Safety and Terrorism: Problems of Correlation

Alexander Yurievich Pidzhakov[1], Michail Nicolaevich Mayor[1], Valery Vasilievich Balyasnikov[1], Shakir Bayram oglu Bayramov[1] & Irina Vladimirovna Zeleneva[2]

[1] St. Petersburg State University of Civil Aviation, St. Petersburg, Russia

[2] St. Petersburg State University, Petersburg, Russia

Correspondence: Alexander Yurievich Pidzhakov, St. Petersburg State University of Civil Aviation, Pilotov Str., 38, St. Petersburg, 196210, Russia.

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the interconnection between security international terrorism. Terrorism became more challenging with globalization; thus, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the nations. The article analyzes international terrorism as a global problem of the humankind. The main attention is paid to the various forms of international terrorism and to problems of international safety.

Keywords: terrorism, security, international cooperation, international terrorist organizations, organized crime, safety, correlation

1. Introduction

Looking to the security side of the globalization analysis, security became so complex and multi-dimensional, traditional national border-setting type of security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. In this context, international terrorism became one of the main concerns with its highly complicated characteristics. Thus, globalized world has to face an immediate threat: international terrorism. This problem has been recognized not only by one nation, but also in the era of globalization when the nations became much more connected and interdependent, it became a threat to international security. September 11, 2001 (9/11) terrorist attacks in the United States was a turning point for all the nations to see the threat of terrorism. Terrorism became the main topic on the top agenda for many nations and institutions. Today, global terror is a giant problem for all humanity. September 11 gave a massage that the target was the main leader of globalization, the United States. The World Trade Center as one target in the United States symbolized economic dimension of globalization, while Pentagon symbolized the political and military dimension. In other words, terrorism has put globalization among its targets (Cha, 2000; Kay, 2004).

The main argument in this paper is that terrorism became more challenging at the age of globalization; thus, the fight against terrorism became a priority for all the nations. This study first considers broader changes in the context of international security. It also emphasizes the impact of globalization on international security. This review is given to show how the security is broadened and why the traditional security perception is not capable of recognizing new threats that transcend the national borders. In this context, international terrorism also acquired new characteristics. It is concluded that terrorism as well as other risks in the twenty first century requires international cooperation for global security. However, the response of the states to 9/11 terrorist attacks provides interesting points about the relationship between globalization and terrorism. In the post-sovereign globalized world the states remain as important agents of security. The strong states try to shape and master the impact of globalization on terrorism. Yet, homeland security gained importance.

Among the different types of international terrorism one that is the most threatening for society is terrorism that utilizes weapons of mass destruction. In any country enormous killing power of such weapons could lead to catastrophic consequences if is used by terrorists. That is why specialists are seeking to monitor the terrorist organizations' endeavors of obtaining such weapons. For instance, in US Federal Bureau of Investigations report on Project 2020, which contains possible scenarios of how international relations may develop until year 2020, in the "Spread of Danger" section one of the issues noted is "high interest of terrorist groups to purchase chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons", which increases the risk of a large terrorist attack using weapons of mass destruction" (Clark, 1999).

Use of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological components and technological characteristics of objects during acts of violence of terrorist nature if a huge problem in the modern world. Comparative analysis of foreign and domestic publications on the subject shows that in our country the state of scientific research and its practical application is inadequate to the threat posed by terrorism. Moreover, until this moment there is no criminal characteristic of such acts and the means of prevention and suppression taking into account all the possible scenarios of terrorists' actions are not well developed.

While the nuclear weapons research has been going on for more than 30 years and as member of Russian Science Academy A. G. Arbatov notes in this area Russian science is on level with western science, even surpassing it in some areas, in biological warfare and bioterrorism the lag in open multidisciplinary academic pursuits is still large.

2. Methodology

In examining the problems of correlation international security and safety, international modern terrorism, the authors have used different methods. Used methods: the method of critical analysis, the method of comparative law, logical, system, dialectical methods were also used. The experiences of the theoretical and observational study of terrorism problems of foreign and local scholars were used as well.

3. The Main Body

3.1 Problems of International Security

The problem of international security is one of the key issues in theory and practice of international relations experts and politicians. Any issue of international politics is in some way connected with.

What is international security, what are the pros and cons of the main theoretical aspects of its perception? What impact does globalization of the world have on international security? Finally, what are the differences between modern and traditional frameworks of international security?

By now the international security system has undergone a series of stages in its development and keeps on advancing, mostly by means of increasing number of focus areas in the field, controlled by global supernational structures.

The system of European, and later of world security has started shaping up in the middle of the 17th century, when European monarchies have recognized the principle of sovereignty, starting a whole new stage in international relations development and creating an industry of international law (Cha, 2000).

Global transformations of the 20th century led to changes in the subjective structure of international security. While during three preceding ages (since the Westphalian arrangement of 1648) governments used to be subjects of international security, in the 20th century other forces become internationally significant: anticolonial freedom movements, guerillas, separatists, and finally international terrorist organizations, which are non-government subjects utilizing force in conflicts. Adding to the list an ever-increasing range of non-military threats (disease, hunger, illegal drug traffic, ecological situation) it becomes obvious that on the 21st century what is meant here is not international (inter-governmental) security, but world (global) security.

International security is such an organization of international (predominantly inter-governmental) relations that are assured by the norms of international law, which ensures safety of nations from different kinds of threats, provides for their main needs and allows development. This term is also used as a synonym for conservative understanding of peace or absence of war. At the same time it entails fulfillment of agreements, working-out of principles, foundation of institutions and routines that would facilitate creation of conditions for maintenance of peace and prevent emergence of prerequisites for war.

Nowadays, several kinds of threats are outlined depending on their source and targeting. They are: politico-military, economic, cultural, energetic, informational, demographical, techno genic, commodity, ecological, etc.

Depending on the object that is threatened and needs protection there are individual and group, social and national, regional and global security. The key role here is devoted to national security, as the concept of regional, international and global security is formed, most of all, basing on the convergence of national interests.

Yet, it is not easy to separate the agenda of discussions on broadening of security from globalization of security. As stated by Clark "part of the broadening of the concept of security can be and has been attributed to the effects of globalization" (Clark, 1999). Furthermore, as Cha states globalization widens the scope of security (Cha, 2000).

As noted by Cha, there is transnationalization of threats, as the individual states can no longer control the pollution, disease, technology and information transfer as well as terrorism on their own. Transnationalization has blurred the division between internal and external security, so the states can no longer ignore the effects of globalization in forming their security policies.

Second, in the age of globalization, the emergence of information based-economies reduces the importance of national industries. For example, the increased foreign direct investment in local economies by the multinational companies decreases the state control on domestic economy and makes them more vulnerable to international crisis and intervention, which is threatening their economic security (Cha, 2000). The states are more sensitive to security and military developments in other regions due to increasing financial, trade and economic relations.

Third, the advancement of communication technologies created vital effects on certain dynamics. For example, during the Kosovo conflict, after the broadcasting of mass deportation and casualties on the television broadcasts, the conflicts became impossible to ignore creating international public pressure for intervention. On the other hand, this might be also dangerous in some cases; as Kay states if there is control on the information and media technology, powerless can become powerful (Kay, 2004).

Fourth, as the nature and strategy of war have changed, the security threats became more difficult to measure, monitor or tackle with the globalization process. Agents of threat can be state, but can also be non-state groups and individuals, such as ethnic militias, cults, organized crime and terrorism. Similarly, as stated by Cha, extremist, fundamentalist groups, terrorists, criminals, and drug smugglers were enhanced by the globalization of technology and information.

Fifth, globalization makes it easy for the states to reach to the weapons of mass destruction and other technologies, thus the states might pose threats that are asymmetrical and disproportionate to their size. Today the term widely used is the asymmetrical strategy (asymmetric power) by which a smaller power would attempt to defeat the largest powers in the globalized international system by striking against its perceived vulnerabilities (Dougherty et al., 2001).

Nowadays the key challenges to security are connected with the global crisis of systems of social and political organization and ideological values. Summing up the conclusions on this issue in Russian and foreign literature, four groups of deductions can be detected.

In modern conditions the threats to national security arise not only from military might of particular nations, but also from numerous transnational actors, pursuing their self-interested, unlawful and criminal goals. M. M. Lebedeva supposes that this term "Is widely spread, but at the same time not easily defined. There are different ways to approach its interpretation, usually through a range of characteristics: a presence of hierarchical structure of organization, distribution of roles, constant involvement into illegal or "semi-legal" business, etc. In some cases they try to define organized crime as an activity, which is based on both legal and illegal business" (Lebedeva, 2003).

One of the conditions of fruitful international cooperation is a similar understanding and definition of the threats by different nations and division of unified methods of countering them. This makes international cooperation on the subject much more probable.

The current "Strategy of National Security of the USA", adopted in September 2002, states that there are two types of threats:

1) Threat to international relations system, which we understand as a polar system with US "leadership" from certain states and or blocks, striving to balance the USA;

2) Threat of rogue states and terrorist networks obtaining the weapons of mass destructions.

The first type of threats belongs to the category of traditional threats, second – to non-traditional. At the same time the latter is defined as the possible combination of at least three threats: terrorism (especially of religious motivation), politics of rogue states and their obtaining weapons of mass destruction (WMD). This combination is what makes such a complex threat especially dangerous. In order to counter both types of threats a proactive mechanism of preventive measures is proposed, with the USA having the priority of its utilization as a warrantor of international security.

"European Security Strategy", prepared under H. Solana's leadership and adopted as the official doctrine of EU in December 2003, is much more oriented at multilateral cooperation. It defines five new global threats, which increase instability in the world:

1) International terrorism (especially with religious motivation);

2) Spread of WMD;

3) Problem of "failed states";

4) Regional conflicts;

5) Organized crime.

If some of these factors or all of them join, it will create a serious complex threat for the safety of EU. Resistance to these threats is seen in the widest possible international cooperation without any countries' of organizations' dominance. Thus, "European Security Strategy" is offering to rely on existing international organizations, which provides alternative to informal international coalitions that have become the basis for US foreign policy.

In the special section of "NATO Strategic Framework" (Washington, 23-24 of April, 1999), called "Challenges to Security and Risks" a rather wide spectrum of traditional and non-traditional threats is enumerated. Among the traditional threats the most attention is given to "Existence of mighty nuclear empires, not included into NATO". Among the non-traditional are such as (Kochler et al., 2008):

- Instability and uncertainty in Euro-Atlantic zone;
- Possibility for religious crises outside the alliance's boundaries;
- Ethnic and religious conflicts;
- Territorial conflicts between nations;
- Conflicts, resulting from "Inadequate or unsuccessful reformation efforts", human rights infringement, fall of governments;
- Distribution of WMD;
- Acts of terrorism or sabotage;
- Organized crime;
- Interruptions in stable provision of nations with vital (predominantly energy) resources.

The "NATO Strategic Framework" points out two key levels of security assurance: the level of North-Atlantic countries and the global security level.

After September 11th 2001 terrorist threat became the forefront of NATO activities. Two documents were dedicated specifically to this problem, complementing the alliance's strategy: "NATO military framework for defense from terrorism" (Prague, November 21st 2001) and "Partner action plan against terrorism".

The way United Nations conceptualize the threats can be drawn from "High-level UN group report on threats, challenges and changes" (2005). Six groups of threats of interest now and in the decades to come are enumerated there:

1) War between nations;

2) Violence within nations, including civil wars, mass human rights infringement and genocide;

3) Poverty, infection and ecological degradation;

4) Nuclear, radioactive, chemical and biological weapons;

5) Terrorism;

6) Transnational organized crime.

To fight these threats a wide use of "preventive politics" is advised, which involves, first of all, a wide variety of socio-economic and culture-informational measures. The basis for broad international front for resisting these threats must be a network of international and regional organizations that would be coordinating the activities of nation-states (Nesi et al., 2006).

An important characteristic of UN approach to identifying threats to security and drawing up countermeasures is that priority here are the interests of a person and civil society instead of governments. Ensuring personal security and providing possibilities for each person's balanced development, the security on national regional and global level is built. The basic indicator here has become the Index of Human Potential development, determined by the specialized departments within the UN. It includes a whole range of factors, including life expectancy, education and income level.

All the doctrinal documents of the key international organizations have several characteristics in terms of threat specification in common (Foradori et al., 2007):

1. The most attention is paid to new, non-traditional threats;

2. A chance of combination of several threats, including traditional and non-traditional, is seen to have the most is disastrous consequences, and is therefore associated with the highest level of danger;

3. Trans-border nature of the threats is emphasized, and the difficulty of maintaining security on any level but global acknowledged. Broad international cooperation in many forms is seen as vital for global security provision.

4. A lot of attention is drawn to prevention and aversion of threats on the early level of development. At the same time the UN and less so the EU are placing the top priority on actions within the established system of international institutions, organizations and international law with emphasis on political, socio-economical, culturo-psychological and informational measures. On the other hand, the USA and NATO, while not downgrading the value of political measures, see politico-military measures of preventive regulation as the most important.

Nowadays scientists are concerned about aggravation of global discrepancies and developmental problems on the regional level. They also acknowledge that regional security is affected by external influence of key non-regional nations and influential transnational actors.

Political strategies of preventing the risks of international terrorism as a global international relations security threat involve not military might, but diplomacy and international cooperation (Jones et al., 2010), constructive partnership (Svendsen, 2010), means of security assurance (Banlaoi, 2010), etc. as key measures and mechanisms.

This strategic line is supported throughout the international community, whose interests are expressed by the UN and other international organizations (Zwitter, 2010).

The key purpose of the former strategies is to create and reinforce international legal framework by improving judicial and legal mechanisms, allowing modern governments to gain support and increase their potential against the threat of international terrorism (Hough et al., 2009; Washington: U.S. G.P.O.: For Sale by the Supt. of Docs., U.S. G.P.O., 2005).

Corresponding strategies take into account certain principles and foundations of globalist security theories.

Globalist Theoretical Perspective is a sort of antithesis to neo-realist theoretical perspective and the idea of static international relations structure, the alterations to which are interpreted as limited changes in balance of political forces on the world arena, that is attributed to the former.

Methodological basis for globalization theories is mostly comprised of culturological and politico-economical perspectives. Globalism may also be based on Marxist or liberal theoretical paradigms.

Globalist security theories are distinguished by proposition of Deterritorialization of World Politics as the key assumption (Banaka, 2010). In this respect a certain conceptual unity can be observed between the liberal and the Marxist versions of globalist theories, focusing similar attention on the increasing role of economic and trans-border integration and therefor weakening of territorialism and the role of government in world politics.

Following the globalism theories' logic, the government and the system of government authorities are retiring from their role of priority objects of political analysis of world politics. Consequently, the sphere of political analysis must also include the activities of non-government actors and structures. Drawing on the thesis about complexity of interrelation between governments and non-government actors, coexisting within the world politics, a proposition is made about the necessity of integrated approach, transcending boundaries of government-centric approach to analysis of security problems and risks of international terrorism.

The key idea of globalist theories is the rationalization of the independent role of both types of transnational structures in international politics. The first are the corporations, non-government social and political organizations, and the second –international organizations and regimes.

At the heart of the research, carried out within the globalism theories, is the question of how the Networks which comprise the structure of interaction between the various actors of world politics on different levels impact rethinking of the principle of territorial sovereignty as foundational in the international relations system.

Globalist theories contain the notion of increase of influence not of the government, but of the network structures as those that have a certain impact on the government.

Estimating the nature of the connection between globalization and security, the advocates of globalism rationalize the thesis about amplification of the tendency for security problem complication in the modern world.

This is accompanied by weakening of the government's role in assuring security and reduction of the number of mechanisms for effective control and realization of corresponding strategies. Consequently, globalists propose that political strategies involving cooperation of governments in the field of safety, especially on the regional level.

The object of special attention for advocates of this approach is analysis of mechanisms of globalization processes as a whole and impact of such aspects of it as financial globalization, liberalization of external economic activities and trade, global problems of international terrorism and ecology on real operation of actors of world politics and nature of their cooperation within international relations system (Luban et al., 2010).

The difference between Marxist and liberal globalization conceptualization models is more of normative, than of substantial nature. The Marxist version views this structure as predatory, unfair, unstable and unprogressive by nature. From liberal viewpoint on the other hand it is progressive, has potential for periphery development, while increasing tendencies for instability are seen as needing creation of effective system of security risk management, primarily within institutional mechanisms and decisions (Tow, 2009).

The thesis about network character of international relations system structure is directly associated with the initial statement of globalism about domination of deterritorialization as a determining risk factor for international relations security.

That is why globalism has been a dominant theory during development of the terrorist network functioning problem, especially such aspects as transnational operations and methods of terrorist activity, amplification of religious identity in identity structure, ant others (Philpott & Powers, 2010).

The object field of international security risk research by globalists in the context of increasing threat of international terrorism consists of the following areas:

- The problem of economic security, Liberal International Economic Order (LIEO) and the threat for crisis development. The traditional themes are: development, realization and effects of regimes, regulating the international trade system and development of financial infrastructure. These problems are studied in the works of J. Arquilla, D. Ronfeld, R. Gunaratna, C. Sterling and others.

- The threat to economic security and stability of LIEO from transnational organized crime, associated with money laundering, drug trafficking, firearms, illegal immigration and other types of criminal activities. These issues are researched by H. Abadinsky, A. Bossard, P. Chalk, A. Dupont, R. Godson, Ph. Williams, C. Hernandes, G. Puttugalan, R. Kendell, P. Lupsha, R. T. Naylor, A. Schmid, D. Vlassis.

- Terrorist and mafia structures have a lot in common in terms of their organizational structure and methods, primarily in that their network structures penetrate government structures and degrade the patterns of regional and global security systems. Despite the diversity of goals they can in some cases intersect, especially on issues regarding networks financing and weapons trade.

- The problem of LIEO instability, connected with the threat of cyber-warfare and dependence of currently existing security structures from information technologies (Buzan, 2004).

Complication and expansion of international terrorism risks within conditions of globalization have dictated the need for reconsideration of traditional approach to development of strategies for mitigation of risks from terrorism. Within conditions of financial globalization the key direction for preventing international terrorism risks is development of effective mechanisms of preventing the financing of international terrorist groups. The system of these international terrorism financing prevention measures is the vital component of the strategy for regulating all cross-border problems.

3.2 International Terrorism as a Threat to Humanity

In the 21st century fighting terrorism is one of the most important global problems. That is a universally recognized fact. The unity also exists in international community on the universalism of cooperation between governments, peoples and nations in solving anti-terrorist issues based on fundamental norms (jus cogens) and principles of international law. A special role in this cooperation is played by international organizations, which carry the political and legal responsibility for world peace and safety together with the governments. In the long term the Organization of United Nations will occupy the central place in the process of formation and functioning of modern law and order.

Terrorism, closely tied together with organized crime as a whole and drug industry in particular is one of the most serious issues, which not only sharpened at the turn of the 21st century, but has also become, essentially,

among the worst threats to international security. Undoubtedly, the tragic events of September 11th 2001 in the US have strained the issues of fighting terrorism and put them on the front line of security problems.

Researchers point out a significant group of different kinds of terrorism. Basing on the subjects of terrorism there is "European", "Latin-American" and "Islamic" terrorism; basing on political ideology of the subjects – "Right" and "Left" terrorism; depending on the sphere of terrorist actions – "aerial", "sea" and other terrorism. These types constantly fluctuate.

Technological terrorism is usage or threat of usage of nuclear, radiological, chemical or bacteriological (biological) weapons or their components, pathogenic microorganisms, radioactive and other solutions that might harm humans. It also includes capture, disablement and destruction of nuclear, chemical and other objects of extreme technological or ecological danger, systems of city life support if these actions are committed in order to intimidate people, influencing the government's decisions, for achieving political, selfish or other goals. Finally, an attempt of committing any of the crimes enumerated, management, financing, fomenting and fellowship in such crimes is also associated to the category.

In the widest sense technological terrorism could be defined as a form of terrorist activity, which is based on the use of advanced means of scientific and technological progress. It is mostly manifests itself in planning, preparation and implementation of terrorist acts, associated with utilization of high-damaging equipment, compromising and destroying dangerous industrial objects and manufacturing and storage of hazardous products.

The weapons of mass destruction are usually divided into nuclear, chemical, biological (bacteriological) and radiological (pulverizing radioactive substances to contaminate the area). Not only weapons, but also comparable in terms of contaminating consequences damaging activities due to destruction of nuclear reactors, compromising poisonous and hazardous materials storage (technogenic terrorism) and penetrating computer networks to disrupt control of large systems: transport, communication, energetics, finance (cyber-terrorism), are viewed as methods and means for committing a terrorist act.

The use of nuclear weapons for committing a terrorist act of international character is associated with the highest level of danger. According to well-known terrorologists D. Stevenson and D. McKenna, the increase of nuclear terrorism threat is a consequence of several factors: easing of access to the information about the technology; increasing number of specialists, who have experience in nuclear energetics or adjacent fields; accumulation of a large amount of fissile materials, fit for use in atomic bombs (Hel et al., 1999; Barkawi et al., 1999).

It must be noted that the threat of nuclear terrorism is a getting highly controversial review from the foreign experts. A part of them denies any possibility of it because throughout the existence of nuclear fission technology not a single act of that nature has been committed. However, it is doubtful that such an argument could be taken seriously.

Another viewpoint of the international group of experts studying the issue of preventing nuclear terrorism appears to be more justified. They believe that "The fact that no one has still witnessed nuclear terrorism is not a reason for making self-comforting conclusions" (Guehenno, 1998-1999). Such acts can only be averted if necessary preventive measures are taken.

Unlike nuclear terrorism, radioactive terrorism is a very real threat. The danger is not in exceeding the maximum allowed levels of external radiation (it is hard to achieve, taken into account that it would demand the use of a significant number of g-radiators), but in the fact that it is quite simple to reach maximum allowed concentration of radioactive material in air and water, which in turn leads to internal radiation injury (Arquilla & Ronfeld, 2001).

Chemical weapons, as well as nuclear, are not only weapons of mass destruction, but also a means of escalating panic within the society. An example of chemical weapons use by terrorists could be the "Aum Senrokyo" sect attack in the Tokyo subway in 1995. This event has demonstrated that security services are unprepared to neutralize threats of chemical contamination.

A special focus must be placed on the issues of a biological threat, connected with bioterrorism. Bioterrorism could be defined as follows: the use of dangerous biological agents in order to cause harm to life or health of people for causes of political or ideological character (Gunaratna, 2006; Juergensmeyer, 1993, 2000; May, 1992; Stewart, 2007). Physical protection of biological materials, which could be used as weapons and prevention of unsanctioned access to them as a result of theft or their transfer to non-government subjects, is an important component of fighting bioterrorism.

During the recent years many Russian and foreign news media have released a whole range of sensational materials on so called geophysical weapons. It is prophesized that its use would result in change of weather

conditions and even climate on Earth, depletion of the ozone layer, which serves as a natural shield from harsh UV-radiation of the Sun, floods and drought, typhoons, tsunami, earthquakes and other catastrophic events.

It is quite probable that the use of geophysical weapons may be identified with terrorism or with use of weapons of mass destruction. Unfortunately, it has not been discussed in scientific literature, though it is obvious that it deserves serious attention. In order to solve this quite extraordinary issue not only geophysicists, but also scientists from other fields of study must be engaged.

Electro-magnetic terrorism is a force destructive impact on electronic appliances with use of specialized technical equipment through wired or wireless channels, as well as electric circuits.

For instance, during the capture of Kizlyar city in Dagestan, the gang of a Chechen terrorist Raduev used an appliances radiating electro-magnetic waves, so-called "Jammers", which blocked police radio communication. Terrorists from Irish Republican Army used electronic impact systems to deactivate bank computers in London. Unfortunately, there are many more of such examples. Of course, at first glance use of such equipment appears to be more humane than organization of targeted explosions by terrorists. However, such logic immediately fades if one imagines, for instance, the consequences of deactivating the electronics on a passenger plane (Lemos, 2010; Garnegi Endowment for International Peace, 1986; Springer, 2005; Zavriev et al., 2009, Mikheev et al., 2011). Terrorist acts with use of electromagnetic weapons and use of such weapons are no longer a myth. There have been instances of use of such weapons in Yugoslavia.

Presently electromagnetic terrorism uses non-lethal easily accessible weapons, that is why it often operates from afar, coveting a large number of targets and leaving virtually no trace. Here lies its primary danger.

Cyberterrorism, or use of corresponding network equipment for shutting down critical components of national infrastructure (energy, transport, finance, governments communications, etc.) in purposes of coercion or intimidations of the government or civilians is a constantly escalating threat.

Wide practical application of the term "cyberterrosim" began in 1997, when M. Polit, employee of FBI, defined it as "deliberate, politically motivated attack on information and computer systems, software and data, carried out by subnational groups or secret agents applying force to civilian targets" (Pollit, 1997).

USA, Great Britain, Germany and a range of other Western countries are now facing a serious threat of cyber attacks by international terrorists. The exports point out that recently there has been a sharp increase in number of attacks on government information systems, The consequences of which are comparable to those of traditional terrorist acts with use of explosives, suicide bombers, etc. Those attacks may lead to shutdown of control and functioning systems of nuclear reactors and other vital objects, oil and gas pipes, electric power plants, railroads, airports, water-supply facilities. That is why the effect of cyberterrorism is sometimes compared with that of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

The World Wide Web may also initiate psychological terrorism. The Internet could be used to spread panic deceive people, lead to destruction of something. The Web is a fertile ground for spreading rumors, including disturbing ones.

Ecological terrorist acts, especially those connected with attacks on ecologically dangerous objects (atomic power stations, chemical facilities, etc.) or with use of environmentally hazardous materials (WMD, nuclear materials, radioactive substances or sources of atomic radiation, poisonous, toxic, chemical or biological hazardous materials) could be lead to very serious damage.

4. Conclusions

Terrorism is not only one countries worry but also a global issue now. The reason why it is a global issue now is because many of the attacks that are happening in the world don`t only affect one country economy, but the economy of all the countries whose companies have been seriously damaged from the attack.

Another reason why terrorism is part of globalization is because nowadays terrorist groups like Al Qaeda and FARC have small groups all around the world, so that when they plan attacks they already have little organizations which makes things easier for them to control and attack.

Terrorism, in all its diversity is seen one of the most pressing issues of anti-criminal warfare in the 21st century. Since the 1990s it has also been affecting Russia. Terrorism as a threat to Russian national security is recognized in the "Strategy for National Security of Russian Federations until 2020": "The key sources of threats to national security… are:… activities of international terrorist organizations, groups and separate persons, targeted at forcible change of the fundamentals of Russian constitutional order… intimidation of citizens, including by

means of nuclear and chemical weapons or hazardous radioactive, chemical and biological substances…" (Gazeta, 2009).

Globalization process widened the support for terrorism. There is a global effort to combat terrorism. A serious issue nowadays is the possible use of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological components and technological characteristics of objects for committing acts of violence of terrorist nature.

It can with certainty be acknowledged that in the early 21st century international terrorism has become an integral part of world and national politics. Its potential for affecting political processes is very substantial and a range of experts believe that in the long-term perspective it will only be increasing (Stepanova, 2010). That is why systematic study of international terrorism is a very important factor of understanding the dynamics of global and national political transformations in medium- to long-term perspective.

References

A Secure Europe in a Better World: European Security Strategy. (2003). Paris: The EU Institute for Security Studies.

Apikuyan, S., & Springer, D. (2005). *Countering Radiological and Nuclear Terrorism*.

Arquilla, J., & Ronfeld, D. (2001). *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime and Militancy*. Santa Monica: RAND.

Banaka, R. (2010). *Rights in Context: Law and Justice in Late Modern Society*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Pub. Co.

Banlaoi, R. C. (2010). *Philippine Security in the Age of Terror: National, Regional, and Global Challenges in the Post – 9/11 World* (p. 357). Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (1999). The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization. *European Journal of International Relations, 5*(4), 403-434)

Buzan, B., Buckley, M., & Fawn, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Implications for the Study of International Relations* (pp. 297-298). Global Responses to Terrorism. London and New York: Routledge.

Cha, V. D. (2000). Globalization and the Study of International Security. *Journal of Peace Research, 37*(3), 391-403.

Clark, I. (1999). *Globalization and International Relations Theory* (pp. 108-126). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dougherty, J. E., & Pfaltzgraff, R. L. Jr. (2001). *Contending Theories of International Relations: A comprehensive Survey*. New York: Longman.

Foradori, P., Rosa, P., & Scartezzini, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Managing a Multilevel Foreign Policy: the EU in International Affairs* (p. 234). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Guehenno, J. M. (1998-1999). The Impact of Globalization on Strategy. *Survival, 40*(4), 5-19.

Gunaratna, R. (2002). *Inside al-Qaeda: Global Network of Terror*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hel, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformation: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hough, M., & Kruys, G. P. H. (2009). *Non-Military Threats to Security: Selected United Nations and Other Multilateral Documents* (p. 157). Pretoria: Institute for Strategic Studies, University of Pretoria.

Jones, B. D., Forman, S., & Gowan, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Cooperating for Peace and Security: Evolving Institutions and Arrangements in a Context of Changing U.S. Security Policy* (p. 332). Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Juergensmeyer, M. (1993). *The New Cold War: Religious Nationalism Confronts the Secular State*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Juergensmeyer, M. (2000). *Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religions Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kay, S. (2004). Globalization, Power and Security. *Security Dialogue, 35*(1), 10.

Kochler, H. (Ed.). (2008). *The Global War on Terror and the Question of World Order* (p. 252). Vienna: International Progress Organization.

Lebedeva, M. M. (2003). *World politics* (p. 179). Moscow.

Lemos, R. (n. d.). *Hacktivism: Mideast Cyberwar Heats Up On Line*. ZdNet New. Retrieved from http://www.sdnet.com

Luban, D., O'Sullivan, J. R., & Stewart, D. P. (2010). *International and Transnational Criminal Law.* New York: Aspen Publishers.

May, R. J. (1992). The Religious Factor in Tree Minority Movements. *Contemporary Southeast Asia, 13*(4).

Mikheev, V. L., Pidzhakov, A., & Chibinev, V. M. (2011). *Modern forms of international terrorism (legal framework to counter)* (pp. 181-182). St. Petersburg.: Lemma.

Nesi, G. (Ed.). (2006). *International Cooperation in Counter-Terrorism: the United Nations and Regional Organizations in the Fight against Terrorism.* (p. 313). Aldershot, England: Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Philpott, D., & Powers, G. F. (Eds.). (2010). *Strategies of Peace.* Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Pollit, M. (1997). *Cyberterrorism. Fact or Fancy?* (pp. 285-286). Proceedings of the 20th National Information Systems Security Conference. Washington.

Presidential Decree of 12.05.2009 № 537 On National Security Strategy of the Russian Federation up to 2020. Rossiyskaya Gazeta.

Report of International Task Force on Preventing Nuclear Terrorism (The Publication Draft). (1986). Garnegi Endowment for International Peace.

Stepanova, E. A. (2010). *Terrorism in asymmetrical conflict on locally-regional and global levels (ideological and organizational aspects)* (p. 2). Author. diss ... Doctor of political sciences. Moscow.

Stewart, S., & Nelson, S. (2007). *Pioneering International Law: Conventions, Treaties, and Standards* (p. 88). Philadelphia: Mason Crest Publishers.

Svendsen, A. D. M. (2010). *Intelligence Cooperation and the War on Terror: Anglo-American Security Relations after 9/11* (p. 236). London, New York: Routledge.

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. (2002). Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html

The United Nations and the Fight against Terrorism: Hearing and Briefing before the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation of the Committee on International Relations. (2005). *House of Representatives, One Hundred Ninth Congress, First Session. Washington: U.S. G.P.O.: For Sale by the Supt. of Docs., U.S. G.P.O.*

Tow, W. T. (Ed.). (2009). *Security Politics in the Asia-Pacific: a Regional-Global Nexus?* (p. 370). Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zavriev, S., & Kolesnikov, A. (2009). Issues Biosafety and counter bioterrorism. *World Economy and International Relations, 12*, 92.

Zwitter, A. (2010). *Human Security, Law, and the Prevention of Terrorism*. New York: Routledge.

Copyrights