CRITERIA FOR DEFINING WAR, TERRORISM, AND GUERRILLA WARFARE BASED ON CLAUSEWITZ'S CONCEPTS OF THE NATURE AND ESSENCE OF WAR

Vitelio Brustolin[1]

ABSTRACT

The definition of terrorism and its differentiation from war and guerrilla warfare has been a problem for science, international relations and legal systems for decades. This article posits that defining terrorism requires also the definition of other warlike phenomena, so as not to conflate the acts or events. Therefore, the proposed criteria for defining terrorism and guerrilla warfare are presented as a means to differentiate their definitions from that of war. The methodology is a review of the concepts of the nature and essence of war, as described in the Carl von Clausewitz book, *Vom Kriege* (in the standard German edition of Hahlweg and its widely accepted English translation by Howard and Paret). These concepts were cross-analyzed with recent scientific discoveries about the behavior of social animals, with a focus on humans. The resulting classification allows historical or contemporary events to be evaluated to determine what kind of conflicts they are.

Keywords: Definition of terrorism. Definition of guerrilla warfare. Definition of war. Carl von Clausewitz International law.

[1] Doutor. Harvard Law School, Estados Unidos. E-mail: info@viteliobrustolin.com

1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no international consensus for a definition of terrorism. According to the Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary, the term "terrorism", of which the first recorded use dates back to 1795, would mean: "The systematic use of terror especially as a means of coercion."[2]

Etymology combines the history and development of a linguistic form (as a word), the transmission from one language to another, the analysis of its component parts, and the identification of its cognates in other languages and in the common form of an ancestral language. It is common for words to receive new and different meanings, either by their application in different cultures, because they originate in other languages, or because their forms are modified by various uses. Thus, the linguistic form "terror", dates back to the fourteenth century, with the following etymology: Middle English, from Anglo-French "*terrour*", from Latin "*terror*", from "*terrēre*" (to frighten); akin to Greek "*trein*" (to be afraid), flee, "*tremein*" (to tremble)[3]. According to the Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, this would be the meaning of terror: "violent or destructive acts (such as bombing) committed by groups in order to intimidate a population or government into granting their demands."[4]

Such definitions, however, do not exhaust the variety of meanings that have been given to both terrorism and terror, especially over the past decades. Faced with such a variety, the academic community have attempted to collect, compile and organize the miscellany of definitions for terrorism. This work is relevant; as the absence of a widely accepted and agreed definition for terrorism makes the study of this field replete with diverse – and often conflicting – perspectives.

In other words, without a clear and precise definition of terrorism, it becomes impractical to study the history of such a phenomenon, because if we do not know what terrorism is, how can we investigate its beginnings? Moreover, without a definition for terrorism, how can we define those who practice it are? Are those who practice terrorism combatants, non-combatants, ordinary criminals or something else?

---

[2] "Terrorism", Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition (Springfield: Merriam-Webster Incorporated 2003, 21st Printing 2018), 1290.

[3] "Terror", Ibid., 1290.

[4] Ibid., 1290.

But the problem goes beyond a mere convention for the concept of that phenomenon. The various definitions of terrorism are so distant from each other that terrorism has more than a hundred different meanings, as Schmid and Jongman (2008) demonstrate.[5]

Likewise, although Laqueur (2004) has published several books about events he calls terrorism, he argues that it is not possible to define terrorism and it is not even worth the attempt.[6]

On the other hand, Hoffman (2006) believes that terrorism does have key characteristics, but the author does not come up with a definition for it.[7]

For Silke (2004) the problem is that there is no general consensus for the definition of terrorism and, although many universal conceptions have been proposed for the phenomenon, consensus is unlikely to be reached, as it is a question of different perspectives in the world. Silke also points out that an energetic compiler would now collect at least twice the 109 conceptions that Schmid and Jongman found for terrorism in the mid-1980s. This difficulty in conceptualizing terrorism is, for Silke, a reflection of the gravity and importance of that phenomenon.[8]

Margariti (2017) explains how this problem has been addressed: "criminal conducts related to terrorism are considered as transnational offenses whose *criminalisation* and prosecution are matters of domestic concern only." So, she defends an international conceptualization for terrorism "by treating it as crime which is much more than the sum of all prohibited acts provided by the anti-terrorist conventions." [9]

Townshend (2003), for his part, notes that the core of almost all definitions of terrorism – the use of violence for political purposes – is very similar to Clausewitz's definition of war.[10]

The same problem applies to guerrilla warfare, which without a specific definition can be confused with terrorism and even with war itself.

---

[5] Schmid, Alex and Jongman, Albert, 3rd ed, Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, & Literature (Transaction Publishers 2008).

[6] Laqueur, Walter, No End to War: Terrorism in The Twenty-first Century (Continuum 2004).

[7] Hoffman, Bruce, Inside Terrorism. Revised & Enlarged (Columbia University Press 2006).

[8] Silke, Andrew, Research into Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures (Routledge 2004), 3.

[9] Margariti, Stella, Defining International Terrorism: Between State Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism (The Hague: TMC Asser Press 2017), 5.

[10] Townshend, Charles, Terrorism: A Very Short Introduction (Oxford University Press 2003), 5.

These points summarize the **research problem** of this article: what criteria could define terrorism and guerrilla warfare in order to differentiate their definitions from a similar phenomenon that already has definitions about its nature and essence: war?

Of course, we are not limited to studying only what has a clear and widely accepted definition. The definition of "life," for example, remains controversial in the scientific community, but this does not stop scientists from studying life. However, the paradigms that define life closely approximate one another. There is a consensus, for example, that rocks have no life, while trees are living beings. Therefore, even though there may be life forms inhabiting the rocks, they are not themselves living beings. Regarding terrorism, however, what stands out is the variety of concepts, which, due to the disparity between them, make it difficult to study this phenomenon. On the other hand, nothing suggests that it is impossible to conceptualize terrorism or to approximate its various definitions of one another. While existing definitions about the nature and essence of war, which is a similar phenomenon, may not satisfy the great variety of paradigms related to war, they at least bring them substantially closer together.

1.1. HYPOTHESES

The first hypothesis of the present article consistent with Townshend's observation, is that to produce the concepts of terrorism and guerrilla warfare it is necessary to compare their characteristics with a similar phenomenon that already has definitions about its nature and essence: war.

The second hypothesis is that to define terrorism it is necessary to define at the same time other warlike phenomena, such as war and guerrilla warfare, because they have similarities that lead us to conflate their meanings.

1.2. METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

"War", according to etymology, derives from the Anglo "*werre*" and French "*guerre*," both from the Germanic origin "*werra*," dating back to the twelfth century, with the following meaning, among others: "a state of hostility, conflict or antagonism."[11] As with "terrorism" and "terror,"

---

[11] "War", Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 1409.

however, this term has been used for a large number of relationships, ranging from the "war on hunger" to "the war against tobacco," among many others, including the "war for peace."

The expression and meaning that are addressed in this article are strictly scientific. Originating in the book of Carl von Clausewitz, "*Vom Kriege*" (1832), the concepts deal with the nature and essence of war and form the founding pillar of the Strategic Studies.

The methodology used in this article, therefore, is a review of the concepts of the nature and essence of war, described in the Clausewitz book, Vom Kriege. These concepts were cross-analyzed with scientific discoveries that occurred long after the publication of Clausewitz's work, especially in relation to the behavior of social animals (including lions, wolves, primates and, among others, human beings). These scientific discoveries are mainly described in the following works:

(1) **Archaeological and anthropological perspectives:** Gat, Azar, *War in Human Civilization* (Oxford University Press 2008). This book presents scientific evidence from various sources that discuss the origin of the war. The author uses archaeology, anthropology, ethnography, demography and biology to answer whether war is rooted in human nature or whether it is a cultural invention. The data spans early hunter-gatherers to contemporary terrorists and is useful for evaluating Clausewitz's concepts about the nature and essence of war. Clausewitz, incidentally, is one of the authors discussed by Gat.

(2) **Political and technological perspectives:** Diamond, Jared, *Guns, Germs and Steel* (New York: WW Norton 2017 [1999]). This book deals with the influence of the environment on people and how it affects the war between civilizations. It is a work that discusses the war, but also considering technologies such as writing and weapons, political structures such as governments, and immunity to deadly germs. This broad discussion is important in answering the questions presented in this article, especially regarding political structures, since Clausewitz considers war as a continuation of political relations, as will be discussed in the following sections.

(3) **Biological and comparative perspectives:** Waal, Frans De, *Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes* (Johns Hopkins University Press 2007 [1982]). This zoology work is considered a modern classic because of its relevance to science. It deals with the power structure among chimpanzees. Comparing the human species with another so closely related genetically helps to understand the origin of the social

conflicts. It also helps to understand whether humans in a state of nature are or are not peaceful, and how social animals, especially apes, organize themselves around the alpha individuals.

For the production of this article, Vom Kriege was analyzed in German and English:

• German edition (the one that preserves the original text of the author): Clausewitz, Carl von, *Vom Kriege*, 19th ed, (ed) Werner Hahlweg (*Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz. Vollständige Ausgabe im Urtext*, Troisdorf: Dümmler 1980 [1832]).

• English edition (the widely accepted and studied edition translated by Paret and Howard): Clausewitz, Carl von, *On War*, (eds) Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1976 [1832]).

As this is an analysis of the German edition – and because this article deals with concepts – the original text of Clausewitz is transcribed in the notes. In addition, to facilitate the work of the reader, the notes present the book number and the chapters of Vom Kriege. For example, reference [VIII, 6b: 993] refers to Book 8, Chapter 6, Section b, page 993, of Vom Kriege. The same notation is used for the translation in English, "On War."

Results: Three categories of conflicts are defined in this study: war, guerrilla warfare and terrorism. The criteria presented here can be used to analyze historical or contemporary events in order to determine what kind of conflicts they are. At the end of the article an example of the application of the criteria in the analysis of facts is presented (Section 5, regarding the Zealots movement in Judea: 66-70 CE).

2. CLAUSEWITZ DOES NOT PRESENT A LITERAL DEFINITION OF WAR

Clausewitz did not elaborate a literal definition of war. Nor was that his proposal. The Prussian General of the nineteenth century states at the beginning of Vom Kriege:

> I shall not begin by expounding a pedantic, literary definition of war, but go straight to the heart of the matter, to the duel. War is nothing but a duel on a larger scale. [12]

---

[12] Clausewitz, Carl von, On War, (eds) Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1976 [1832]), 75 [I, 1: 75]. Clausewitz, Carl von, Vom Kriege, 19th ed, (ed) Werner Hahlweg (*Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz*. Vollständige Ausgabe im Urtext, Troisdorf: Dümmler 1980 [1832]), 191 [I, 1: 191]: "Wir wollen hier nicht

The author, therefore, expresses his proposal to start the book by treating his object of study from its "essence" and not by a literal definition. The name of this chapter in the work, moreover, is "On the Nature of War".[13]

Although Clausewitz mentioned that he would not begin with a "literary definition of war," he proceeds to present general conceptions about the nature and essence of war, among which: *"War is thus an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will."*[14] As well as the famous sentence: *"War is merely the continuation of policy by other means."* [15]

And since it was not a definition of his object of study, but of its nature and of what Clausewitz considered essential in it, the author states:

> War is more than a true chameleon that slightly adapts its characteristics to the given case. As a total phenomenon its dominant tendencies always make war a paradoxical trinity – composed of primordial violence, hatred, and enmity, which are to be regarded as a blind natural force; of the play of chance and probability within which the creative spirit is free to roam; and of its element of subordination, as an instrument of policy, which makes it subject to reason alone. [16]

In fact, Clausewitz does not present a literal definition of war, and even goes so far as to reject this intention in the text he declared to be

---

erst in eine schwerfällige publizistische Definition des Krieges hineinsteigen, sondern uns an das Element desselben halten, an den Zweikampf Der Krieg ist nichts als ein erweiterter Zweikampf."

[13] Clausewitz, On War, 73 [I, 1: 73]; cf. Vom Kriege, 189 [I, 1: 189]: "Über die Natur des Krieges".

[14] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191-192 [I, 1: 191-192]: "Der Krieg ist also ein Akt der Gewalt, um den Gegner zur Erfüllung unseres Willens zu zwingen."

[15] Clausewitz, On War, 87 [I, 1: 87]; cf. Vom Kriege, 210 [I, 1: 210]: "Der Krieg ist eine bloße Fortsetzung der Politik mit anderen Mitteln."

[16] Clausewitz, On War, 89 [I, 1: 89]; cf. Vom Kriege, 212-213 [I, 1: 212-213]: "Der Krieg ist also nicht nur ein wahres Chamäleon, weil er in jedem konkreten Falle seine Natur etwas ändert, sondern er ist auch seinen Gesamterscheinungen nach, in Beziehung auf die in ihm herrschenden Tendenzen eine wunderliche Dreifaltigkeit, zusammengesetzt aus der ursprünglichen Gewaltsamkeit seines Elementes, dem Haß und der Feindschaft, die wie ein blinder Naturtrieb anzusehen sind, aus dem Spiel der Wahrscheinlichkeiten und des Zufalls, die ihn zu einer freien Seelentätigkeit machen, und aus der untergeordneten Natur eines politischen Werkzeuges, wodurch er dem bloßen Verstande anheimfällt."

finished: *"The first chapter of Book One alone I regard as finished. It will at least serve the whole by indicating the direction I meant to follow everywhere."[17]*

It should be noted that even in dealing with what he considers the essence of war, "duel," Clausewitz does not mean that this is war, since he makes it very clear that he is using a figure of speech:

> Countless duels go to make up war[18], but a picture of it as a whole can be formed by imagining a pair of wrestlers.[19] Each tries through physical force to compel the other to do his will; his immediate aim is to throw his opponent in order to make him incapable of further resistance.[20]

The author states that war is not a single duel, but rather consists of "countless duels." Clausewitz uses figurative language (e.g., "formed by imagining a pair of wrestlers"), to evoke an expository image, and provide a simplification and an abstraction. At no time does the author claim that this is war itself. On the contrary. In Chapter 2 of Book I, Clausewitz again leaves no doubt: *"Combat in war is not a contest between individuals. It is a whole made up of many parts."[21]*

Moreover, throughout Chapter 1 of Book I, as well as throughout the rest of Von Kriege, Clausewitz does not present a definition of the war itself, but of its essence and nature. These attributes derive from the

---

[17] Clausewitz, On War, 70 (Unfinished Note, Presumably Written in 1830). Cf. Vom Kriege, 181: "Das erste Kapitel des ersten Buches ist das einzige, was ich als vollendet betrachte; es wird wenigstens dem Ganzen den Dienst erweisen, die Richtung anzugeben, die ich überall halten wollte." [N.A.: Clausewitz died in 1831, before having completed the revision of Vom Kriege].

[18] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191 [I, 1:191]: "Wollen wir uns die Unzahl der einzelnen Zweikämpfe," [N.A.: Here Clausewitz leaves no room for the assumption that war could be a single duel].

[19] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191 [I, 1: 191]: "aus denen er besteht, als Einheit denken, so tun wir besser, uns zwei Ringende vorzustellen." [N.A.: Here it is clear that Clausewitz is creating a figure of imagination, a mental abstraction to explain the essence of war, as stated at the beginning of the paragraph].

[20] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191 [I, 1: 191]: "Jeder sucht den anderen durch physische Gewalt zur Erfüllung seines Willens zu zwingen; sein nächster Zweck ist, den Gegner niederzuwerfen und dadurch zu jedem ferneren Widerstand unfähig zu machen."

[21] Clausewitz, On War, 95 [I, 2: 95]; cf. Vom Kriege, 222-223 [I, 2: 222-223]: "Der Kampf im Kriege ist nicht ein Kampf des einzelnen gegen den einzelnen, sondern ein vielfach gegliedertes Ganzes."

simplified expository image that the author makes of the duel, which is: "War is thus an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will."[22]

In addition to the aforementioned sentence: "We see, therefore, that war is not merely an act of policy but a true political instrument, a continuation of political intercourse, carried on with other means."[23] Or, complementarily:

> We maintain, on the contrary, that war is simply a continuation of political intercourse, 'with the addition of other means' because we also want to make it clear that war in itself does not suspend political intercourse or change it into something entirely different.[24]

Clausewitz created a concept of the **nature of the act of force for the purposes of policy:** "to compel our enemy to do our will"[25], and a concept of the **essence of war:** "a duel on a larger scale"[26], beyond of a **general concept of war:** "the continuation of policy by other means"[27].

Thus, in order that the conceptions of the nature and essence of war to be fully understood, and considering that Clausewitz also presents war as "an act," "an instrument" and "a continuation" of policy, it is necessary to understand how the author defines "policy" in his theory.

---

[22] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191-192 [I, 1: 191-192]: "Der Krieg ist also ein Akt der Gewalt, um den Gegner zur Erfüllung unseres Willens zu zwingen."

[23] Clausewitz, On War, 87 [I, 1: 87]; cf. Vom Kriege, 210 [I, 1: 210]: "So sehen wir also, daß der Krieg nicht bloß ein politischer Akt, sondern ein wahres politisches Instrument ist, eine Fortsetzung des politischen Verkehrs, ein Durchführen desselben mit anderen Mitteln."

[24] Clausewitz, On War, 605 [VIII, 6b: 605]; cf. Vom Kriege, 990-991 [VIII, 6b: 990-991]: "Wir behaupten dagegen, der Krieg ist nichts als eine Fortsetzung des politischen Verkehrs mit Einmischung anderer Mittel. Wir sagen mit Einmischung anderer Mittel, um damit zugleich zu behaupten, daß dieser politische Verkehr durch den Krieg selbst nicht aufhört, nicht in etwas ganz anderes verwandelt wird."

[25] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191-192 [I, 1: 191-192]: "Der Krieg ist also ein Akt der Gewalt, um den Gegner zur Erfüllung unseres Willens zu zwingen."

[26] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 191 [I, 1: 191]: "Wir wollen hier nicht erst in eine schwerfällige publizistische Definition des Krieges hineinsteigen, sondern uns an das Element desselben halten, an den Zweikampf. Der Krieg ist nichts als ein erweiterter Zweikampf."

[27] Clausewitz, On War, 87 [I, 1: 87]; cf. Vom Kriege, 210 [I, 1: 210]: "Der Krieg ist eine bloße Fortsetzung der Politik mit anderen Mitteln."

3. THE CONCEPT OF POLICY FOR CLAUSEWITZ

The first definition of policy presented in Vom Kriege – and the one most consistent with Clausewitz's view, as it is in the chapter he expressly declared finished – is this:

> If the **state** is thought of as a person, and **policy as the product of its brain**, then among the contingencies for which the **state** must be prepared is a war in which every element calls for policy to be eclipsed by violence. Only if politics is regarded not as resulting from a just appreciation of affairs, but – as it conventionally is – as cautious, devious, even dishonest, shying away from force, could the second type of war appear to be more 'political' than the first.[28]

It is, however, a rather inconclusive definition, in which Clausewitz limits his focus to states, not covering the beginning of the human social relations. In the same way, he considers policy under two perspectives: "as the product" of a brain of a personified state, and "not as resulting from a just appreciation of affairs, but (…) as cautious, devious, even dishonest."

These are not conclusive definitions and, therefore, it is necessary to compare them with others that are presented in Vom Kriege: "Policy, of course, is nothing in itself; it is simply the trustee for all these interests against other **states**."[29] Clausewitz again limits his definition to states, but then, in the same paragraph, he complements: "In no sense can the art of war ever be regarded as the preceptor of policy, **and here we can only treat policy as representative of all interests of the community**."[30]

---

[28] Clausewitz, On War, 88 [I, 1: 88]; cf. Vom Kriege, 211-212 [I, 1: 211-212]: "(…) denn betrachtet man die Politik wie die Intelligenz des personifizierten Staates, so muß unter allen Konstellationen, die ihr Kalkül aufzufassen hat, doch auch diejenige begriffen sein können, wo die Natur aller Verhältnisse einen Krieg der ersten Art bedingt. Nur insofern man unter Politik nicht eine allgemeine Einsicht, sondern den konventionellen Begriff einer der Gewalt abgewendeten, behutsamen, verschlagenen, auch unredlichen Klugheit versteht, könnte die letzte Art des Krieges ihr mehr angehören als die erstere." [N.A.: Emphasis added].

[29] Clausewitz, On War, 606 [VIII, 6b: 606]; cf. Vom Kriege, 993 [VIII, 6b: p. 993]: "(…) Politik ist ja nichts an sich, sondern ein bloßer Sachwalter aller dieser Interessen gegen andere Staaten." [N.A.: Emphasis added].

[30] Clausewitz, On War, 607 [VIII, 6b: 607]; cf. Vom Kriege, 993 [VIII, 6b: 993]: "Daß sie eine falsche Richtung haben, dem Ehrgeiz, dem Privatinteresse, der Eitelkeit der Regierenden vorzugsweise dienen kann, gehört nicht hierher; denn in keinem Fall ist es die Kriegskunst, welche als ihr Präzeptor betrachtet werden kann, und wir können hier die Politik nur als

Therefore, we have here the definition of policy for Clausewitz that more deeply reaches the history of social relations: "as representative of all interests of the community". This definition is corroborated by Diniz and Proença Jr. (2012).[31]

3.1. CONSIDERATIONS ON WAR AND POLICY

If the policy is "representative of all interests of the community," it does not matter if war comes from culture, as stated Keegan (1994)[32], because such a definition of policy also encompasses culture. Similarly, it is not relevant, for the purposes of this study, whether war "represents the ruling interests in society," as Gat (2008) claims[33], because although society is broader than community, both are political forms.

However, the conception of war as "the continuation of policy by other means" and policy as "representative of all interests of the community" makes it clear that war does not occur between individuals. Unless the individuals are representing the interests of their respective communities; so, the war would be between communities.

We can conclude, therefore, that:

(1) War is a phenomenon of a social nature, since it is "the continuation of policy" which, in the Clausewitzian definition, is "representative of all interests of the community;"

(2) There can be no war before there are communities (if we go to the concept of Gat, there can be no war without society);

(3) To represent "**all** the interests of the community," and thus characterize the policy of which war is a continuation, it is necessary to concentrate the representation of the community. That is, either the community gathers together and makes the decision, or is represented by one or more decision makers.

Repräsentanten aller Interessen der ganzen Gesellschaft betrachten." [N.A.: Emphasis added].

[31] Diniz, Eugênio and Proença Jr., Domício, A Criterion for Settling Inconsistencies in Clausewitz's On War (Journal of Strategic Studies 37:6-7, 879-902, 2012), 18-19.

[32] Keegan, John, A History of Warfare (London: Hutchinson 1993), 24.

[33] Gat, Azar, War in Human Civilization (Oxford University Press 2008), 666: "Contrary to Carl von Clausewitz's idealist view that politics is the 'representative of all interests of the community', it rather represents the ruling interests in society, which can be more or less inclusive."

4. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE NATURE AND ESSENCE OF WAR TO THE DEFINITION OF TERRORISM

Considering Clausewitz's definitions of the nature and the essence of war, how do such conceptions contribute to the definition of terrorism, which is one of the objects of this study?

In fact, the concept of the nature of war as "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will," allows us to derive other conflicts besides war. In other words, by taking the concept of Clausewitz for the nature of his object of study, it is possible to apply his theory to the most diverse phenomena involving acts of force to compel our enemies to do our will, as proposed by Gray (2003):

> Terrorism and civil strife of several kinds are all warfare phenomena. Clausewitz's theory of war applies to them all. They are not activities of a nature quite distinctive from previous, or other, cases of war.[34]

Conflicts involving "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will" are diverse; therefore, it is necessary to analyze the particularities of each of the possible conflicts. However, the generalist definition presented by Clausewitz for the nature of war could be used for a multitude of phenomena without delving into the particularities of any of them.

"An act of force to compel our enemy to do our will", could be applied, for example, to two rival families who fight for a parking spot. However, the contrast is clear between that situation and an event with soldiers from different nations facing one another on the battlefield.

The generalist definition of the nature of war is inherently problematic because, as demonstrated in the initial part of this study, for decades the scientific community has been seeking to formulate a definition for terrorism. As yet, there is no agreed concept for the phenomenon, but rather multiple, as the authors cited in the Introduction demonstrate – notwithstanding the compilation made by Schmid (2011)[35] and Jongman (2008)[36].

---

[34] Gray, Colin, Clausewitz, History, and the Future Strategic World, The Strategic and Combat Studies Institute (The Occasional, n. 47, 2003), 11.

[35] Schmid, Alex (ed), The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research (Routledge 2011).

[36] Schmid and Jongman, Political Terrorism (2008).

Likewise, the concept of the essence of war, "a duel on a larger scale," ranges from two rival teams in a tug-of-war competition, to two combatant forces destroying each other by order of their governments.

While Clausewitz's theory reaches terrorism, his generalist conceptions do not allow us to precisely define the phenomenon of terrorism because the criteria for circumscribing a phenomenon are lost when the phenomenon is treated with generalization. To circumscribe a phenomenon is fundamental for a definition and a differentiation from other phenomena.

In fact, "a duel on a larger scale" and "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will" are intrinsic to the human species, as Gat (2008) described.[37] This, however, does not necessarily mean that such duels and acts of force are always war.

The human beings are political as a part of survival. If one is abandoned, especially in the first years of their life, this person will die of thirst, hunger or any other basic need[38]. However, this does not mean that any "continuation of policy by other means" is war.

In the general conceptualization of the word "war" one can even include events as varied as the war against tobacco or two rival families fighting for a parking spot. Yet when we treat the war phenomenon scientifically, there must be some criterion of distinction between these events and combatants' forces fighting under the orders of their governments.

In the preliminary conclusions of the previous Section, the existence of community is found to be a necessary component for the existence of war, as war is "the continuation of policy by other means" and policy, for Clausewitz, is "representative of all interests of the community." Could this also be a required component for the existence of terrorism? In order to answer this question, it is necessary to analyze some paleontological and biological evidence of the history of our species.

---

[37] Gat, War in Human Civilization, 25.

[38] Diamond, Jared, Guns, Germs and Steel (New York: WW Norton 1999), 270: "Our closest animal relatives, the gorillas and chimpanzees and bonobos of Africa, also live in bands. All humans presumably did so too, until improved technology for extracting food allowed some hunter-gatherers to settle in permanent dwellings in some resource-rich areas. The band is the political, economic, and social organization that we inherited from our millions of years of evolutionary history."

4.1. SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND ALPHA INDIVIDUALS

The dynamics of how our species is organized in its most primitive social form is extremely relevant to this study. An exploration of the origin of the phenomena of this study will reveal whether or not they can be distinguished according to the criteria that are being established here.

Studies of social animals have widely verified the existence of individuals who compel the others of their species to do their will. Social animals include lions, wolves, primates and, among others, human beings[39]. The highest-ranking individual is designated as the "alpha". What allows the alpha to compel the others may be its superior physical strength, aggression, ability to obtain food, and social efforts for building alliances[40] within the group, among other factors.

The alpha individuals have several advantages over others: "Among social mammals and primates, higher rank in the group gives improved share in communal resources, such as hunting spoils, and better access to females."[41] The advantages vary between different species: "In some species, such as baboons and wolves, rank differences are sharp, with the so-called alpha males (and sometimes also females) reaping most of the advantages, relative to the other group members."[42]

This behavior is also replicated by a very sociable species that is genetically close to humans: "Even in those social species, such as the chimpanzees, where group relations are more egalitarian, 'leadership' positions confer considerable somatic and reproductive advantages."[43]

The imposition of will can be reiterated with growls, bites, persecutions and lacerations, until the alpha is challenged by another individual. So, when the challenger manages to compel the alpha to do its will, the challenger takes the alpha position.[44]

---

[39] Diamond, Guns, Germs, and Steel, 172: "Almost all species of domesticated large mammals prove to be ones whose wild ancestors share three social characteristics: they live in herds; they maintain a well-developed dominance hierarchy among herd members; and the herds occupy overlapping home ranges rather than mutually exclusive territories."

[40] Waal, Frans De, Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes (Johns Hopkins University Press 2007 [1982]), 81.

[41] Gat, War in Human Civilization, 87.

[42] Ibid., 87.

[43] Ibid., 87-88.

[44] Waal, Chimpanzee Politics, XI: "We are not the only primates to kill our own kind. Reports of lethal territorial fighting among chimpanzee communities profoundly affected the postwar debate about the origins of human aggression."

Nevertheless, compelling others to do the alpha's will, does not always require the use of physical force. "Status rivalry is acute and never ending. It is the strong, fierce, and – among our sophisticated cousins, the chimpanzees – also the 'politically'[45] astute that win status by the actual and implied use of force."[46] Humans did not escape from this natural pattern of behavior, especially with regard to the "politically astute" aspect. "Closer to the chimpanzees' pattern, human groups in the 'state of nature' were more egalitarian than those of some species but still displayed significant status differences."[47] That is, "differences in strength, hunting skills, social astuteness, and clan size unfolded and accentuated in direct relation to the abundance of the resources available."[48]

It is necessary to highlight that within groups there are also individuals who impose themselves over others without taking the place of the alpha. It would be possible, therefore, to form a "ranking" from the base to the top. However, the ranking order (alpha, beta, theta, etc.) is irrelevant to the purposes of this analysis. The focus here is only on submission on the last instance, that is, from the alpha over the others. Thus, considering the top of the ranking, it is possible to verify the existence of two categories:

(1) Alpha individuals, who compel the others of their groups to do their will;

(2) Individuals who are compelled by the alpha.

The imposition of the alpha's will over others always happens in a physical space[49]. The issue of space is implicit, since the very existence of individuals occurs in the spatial dimension and over time. But this observation is pertinent, since the alpha can only impose their will over others when they are able to:

(1) Keep control over the group;

(2) Keep away individuals who can take their alpha position.

Thus, both in groups of individuals that are fixed in a physical space (on the edge of a river where food reaches them for example), as in groups of nomadic individuals, **the dominance of alpha over others is intrinsically**

---

[45] Ibid., 22: "When two apes confront each other aggressively, one of them may hold his hand to a third ape. This gesture of invitation plays an important role in the formation of aggressive alliances, or coalitions: the political instrument par excellence."

[46] Gat, War in Human Civilization, 88.

[47] Ibid., 88.

[48] Ibid., 88.

[49] Diamond, Guns, Germs, and Steel, 270.

related to the space they are occupying. From the moment individuals get far enough away from the alpha, they will no longer be dominated by them. In the same way, individuals who approach to the point of invading the physical space occupied by a group, will have to force the submission or be dominated by the alpha. Hence, even in groups that do not settle, the question of the imposition of will is always related to the physical space. This information is useful for the purpose of this study because:

(1) The concepts of the nature and essence of war can also be applied to terrorism (as previously discussed);

(2) War, because it is a continuation of policy, only occurs where there is community, according to the Clausewitzian concept;

(3) The representation of all interests of the community occurs either by the community gathering together to decide, or by representation of one or more decision makers.

In fact, if war is "the continuation of policy by other means" and "we can only treat policy as representative of all interests of the community", we can conclude that:

It is not always possible to represent all the interests of the community, as individuals constantly think differently and have varied interests. Therefore, for a community to practice war, it is necessary that the community:

(1) Is commanded by one or more alpha; or

(2) Decides it together, seeking a consensus.[50]

As shown above, the existence of alpha individuals is characteristic of our species, so the first hypothesis is the most frequent one.[51]

In the same way, since war is an extension of policy, against whom would the community fight?

The community would not fight against individuals within itself. Due to conflicting interests among the individuals there would inherently be a lack of representation for "all interests of the community."

Therefore, to be war, it must be against individuals who are outside the community. And vice versa: from the point of view of these other individuals, the same principles apply, that is, it will only be war if it is against another community.

So, war, by the criterion of the individuals involved, only occurs between different communities, which are characterized, precisely, by

---

[50] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, The Social Contract & Discourses (CreateSpace 2018 [1762]), 29.
[51] Gat, War in Human Civilization, 87-88.

having another alpha on their command, in the physical space occupied by the communities.

But it could also happen that one community splits in two. In that case, the same principles apply again: each would have its specific command and would be stronger or weaker in a certain physical space occupied. Therefore, a war between both could be characterized.

As we have observed above, what characterizes the boundary between one alpha and another is the physical space which supplies the resources for the community. Thus, the alpha has the command of last instance in the ranking of their community, over a physical space and during the time in which they perpetuate in the command. A sufficiently powerful alpha could command over all existing physical space.

4.2. CONSIDERATIONS AND CONVENTIONS

With Clausewitz's conceptions of the nature and essence of war, a consideration of his definition of war as a continuation of policy, and an understanding the dynamics of our species, it is possible to produce a definition of war itself, which can then be differentiated from a definition of terrorism. To do so, however, it is relevant that the conventions proposed here be listed:

"Force," for Clausewitz, is the "*physical force, for moral force has no existence save as expressed in the state and the law.*"[52] Conceptually then, the "act of force" takes place in compelling our enemy to do our will[53].

Observation of the alpha reveals their command over their group. In the case of the existence of groups commanded not by an alpha, but by all the individuals, command implies the ability of the commander to convince or to force his opponents to submit to his will inside the group and to follow a single policy, forming a single command that represents "all interests of the community".

Command is, therefore: The consensual or forced submission of the will of others.

---

[52] Clausewitz, On War, 75 [I, 1: 75]; cf. Vom Kriege, 192 [I, 1: 192]: "Gewalt, d. h. die physische Gewalt (denn eine moralische gibt es außer dem Begriffe des Staates und Gesetzes nicht)."

[53] The Clausewitzian definition, notably, does not disregard cyber-attacks, as they materialize in physical damages, such as the shutting down of hospitals, banks, or even military infrastructure of territories.

Last instance: The command, exercised by the alpha or the collectivity, is at the highest level of the group and is exercised along the physical space that the group dominates.

Agents: War is practiced by the community, including the individuals who form it[54] – even, if necessary, the least capable.[55] That is, among human beings, to preserve their own survival, men, women and children capable of acting are agents.[56]

As we have observed previously, a community can only have **war** [57]against another community – which is characterized by having another alpha or collectivity over its command.[58]

Therefore, considering the above elements and following the Clausewitz's concept of the **nature of war**, we have the conditions to formulate a first definition of war itself:

War is an act of force – from individuals who are acting under a command of last instance in a physical space, against individuals who are acting under another command of last instance in a physical space – to compel a command to the will of the other.

Clausewitz does not present a literal definition of war, but works with data, quotations and examples strictly delineated according to the definition proposed above. Therefore, this definition is a direct result of the conceptions of the nature, the essence and the political aspect of the war that Clausewitz presents in his work.

This definition will be further developed and simplified in the following sections, after a necessary discussion about commands, governments, and states.

---

[54] Clausewitz, On War, 95 [I, 2: 95]: "**Everything that occurs in war results from the existence of armed forces; but whenever armed forces, that is, armed individual**, are used, the idea of combat must be present." Cf. Vom Kriege, 222 [I, 2: 222]: "Alles, was im Kriege geschieht, geschieht durch Streitkräfte; wo aber Streitkräfte, das ist bewaffnete Menschen angewendet werden, da muß notwendig die Vorstellung des Kampfes zum Grunde liegen." [N.A.: Emphasis added].

[55] Clausewitz, On War, 586 [VIII, 3b: 586]; cf. Vom Kriege, 962 [VIII, 3b: 962].

[56] In addition, agents include any extensions of beings and their will, such as machines, for example.

[57] This does not mean that other kinds of conflicts other than war cannot involve the community; on the contrary, as we shall see below.

[58] Acts of force practiced against other species of living beings or things in the physical space of a command of last instance are actually attacks against the command itself. Other species of living beings include animals and plants. Things also include the virtual universe which, ultimately, is based on devices that exist in a physical space.

4.3. CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT COMMANDS, GOVERNMENTS, AND STATES

The whole theory of the conduct of the war that Clausewitz presents in Von Kriege is built on state and governmental combatant forces. Throughout the work Clausewitz addresses the conduct of war of armies of governments and states, against armies of governments and states.

The only occasions in which the author looks at a structure other than armies are those in which he refers to the use of the people by armies[59], when he uses the expression "armed forces"[60] or when he criticizes the use of the term army for little more than "a band of partisans":

> On the other hand, it would be sheer pedantry to claim the term 'army' for every band of partisans that operates on its own in a remote part of the country. Still, we must admit that no one thinks it odd to talk of the 'army' of the Vendée during the French Revolutionary Wars, though it was frequently little more than a band of partisans. [61]

Clausewitz makes it clear in that passage that he distinguishes the warlike phenomenon between soldiers and partisans.

Besides, when Clausewitz produces a historical revision of the warlike phenomenon, initiating the revision with the Tartar hordes, he affirms that:

> The Tartar hordes searched for new land. Setting forth as a nation, with women and children, they outnumbered any other army. Their aim was to subdue their enemies or expel them. If a high degree of civilization could have been combined with such methods, they would have carried all before them. [62]

---

[59] Clausewitz, On War, 479-483 [VI, 26: 479-483]; cf. Vom Kriege, 799-806 [VI, 26: 799-806].

[60] Clausewitz, On War, 128 [II, 1: 128]; cf. Vom Kriege, 271 [II, 1: 271]: "Streitkräfte".

[61] Clausewitz, On War, 281 [V, 2: 281]; cf. Vom Kriege, 501 [V, 2: 501]: "Auf der anderen Seite wäre es zwar pedantisch, für jeden Parteigänger, der in einer entfernten Provinz unabhängig haust, den Namen einer Armee in Anspruch zu nehmen, doch kann man nicht unbemerkt lassen, daß es niemand auffällt, wenn von der Armee der Vendéer im Revolutionskriege die Rede ist, wiewohl sie oft nicht viel stärker war."

[62] Clausewitz, On War, 586 [VIII, 3b: 586]; cf. Vom Kriege, 962 [VIII, 3b: 962]: "Die Tatarenschwärme suchen neue Wohnsitze. Sie ziehen mit dem ganzen Volke aus, mit Weib und Kind, sie sind also zahlreich wie verhältnismäßig kein anderes Heer, und ihr Ziel ist Unterwerfung oder Vertreibung des Gegners. Sie würden mit diesen Mitteln bald alles vor

The author thus extends tacitly the analysis of the conduct of war to stateless combatants.

The progression of that historical revision transcends the republics of antiquity, the feudal lords, the commercial cities of the middle ages and the kings of the eighteenth century.[63] Clausewitz thus adds to his analysis groups so heterogeneous that, if not for having command (albeit in different forms), they bear little resemblance to each other. In his analysis, Clausewitz also implicitly includes the mention of "the people in arms"[64] and expressly in the example of the Tartars, women and children in the war, demonstrating that all combatants are individuals who are acting.

It is clear, therefore, that in Vom Kriege, Clausewitz discusses and demonstrates in his examples that war is an act of force – from individuals who are acting under a command of last instance in a physical space, against individuals who are acting under another command of last instance in a physical space – to compel a command to the will of the other.

In addition, Clausewitz expressly differentiates armies, militias and bands of armed civilians.[65] This differentiation will be the starting point for the next Section.

4.4. DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN WAR, TERRORISM AND GUERRILLA WARFARE

What then differentiates war from terrorism – and additionally, once this element has already been mentioned – from guerrilla warfare?

Let us return to the definition of war:

War is an act of force – from individuals who are acting under a command of last instance in a physical space, against individuals who are acting under another command of last instance in a physical space – to compel a command to the will of the other.

We have seen that both the nature and the essence of war apply not only to terrorism but also to a multitude of human relations.

---

sich niederwerfen, ließe sich damit ein hoher Kulturzustand vereinigen."

[63] Clausewitz, On War, 586-594 [VIII, 3: 586-594]; cf. Vom Kriege, 962-974 [VIII, 3: 962-974].

[64] Clausewitz, On War, 128 [VI, 26: 479]; cf. Vom Kriege, 799 [VI, 26: 799]: "Volksbewaffnung".

[65] Clausewitz, On War, 479-483 [VI, 26: 479-483]; cf. Vom Kriege, 799-806 [VI, 26: 799-806].

One aspect of war, however, is not necessarily a characteristic of terrorism and guerrilla warfare:

War is a continuation of policy (representing all interests of the community) by other means.

Terrorism and guerrilla warfare, on the other hand, are not necessarily representations of all interests of the community. Moreover, terrorism and guerrilla warfare are not necessarily a continuation of policy by other means.

War can only be practiced by a command of last instance in a physical space.

Terrorism and guerrilla warfare, on the other hand, can be practiced by any individual.

The first objective of war is to compel a command of last instance in a physical space, in order to serve the ends of policy.

The first objective of terrorism and guerrilla warfare are also to compel a command of last instance in a physical space (to the will of those who practice these acts).

War can only be practiced against another command of last instance in a physical space.

What about terrorism and guerrilla warfare, against whom they can be practiced? In fact, at this point, there are two possible cases that make relevant the discussion of what differentiates terrorism from guerrilla warfare:

(1) The act of force practiced against individuals who *are not* acting under a command of last instance over a physical space;

(2) The act of force practiced against individuals who *are* acting under a command of last instance over a physical space.

That being said, how can we express the definitions of guerrilla warfare and terrorism? Let us see:

War is an act of force – **from individuals who *are* acting under a command of last instance** in a physical space, against individuals who are acting under another command of last instance in a physical space – to compel a command to the will of the other.

In its turn,

Guerrilla warfare is an act of force – **from individuals who *are not* acting under a command of last instance** in a physical space, against individuals who are acting under a command of last instance in a physical space – to compel a command to the will of those who practice this act.

Therefore,

Terrorism is an act of force – f**rom individuals who** *are not* **acting under a command of last instance** in a physical space, **against individuals who** *are not* **acting under a command of last instance** in a physical space – **to compel a command** to the will of those who practice this act.

By systematizing the proposed logical criteria, it is possible to see more clearly the differences between these three types of conflicts (Table 1).

Table 1. Type of Conflict when there are no Governments Over Territories

Individuals in relation to a command of last instance in a physical space	*Against…*	Individuals in relation to a command of last instance in a physical space	*With the Intention or Result…*	To compel a command of last instance in a physical space?	Type of conflict:
+		+		Yes	War
−	←→	+	→	Yes	Guerrilla Warfare
−		−		Yes	Terrorism

+ = Individuals who are acting under a command of last instance in a physical space;

− = Individuals who are not acting under a command of last instance in a physical space.

In order to apply the criteria outlined here in the analysis of concrete situations, the concept of command of last instance in a physical space must be further developed.

In a place governed by a totalitarian king, for example, the inhabitant of a house of his own has command over it, as well as over the land where the house was built, until the pre-established physical limits of the land. This command, however, is not of last instance. As the king holds sovereignty over the whole territory, he can, if he wishes, use (or even destroy) the house and the land of that inhabitant.

Although the division of powers between executive, legislative and judiciary – created by Montesquieu (1748)[66] and adapted in different ways by various governments around the world over the last centuries – complicates the above example, the same principle is maintained. An individual has command over his own house and land, but above the will of the individual is the state, with its representatives and instruments to compel the individual to the will of the government.[67]

---

[66] Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat, The Spirit of the Laws (Palala Press 2015 [1748]), 64.

[67] Hobbes, Thomas, Leviathan, (London: Wordsworth Classics of World Literature 2014 [1651]), 134.

It does not matter if another government (therefore, another command of last instance) has the possibility to force the submission of the totalitarian king, in the previous example. It is necessary that the submission of the will for the command to be taken exists. The type of act of force that will compel the command is also not the focus here, thus the command can be taken or given, with or without resistance.

That being said, an example of the application of the definitions of terrorism and guerrilla warfare to a concrete case will be presented in the Section "Application of the criteria in the analysis of facts", after a discussion about the possible simplification of these concepts.

4.5. POSSIBLE SIMPLIFICATION OF CONCEPTS

The above criteria are being proposed to cover the human trajectory as primordially as possible. Therefore, the criteria embrace the period prior to the concepts of "government" and "territory". However, it is possible to simplify the concepts presented and to facilitate their practical application, as follows:

(1) When there is "territory", the "physical space" can be referred to as such;

(2) When there is "government", the "command of last instance in a physical space" can be referred to as such;

(3) Individuals acting under a command of last instance in a physical space may be referred to as "agents" (following the criteria discussed in the Section "Considerations and conventions" of this article for the concept of agents). Also, the expression "agents" is presented here in the plural to facilitate conceptualization. It is possible that a single agent commits (or becomes a victim) of the acts described here.[68]

The systematized criteria with the concepts of agents, government and territory are available in Table 2.

_____

[68] As noted in the Section "Considerations on war and policy": "However, the conception of war as 'the continuation of policy by other means' and policy as 'representative of all interests of the community' makes it clear that war does not occur only between two individuals. Unless they are representing the interests of their communities, and in this case, the war would be between communities."

Table 2: Type of Conflict when there are Governments Over Territories

Agent *G = Governmental* *N = Non-governmental* AGAINST...	Agent *G = Governmental* *N = Non-governmental* INTENTION/RESULT...	To compel a government?	Type of conflict:
G	G	Yes	War
N	G	Yes	Guerrilla Warfare
N	N	Yes	Terrorism

These are the simplified definitions:

• War: An act of force, from governmental agents, against governmental agents, to compel a government to the will of the other.

• Guerrilla warfare: An act of force, from non-governmental agents, against governmental agents, to compel a government to the will of those who practice this act.

• Terrorism: is an act of force, from non-governmental agents, against non-governmental agents, to compel a government to the will of those who practice this act.

As previously mentioned, an example of the application of the definitions of terrorism and guerrilla warfare in a concrete situation will be presented below.

5. APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA IN THE ANALYSIS OF FACTS

66-70 CE: The Zealots (Sicarii) movement generated mass insurrection in Judea, which at that time had been turned into a province of Rome. The worsening situation led to the destruction of much of Jerusalem and the Second Temple by the Romans, in addition to the generalized suicide of the Zealots besieged at Masada fortress.[69]

The above event is commonly described as the first terrorism case in history.[70] The Zealots were non-governmental agents. It was a religious group that, in the case in question, opposed the Roman occupation.[71] The

---

[69] Anderson, Sean and Sloan, Stephen, 3rd ed, Historical Dictionary of Terrorism (Scarecrow Press 2009), XXIX.

[70] Laqueur, Walter, A History of Terrorism: Expanded Edition (New Brunswick: Transaction 2016), 5.

[71] Josephus, Flavius, War of the Jews, (London: Penguin Books 1970 [c. 75 CE]).

Zealots were also known as "Sicarii", because of the dagger they carried hidden to attack opponents.

Chaliand and Blin (2007) believe that the Zealots adopted techniques of terrorism over the decades in which they remained active. However, these authors also believe that the Zealots probably engaged in guerrilla warfare, including urban fighting and using "psychological terror." An example of this would be cutting the neck of the victims with daggers in public places such as markets.[72] It is not clear whether such terror – which stands out among the criteria of the authors and others for classifying the Zealots as terrorists – could be extended to any person or only to governmental agents.

Certainly, this distinction is crucial. First, because of the criteria proposed in this article. Second, because acts of force that only affect governmental agents (therefore, not involving people that are not working for the government), disqualify the Zealots actions as terrorism in any more accurate analysis.

In fact, when attacking Roman soldiers and other Roman governmental agents (as public officials and politicians for example), the Zealots had the intention to compel the government of Rome to their own will. This disqualifies them from being common criminals. They practiced, nonetheless:

Acts of force, from non-governmental agents, against governmental agents, to compel a government to the will of those who practice these acts.

The Zealots were, therefore, guerrillas.

However, is it possible that the Zealots have also committed acts of force against non-governmental agents? Let us see:

> Flavius Josephus has little to say about the Zealots' tactics, preferring to dwell in detail on the organization of the Roman army arrayed against them. And yet, it would appear that their strategy was relatively complex. In the year 66, for instance, the Zealots assassinated a number of political and religious figures. They also attacked buildings used to store archives, including loan documents, with the aim of winning the support of a working class crushed by debt.[73]

---

[72] Chaliand, Gérard and Blin, Arnaud, The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to al Qaeda (University of California Press 2007), 58.

[73] Chaliand and Blin, The History of Terrorism, 58.

The religious had an active voice in the government of Judea at that time. Those whom the Zealots killed were working as governmental agents. In addition, the buildings and other targets the Zealots attacked were, according to the descriptions, owned by the government. The Zealots' attacks continue to be acts of guerrilla warfare.

It is possible that the Zealots had practiced acts of force against non-governmental agents – as simple Roman citizens, innocent religious, or even Jewish in general, for example. If that happened – and the Zealots had the intention or result of compelling the government to their will – they would also be terrorists (as well as guerrillas). We have no historical records to prove that, though. Therefore, we can just classify the Zealots as guerrillas.

6. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

There is a current among Clausewitzian scholars that classifies terrorism as a tactic of war.[74] However, as presented, war for Clausewitz is "the continuation of policy", which is "representative of all interests of the community." Therefore, if the terrorism is promoted by governmental agents, it would then be defined as an act of war disguised as terrorism. Likewise, if the act is promoted by non-governmental agents against governmental agents to force the submission of a government, it will be an act of guerrilla warfare.

Some Clausewitzians propose the definition of terrorism based on its means and ends, but in Chapter 2 of Book I of Vom Kriege, Clausewitz presents the "Purpose and Means in War"[75]. Observation of means and ends is crucial because they are the same of terrorism. The aim, according to Clausewitz, is not limited to defeat the opponent and to disarm him,[76] because it depends on the circumstances:

> We can now see that in war many roads lead to success, and that they do not all involve the opponent's outright defeat. They range from the destruction of the enemy's forces, the conquest of his territory, to a temporary occupation or invasion, to projects with an

---

[74] Gray, Colin, Peace and International Relations (Routledge 2007), 247: "Terrorism is a mode of irregular combat, and it may or may not accompany guerrilla warfare. It is simply a tactic, as is guerrilla fighting. Strategic irregularity is proof of relative weakness."

[75] Clausewitz, On War, 90 [I, 2: 90]; cf. Vom Kriege, 214 [I, 2: 214]: "Zweck und Mittel im Kriege".

[76] Clausewitz, On War, 77 [I, 1: 77]; cf. Vom Kriege, 194 [I, 1: 194].

immediate political purpose, and finally to passively awaiting the enemy's attacks. Any one of these may be used to overcome the enemy's will: the choice depends on circumstances.[77]

It is evident that within the ends of war of projecting "an immediate political purpose," in order "to overcome the enemy's will," the ends of terrorism are included.

With regard to the means, Clausewitz is very specific: "*let us now turn to the means. There is only one: combat.*"[78] Moreover, there is no doubt that the means by which terrorism is practiced is a form of combat.

Therefore, both war and terrorism have the similar ends and a single means: combat. War and terrorism are equal and indistinguishable, thus, on these characteristics. Regarding other characteristics, however, those conflicts are different and differentiable from each other, according to the criteria demonstrated in this study.

That being said, all the conflicts presented here have the intention or the result of compelling a government. Phenomena that do not have these purpose or effect will, therefore, receive other classifications, which are not the object of this study.

Of course, events of conflict may overlap. An act of force, from non-governmental agents, against governmental agents, to compel a government (that is, guerrilla warfare) may be followed by an act of suppression, from governmental agents, against the guerrillas. The same applies to terrorism or even to war itself. There may also be overlap in another sense, war and terrorism, at the same time. As long as the terrorists are not under the command of the government that practices the war against the other government, then both events could co-occur.[79]

---

[77] Clausewitz, On War, 94 [I, 2: 94]; cf. Vom Kriege, 221-222 [I, 2: 221-222]: "Wir können noch eine ganze Klasse von Zwecken als kürzere Wege zum Ziele hinzufügen, die wir Argumente ad hominem nennen könnten. In welchem Gebiete menschlichen Verkehrs kämen diese, alle sächlichen Verhältnisse überspringenden Funken der persönlichen Beziehungen nicht vor, und im Kriege, wo die Persönlichkeit der Kämpfer, im Kabinett und Felde, eine so große Rolle spielt, können sie wohl am wenigsten fehlen. Wir begnügen uns, darauf hinzudeuten, weil es eine Pedanterie wäre, sie in Klassen bringen zu wollen. Mit diesen, kann man wohl sagen, wächst die Zahl der möglichen Wege zum Ziel bis ins Unendliche."

[78] Clausewitz, On War, 95 [I, 2: 95]; cf. Vom Kriege, 222 [I, 2: 222]: "So ist es im allgemeinen mit dem Ziel beschaffen, welches man im Kriege zu verfolgen hat; wenden wir uns jetzt zu den Mitteln. Dieser Mittel gibt es nur ein einziges, es ist der Kampf."

[79] A situation in which terrorists would actually be governmental agents at the time of the

Similar circumstances are possible in relation to the other types of acts of force described in this study, both with the full and with the simplified concepts.

Of course, conventions of language impact the denominations that can be given for particular phenomena. An act of force, from non-governmental agents, against governmental agents, to compel a government to the will of those who practice this act, will be guerrilla warfare, even if one names the same phenomenon a revolution or any other name. The elements are the same and, however much one may want to differentiate the denomination, it is the same phenomenon.

As for the gravity level of each phenomenon, it depends on analytical judgment, on a case-by-case basis, considering the time, place, historical, social, cultural and other diverse circumstances.

Finally, in war, terrorism and guerrilla warfare, can be found subtypes. It is possible that future studies will find widely applicable criteria that allow, independently of the individual judgment and the subjectivity of each case, to analyze the subtypes existing within each category here described.

act.

CRITÉRIOS PARA DEFINIR A GUERRA, O TERRORISMO E A GUERRA DE GUERRILHA BASEADOS NOS CONCEITOS DE NATUREZA E ESSÊNCIA DE CLAUSEWITZ

RESUMO

A conceituação de terrorismo e a sua diferenciação de guerra e de guerrilha têm sido um problema para a ciência, as relações internacionais e os sistemas jurídicos há décadas. Este artigo parte do pressuposto de que para seja formulado o conceito de terrorismo é necessário definir-se, ao mesmo tempo, outros fenômenos bélicos – tais quais a guerrilha e a guerra – a fim de que atos ou eventos não sejam confundidos entre si. Para tanto, a metodologia aqui empregada é uma revisão dos conceitos da natureza e da essência da guerra, conforme descritos na obra de Carl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege* (na edição alemã de Hahlweg e na amplamente aceita e empregada tradução em inglês de Howard e Paret). Esses conceitos são analisados à luz de descobertas científicas recentes sobre o comportamento de animais sociais, com foco em seres humanos. A classificação resultante permite que eventos históricos ou contemporâneos sejam avaliados para determinar-se que tipo de conflito eles são.

Palavras-chave: Definição de terrorismo. Definição de guerrilha. Definição de guerra. Carl von Clausewitz. Direito Internacional.

REFERENCES

ANDERSON, Sean and SLOAN, Stephen. 2009. Historical Dictionary of Terrorism. Scarecrow Press, 3rd ed.

CHALIAND, Gérard and BLIN, Arnaud. 2007. The History of Terrorism: From Antiquity to al Qaeda. University of California Press.

CLAUSEWITZ, Carl von. (1832) 1980. Vom Kriege. Ed. Werner Hahlweg (Hinterlassenes Werk des Generals Carl von Clausewitz. Vollständige Ausgabe im Urtext). Troisdorf: Dümmler, 19th ed.

CLAUSEWITZ, Carl von. (1832) 1976. On War. Eds. Michael Howard and Peter Paret. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

DIAMOND, Jared. (1999) 2017. Guns, Germs, and Steel. New York: WW Norton.

DINIZ, Eugênio and PROENÇA Jr., Domício. 2012. "A Criterion for Settling Inconsistencies in Clausewitz's On War". Journal of Strategic Studies 37:6-7 (879-902). DOI: 10.1080/01402390.2011.621725.

GAT, Azar. 2008. War in Human Civilization. Oxford University Press.

GRAY, Colin. 2003. "Clausewitz, History, and the Future Strategic World." The Strategic and Combat Studies Institute (The Occasional, n. 47).

GRAY, Colin. 2007. Peace and International Relations. Routledge.

HOBBES, Thomas. (1651) 2014. Leviathan. London: Wordsworth Classics of World Literature.

HOFFMAN, Bruce. 2006. Inside Terrorism. Revised & Enlarged. Columbia University Press.

JOSEPHUS, Flavius. (c. 75 CE) 1970. War of the Jews. London: Penguin Books.

KEEGAN, John. 1994. A History of Warfare. London: Hutchinson.

LAQUEUR, Walter. 2004. No End to War: Terrorism in the Twenty-first Century. Continuum.

LAQUEUR, Walter. 2016. A History of Terrorism: Expanded Edition. New Brunswick: Transaction.

MARGARITI, Stella. 2017. Defining International Terrorism: Between State Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism. The Hague: TMC Asser Press.

MERRIAM-WEBSTER'S Collegiate Dictionary. 2018. Springfield: Merriam-Webster Incorporated 2003, 21st printing, 11th ed.

MONTESQUIEU, Charles-Louis de Secondat. (1748) 2015. The Spirit of the Laws. Palala Press.

ROUSSEAU, Jean-Jacques. (1762) 2018. The Social Contract & Discourses. CreateSpace.

SCHMID, Alex (ed). 2011. The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research. Routledge.

SCHMID, Alex and Jongman, Albert. 2008. Political Terrorism: A New Guide to Actors, Authors, Concepts, Data Bases, Theories, & Literature. Transaction Publishers, 3rd ed.

SILKE, Andrew. 2004. Research into Terrorism: Trends, Achievements and Failures. Routledge.

TOWNSHEND, Charles. 2003. Terrorism: A Very Short Introduction. Oxford University Press.

WAAL, Frans De. (1982) 2007. Chimpanzee Politics: Power and Sex Among Apes. Johns Hopkins University Press.