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Streszczenie: W artykule analizuje się terroryzm jako niebezpieczne zjawisko dla ludzkości stojące w jednym szeregu zagrożeń światowych obok jądrowego i ekologicznego. Międzynarodowy terroryzm staje się najbardziej rozpowszechnionym środkiem decyzji konfliktów w różnych regionach. W warunkach zaostrenia kryzysu obejmującego polityczne, gospodarcze i społeczne życie na Ukrainie, można określić czynniki sprzyjające rozwojowy terroryzm: kryminalizacja społeczeństwa, korupcja, niski poziom gospodarczy kraju, niezadowolenie z istniejących stosunków społecznych, wzrastający poziom przestępczości.
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Almost every day in media reports you may come across such notions as “terrorism”, “terrorists”, “terrorist activity” that cause concerns and fuel fears among our citizens for their present and future, for their rights and freedoms, guaranteed by the Constitution of Ukraine. Nowadays there are two main lines of research into the problem of combating terrorism.

The topic of the article is relevant in the context of efforts to enhance anti-terrorism measures as it deals with the notion and essence as well as forms and sources of terrorism along with the measures of its prevention.

The aim of the article is to determine the causes of terrorism, to analyze theoretical literature which deals with the definition, classification and methods of terrorism prevention.

The first line of research is connected with the study of terrorism as an international and legal category of a political nature. The most noticeable progress has been achieved in the works of Vasyl Krutov, Volodymyr Antypenko, Dmytro Olshanskyi, Sergiy Kachura, Alina Komarova, Yurij Zemlianskyi, Vyacheslav Yemelianov, Leonid Bagriy-Shakhmatov, Igor Mikheiev, Kyamil Salimov, Lidia Madzhorian, Yurii Reshetov, Galina Ovchinnikova, Sergiy Teleshun and other scholars.
During the recent years the emergence of a new line of research that deals with the problem of terrorism exclusively from the penal, legal and criminal perspectives has been observed. The most in-depth study has been presented in the works by Vyacheslav Yemelianov, Vasyl Krutov, Volodymyr Antypenko, Viktor Gryshchuk, Valentyn Lytvynenko, Lev Mitrokhin, Sergiy Baranov, Kamil Salimov, Sergiy Teleshun.

The problem of combating terrorism is still the most pressing issue of today. Modern terrorism is characterized by a rapid growth of technical equipment application, high level of organization, substantial financial resources. Its main distinctive feature is the presence of smooth boundaries between national and international terrorism. Terrorist organizations expand their connections with trafficking in drugs and arms. The number of terrorist groups is visibly growing in the modern world.

The development of the notion of terrorism is one of the most complex tasks of the world scientific and practical aspects of combating crime. Today there are more than 200 definitions of terrorism, but none of them is generally recognized and accepted, due to the complexity of the phenomenon itself and some subjective factors at the national and international levels.

The law of Ukraine “On combating terrorism” defines terrorism (from Latin – terror – terror, horror) as socially dangerous activity, which is conscious, deliberate use of violence by the hostage-taking, arson, murder, torture, intimidation of people and public authorities, or commitment of other assaults on the lives or health of innocent people or the threat of committing criminal acts to achieve a criminal purpose [Закон України 2003].

The analysis of Ukrainian authors’ definitions of the notion of terrorism shows that virtually all researchers strive to get a clearer division between the notions of “terror”, “terrorism”, “terrorist act”.

We believe that terrorism should refer to a criminal activity with the use of violence or the threat of violence against a certain individual or a group of people that is accompanied with the intimidation of the population and deliberate creation of the environment of fear, depression and tension in order to impose the decisions that would benefit the terrorists and present considerable social danger, while the realization of this activity is public. At the same time the terrorists’ goals may be different, namely, political, economic, religious etc. The importance of defining the essence of terrorism and the sense of this notion with its structural elements as a
criminal activity is conditioned by the necessity of developing an independent notion of terrorism.

For a long time the researchers in the field of terrorism have been trying to give a precise definition of its essence. None of the developed definitions, however, has become generally recognized because of the complex character of this field of research and additional complications that may arise in the course of the study. It should be mentioned that terrorism has been analyzed from different perspectives, i.e. philosophical, political, psychological, legal, etc., and every researcher studied this phenomenon from his or her own point of view and gave the notion of “terrorism” his or her own interpretation.

The essence of terrorism, in our opinion, should be understood as a set of original, characteristic and distinctive features intrinsic to terrorism as a social, political and legal category and which define its internal content. The distinctive features of terrorism include:

First, it presents a very serious danger to society because of the commitment of generally dangerous acts or threat thereof. The terrorist’s intent is to kill hostages, persons who are close to explosion sites, etc.

Second, terrorism features a public character of is performance. Most other crimes are committed without any intent to be made public, other than the situation when the criminals inform the people involved in order to make them do any intended actions.

Third, a distinctive feature of terrorism is a deliberate creation of the environment of fear, depression and tension. At the same time this environment is created not at an individual level or a level of a certain small group of people, it is created at the social level and constitutes an objective social and psychological factor that influences other people to make them commit certain acts benefitting terrorists or accept their demands.

The disregard of these conditions sometimes prompts to refer to any action that causes fear and anxiety in the society as terrorism. But terrorism differs from other fear-inducing crimes, because the fear, which is the result of well-publicized acts, does not emerge on its own, these acts are committed not to induce fear but to achieve some other goal. They serve as an objective leverage and the environment of fear is not the goal but the means to achieve some other goal. Thus, the environment of fear is an expression of terrorism, a manifestation of its essence, rather than its ultimate goal.
Fourth, another distinctive feature of terrorism is that the generally dangerous violence of the very terrorist act is directed at certain people or property while the psychological influence to induce certain behavior is exercised on other people, i.e. the violence influence the victims’ decisions not directly but indirectly, through a resolute decision of a victim (an individual, a legal person or a group of people) resulting from the environment of fear and the demands, stated by the terrorists in this environment.

At the same time the influence on people, who terrorists want to get an expected result from, may be both direct and indirect. Explosions in public places carried out by national separatists who aimed at forcing the government to give in to their demands constitutes a direct influence, while the same actions committed by someone to spread mistrust to the “ruling party” among the population and present it as incapable of bringing order, thus creating a background for promises of improving the situation in the region or the country, if the citizens let certain candidates win the elections, then these actions can be considered as indirect influence.

Galina Ovchinnikova states that politically over-loaded opinions constitute the main complicating factor for developing a unified approach to the determination of terrorism as well as the arrival at its legal definition. In addition they also impede the development of international measures for combating terrorism. Another factor that stands in the way of defining the essence and notion of terrorism is the problem of identifying the notion of terrorism with the notion of terror. These two notions are often used as synonyms [Овчинникова 2008, 17].

We agree with the authors who believe that terrorism is a crime, while terror is a modus operandi of any subject (a state, an organization, an individual) that provides for the use or threat of force, inducement of fear. Vyacheslav Yemelianov compares the term "terror" with such terms as "aggression", "genocide", "war", referring to terror as mass-scale violence used by power subjects, so it allows him to consider such terms as "ideological terror", "state terror", "extrajudicial terror", "administrative terror" [Емельянов 2006, 32].

According to Vyacheslav Yemelianov, in many cases terrorism and terrorist act often correlate as a part and the whole, especially when it comes to actually committed acts of violence, because to define certain actions as a terrorist act, these acts not necessarily have to be committed in a generally dangerous way that would threaten to injure an unlimited number of people or have any other adverse consequences. Thus a terrorist act has to comprise all the features of terrorism with an
exception of the first one, namely, creation of public danger, nevertheless this feature can also be present. Besides, the author states that together terrorism and terrorist act make up a more general notion — “a crime of a terrorist nature in a narrow or proper sense of the word” or “terrorism in a broad sense of the word”.

Famous Ukrainian political scientist Sergiy Teleshun differentiates three main types of terror, this classification is based on the citizenship of terrorists and their victims as well as the venue of the terrorist attack:

1. National – the respective actions by the citizens of one state against their compatriots on their own territory;
2. Transnational – respective actions by the citizens of one state against their compatriots on the territory of other state;
3. International – respective actions of a group of citizens with homogeneous or mixed nationality composition against any person or people on the territory of third countries [Телешун 2005, 167].

Most phenomena that we are considering involve terrorizing, i.e. persecution and harassment with the threat of reprisal, violence, intimidation and inducement of fear. Terrorizing, as a spate kind of criminal activity, has the following features:

1. violent actions as well as other actions of a culprit are not the ultimate goal but rather a mean to achieve other goals;
2. the environment of fear is deliberately created by a culprit to use its effect in achieving a criminal goal to make a person, a group of people, an organization or a state take or refrain from taking any decision in the interest of the culprit or some other party;
3. the ultimate result is achieved not due to the culprit’s actions but by the actions of those who have been targeted with these threatening actions;
4. violent and threatening actions may be targeted at some people, while the ultimate criminal goal of a culprit may be achieved by the actions of the third party. It is possible that the target of the actions and the achieved ultimate criminal goal will be associated with the same person.

National legal and political thought refers to terrorism as a radical form of extremism. Extremism (extremist activity) is defined by the Russian legal doctrine in the following way:

1. extremism is an activity of individuals or various organizations (public, religious etc.) that implies planning, organizing, preparing and carrying out actions aimed at the forcible change of the foundations of the constitutional
system and violation of the integrity of the Russian Federation, undermining the security of the Russian federation, seizure and appropriation of commanding authority, creation of illegal armed forces, carrying out terrorist activity etc.;
2. propaganda and public demonstration of Nazi and Nazi-like paraphernalia or symbols;
3. public incitement to the abovementioned activities;
4. funding of the aforementioned activity [Закон 1998].

Exceptional complexity, the variety of forms, conflicting political definitions and terms are the reasons why there is still no unified approach to the classification of terrorism types. Western and national philosophers, political scientists, historians, experts in state law systematize and classify terrorism at different levels with specific classification criteria, which, of course, reflects the multi-level and complex character of this phenomenon. With all its variety and sometimes conflicting approaches such a multi-dimensional scope of the research into the problem allows the scholars to conduct a more thorough analysis of detecting the public danger of terrorism and its features that are important in political and legal aspects.

At the International Human Rights Conference (1970) devoted to terrorism and protection of people from it, there were suggested three forms of terrorism: political, social and ideological. Political scientist Dmytro Olshanskyi distinguishes the following types of terrorism: political (terrorist acts of various origin with the aim to influence political leader, the government or their policies and make them take certain actions or decisions); informational (direct influence on psychic and conscience of people to form necessary thoughts and opinions, and somehow adjust people’s behavior); economic (various discriminating economic actions to influence economic competitors, social groups and population strata as well as the countries and their leaders to secure certain decisions that would be economically beneficial for terrorists) and social (domestic) terrorism (uncontrolled street crimes, growing criminal world, overall social instability and mass social despondency) [Петрищев 2005, 93].

Leonid Serdiuk distinguishes an unselfish terrorism illustrating it with the activity of Russian revolutionaries and terrorists of the early 20th century. In addition, the author points on the positive character of the fanatical activity of revolutionaries and terrorists that is their unselfishness and aspirations for social justice for all the people in the state [Богданова 2007, 36]. The author’s opinion is, however, controversial as the actions that Serdiuk calls unselfish terrorism can to a certain extent be
qualified as political terrorism, i.e. violent lethal actions that are quite regularly planned by semi-legal and legal groups with the aim to fuel fear and thus pressurize the authorities to achieve certain results.

The works in the field of terrorism often use the notion of suicide terrorism (Sergiy Kachura) that refers to a readiness to sacrifice one’s own life in order to achieve a certain political goal [Качура 2010, 10].

Nowadays there are a lot of religious and secular terrorist groups capable of using suicide terrorism as a maneuver to fight against one’s own or foreign government. These groups include: Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas) and Palestinian Islamic Jihad on the territories occupied by Israel; Party of Allah (Hezbollah) in the Lebanon; Egyptian Islamic Jihad and Gamaya Islamiya (Islamic Group) in Egypt; Groupe Islamique Armé (GIA) in Algeria; Babbar Khalsa International (BKI) in India; Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka; Kurdistan Workers’ Party (PKK) in Turkey; Osama bin Laden’s terrorist network al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. As an illustration of suicide terrorism we can mention the tragic events of 911 (September 11th, 2002) in New York, Washington and Pennsylvania (the USA), when passenger flights were hijacked by suicide terrorists that directed at the vital buildings claiming the lives of almost 7 thousand people, including 266 passangers of the hijacked flights, more than 200 people in Washington and 6333 in New-York [Устинов 2004, 58].

Modern publications also distinguish a technological terrorism that refers to illegal use of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological (biological) weapons and their components, nuclear, radioactive, highly toxic chemical substances, pathogenic microorganisms, putting out of operation, destruction or capture of nuclear, chemical or other facilities, vital infrastructure and utilities in cities and industrial centers in order to achieve political, economic and other goals.

The analysis of trends in crime development, operational, social and economic situation in the country allows to come to a conclusion that potentially dangerous facilities may become targets for possible terrorist acts. Presently, the threat of radioactive terrorism becomes quite explicit due to the possibility of terrorists’ gaining illegal access to nuclear materials, nuclear wastes and isotope products.

About 36% of engineering and technological complexes of nuclear facilities security systems and 74% of controlled closed administrative and territorial areas require reconstruction and major repairs and 30% of the guarded buildings and
premises do not have electronic alarm systems, it considerably reduces the effectiveness of tracking trespassers. The access to the nuclear power plant locations is unrestricted for people or transport.

It can be used in a disguised preparation for a surprise terrorist attack on the facility or in its vicinity, complicate the task of taking preventive measures in the rapidly changing environment. Hydraulic facilities potentially may be that much dangerous, because usually they are located within boundaries of big cities or upstream. Their destruction may cause considerable casualties, flood vast territories with important economic and strategic facilities and infrastructure. Technological terrorism is one of the forms of different types of terrorism, rather than its particular type.

The notion of anti-state terrorism was introduced by Mykola Litvinov to refer to an intentional activity of individuals or organized groups aimed at changing social and economic formations, ruining the state ideology, changing the form of government as well as the state and political regime, undermining territorial integrity, disrupting the state operations with the help of terrorist means [Ляхов 2001, 140].

The abovementioned types of terrorism cannot be a subject of law (e.g. state domestic terrorism against the citizens of own state). Because the international law does not recognize the state as a subject of crimes, the notion of “state terrorism” is “faulty”, says Vyacheslav Yemelianov [Емельянов 2006, 165]. In this classification the types of terrorism and the forms of its realization are confused. Any type of terrorism (international or political) may be spontaneous or organized.

Vyacheslav Yemelianov believes that it is a mistake to have a classification where the state, political and religious types of terrorism are also supplemented with criminal terrorism. Any terrorism, claims Vyacheslav Yemelianov and we agree with him, is criminal and there is no non-criminal terrorism.

But criminal terrorism itself may have subtypes by motivation (political, religious, economic) and by the crime subject (committed by a national or non-national, a regular person or a representative of the government bodies). The division between “criminal” terrorism and “non-criminal” terrorism can be made only by its motivation, i.e. at the criminalistic or psychological levels. Criminal law considers any terrorism as criminal because it violates the criminal law. In addition, not only national law but international treaties as well consider terrorism to be a criminal act.

Western researchers distinguish the following types of terrorism:

1. Psychological and criminal (John Bell).
2. Revolutionary, subrevolutionary and repressive (Paul Wilkinson and Richard Schultz).

3. Nuclear, economic, technological and environmental.

We believe that terrorism can be classified into the following independent types:
1. By the territorial principle – a) international; b) national; c) transnational.
2. By criminal motivation – a) political; b) religious; c) nationalist; d) economic.

Taking into account all the various types of terrorism and the debate on the problems of classifying the types of terrorism we see an urgent need for further political and legal research into these problems, because their development is also conditioned by a considerable practical necessity.

National researchers point out two types of crime prevention: general (general social) crime prevention and special crime prevention. The former realizes the society’s anti-criminogenic potential on the whole, all its institutions; the latter has a task-oriented character, namely, to prevent crimes.

All-national crime prevention has large-scale and long-lasting types of social practices in the general meaning of this word.

In the economy these measures include the production development on the basis of modern technologies, sound investment structure and strategy, strengthening of the national currency and the whole financial system, curbing inflation. In the political field they are: the establishment and development of the new Ukrainian statehood, strengthening of democracy and all branches of government. Important anti-criminogenic measures in the social field include the removal of a radical social division in the society, support of the low-income citizens, promotion of family values and principles, curbing the negative effects of unemployment, forced migration. The spiritual field of the society’s life is of a special attention, because morality often opposes crime, whereas moral decay contributes to it.

Special crime-prevention measures are diverse and have different classifications. Specialized criminalistic measures are distinguished by the content (economic, political, cultural and educational etc.); by the scale (all-national, regional etc.); by the legal character they are divided into specialized criminalistic measures based on legal norms but not regulated by them (e.g. legal education and upbringing), and explicitly regulated norms (e.g. the police administrative monitoring of the people who were released from penitentiary institutions).
There are also other reasons for differentiating measures of special prevention. The existing measures of crime prevention can be fully applied to combating terrorism. As an example we may cite Sergiy Goncharov’s classification of anti-terrorist measures that include financial and economic, political, military measures, propaganda and prevention.

Valeriy Velychko shares Goncharov’s opinion but adds that this classification has to include the cooperation of national and international participants, he also states that coercion methods are to be used at the final stage – the annihilation of terrorists [Величко 2005, 44].

Viktor Petryshchev voiced a similar opinion and pointed out that the new situation dictates the necessity of pursuing an internationally coordinated policy of terrorism deterrence [Петрищев 2005, 168]. The governments should agree on certain fundamental positions: what diplomatic measures can increase the efficiency of anti-terrorist activity; what concessions can be allowed in the negotiations with terrorists and the author remarks, and we completely agree with him, that the hard-line principle of “no concessions” does not work in the modern conditions; what mechanism of an economic embargo imposition can be applied against the countries that sponsor terrorism.

The President of the Board of the World association of Detectives Johnathan Tal pointed out the role of private security services in the prevention of and combating terrorism and suggested an idea that professional organizations can act as carriers of ideas and efforts, like bridges that connect governments, law enforcement agencies and the industry of private security services [Ляхов 2001, 112]. According to Yuriy Levutskyi non-governmental security agencies can participate in the prevention of terrorism in the following ways:

1. timely provision of information to the law enforcement agencies about suspicious individuals, firms and specific facts;
2. participation of rapid reaction groups from non-governmental security agencies to provide manpower and technical support in the large-scale operations by law-enforcement agencies (detention, arrests, searches, seizures, involvement of witnesses etc.);
3. publications and broadcast of expert interviews and accounts of former law-enforcement agents knowledgeable of the problem of combating terrorism;
4. formulation of guidelines and holding consultations on the problem of countering terrorism;
5. holding of public events (conferences, round-table conferences, workshops, etc.)
   with the participation of representatives from state law-enforcement bodies and
   intelligence agencies;
6. involvement of private security agencies’ personnel in patrolling residential blocks
   in big cities;
7. participation in the international public committees and movements for combating
   terrorism;
8. development, production and supply of special equipment to detect weapons,
   explosive devices and substances as well as explosion-protection devices (e.g.
   anti-radio explosion blocking gear) by private enterprises for law-enforcement
   and intelligence agencies, other private security agencies. Use of this special
   equipment at checkpoints located in crowded places.

The terrorism prevention strategy should include a sound information policy
by the media. Today experts in different areas of knowledge (political scientists, phi-
losophers, theologists, psychologists, medical doctors) note the adverse influence
of some information products on the psychological and, as the result, behavioral max-
ims of the population (the media propaganda of cruelty, violence, blood vengeance,
radical nationalist maxims, morally deformed behavioral stereotypes).

In the system of terrorism prevention a special place belongs to the subjects
of this activity:
1. Antiterrorist Center under the Security Service of Ukraine, a department that is
   responsible for anti-terrorist activity of conducting operational and investiga-
   tion measures to prevent, detect and suppress terrorism.
2. Prosecutor General’s Office of Ukraine is responsible within its jurisdiction for
   the supervision over the legality and quality of collecting operational informa-
   tion about terrorism incidents, investigation of cases involving terrorism.
3. Foreign Intelligence Service of Ukraine prevents any political terrorism activity
   by ensuring the protection of Ukrainian institution abroad as well as their staff
   and families.
4. Ministry of Defense of Ukraine is responsible for the storage of adopted weap-
   ons of mass destruction, missile weapons, ammunition and explosives, military
   facilities security. In addition the Ministry of Defense is responsible for ensuring
   the security of national marine navigation, national airspace of Ukraine, con-
   ducting counter-terrorist operations.
5. State Border Guard Service of Ukraine is responsible for combating political terrorism by prevention, detection and counteracting the terrorists’ efforts to cross Ukraine’s official border, illegal smuggling into or out of the territory of Ukraine weapons, explosives and other objects that can be used as means for terrorist attacks.

6. Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine is responsible for combating terrorism, detection and prevention of crimes of a terrorist nature that have lucrative motives.

Effective combating terrorism is nowadays generally admitted to be possible on condition of joint efforts of the entire world community. That is due to the particular features of terrorism in the first place including its transnational character. There are a number of international conventions of universal and regional types that as the object of regulation establish implementation of mutual cooperation between countries in their war on international terrorism on the basis of clearly defined criteria.

Among them are: Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism (Geneva 1937), Convention to Prevent and Punish Acts of Terrorism Taking the Form of Crimes Against Persons and Related Extortion that are of International Significance (Washington, D.C. 1971), European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism (Strasbourg 1977) etc.

World community has certain experience in common war on terrorism:
1. The resolutions for prevention of terrorism were passed at the international conferences on unification of criminal legislation in 1930, 1931 and 1934. The same convention was adopted by the League of Nations;
2. Since the middle 1970s, The UN Committee on Crime Prevention and Control has been raising the issue of terrorism in general and international terrorism in particular in a varying degree of interpretation at all its sessions (e.g. at the 5th and 6th sessions in 1980 and 1982; at the 11th session of the Committee in 1990 the resolution “Criminal Terrorist Activity” was adopted, and it shows the attitude of the experts in combating criminal activity to the problem of international terrorism);
3. Since the 1970s, the UNO has adopted more than ten counter-terrorism documents;
4. There have been created international structures that are completely or partially aimed at counter-terrorism (e.g. International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), European Police Office (EUROPOL), CIS Antiterrorism Center);

5. At the 13\textsuperscript{th} session of League of Arab States Interior Ministers Council there was a project “The Code of Conduct” in combating terrorism. It prohibits granting national territories for planning and implementation of terrorist activity, granting financial or other kinds of help to terrorist organizations;

6. Ukraine has signed intergovernmental memoranda of common understanding and cooperation in the field of civil aviation that specify the forms of bilateral operational cooperation in crisis situations created by terrorist activity in civil airlines. The productive cooperation in fighting against terrorism is being developed between Russia, USA, Great Britain, Turkey, France and Germany.

The cooperation between Ukraine and the Commonwealth of Independent States member states in war on terrorism deserves particular attention. The member states of the Commonwealth, in particular Ukraine, Russia, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan together with the other member states have taken specific measures to coordinate efforts to fight against international terrorism on the territory of the former Soviet Union.

These measures resulted in the resolution on Creating Anti-terrorism Center of CIS member states adopted by the Council of Heads of States of the CIS (June, 21\textsuperscript{st} 2000). In November 2001 they created an ATC CIS Task Force in Central Asian region that monitors operative situations in the field of combating international terrorism on the Southern borders of the Commonwealth and acts in close touch with competent authorities in order to suppress terrorism in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan and Ukraine.

The sessions of the Council of Heads of States of the CIS that took place in Moscow (January, 25\textsuperscript{th} 2000; June 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2000) resulted in adoption of the program for the CIS member states aimed at combating international terrorism and other kinds of extremism by 2003. In practice, separate efforts of certain countries are not enough for effective war on terrorism. Fight against terrorism needs participation of all countries in the world community, especially amidst globalization of world processes, and makes it necessary to develop international approach and common methods of resistance to various kinds of terrorist activity.
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GLOBAL TERRORISM AS A METHOD OF POLITICAL FIGHT AND A FORM OF RAPE

**Abstrakt.** Modern international community always faces problems and terrorism is ranked as a number one of these challenges. It can be traced back to ancient times. The foundation for terrorism emergence and development was in property and social inequalities, transformation of the well-established way of life, differences in the mentality, the objective need for changing the trajectory of the development, the growing gap between the rich and the poor inside the country and at the international level, rapid technical and technological progress, the commercialization of life and resulting moral decay.
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