, etc)
- Intimidation by street violence (muggers, street gangs, etc)

Peer-related terror

- Intimidation by fellow students (bullying, torture, hazing rituals, etc)
- Intimidation by drivers (tailgating, cutting in, etc)
- Intimidation by work colleagues (bullying, etc)
- Intimidation by fellow prisoners (rape, sex slavery, etc)
- Intimidation by military platoon mates (bullying, hazing rituals, etc)

**Personal and domestic terror**
- Sexual intimidation (rape, etc)
- Intimidation of servants (bullying, threat of job loss, threat of beating, etc)
- Intimidation of spouse (bullying, domestic violence, etc)
- Intimidation by siblings (bullying, torture, etc)
- Intimidation by parents (child abuse, etc)
- Intimidation by in-laws (dowry-related, etc)

**Subjectively-induced terror**
- Intimidation through induced phobias:
  - of the dark
  - of being alone
  - of open spaces (wilderness, etc)
  - of insects
  - etc [checklist]
- Intimidation by the media (horror movies, etc)
- Intimidation through hoaxes (duplicity, harassment, hazing, "only a joke", etc)
- Intimidation by extraterrestrials (abductions, etc)
- Intimidation by beliefs in the supernatural (demons, evil spirits, evil eye, ghosts, etc)
- Intimidation by witchdoctors
- Intimidation through superstition (inauspicious, etc)
- Intimidation by the unknown
- Intimidation by the prospect of:
  - ageing (loss of looks, senility, dependency, etc)
  - being forgotten
  - being unrecognized
  - being ignored
  - being impotent
- Intimidation by alienation of affection

**Broadening the taxonomy of terrorism**

It may well be that a more appropriate approach to a framework for a taxonomy of terrorism is a mix of the following:

**Origins of European understandings of "fear"**: The work of Jan Edward Garret (see Table 1) distinguishes varieties of fear in the classical Greek and Roman literature that is basic to understanding of so many terms in European languages. He notes the classical definition of fear as a disorder arising from expectation of evil; a belief of threatening evil which seems to the subject of it insupportable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety of fear</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sluggishness</td>
<td>Sluggishness: fear of ensuing toil</td>
<td>oknos</td>
<td>pigritia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Shame: fear of disgrace</td>
<td>aischuné</td>
<td>pudor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fright</td>
<td>Paralyzing fear which causes paleness, trembling and chattering of teeth</td>
<td>ekplêxis</td>
<td>terror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timidity</td>
<td>Fear of approaching evil</td>
<td>deima</td>
<td>timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consternation</td>
<td>Fear upsetting the mental balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>pavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursillanimity</td>
<td>Fear following upon the heels of fright</td>
<td>agonia</td>
<td>examinatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewildernment</td>
<td>Lust for beholding someone who is not present</td>
<td>thorubio</td>
<td>conturbatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painheartedness</td>
<td>Lasting fear</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>formido</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding of himsa in Sanskrit**: The concept of ahimsa is based on recognition of the forms of injury (himsa) to which any philosophy of non-violence (ahimsa) must necessarily be attentive. It is notably fundamental to the Jain religion but has been central to some understandings of peace activism. In Table 2, a simplified version of the Jain approach to himsa is presented.

| Arambhaja or Arambhi Himsa, (Occupational Injury) | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|---|---|
| Udyami Himsa, (industrial injury) | • Asi: through the profession of a soldier, | | |
| Grharambhi Himsa, (domestic) | • Masi: through the profession of a writer, | | |
|                               | • Krsh: through the profession of an agriculturist, | | |
|                               | • Vaniya: through the profession of a trader, | | |
|                               | • Silpa: through the profession of an artisan, and | | |
|                               | • Vidya: through the profession of an intellectual. | | |
|                               | Committed in the performance of necessary domestic acts, such as preparation of food, keeping the house, body, clothes and other things clean, construction of buildings, wells, gardens, and other structures, keeping cattle, etc. | | |
Cross-cutting distinctions are made between

- **Sthula Himsa vs Sukshma Himsa:**
  - Sthula Himsa: the destruction of the higher forms of life from dvindriyas, i.e., two-sensed beings upwards
  - Sukshma Himsa: taking of life in any form including even the killing of ekendriyas, i.e., one sensed beings. (The lay Jain is also enjoined to avoid the useless destruction of Sthavara-Jivas, i.e., immobile souls).

- **Dravya vs Bhava:**
  - Dravya Himsa, i.e., the actual hurt or injury and
  - Bhava Himsa, i.e., the intention to hurt or injury to vitality.

- **Bahya vs Antargata:**
  - Bahya i.e. external aspects: the external or actual acts of killing or injury
  - Antargata, i.e., internal aspects: the internal or intentional side of committing of injury.

- **Vyavahara vs Nischaya Naya:**
  - Vyavahara Naya, i.e., the practical point of view: hurting of the vitalities by passionate vibrations, namely injury of any kind to the material or conscious vitalities caused through passionate activity of mind, body or speech
  - Nischaya Naya, i.e., the real point of view: the intentional side of injury, even when passions to hurt others arise in the mind.

**Panetics:** The systematic work of the *International Society for Panetics*, founded by Taoist R G H Siu, is concerned with the sensitivity and vigilance required of any ethical system. Its focus on suffering and its infliction raises the question of the relationship between suffering and the fear it engenders. This work has notably identified:

- Ways of inflicting suffering: Some 3,700 English terms relating to the notion of "inflict" (R G H Siu. *Less Suffering for Everybody*, 1993; Appendix B)
- Analysis of the infliction process (R G H Siu. *Panetics and Dukkha: an integrated study of the infliction of suffering and the reduction of infliction*. 1993; Chapter 5) in which he distinguishes the following modulating factors (relevant to any taxonomy) of terrorism:
  - personality and psychological state
  - institutional interests
  - discipline
  - rules, morality, and love
  - justifications and rationalizations
  - theories
  - virtual presences
  - public relations
  - solace and explanation
  - pursuit of happiness
  - craving for money
  - thirst for knowledge
  - lust for power and urge to win
  - duplicity
  - irresponsibility and thoughtlessness
  - incompetence
  - strangers
  - distance

- Contemporary case study: United States of America (R G H Siu. *Panetics and Dukkha: an integrated study of the infliction of suffering and the reduction of infliction*. 1993; Chapter 4) (see Table 5 below)

**Varieties of love:** The very extensive literature on the varieties of love and loving (as the polar opposite of fear and terrifying) suggests that the methodology employed in such studies might be used for a better understanding of fear (cf Robert M. Young. *Love: from libido theory to object relations*). This is especially the case given the intimate relationship between love and fear in love-making (versus rape, for example) and the recognized eroticism of torture -- as well as the justifications advanced for responding to "terrorism" in the name of a Christian-inspired civilization emphasizing "love". Just as Sanskrit distinguishes some 80 terms for love, the point has been made by Stephen Post (Unlimited Love and Ultimate Reality, 2003) that:

The Greek’s were more careful to make linguistic distinctions. They had a myriad of words for love: "eunoia" refers to good will or benevolence, "physike" to kindness toward people of one’s own race, " xenike" to kindness toward guest’s and strangers, "eroticke" to sexual desire, " erot" to impassioned attraction, " philia" to friendship, " storge" to tenderness, and " agape" to a disinterested affection. Agape, divine limitless love, would be taken up by emergent Christianity and identified as the essential nature of God. This affectionate love for all humanity seems to have at least some place in all major religious traditions of the world.

**Metaphoric articulation of fear:** Several authors have explored the consequences of the creative and uncritical reframing of fear through metaphor.
The first narrative is that of the Atlantic ruling classes as they seek to consolidate their control of this new Empire and create legitimizing myths to justify their acts of "terror" used to pacify resistant populations—both at home and abroad. The second narrative, which is more important to the authors, is the alliances formed amongst multi-ethnic workers in response to the brutal conditions of this new empire. These resistances are the main theme of Many-Headed Hydra. Linebaugh and Rediker explore the various resistances to these global colonizing forces through the metaphors of "terror" that the dominant society used to demonize alternative lifestyles. Prominent amongst these was the image of the multi-headed Hydra that the mythic Hercules had to destroy as one of his heroic labors. The mythical Hydra would sprout two heads in the place of every head that was lopped off by Hercules. In a final desperate move Hercules used a torch to sear the severed necks in order to prevent new heads from sprouting. It was the legitimizing myths of political theorists, like Francis Bacon, that supported the representation of marginalized peoples as monstrous forces that threatened the ordered progression of society.

However it is only in a commentary on a classical text from Judaism that metaphor seems to be used to distinguish between the varieties of fear. Rabbinical commentary (see Table 3) distinguishes five instances in which the weak cast fear over the strong: "The fear of the lion for the mafia, the fear of an elephant for a mosquito, the fear of a scorpion for a spider, the fear of the eagle for a swallow, the fear of Leviathan for a stickleback fish" (Shabbat 77b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Five Kinds of Fear (adapted here into tabular form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The fear of a lion for a mafia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fear of an elephant for a mosquito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fear of a scorpion for a spider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fear of an eagle for a swallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fear of Leviathan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engendering fear through the arts: Given the overwhelming role of the entertainment media in seeking innovative ways to engender fear (see below), the understanding of the varieties of fear as aesthetic devices is instructive for a broader understanding of terrorism. Oscar Sharp with Tom DeVille have produced such a taxonomy as a guide to developing horror films (see Table 4).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions in distinguishing terror and terrorism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In reviewing frameworks like those above, some guiding questions include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How afraid does a person need to be before they are considered to be terrified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can we say the quality of fear felt by one person is different to the quality of fear felt by another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How to distinguish -- and possibly thereby marginalize -- the degree of fear of a vulnerable person (elderly, child, etc) exposed to non-terrorist threat, as compared to the fear associated with the action of terrorists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the essence of terrorism is the deliberate targeting of innocents to further political goals, how is &quot;innocence&quot; to be defined in an exploitative society based on increasingly institutionalized inequality? If the claim -- made by terrorists in targeting innocents is that they are &quot;fighting for justice&quot; -- is &quot;morally bankrupt&quot;, to what extent is the failure to address the issues of those suffering from starvation, disease and injustice also morally bankrupt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If terrorism is defined as any use of violence for the purpose of putting any section of the public in fear (cf UK Prevention of Terrorism Act, 1976), what degree of fear is implied and how is that distinct from fear-inducing movies, for example? How is the use of violence by dominant groups (as a political goal to maintain their position through &quot;security measures&quot;) to be distinguished from the goals of groups and individuals in seeking freedom from that dominance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the organized response to an act defined as &quot;terrorism&quot; includes the infliction of maximal pain (to induce &quot;terror&quot; in suspects under interrogation) is defined as &quot;legitimate&quot;, if the pain infliction is not properly based in law? This is the challenge to George Bush and his supporters, given that he affirmed that his (political) response was not to be constrained by the Geneva Conventions, that such acts were deliberately undertaken in an extrajudicial context (eg the Guantanamo facility), and that observers have expressed concern that they were indeed war crimes [more]. Does the fact that the nature of the enabling presidential decisions to encourage such use of maximal pain have only reluctantly been made public suggest a stealthy use of violence to create fear for political ends -- namely a form of terrorism according to common definitions? Or is &quot;terrorism&quot; only something that others do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Just as a case is made for a &quot;just war&quot; by civilized countries (with terrifying collateral damage to innocent civilians), a case is made for supportive participation by covert military forces in the destabilization of regimes for political ends -- also with terrifying collateral damage [more]. How are those foreign force participants to be distinguished from &quot;terrorists&quot;? Who determines that they are not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How arbitrary is the distinction between &quot;mercenaries&quot; and &quot;terrorists&quot;. George Monbiot (Pedigree Dogs of War, Guardian, 25 January 2005) explores how some people who engage in foreign conflicts are called terrorists, whereas others are distinguished as businessmen licensed by the government of their home country. He asks why an alleged engagement in foreign military operations is called terrorism one moment and business the next. The UK government, for example, seeks to distinguish between &quot;responsible and reputable private-sector operators&quot;, in order to &quot;encourage and support the former&quot; -- thus allowing it to support military action by such operators, without having to declare war or seek parliamentary approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinguishing degrees of fear and terror

At what point dies "intimidation" become "terrorism"? Or is it always a kind of "terrorism-lite"? What weight should be attached to the claims of the "intimidated" ("terrorized") as against that attached to the denials of the "intimidator" ("terrorist")?

How dissimilar from modern day terrorist militia activities are the acts of the Bushwackers and Jayhawkers during the American Civil War? Which groups active in that war, if any, should be more correctly labelled as "terrorists" according to modern criteria? What of the contemporary supporters of those militia -- are they "terrorist sympathizers"?

Us Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, responding to press queries on 10 September 2004 about the follow-up to the photographed abuses at Abu Ghraib "on his watch", argued that there was no comparison between those extraordinary events (perpetrated covertly by military personnel and now subject to corrective measures) and "chopping off" heads of hostages by terrorists on television [more]. Does this mean that genuine terror in a climate of fear was not evoked at the Abu Ghraib facility -- even though engendering terror was a feature of the authorized interrogation techniques employed, to the degree that soldiers have admitted betting on their capacity to make prisoners soil themselves from fear (presumably a good indicator of terror) (see Use of Dogs to Scare Prisoners Was Authorized, Washington Post, 11 June 2004)?

Some cultures consider official execution of any form to be barbaric, whether practiced by terrorist militia or by the USA, whether televised or not. In terms of creating an addictive taste for terrorism in a population, how are occasional real executions (broadcast to cultures having that tradition) to be compared with multi-channel, 24-hour, worldwide broadcasting of fictional murder, mutilation, torture and gore of maximal brutality? Who distinguishes effectively between televised exposure to "real" terror and to "reef" terror?

To what extent does repeated empathetic engagement in the televised perpetration of terror-inducing acts by movie heroes, and appreciative observation of their consequences on the victims, transform the viewer into a "terrorist"?

Animal rights activists deplore the painful experiences to which scientists subject animals in experiments (justified by the value of such work to humanity), whilst denying the significance of any terror experienced by the animal. How is this "terrorism", of which scientists are accused, to be distinguished from the "terrorism" of which the activists are themselves accused in seeking to block such experimentation. Can the distinction be appropriately made without having been exposed to the reality of animals in such laboratory environments -- or in abattoirs?

Animal rights activists perceive the activities of the pro-hunting community as a form of terrorism -- against animals killed for pleasure. However, if pro-hunting activists engage in any form of protest, as with their penetration of the UK Houses of Parliament (Invasion of the Commons, The Guardian, 16 September 2004), to what extent should they be assumed to be "terrorists" or treated as "terrorist suspects"? If they are killed by security forces, would this action be considered legitimate -- applying the precautionary principle to assume that they were indeed terrorists? How would the situation be treated (by the media, for example) if some of them were of apparent Arab extraction?

To what extent should the annual ritual slaughter of sheep (at the festival of Eid el-Kebir), by the head of each Muslim household, be recognized as a form of terrorism -- even though studies show "no sign of distress in the animals" when they are able to see others being slaughtered nearby [more]? How to distinguish the terror experienced in an incident of exposure to a dangerous driver, or a mugger, from an incident involving a terrorist?

From the perspective of those exposed to extreme intimidation in institutional environments (prison violence and sex slavery, bullying in the military or in the playground, student hazing, etc), at what point do they have every right to perceive themselves as victims of "terrorism"? How is the toleration of such behaviour (or its denial) by authorities to be compared with their toleration of extreme fear in non-institutional contexts where such authorities have power and arrogate to themselves the right to define what is "terrorism" in such a way as to deny their own role in it?

"Fear of the Lord" is fundamental to the current Christian-inspired approach to world order (Proverbs 1:7, "The fear of the Lord [is the beginning of knowledge: [but] fools despise wisdom and instruction.") [more]. How is such fear to be distinguished from the "climate of fear" which is the objective of terrorism? (see Is God a Terrorist: Definitional game-playing by the Coalition of the Willing? 2004)

How is the extreme terror caused by "anti-terrorist" security forces -- before killing a person (or their child) in a search and destroy mission in the name of peace and democracy -- to be distinguished from the actions of a terrorist bent on creating mayhem?

To what degree are the actors, in a confrontation engendering terror, free to define each other as a "terrorist" -- especially when the death of one by a bullet from the other (pre-defined as an "anti-terrorist") is accepted as prima facie evidence confirming that the one killed was necessarily a "terrorist"? Who controls judgements in this radical definitional process? Is this pre-emptive justice the legitimating framework for pre-emptive strikes?
Fear can be described by different terms in accordance with its relative degrees. Fear covers a number of terms -- terror, fright, paranoia, horror, persecution complex. Terror then refers to a pronounced state of fear, where someone becomes overwhelmed with a sense of immediate danger [more]. In distinguishing degrees of fear and terror, how relevant are the following frameworks:

- Should degrees of fear be distinguished according to a metaphor such as heating water: low order fear corresponding to "tepid", mild fear to "warm", and severe fear to "hot" -- with only "boiling" corresponding to "terror"? Or are there more appropriate distinctions explored by specialists in interrogation?

If the water-heating metaphor is meaningful it might be usefully combined with the classic story of the experience of two frogs, one exposed suddenly and the other gradually to heated water. What then is to be said of the "terror" experienced by someone exposed suddenly to a "terrifying" situation, as compared to someone who has been gradually exposed to an increasingly fearful environment? As with the frog subjected to progressively hotter water, does the person's adaptation imply that "terror" is never actually experienced (before he or she dies of "fright")? How do people living in extremely fearful environments distinguish "terror"?

- VIPs, whether government leaders, corporate executives, or celebrities, or the paranoid wealthy, increasingly make use of bodyguards (close protection officers or protection specialists) in response to death threats and the possibility of kidnapping. The number of such bodyguards, or the budget allocated to them, may be considered a quantitative measure of the level of fear under which the protected person lives. In 2000 hundreds of bodyguards were being funded (at an estimated cost £50m each year) by the UK government for public figures considered to be at risk. British MPs may have one. Coverage may range from one (namely a team of 3 for 24-hour coverage), to 10 or more for special events (as in the case of Salman Rushdie), to 35 in the case of Mohamed al-Fayed, to £30m per year for the UK Royal Family [more]. From such a perspective, the rising cost of protection of the most powerful man on the planet may ironically be considered as a measure of the level of fear under which the champion of freedom lives: At the time of the American Civil War, 3 people were required for presidential protection at The White House. By 1895 this had risen to 27, rising thereafter as follows: 1917, 34; 1930, 48; 1935, 60; 1940, 80; 1947, 110; 1952, 170; 1967, 213; 1970, 850; to an estimated level of 1200 [more]. In the USA, following 9/11, the needs of homeland security have escalated the investment in personal security -- which might again be used as a quantitative measure of the level of fear. In fiscal year 2004, the USA $41.347 billion homeland security budget request was a $3.2 billion increase over 2003 [more]

- Given the security preoccupation with distinct levels of threat, can levels of fear or terror be usefully correlated with the US DEFense CONdition (defense readiness) typology? In the USA, in the event of a national emergency, a series of seven different alert Conditions (LERTCONs) can be called. The 7 LERTCONs are broken down into 5 Defense Conditions (DEFCONs) and 2 Emergency Conditions (EMERGCONs). Defense readiness conditions (DEFCONs) describe progressive alert postures primarily for use between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of unified commands and are graduated to match situations of varying military severity. They are are phased increases in combat readiness [more]:
  - DEFCON 5: Normal peacetime readiness
  - DEFCON 4: Normal, increased intelligence and strengthened security measures
  - DEFCON 3: Increase in force readiness above normal readiness
  - DEFCON 2: Further Increase in force readiness, but less than maximum readiness
  - DEFCON 1: Maximum force readiness

In direct response to the terrorist threat, TotalSecurity.US, has partnered with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to establish and create two new phases in the Homeland Security Advisory System resulting in a seven-colour scale understanding of collective threat [more]

A fundamental question that might be asked is why no corresponding threat level scales exist for the kinds of terrifying situation experienced by many independently of any terrorist threat (narrowly defined)? For example:

- In measures of quality of life, what kind of scale would be appropriate to distinguish the level of fear (or terror) associated with a privileged environment in contrast with one of extreme poverty, notably in inner city urban slum environments? How are degrees of existential fear to be distinguished -- notably those characteristic of some mental disorders?

- How is it that, in areas vulnerable to bush fires, risk level indicators are in widespread use as a warning to adjust behaviour appropriately? Would it not be appropriate to position such indicators in urban environments to indicate the fear/threat level? A precedent for such an approach is the Doomsday Clock indicator maintained by the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists from 1947 (and standing at 7 minutes to midnight since 2003).

- How is it that with respect to species of plant and animal (and irrespective of any possible terror the species might be assumed to experience under the circumstances), an IUCN scale of different levels of threat to their possible extinction is widely used?

- Matching threats to species, an associated scale is also used with respect to threats to ecosystems (whose quality of "terror" is presumably beyond understanding through any currently favoured anthropomorphic models). For example, with respect to forested areas, distinctions may be made between:
  - Parcel is in danger of conversion to non-forest use within 5 years
  - Parcel may remain wooded, but will become further subdivided within 5 years.
  - Parcel is currently for sale on the open market.
  - Parcel may remain wooded but is in danger of being harvested in a non-sustainable fashion.
  - Parcel contains a remnant of a diminishing forest type
- Infrastructure extensions are imminent in the area. [more]

- How is it that the movie industry is under pressure to develop somewhat analogous scales to distinguish movies suitable for kids from those (more terrifying) requiring adult guidance, or designed only for adults?

- Would it not be appropriate to adapt the statistical conclusions of the UN Human Development Report, which seeks to distinguish conditions of quality of life, in order to correlate them with levels of fear and terror? Is the failure to acknowledge the "quality of fear" under some circumstances tantamount to a cynical indulgence in political correctness that uses "quality of life" to put a euphemistic gloss on lives undermined by such fear?

- Given the availability of data on "small arms" and "light weapons" in civilian hands, it is worth considering whether the percentage of households with firearms could be used as an indication of the level of the "climate of fear" in a country. Such weapons, whether used in attack or defence, could be considered as a kind of "unit of terror". Aside from gun related deaths, in one of the largest studies, based on a standardized survey of victimization in 54 countries, gun ownership was significantly related to both the level of robberies and the level of sexual assaults. There was also evidence that high levels of gun ownership, such as exist in the US, the former Yugoslavia, South Africa, and several Latin American countries, are strongly related to higher levels of violence generally (Wendy Cukier. Small Arms: A Major Public Health Hazard, 2001)

- Given the research of R G H Siu and the International Society for Panetics on the concept of the "dukkha" as a measure of suffering, to what extent can that be adapted to measurement of degrees of fear? What is the correlation between suffering and fear? For the panetics community, the dukkha is a measure of the intensity and duration of pain and anguish adapted from the 9-point hedonic scale used to provide subjective judgements in market research. In this light the 9-point dukkha scale is as follows (from R G H Siu. Less Suffering for Everybody, 1993: Chapter 3):
  - Level 1: noticeable
  - Level 2: bothersome
  - Level 3: moderate
  - Level 4: considerable, seeking relief
  - Level 5: middle point, interfering with daily life
  - Level 6: quite a lot
  - Level 7: miserable, seeking physician or other healer
  - Level 8: excruciating
  - Level 9: unbearable, wanting to die

According to this approach, one dukkha expresses the amount of suffering endured by one person experiencing one intensity unit for one day (roughly the equivalent to the amount of suffering felt by one person with a moderate toothache for eight hours). A megadukkha represents the order of magnitude of suffering sustained by 1,000 persons for about 10 hours a day, for a year, with severe stomach ulcers and without medication. Siu applied this tentatively to the USA as indicated in Table 5. The question is how such indicators relate to the creation of a climate of fear associated with that suffering. The approach is explored further by Johan Galtung (Panetics and the Practice of Peace and Development, 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative categories</th>
<th>Unemployment and poverty</th>
<th>Environmental pollution</th>
<th>Occupational hazard and stress</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Justice system</th>
<th>Alcohol consumpt.</th>
<th>Smoking</th>
<th>Mental anguish</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressmen</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career government officials</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business leaders</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public media persons</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>2,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church leaders</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1,851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others, including parents</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>7,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,280</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>6,300,46,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* Estimates based on incomplete data

In exploring a more general taxonomy for the varieties of fear and terror -- which may well drive terrorism as now publicized -- there is an important case to be made for attentiveness to defintional game-playing and conceptual gerrymandering [more]. Definitional boundaries are in process of being promoted and institutionalized for political reasons. This strategy is bracketing off the forms of terror that many experience but that have not been legitimated by the preoccupations of the Coalition of the Willing.

Any web search of "terrified by" and "terrified of" (respectively 57,800 and 149,000 documents via Google) is indicative of the range of
sources of terror beyond those of the preoccupations of the Coalition of the Willing. Who, or what, are the causative agents of all these other kinds of terror? Surely not al-Qaeda? Is there a real danger that the outmoded mindset underpinning racist views of ethnic groups is re-emerging in support of a form of "conceptual apartheid" -- distinguishing forms of terror particularly threatening to the privileged from those that can be neglected in relation to the underprivileged and voiceless?

It might indeed be said of that Coalition that it is above all characterized by a willingness to tolerate all forms of terror bar that for which its institutional systems can be retargeted -- having previously demonstrated far less than modest success in retargeting those systems to address more common forms of terror (associated with poverty, disease, urban violence, etc). The extremely tardy response in 2004 to the major humanitarian disaster in Darfur (Sudan) is but one example. In this sense it might be asked whether the Coalition of the Willing is above all fearful of its own shadow (see Attacking the Shadow through Iraq, 2002). Curiously the old concept of the "bogeyman" is increasingly cited in relation to terrorism. Is the international community basically terrified by the bogeyman under its own "bed", or in its "attic" -- or maybe in its "cellar"?

**Training for intimidation and terrorism**

To what extent should blood sports be considered as a form of training in terrorism? Fox hunting, for example, would appear to offer many parallels to search and destroy missions. Does it develop appreciation of the methods of targeted killing -- and total indifference to the level of terror created in the victim?

It could be argued that such experiences condition people to the acceptability of subsequently engendering terror in those they define as non-human -- a practice developed in relation to slaves, indigenous peoples, and "people of colour", as well as to those of "below-average" intelligence. Michael Moore's movie Fahrenheit 9/11 includes footage of drivers of armoured personnel carriers in Iraq on missions to the accompaniment of suitable music. How does their experience differ from that of video games -- or of the Gulf War "turkey shoot" of which US military boasted in 1991:

> U.S. military forces, in violation of international law, fired on retreating and largely defenseless Iraqi soldiers just before the cease-fire. U.S. pilots described it in news accounts as a "turkey shoot" and "like shooting fish in a barrel." [more | more ]

> Two days after the Gulf War cease-fire, the 24th Infantry Division demolished a retreating Iraqi Republican Guard tank division near the Rumaila oil field at hardly any cost of American life. [more]

The point is reinforced by the total lack of official interest in documenting the number of Iraqi civilian deaths in Iraq.

Many of the aspects and circumstances of intimidation are repeatedly rehearsed every day on television and on widely available videos and video techniques. Ironically again, it might be said that television provides continuous "educational" and "training" programmes in support of intimidation and its techniques. It is difficult to imagine how populations could be given a more thorough orientation in support of the techniques of terrorism -- or nourished in their various forms of paranoia.

From this perspective, television provides the most comprehensive, and essentially free, adult education programme undertaken by any civilization -- in the art of terrorism. Specific movies could be usefully associated as illustrative examples of each of the above forms of terrorism -- annotated according to their degree of refinement. What role do movies like Mel Gibson's controversial portrayal of the Crucifixion in the The Passion of the Christ (2003) play in cultivating Christian attitudes to state-sponsored terror against those with whom the dominant majority disagrees?

Golliwogs as a children's toy were eliminated in the 1980s and 1990s in campaigns of anti-racist political correctness. It is therefore curious that, given the terror that it is recognized that a cat engenders in a mouse, even when "playing" with it, there is little sensitivity to the subtle role that a classical cartoon like Tom and Jerry (160 since 1940) may play in reframing terrifying others in one's power as fun? Terrorism as fun? As cited by Carolyn Conley (The Agreeable Recreation Of Fighting, Journal of Social History, Fall, 1999), Don Atyeo points out:

> "The thing about sports is it legitimizes violence, thereby laundering it acceptably clean. Incidents routinely occur in the name of sport which if they were perpetrated under any other banner short of open warfare would be roundly condemned as crimes. . . . The pain inflicted in sport is somehow not really pain at all; it is Tom and Jerry pain, cartoon agony which doesn't hurt." (Blood and Guts: Violence in Sports, 1979)

Many of the strategies employed by terrorists (in the narrowest sense) have been explored (in the greatest of detail and in advance of their use in practice) in such movie scenarios -- including many employing the use of airplanes [more | more] | more | more]. Many also focus on rogue agencies, rogue agents and various levels of covert action and denial. Movie producers exploit every opportunity to respond creatively to new scenario possibilities for engendering fear -- to the extent that the Pentagon has called upon Hollywood to enhance anti-terrorism preparedness [more | more | more]. In a real sense the population is programmed to anticipate -- and possibly to engender -- new sources of fear (bioterrorism, aliens, doomsday scenarios, etc).

What such movie scenarios are unable to achieve is the articulation of a credible imaginative approach to the ordinary terror tainting so many lives. Basically it does not make for good television. It is not focused on the excitement of terrorist action as an "evil" happening and the response to it in the short-term by heroic "special forces" (with playing-card wanted lists, using targeted extrajudicial assassinations, etc) in defence of the "fundamental values" of civilization -- the "good guys" versus the "bad guys".

The focus is on destructive remedial action ("action movies" by "alpha males") with a positive resolution in the short-term. Such
programming suggests that viewers have become addicted to "terrorism" in some form -- with media companies effectively acting as "pushers". The "quick fix" such programmes provide in the "real world" frames expectations with regard to terrorism and the response to it in the "real world". Exposure to "evil" elsewhere would appear to be a vital stimulus to life in modern civilization (cf Needing Evil Elsewhere, 2001)

The movie industry responds extremely poorly to the need to give credibility to alternatives that address long-term systemic ills rather than short-term disasters. In that sense it not only offers training to those inclined to terrorism as an alternative but also fails to articulate those alternatives that might remedy the systemic ills that engender them. Indeed movies tend to reinforce any tendency to conflate terrorism with dissidence and alternative modes of action. Ironically they also highlight the probability of betrayal of fundamental values by those in authority.

Arguments for or against "moral equivalence" are of course pure exercises in scholasticism to those terrorized by unrestrained violence -- irrespective of the belief of those perpetrating it.

"Terrorism-alpha" vs "Terrorism-beta"

It is perhaps useful to distinguish between:

- "Terrorism-alpha" as the narrowly defined form of terrorism (emphasizing the total responsibility of the immediate perpetrators and the total innocence of the victims). As the "evil needed elsewhere", it affects very few and relatively rarely (even in comparison with road accidents). It lends itself to extensive media coverage using individual human tragedy as a form of emotional camouflage (based on unchallengeable "motherhood statements") to facilitate simplistic analysis and to avoid questioning of strategic assumptions. It offers considerable opportunities for immediate action by reallocation of resources to the military-industrial complex and by restriction of human rights in the name of national security. This assumes (or sets up) an identifiable target -- a "linchpin" -- as the focus for the delivery of a "silver bullet".

- "Terrorism-beta" as the more inclusive understanding of terrorism that recognizes the experience of terror amongst many over long periods of time. Responsibilities in this case tend to be deliberately obscured or "spun" in media coverage with little attention to the wider tragedy for many. Since there are relatively few lucrative opportunities for the military-industrial complex, the focus is on recognizing the most general principles of human rights (in terms of which appeals can be made, and regrets can be sincerely expressed) -- avoiding, to the extent possible, any sustained remedial action. Such action, when it is successful, tends to be based on subtler conceptual frameworks that seek to evoke widespread participation and engagement -- intuitively recognized in counter-productive battles for "hearts and minds" by propaganda and "psychological operations".

The media incapacity described above, with respect to collective imaginal enhancement, frames and biases the response to terrorism into a short-term, "fix-it" mode (terrorism-alpha). This may well be completely incompatible with the creativity and strategic innovation required to address the systemic ills associated with the ordinary tyrants (terrorism-beta) -- that sustain those inspired to terrorism in its narrowest sense. The historically myopic focus on terrorism-alpha, and the principled emphasis on proximate causes ("one stop" emotive explanations), notably obscures the long-term factors and the root causes of (terrorism-beta). These are especially characteristic of cultures with longer memories, as with feuding tribes, the Northern Ireland situation, or in many instances of encroachment (see also Errrorism vs Terrorism? Encroachment, Complicity, Denial and Terrorism, 2004).

The contrast between terrorism-alpha and beta might be usefully related to the conflict between two quite different senses of time and pace (cf Jeremy Rifkin. Time Wars: the primary conflict in human history, 1987). The alpha variant is the fast-paced, frustrated response to modern civilization's dilatory approach to the immediate suffering associated with terrorism-beta amongst those embedded in a slow-paced, subsistence lifestyle. Those sustaining the beta variant (through their slow-paced, minimalistic adaptation to the basic needs of others) satisfy their own fast-paced needs through violent entertainment -- and by the profitable delivery of increasingly non-essential products and services that significantly fail to address that long-term suffering. The reaction to terrorism-alpha by those primarily invested in the beta-variant then occurs within the urgent time-frame of non-essential product delivery -- rather than in terms of the sustained pacing required in response to the beta-variant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Terrorism-gamma&quot; and &quot;Terrorism-delta&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whilst the response to Terrorism-alpha impedes recognition of Terrorism-beta, it might be asked whether the latter obscures a &quot;Terrorism-gamma&quot;. The gamma variant is likely to be much more widespread -- to the point of being endemic in society. It is partially acknowledged, and simultaneously excused, with such phrases as &quot;human nature&quot; or &quot;being only human&quot; -- namely a potential, if not explicit, characteristic of everyone as being in some way responsible for the beta form and the generally unpeaceful nature of society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More intriguing is the possibility of a "Terrorism-delta". This might be the specific corollary to recognition of the gamma variant, namely the extent to which one is oneself an "Osama bin Laden" in some measure -- carrier in one's own psyche: makeup of a covert mindset that engenders terror of the most terrible kind. This possibility would of course be most vigorously denied -- especially by oneself! This would however be consistent with the preoccupations of eactivism. It is also consistent with many spiritual insights, including the Christian sense of personal sinfulness, and understandings of ignorance in Hinduism (avidadha), in Buddhism (mithyajnana), or "forgetting God" in Islam). These all understand personal thoughts of violence as the root cause of wider social ills [more].

Together these four forms of terrorism appear to have a curious symmetry. Terrorism-alpha is the extremely focused outward projection of dysfunctionality onto Osama bin Laden, and his like-minded terrorists, as the ultimate evil causative factor undermining the values of the civilized, essentially good, world. The problematic nature of this world, with its many other experienced sources of terror, is characterized by the less-focused,
more diffusely widespread] Terrorism-beta. This recognition of multiple others as a source of terror in society can however be matched by a recognition of a diffusely shared responsibility with others as contributing to the climate of fear -- Terrorism-gamma. The symmetry is however completed by recognition of Terrorism-delta, of which the engendering source is oneself, as the inner complementary focus of dysfunctionality mirroring the outer focused projection of unmitigated evil. (see En-minding the Extended Body: Enactive engagement in conceptual shapeshifting and deep ecology, 2003).

Could it be that it is through an understanding of the radically existential dimensions of Terrorism-delta that the basis can be found for fruitful dialogue with those inspired to suicide bombing by Terrorism-alpha?

Conclusions

Remarkably, despite the strong resolution expressed by the Coalition of the Willing under American leadership, the "war on terror" remains focused on the narrowest concepts of terror (terrorism-alpha) -- best suited to media coverage and ratings. The need to alleviate the terror experienced in daily life (terrorism-beta) by many is not addressed -- or even recognized. It might indeed be argued that the "climate of fear" which the "war on terror" addresses (and paradoxically feeds) is perceived as distinct from that experienced by individuals exposed to other forms of fear. But how is an individual to distinguish between one "climate of fear" and the other -- between the contextual fear and their personal fear -- when the former can only be sensed through the latter, if at all?

Is revenge in response to a perceived act of "evil" terrorism to be understood as itself involving terrorism or -- being "legitimate" -- is such revenge to be understood otherwise ("an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"), possibly as a noble act in defence of fundamental values? Is the matching belief of the "evil" terrorists only to be considered an indication of twisted perversion -- or are there other insights to be gained? If the focus is on proximate causes, avoiding any sense of history, how is such a cycle of violence ever to be recognized and broken?

It would appear that legislative measures are now carefully crafted to avoid investment in remedies to "ordinary terror" (terrorism-beta) that do not require strategies and thinking distinct from those of the security-intelligence community and its technology suppliers. How would a "counter-terrorism" unit -- a national "security Tsar" -- respond to information on other forms of terror? How would a Tsar of "homeland security" respond to many forms of insecurity arising from a broader experience of terror -- amongst the "serfs"?

Ironically the focused institutional re-targeting in the industrialized world against the terrorism (of al-Qaeda) is legitimating coordinated determined global strategies that have been lacking in relation to other forms of terror -- notably to those to which the United Nations, however impotent, has been attentive. This irony is only too evident if terror-engendering factors ("poverty", "malnutrition", "injustice", "disease", etc) are substituted for "terror" in any current speech by the leadership of the Coalition of the Willing. This then implies the will to act against "poverty-ism", "disease-ism", "malnutrition-ism", etc -- for which many have waited expectantly for decades.

But, just as al-Qaeda terrorism calls for unconventional thinking and has made evident the "failures of intelligence" and "failures of imagination" of the "intelligence" and "policy-making communities", it is only when the implication of such failures for the conventional strategic approaches of the international community are fully recognized that the strategies of coordination appropriate to factors engendering terrorism will be understood (see Transforming the Encounter with Terrorism, 2002). Until then the Coalition of the Willing, through its negligence, is effectively giving form to the four Horsemens of the Apocalypse anticipated by the Christian belief system -- Conquest (of the non-Christian world?), War (against disobedience in any form?), Famine (of increasing proportions of the population?), and Death (notably associated with pestilence?). (see also Spontaneous Initiation of Armageddon -- a heartfelt response to systemic negligence, 2004)

Perhaps most ironic for the Christian-inspired Coalition of the Willing is that their "fear of dialogue" with those of dissident views is far greater than their "fear of terrorism". It is framed as dialogue with the demonic. Any cost in human lives is worth paying to avoid such dialogue and the acknowledgement of some responsibility for the terrible actions of those to whose terror they have not listened. Whose interests are served by this? Who needs the kind of of national unity that is sustained by such quantities of blood and ensures that in consequence many live their lives in terror?

There is a marked tendency to marginalize, and even to criminalize and demonize, any perspective which seeks to transcend the Coalition's framing of "either with us or against us" ("them bad, we good"). The motivation of "terrorists" is considered to be, by definition, without foundation in comparison with the legitimacy of those who escalate terror in vengeful response. To imply other possibilities is to be identified as a fellow traveller and treated accordingly (as a "terrorist suspect") -- as in the Cold War period. Does this not suggest a fundamental degree of insecurity in relation to the values of civilization as currently interpreted and promoted? Are they indefensible in rational discourse?

The international "war on drugs" has acquired an unusual significance now that Coalition forces are regularly sent to war on drugs in Iraq ("Go pills! A war on drugs?", 2003) [more | more | more]. It might be asked whether this particular strategic twist is also being used by leaders of the Coalition in going to "war on terror". As such are they using the long-term unacknowledged terror of others as their "warhorse" -- whether inadvertently, or deliberately? (see The "Dark Riders" of Social Change, 2002).

Language used in response to terror (Google)
"war on terror" (3,270,000 hits), "war on terrorism" (1,560,000), "war against terrorism" (385,000), "war against terror" (164,000).
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