

THE UNIDENTIFIED THREAT: TERRORISM'S IMPASSE ON NATIONAL POLITICS AND DEMOCRACY

Aleyna ARAS*

Abstract

The aim of this study is to fill the gap created by the uncertainty in the definition of the concept of terrorism in political science and the international arena by examining the paradoxical relationship between the norms that shape the understanding of democracy of states and nationalism and anarchism, so it is emphasized that the limitations in the definition of this concept should be overcome with the help of constructivist theory and the issue should be addressed from broader perspectives. Terrorism's attempts to legitimize actions aimed at directly affecting societies and restricting or eliminating state actions through political manipulations create security problems both globally and nationally. Especially in democratic systems, the fact that such separatist attitudes threaten the sustainability of peace by changing the perception of the people, creating problems such as insecurity and polarization with the potential to weaken state structures should not be ignored. Therefore, it is of critical importance for nations to strengthen their understanding of nationalism, identity norms, and to clarify the distinction between us and them. In this respect, constructivism theory's effort to explain the concept supports all actors by reminding them that events change according to the way they occur and the conditions of the period. In addition, the theory deeply affects the social order and norms of terrorism and the paradoxical relationship between nationalism and anarchism. However, the changes brought by globalization also show that terrorism can manifest in different forms and methods, acquiring new dynamics over time.

Keywords: *Difficulty of Defining Terrorism, Democracy, Nationalism, Anarchism, Constructivism, Identity, Security.*

Tanımlanamayan Tehdit: Terörizmin Milli Politika ve Demokrasi Üzerindeki Çıkmazı

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı terörizm kavramının tanımlanmasındaki belirsizliğin, siyaset bilimi ve uluslararası alandan yarattığı boşluğu kavramın devletlerin demokrasi anlayışlarını şekillendiren normlarla birlikte milliyetçilik ve anarşizm arasındaki paradoksal ilişkinin yarattığı karmaşık ilişkiyi test ederek doldurmaktır. Bu sebeple konstrüktivist teorinin çalışma prensipleri yardımıyla bu kavramın tanımındaki sınırlılıkları aşmak ve daha geniş perspektiflerden durumun ele alınması gerektiğinin üzerinde durulmaktadır. Terörizmin siyasi manipölasyonları

* Aleyna Aras, Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi, aleynaaras7@gmail.com, ORCID: 0009-0009-9557-6718

doğrudan kullanarak toplumları etkileme, devlet hareketlerini kısıtlmaya ve ya ortadan kaldırmaya yönelik eylemleri meşrulaştırmaya çalışmaları hem küresel hem de ulusal ölçekte ciddi güvenlik problemleri oluşturmaktadır. Özellikle demokratik sistemlerde bu tür ayrılcı tutumların halkın algısını değiştirerek, devlet yapılarını zayıflatma potansiyeli güvensizlik ve kutuplaşma gibi problemleri meydana getirerek barışın sürdürülebilirliğini tehdit ettiği gerçeği göz ardı edilmemelidir. Bu nedenle ulusların milliyetçilik anlayışlarını, kimlik normlarını güçlendirilmesi, biz ve onlar ayrımının netleştirilmesi kritik öneme sahiptir. Bu açıdan yapılandırmacılık teorisinin kavramı açıklamaya yönelik çabası olayların meydana geliş şekline ve dönemin koşullarına göre değişiklik gösterdiğini tüm aktörlere hatırlatarak destek olmaktadır. Ayrıca teori terörizmin milliyetçik ve anarşizm arasındaki paradoksal ilişkinin toplum düzenini ve normları derinden etkilemektedir. Fakat küreselleşmenin getirdiği değişimler terörizmin farklı şekil ve yöntemlerle de meydana gelerek farklı dinamikler kazanabileceğini de göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Terörizmin Tanımlanmasının Zorluğu, Demokrasi, Milliyetçilik, Anarşizm, Yapılandırmacılık, Kimlik, Güvenlik.*

Introduction

Terrorism is seen today as a structure that does not hesitate to use all kinds of violence, such as oppression, use of various resources, social media, human trafficking, etc., in order to reach the desired power in the political, economic, social, etc. fields, it is actually seen as a concept that is difficult to reach a common decision on what it exactly means according to the states. Although terrorism has been accepted as a common problem in the new century, it is thought that the difficulty of creating a common definition that is general and acceptable to everyone is due to the fact that the concept is not a physical entity that can be measured, weighed and analyzed (White, 2015, p. 3), because such actions fundamentally create perceptions that may differ from society to society. For this reason, it can be said that the definitions of terrorism change and are affected by the national policies of states and the understanding of democracy they have created, depending on the socio-environment in which terrorism emerges.

This paper asks the main research question “How does the difficulty of defining terrorism affect national politics, shape its relationship with democracy, and reveal the paradoxical interaction between nationalism and anarchism?”. In the context of this question, the study will consist of four sections following the introduction and the literature review provided within. In the first section, the difficulty of defining terrorism and its impact on national politics will be discussed, in the other section, the relationship of the concept with democracy will be evaluated, and in the next section, the paradoxical interaction between nationalism and anarchism will be examined, and in the conclusion section, general evaluations on the subject will be made. It is thought that the principles of constructivism theory will better explain the emphasis given by terrorism being a variable structure in the social, cultural and political context, and therefore, the theory will facilitate our understanding of why, how, why and according to what the common definition of the concept changes.

The problem of defining terrorism is becoming increasingly problematic. According to Jenny Teichman, one of the reasons for this is the disagreements among linguists, international relations scholars, and even philosophers about whether terrorism is wrong by definition or simply a fact (How to Define Terrorism, 2009, p. 506). Another dilemma created by the emergence of disagreements is what kind of behaviors should be called terrorism. Jonathan R. White, in his book *Terrorism and Homeland Security*, states that some academics prefer a simple definition that states that terrorism is an act of violence or a threatened act against innocent people for political purposes, while some countries define terrorism as a violation of the law and consider it a crime (2015, p. 3). Jenny Teichman explains a similar example in her article "How to Define Terrorism". He stated that terrorism is good for some and bad for others, but Haig Khatchadourian argues that there are exceptions to the (undefined) rule that terrorism is always bad, whereas C. A. J. Coady seems to argue that terrorism is necessarily bad. Noam Chomsky believes that the state is today the main perpetrator of terrorism, whereas Anthony Kenny and a few others argue that terrorism should be defined as a form of unjust rebellion (2009, p. 506). Now, underground groups have started to crawl and take the name terrorism. Similarly, in the joint work of Leonard Weinberg and his colleagues, they see terrorism as actions carried out under the title of freedom in some cases, while others see this situation as a deadly and judgmental behavior, and they exemplify this event with the post-war attitude of the leader of the Irgun in Palestine (*The Challenges of Conceptualizing Terrorism*, 2010, p. 787).

The relationship between democracy and terrorism is quite complex. Both are greatly affected by each other. While democracy has a preventive effect on terrorism, on the other hand, it can be said that the principles of tolerance and equality put forward by the system pave the way for terrorism. Gizem Kemik sees terrorism as a national security problem due to the increase in needs and demands in the globalizing world (2021, pp. 172-173). These concepts are intertwined, for this reason, it is necessary for states to have a definition of terrorism in their national policies and to have deterrent policies. Doğuhan Sökücü also supported Kemik's work with his work and mentioned that terrorism is a driving force that shapes the national security policies of states and strengthens intelligence (*The Effect of Globalized Terrorism to International Politics*, 2009, p. 55). Ted Piccone mentioned in line with the mentioned studies that the intertwined relationship between terrorism and democracy, their use of violence against innocents or their attempts to achieve their goals by exploiting the religious weaknesses of societies with this threat, have an undeniable effect on the domestic and foreign policy processes of the state (*Democracy and Terrorism*, 2017, p. 3). Because while it is mentioned that the principles of accountability, transparency and openness created by the democratic environment make it difficult for terrorism to occur in such societies (Magen, 2018, pp. 8-9).

Some studies state that the opposite is possible. For example, in the joint study of Ashlyn W. Hand and Nilay Saiyra, the idea that the goals of universalist terrorist groups and the goals of strategic terrorist groups are democratic states is explained (*Democracy's Ambivalent Effect on Terrorism*, 2023, p. 1624).

Terrorism has a paradoxical interaction with nationalism and anarchism. Jose A. Gutierrez and Ruth Kinna have argued in their articles that anarchism is diametrically opposed to nationalism because it is an anti-authoritarian movement (Anarchism and The National Question—Historical, Theoretical and Contemporary Perspectives, 2022, p. 124). Whitney Kassel has also stated that anarchism shares similar characteristics with terrorism, since its ultimate goal is destruction, based on the article by Gutierrez and his collaborator (Terrorism and the International Anarchist Movement of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries, 2009, p. 238). Nationalism, on the other hand, is the opposite of anarchism, in which a society seeks to protect its sovereignty, existence, identity, and all the values that create them, and to continue this continuity. However, this understanding, in addition to its potential to encourage national feelings within a nation, also carries the risk of fueling exclusionary, othering, terrorism and chauvinist feelings (Ayas & Ünsal, 2024, p. 163). In this respect, Aditi Bhatia, in her study, has emphasized the fine line between ideologies by recalling the words of former US President Bush on the distinction between us and them, and that these can easily transform into each other at any time (The Discourses of Terrorism, 2009, p. 287).

1. The Difficulty of Defining the Concept of Terrorism and Its Impact on National Politics

The definition of terrorism has always emerged in different ways throughout history, and what it exactly means has always been a subject of debate by all countries in the world. Due to the multifaceted nature of the concept and its relationship with all disciplines, it is a concept that gains dimensions according to ethical moral principles, legal principles and the customs formed by international norms and the rule of law and reflects all these dimensions. When viewed from this perspective, it becomes quite difficult to define due to the complexities and dilemmas it creates both from a historical perspective and within the framework of political relations. When viewed today, there are many definitions of terrorism such as according to “The Great Larousse Dictionary (1986, p. 1144) encyclopedia terrorism: “The systematic use of violence in order to force a power or authority to accept, intimidation, terror”, in the French Le Petit Robert Dictionary, it was given as “The common fear created by a group in a society in order to break the resistance of the people”, in the Turkish Language Association Dictionary, it was given as “Intimidation, killing and destroying property, frightening, terror” (Abubaker, 2021, p. 37). Thornton, who specializes in international relations and security studies, defines terrorism as “symbolic acts aimed at influencing political behavior through methods that would be considered normal” (Özerkmen, 2004, p. 250). Similarly, Ted Honderich defines terrorism or political violence as: “Violence with a political and social intention, whether or not intended to put people in general in fear, and raising a question of its moral justification – either illegal violence within a society or smaller-scale violence than war between states or societies and not according to international war” (Meisels, 2009, p. 335). In the definitions created for terrorism, the dominant effects of the concepts of use of force and violence are seen in common, but the differences in the boundaries of the concept and the ways it is expressed have created an increasingly deepening process in

defining and making sense of the problem. The fact that the problem has not been solved and has reached an even greater impasse is actually due to the disagreements of politicians, linguists, international relations concepts and even philosophers, especially on whether terrorism is wrong by definition or wrong as a mere fact, whether it should be defined in terms of its aims or methods or both or neither, and whether states can carry out terrorism (Teichman, 2009, p. 506). At the same time, there are serious disagreements created by the fact that the concept of terrorism is a multidisciplinary concept. For example, even today, the nature and level of social events that occur within many states are being discussed. Serious impasses are being created on how to evaluate social events that occur in France, Turkey and Germany. However, the important criterion here is to forget that events that can be considered as terrorist acts are defined in different ways depending on the answer to the questions such as who, where and in what way they occur, who is the observer, etc.

As a result, while some may consider these events as actions carried out under the title of freedom, others may consider this situation as divisive and judgmental behavior. For example, Menachem Begin, as the leader of the Irgun (Lehi's Zionist rival) in post-war Palestine, was someone who called his followers "freedom fighters" instead of "terrorists." Then, terrorist groups adopted this attractive description and called themselves freedom fighters because they understood the propaganda advantage of this description (Weinberg, Pedahzur, & Hirsch-Hofler, 2010, p. 787).

The emergence of many possibilities about how terrorism emerged and how it will occur again for about 50 years has revealed the difficulty of making a common definition. However, certain answers clearly show that terrorism is widely used with political purposes. As a concept, it carries political liabilities and negativities. Although many researchers see terrorism as a form of political violence, it is known that this concept, which has an analytical characteristic, has a tendency for states to create definitions with the actions it takes place in different countries. In this respect, states also categorize terrorism according to various cases that occur, draw certain boundaries for it, but it has a different format elsewhere, and this concept needs to be expanded and organized according to the new century and new contexts. This situation naturally shows that skepticism has increased, that actions should be defined correctly, and at which points there should be flexibility, and that intensive studies should be carried out to determine what direction the requirements of the age are. In this context, it is necessary to ensure that the international relations network works well and that sessions are held to bring states together on this issue, because terrorism is still a problem that continues in the 21st century, with large gaps between actors and complex meanings in the literature. Especially in recent times, the uneasiness created by this conceptual ambiguity has been seriously felt. For example, after the September 11 terrorist attacks, it is seen that many academics complain about the inadequacy of the academic studies conducted and the inadequacy of the definition of terrorism. Another similar thing in this context is the mixed success of the global war on terror, foreign occupation, Guantanamo Bay concentration camp, extraordinary repatriation, use of torture and the erosion of civil liberties,

along with morally disturbing and adverse aspects, such as an increasing political unrest and sense of horror, which also shows that the definition of terrorism is only a derogatory attitude in its social context (Rnastrop, 2009, p. 16). For this reason, the concept has not gone beyond being a controversial concept in every period. However, the definition that needs to be discussed at this point is to decide what will be supported and what will not be supported.

The concept of terrorism, which is not considered ethical by its nature and focuses on illegality, spreading fear, political and ideological purposes, and legitimacy of oppression practices, should be defined with care. By focusing on the historical background of the concept, by determining state and non-state factors, by focusing on the issues of violence, ways of intimidation and in what ways they attract society, far from moral judgments and in its pure form, without serving anyone's interests, by focusing on the level of violence. Otherwise, there is a margin of error in policies that can be created against terrorism and similar asymmetric threats, and it can threaten national security and cause states to make strategic mistakes in providing people with the environment of trust that they deserve. For example, it is known that in the history of the USA, terror and asymmetric wars have always existed and adopted creative and original approaches to be strategically effective against such threats. The US, which emphasizes the need for good intelligence, should do its best to make life difficult for terrorists, but this nature of asymmetric conflict is often not rewarding for careful defense. The reason is clear. Simply put, we and our friends and allies present so many targets around the world that providing preventive protection can only be a valuable policy goal. We tend to seize the past event and project it as the threat of the moment (Gray, 2002, pp. 3-4). However, we can say that the strategies that the US has developed against such threats have caused overreactions and constant tensions, while this situation has disregarded public security and disturbed the national and international political balance due to the anxiety it has created in the people.

Terrorism has a major impact on national politics. This impact plays a role in the state's domestic and foreign policy-making processes, in protecting the social structure and creating an environment of trust, and in respecting democratic values. Security is an important area in this regard, and states need to take measures against terrorism in their politics, because terrorism is an element that threatens societies, states, the world, and the international system, no matter how difficult it is to define from the past to the present.

The globalization of the world, the change in perception created by the Cold War, and the emergence of various concepts of terrorism, along with different shapes and dimensions, are the most frequently used and repeated points for terrorism, which occurs in different forms and dimensions. The security problem, which refers to the systematic use of violent discourse and strategy in order to achieve political goals (Kemik, 2021, pp. 172-173). Terrorism, which shapes the security policies of states in their national politics, pushes states to strengthen their intelligence demands, emphasize the importance of the concept of terrorism in legislative, judicial and executive processes, and restructure their internal security systems, creating control centers. While terrorism, which has a pluralistic understanding, directs the globalizing and modernizing

world through politics, it continues to target the nation-states, which are the most fundamental actors of the system (Sökücü, 2009, p. 55). In this respect, the balance that the state will create in protecting its national identities, values and ensuring its security is very important. Similarly, terrorism can easily shape the public opinion of states these days. The increase in the use of social media and the fact that everyone can easily access the information they want is one of the steps that terrorism can take in terms of “perception management”. This is also the biggest difficulty encountered in making the typology of real terrorism, stemming from its nature. As Ferracut stated, terrorism is limited to trying to disrupt the stability of the society it considers an enemy by spreading fear, and in real politics, it is a structure that sees it as permissible to gain power and do everything for power, and destructions, losses and deaths have been continuing for centuries (Hazır, 1990, p. 38). At the same time, states are expected to strengthen social solidarity and national identity feelings against the threat of terrorism in their national policies. When we look from a sociological perspective, it should not be ignored that while the internal struggles of states shape elements of nationalism and national identity, there may also be a tendency towards more centralized and oppressive forms of government, as in the case of the USA, due to security threats.

2. The Relationship Between Terrorism and Democracy

The difficulties in expressing terrorism are essentially important in terms of what they need to do in their actions that bring such groups together and give them a political dimension. Secrecy, threats, sending messages, intimidation, claiming rights, and being disciplined are at the core of terrorism, and the fact that they can obtain the necessary financial support through illegal and legal means shows that their possibilities are limited at certain points. Terrorism is a revolutionary strategy, and they aim to overthrow the current dominant democratic administrations by using political power with separatist attitudes in their minds. They have the intention of undermining the nationalist and democratic structures of societies and creating a psychological effect that will change their political views and behaviors by representing groups that are shown as targets for terrorism within certain frameworks and disciplines and by containing elements of violence (Biçer, 2019, p. 113). It is possible to say that terrorism emerges by disrupting the integrity of the state, damaging the belief systems that people trust, know and believe into the end, and breaking the chain of give-take balance between the state and society. When the processes from the first days of terrorism to the present are examined, it is possible to speak of a structure that has grown by adding more to the previous period in each period. According to Western thinkers, the word terrorism was used by Edmund Burke, an English political philosopher, during the French Revolution to describe the situation in revolutionary Paris, and the Napoleonic wars, the sharp divisions in the class hierarchy, the desire of all people to be equal and the idea that democracy should be based not only on freedom but also on economic equality, paved the way for the formation of democratic movements and ideas that would ensure their continuation (White, 2015, pp. 9-10). This situation was seen as demands for democratization, liberation and political struggle. However, we see another dilemma created by the concept here. Michael

Burleigh (2007) writes that this action marks the beginning of modern terrorism. It started with the nation-state and the French Revolution, and his comment that organized governments used terrorism much more effectively than revolutionary groups actually reveals the need to examine all the possibilities that could affect the definition of terrorism and how it affects the sociology of society and the state structure (White, 2015, p. 10). In democratic systems, everything is quite transparent and permeable. In structures where people make free choices, take responsibility for their actions, have equal rights regardless of the conditions, have freedom of expression, and can choose who they want and live the life they choose, there are certain openings.

The formation of terrorist groups, the spread of propaganda and their support, because the results of globalization today are obvious in democratic countries, where terrorism uses the country's media to spread its own ideology. Although it is observed that terrorism is less experienced in more established and autocracies, the wave of terrorism has changed in the period after 2001. There is a tendency for democratic countries to take on a greater role in the fight against terrorism, especially in Middle Eastern countries where there is a lot of conflict. The intertwined relationship between terrorism and democracy, their use of violence against innocents or their attempts to achieve their goals by exploiting the religious weaknesses of societies with this threat, has an undeniable effect on state domestic and foreign policy processes, because societies committed to this democracy tend to respond more strongly to terrorism occurring in their territories through a combination of legal, political and social measures, and courts, legislatures and public opinion tend to reject violent means to achieve political goals when non-violent means are widely available (Piccone, 2017, p. 3). Because accountability, the idea that strict measures can be taken against all forms of violence, makes it difficult to sow discord in societies. In this respect, democracy makes it difficult for terrorism to gain legitimacy in terms of protecting rights and freedoms, defending peaceful means in solution processes and ensuring the sustainability of this environment (Magen, 2018, pp. 8-9). However, based on this, democracy also has a vulnerability to terrorism. The reason for this is that the freedom of the press, the organization of terrorist groups and their propaganda are facilitated by the liberal ideas created by the idea of democracy. The actions of terrorism depend on influencing societies and mobilizing states through this idea.

The constructivist perspective clearly states that the impact of terrorism on democracy varies depending on the motivations of the groups in their actions. Terrorism is not a fixed phenomenon. The changes in its meaning and perception, which are manipulated by states and the international system according to their interests, prove that while it may be a war of freedom for some, it threatens the independence and existence of others. This demonstrates that constructivist theory views the international system as a living entity. The theory, which comprises the material elements (military, economic, etc.) and identity norms of states, also represents a social process in defining and constructing terrorism today. This perspective reminds states, institutions, and the international system that the identity, ideology, and norms of terrorism depend on historical and political contexts and that terrorism discourses should be carefully analyzed. In this regard, it facilitates the definition of the concept by questioning where, how, and based on which discourses and behaviors the concept of terrorism—on which international actors and

states have yet to reach a consensus—has emerged. What is important in this theory is whether the actions of terrorism in order to achieve its ideological goals may directly target democracy and whether they tend to use the advantages created by democracy against them. For example, universalist terrorist groups, because they act with abstract ideological goals (e.g., global jihad or worldwide revolution), may tend to target democratic states because these states represent the values they oppose (e.g., liberalism, secularism) (Hand & Saiyra, *Ambivalent*, 2023, p. 1624). To give another similar example, strategic terrorist groups, because they have more local and concrete goals (e.g., national independence or regime change), may use the freedoms in democratic regimes to gather support or carry out operations, but their goals are more limited and may be related to specific geographical regions (Saiya, 2018, pp. 55-56). As a result, the impact of terrorism on democracy can be considered both threatening and challenging. In this respect, it cannot be said that they have a homogeneous relationship. In democratic systems or societies that tend to this direction, the fight against terrorism emerges as a new regime beyond the changes in the national politics of the states (Yilmaz, 2011, p. 53).

In this context, constructivist theory focuses on the results of collective actions rather than the behaviors of individuals in the formation and development of terrorism, thus ensuring the formation of the building blocks of societies. At the same time, the concepts discussed in the place where democracy exists, such as civil rights and freedoms, political rights and the unifying structure that forms all of these, also pave the way for the emergence of terrorism at one point. These dynamics reveal the cross-relationships of the terrorist groups that we separate as state, society and others, and they also bring about serious criticism.

3. The Paradoxical Interaction of Terrorism with Nationalism and Anarchism

Terrorism, as a socio-political phenomenon, is difficult to define objectively and universally, and is a contextual structure that is misleading, complex, and interacts with many areas (Bhatia, 2009, p. 281). If we go back to the starting point, in its simplest and narrowest sense, it is to reach the state by controlling the mass it determines as a target by any means, and these relations are intertwined with a sensitive feeling such as nationalism and anarchism, creating a completely different universe for terrorism. After the French Revolution, it was observed that anarchism also spread with the spread of democracy and nationalism in the West. The similarities between the basic motivations in the paradoxical relationship of terrorism with these concepts are striking. When looked at, it can be said that while nationalism and anarchism try to integrate certain ideologies into societies in order to change the social order, terrorism uses this situation in a different way, but as a result, it has come to the same point with the working principles of other concepts.

Anarchism is taking shape as an anti-authoritarian movement within the socialist movement. Anarchists' approaches to nationalism and national independence struggles emphasize theoretical and practical differences regarding the role of the nation-state (Gutierrez & Kinna, 2022, p. 124). According to anarchists, the idea that the state and its central authority should be abolished, and that equality can only be achieved under these conditions is the building block. For this reason, they

are against all authorities. Just like one of the underlying reasons for terrorism, they are against the state and see themselves as entitled to use violence as a legitimate tool, and they draw the state and the people who represent them into their own areas through perception operations. In this context, anarchism criticizes the structure of the nation-state and supports the struggle for independence, but they stay away from decentralization and reject the nation-state (Gutierrez & Kinna, 2022, pp. 124-125). Anarchism's extreme end goals advocate almost indiscriminate destruction (although some anarchist theorists condemn such an approach) and are therefore often likened in this respect to nihilistic or "irrational terrorism", which is carried out for narrower, individual psychological reasons without concrete political purpose (Kassel, 2009, p. 238).

A society maintains its sovereignty, existence, identity, all the values that create them, and continues this continuity under the understanding of nationalism. This understanding, in addition to the potential to encourage a sense of unity and pride within a nation, also carries the risk of fueling exclusionary, othering, terrorism, and chauvinist feelings (Ayas & Ünsal, 2024, p. 163). While the general desire of nationalism is to protect the identity of unity and solidarity within the society, some forms of this situation are a kind of breaking point for those who prioritize their own interests over others, such as terrorist groups. This is also an example of serious conflict politics. Some ethnic groups within the society may demand the establishment of their own states or autonomy. If states do not support this situation through peaceful means, these ethnic and separatist demands can lead groups to terrorism because the problem of identity and belonging, not being supported by the state, not being able to have the same status within the context of the principles of equal rights and freedoms for everyone, and the nationalist attitude of the people not allowing such groups to have separatist attitudes mean that nationalism and social integrity are damaged. Examples of this are the emergence of ETA (it is an acronym for Euzkadi ta Askatasuna (Basque Homeland and Freedom), clearly a phrase that sums up the liberationist zeal of those who feel oppressed), the repressions during the Franco period and the rejection of the Basque identity, because the Basques separated their own identity from the identity of Spain, separated the distinction between us and them and strengthened nationalism. However, while ETA emerged on the basis of nationalism, it became a terrorist organization due to its demands that were not accepted by Spain, and it became a structure that did not hesitate to use violence and weapons, creating a dilemma among its supporters in terms of identity construction (Whittaker, 2004, pp. 43-44). Former US President Bush expressed the opposites that confirm the distinction between one and them in the relationship between nationalism and terrorism with the words, "Everyone prefers freedom to slavery; prosperity to misery; self-government to the rule of fear and torture" (Bhatia, 2009, p. 287). In short, constructivist theory shows that nationalism and terrorism have always occurred one after another in historical processes and progressed cumulatively by taking on different meanings.

The paradoxical interaction between terrorism, nationalism and anarchism comes from the desire of all of them to create a different social order. While nationalism thinks that the state should continue to exist as the authority in protecting national identity and politics, anarchists argue the opposite and seek ways to get rid of the oppressiveness of the state and national identity. While the difficulty of defining the concept and understanding its ideology and examining

its relations with other ideologies, the increasing pressures in this relationship paradox, mass failures, increasing harsh pressures of the government, ideas such as forming ideas freely with violent actions are rapidly spreading (Jensen, 2004, pp. 121-126).

Conclusion

Terrorism continues to be a subject of debate in international law, although it has become a global problem. People know what terrorism is, what methods and methods are used together, their motivations, ideologies and interests, it has always been a subject to debate because it is an issue that cannot be measured in the international arena. Political scientists and international relations, although they do not approve of whether the deficiencies in this regard are known or not, that terrorism is accepted as a crime and that it is carried out legitimately, it is seen that these definitions are left as a simple solution plan on how the national policies of states are met and how protective policies are created. The necessity of making long-term transactions on this issue creates unnecessary tensions between situations and groups or is seen as a necessary step to ensure sustainable peace. The most effective way to achieve this is to create jointly thought-out security policies on terrorism, which are sustainable ideologies and identities according to the context in which it occurs, the conditions of the period and how it emerged. It is now time to overcome the perception of terrorism adopted in the national policies of decision-makers and the democratic understanding of international actors and the limit definitions in the system.

Terrorism, which exists by shaking the belief systems of states and systems, is encountered even in the most democratic systems. The result obtained from the study has determined that the relationship between democracy and terrorism has become a phenomenon by producing both positive and negative effects. In the libertarian environment provided by democracy, the use of resources provided by the libertarian environment in pursuit of opportunities such as suppressing such separatist rebel groups and preventing the legitimization process by protesting is also of great interest to such groups. Striking examples of terrorism have recently come to the agenda in countries such as Turkey and the USA, using channels such as social media, mass communication tools, etc. However, the norms that the constructivist theory feeds on and the effect on the formation of norms prove that groups, states and actors vary according to their goals. It has been determined that all rings in this complex but direct chain of relationships can benefit from this construction process while defining the elements that form and affect their own identity. Therefore, the assistance of constructivist theory in policies and definitions that can be created against terrorism should not be ignored.

Terrorism has gained a multifaceted place between anarchism and nationalism by targeting the principles and rights provided by democracy in different ways throughout the historical process. It has been observed that anarchism is against authority and advocates the elimination of the state, while nationalism is affected by these contexts and tries to exist in the same direction by protecting national identity, unity and sense of belonging. In this context, strong reactions and judicial decisions against detected threats are the main targets, preventing terrorist events

from gaining legitimacy, and nationalism clarifies the attitude of the society and anarchism similarly takes advantage of social dynamics. The ETA example mentioned in the study has shown that the sense of identity and belonging in the society reinforces the unity, but at a certain point it also fuels discriminatory and exclusionary attitudes, and this situation can be used as a tool against the state. In short, it proves how the thin line between nationalism, anarchism and terrorism can quickly transform into each other.

Overall, the study shows that the difficulty in defining terrorism is growing but a solution process is needed. At this point, identity norms and ideologies clearly show that the effects, methods and development process of terrorism are constantly changing but will continue to exist as an eternal phenomenon, affected by cumulative motivations. It has proven that it is a structure that uses the libertarian structure of democracy, the sense of equality, unity and togetherness offered by nationalism, and the opposition of anarchism to the central authority and its efforts to legitimize its actions in a disciplined way to achieve its ideological goals and ensure the continuity of this concept.

Resources

- Özerkmen, N. (2004). Terör, Terörizm ve Radikal İslamcı Terör . *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 247-265.
- Abubaker, S. S. (2021). Terrorsim: A Conceptual Framework. *International Humanites and Social Science Revies*, 5(1), 35-58.
- Ayas, M. Ö., & Ünsal, Z. E. (2024). Avrupa Birliği'nde Yükselen Milliyetçilik, Göç ve Terörizm Arasındaki İlişki: Kavramsal Bir Analiz. *Florya Chronicles of Political Economy*, 157-185.
- Bhatia, A. (2009). The Discourses of Terrorisim. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 279-289.
- Bıçer, R. S. (2019). Uluslararası Çatışmaların Değişen Yapısında Terörün Yeri ve Önemi Üzerine Bir İncelem. *Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi*, 110-133.
- Gray, C. S. (2002, June 5). *Thinking Asymmetrically in Time of Terror*. Retrieved from The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters: <https://press.armywarcollege.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2079&context=parameters>
- Gutierrez, J. A., & Kinna, R. (2022). Anarchism and The National Question—Historical, Theoretical and Contemporary Perspectives. *Nations and Nationalism* , 121-130.
- Hand, A. W., & Saiyra, N. (2023). Democracy's Ambivalent Effect on Terrorism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1618-1643.
- Hazır, H. (1990, June 13). *Demokrasi ve Siyasi Terör*. Retrieved from DergiPark: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/>
- Jensen, R. B. (2004). Daggers, Rifles and Dynamite: Anarchist Terrorsim in Nineteenth Century Europe. *Terrorism and Political Violenc*, 116-153.
- Kassel, W. (2009). Terrorism and the International Anarchist Movement of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 237-252.

- Kemik, G. (2021). Discussinf Terror: The Problem of Definition, General Chracteristic and Analysisi in Terms of International IAw. *Artuklu Kaime Uluslararası İktisadi ve İsari Araştırma Dergisi*, 166-187.
- Magen, A. (2018, January). *Fighting Terrorism: The democracy Advantage*. Retrieved from Journey of Democracy: <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/fighting-terrorism-the-democracy-advantage/>
- Meisels, T. (2009, September). Defining terrorism – a typology. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 12(3), 331-351.
- Piccone, T. (2017, September 5). *Democracy and Terrorism*. Retrieved from Brookings: https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/fp_20170905_democracy_terrorism.pdf
- Rnastrop, M. (2009). The Contemporary Study of Political Terrorism. In R. Jackson, M. B. Smyth, & J. Gunning, *Critical Terrorism Studies* (pp. 1-270). New York: Routledge.
- Sökücü, D. (2009). *Küreselleşen Terörizmin Uluslararası Siyasete Etkisi*. Retrieved from İstanbul Üniversitesi: <https://nek.istanbul.edu.tr/ekos/TEZ/45789.pdf>
- Saiya, N. (2018). *Weapon of Peace: How Religious Liberty Combats Terrorism*. *Cambridge University Press*, 1-240.
- Teichman, J. (2009, January 30). *How to Define Terrorism*. Retrieved from Cambridge University Press: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/C1178DA4990BFA8A-2DA3DA48F6960BF0/S0031819100044260a.pdf/how-to-define-terrorism.pdf>
- Weinberg, L., Pedahzur, A., & Hirsch-Hofler, S. (2010, August 10). The Challenges of Conceptualizing Terrorism. *Terrorism and Policial Violence*, 777-794. Retrieved from Terrorism an: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/095465590899768?needAccess=true>
- White, J. R. (2015). Terrorism in Historical and Social Contexts. In J. R. White, *Terrorism and Homeland Security* (pp. 1-24). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Whittaker, D. J. (2004). Terrorist in Groups. In D. J. Whittaker, *Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World* (pp. 33-48). New York: Routledge.
- Yılmaz, V. (2011, June 30). *Modern Demokrasilerde Terörle Mücadele ve Otoriter Yansımalar*. Retrieved from Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi: <https://acikerisim.aku.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11630/2606/Vedat%20YILMAZ%20YÜKSEK%20LİSANS%20TEZİ%20090642013.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış Bağımsız

Yazar Katkısı: Aleyna Aras %100

Destek ve Teşekkür Beyanı: Çalışma için destek alınmamıştır.

Etik Onay: Bu çalışma etik onay gerektiren herhangi bir insan veya hayvan araştırması içermemektedir.

Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı: Çalışma ile ilgili herhangi bir kurum veya kişi ile çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.

Peer Review: Independent double-blind

Author Contributions: Aleyna Aras 100%

Funding and Acknowledgement: No support was received for the study.

Ethics Approval: This study does not contain any human or animal research that requires ethical approval.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person related to the study.