*Predrag Pavlićević**
University Singidunum, Belgrade

GLOBALIZATION, CRISIS AND DISCOURSE ON TERRORISM**

Abstract

In this paper, I examine the discourse on terrorism in the context of contemporary globalization trends. The goal is to test the validity of the hypothesis that the evolving geopolitical landscape is providing an opportunity to expand and deepen the understanding of the concept of "state terrorism." Bearing in mind the wide implementation of the mechanisms of securitization by states and other actors of international relations aimed at gaining support in public opinion, this paper emphasizes the need to research factual knowledge in place of the securitization policy agenda. The issue stems from manipulative qualifications that fail to establish the truth. The problem lies in qualifications not acquired through procedures that lead to an objective view of reality. Prejudicially selected facts and discourse-contextualized information are postulated as true to support the pre-set qualifications, thus legitimizing strategic goals and justifying certain methods and means of further actions. The goal of this work is to determine potential challenges and important elements that may arise in the process of rational decision-making regarding the promotion of the discourse on terrorism. In the context of the defined problem, this paper first indicates some theoretical models of interpretation of globalization and terrorism, then presents the concept of discourse, and then explores the concept of crisis. The basic method

---

* E-mail: ppavlicevic@singidunum.ac.rs; ORCID: 0000-0003-1349-0136
 The author's secondary afiliation is with the National Security Academy, Belgrade, Republic of Serbia.

applied in the research is functional analysis, while content analysis and discourse analysis are operational methods. The crisis of globalization, as a pivotal global process, unequivocally reveals key aspects that encompass our research focus. It compels us to critically examine the characteristics of theorizing about today's international environment, and consequently, rational decision-making. The obtained results show that globalization flows have expanded the possibilities of terrorist activity due to the multidimensional process of global interdependence (overcoming the time and space component as a key feature of globalization), the universalization of values, the changed character and role of mass and new media, and the enormous progress and expansion of the application of new information technologies. It is concluded that the actualization of the phrase state terrorism is particularly noticeable in the context of armed conflicts in Ukraine. The results we have gathered lay a solid foundation for concluding that the discourse surrounding the armed conflict in Ukraine heralds profound changes on the global stage. This conflict has reshaped the factors that influence the trends in globalization, creating a landscape marked by significant upheaval and realignment of geopolitical and security trends. The key conclusion that was drawn is that overcoming the problem of discourse requires the process of rational decision-making, and, thus, effective setting up and action in an international environment. The overwhelming impression, however, is that the stated setting is difficult to implement in decision-making practice due to the dominant influence of a series of supranational mechanisms, which makes this topic relevant for more in-depth research.

INTRODUCTION

Research on the discourse on terrorism is actualized in the context of contemporary globalization trends, especially if the point of view is supported that securitization mechanisms are widely applied at the global level (Ejdus 2012, 106–113) – and on that basis, with the application of the desired methods and means, enables the realization of goals of national and strategic interests. Considering the widely applied securitization mechanisms by states, as well as by other actors in international relations,

aimed at gaining support in public opinion, this paper emphasizes the need for research into factual knowledge instead of the securitization policy agenda.

The aim of the paper is to identify potential challenges and important elements that may arise in the rational decision-making process regarding the placement of discourse on terrorism. In the context of the defined problem, the paper outlines certain theoretical models of interpreting globalization and terrorism, then presents the concept of discourse – with an emphasis on the discourse on terrorism, explores the concept of crisis, and finally, the problem of rational decision-making.

DETERMINATION OF CENTRAL CATEGORIES

Terrorism and state terrorism

We start with the following definitions. First, terrorism is "a complex form of an organized group, and less individual or institutional, political violence, marked not only by physical and psychological intimidation but also sophisticated technological methods of political struggle, as a means with which whoever usually, especially during the political and economic crisis and rarely during economic and political stability of the society, systematically attempt to achieve 'great goals' in a morbidly spectacular way, inappropriate to certain conditions, such as social situation or historical possibilities of those who practice it as a political strategy." (Simeunović 2009, 80). Also, precisely in the context of our topic, it is necessary to know: "The socially threatening description of terrorism includes the threat of force within the framework of intensive psychological and propaganda activities, the misuse of the Internet for terrorist purposes, kidnappings, blackmail, psychophysical abuse, assassinations, sabotage, diversions, suicide attacks, individual and mass political murders and the intention to manifest itself less often against real and potential political opponents, and more often against representatives of the system and innocent victims." (Simeunović 2009, 80).

Secondly, "[t]he term state terrorism is usually used to refer, with strong moral and political condemnation, to terrorist acts that are organized, instigated, or logistically supported by a state. State terrorism is usually carried out against hostile regimes in order to destabilize or pressure them or to intimidate their own population. It is carried out by members of the intelligence service, special forces, or mercenaries." (Simeunović 2009, 81).

Globalization and (state) terrorism

It should be pointed out right away: "Globalism is an ideology, globalization is a process, and the new world order is a system." (Simeunović 2014, 116). Each of the three basic theoretical orientations for understanding the phenomenon of globalization – hyperglobalists, skeptics and transformationists (Held 2003, 48–60) – carries segments of truth, emphasizing with greater or lesser validity certain dimensions of this multivalent phenomenon. Therefore, even when the author of this paper somewhat more strongly supports certain theses of the transformationists,[1] it is necessary to respect different perspectives. Contemporary tectonic shifts that can be interpreted from the perspective of geopolitics and geoeconomics justify long-standing models of analysis of globalization trends: "Thus, the first significant consequence of a globalized economy would be the fundamentally problematic nature of governing it [...] The main difficulty is to create both effective and compatible patterns of national and international state policy in order to master global market forces. The systemic economic interdependence of countries and markets would by no means necessarily lead to harmonious integration in which the world's consumers would benefit from truly independent, distributedly efficient market mechanisms. On the contrary [...] Then interdependence would readily support *disintegration*, i.e., competition and conflict – between regulatory forces at different levels." (Hirst i Tompson 2003, 124).

Namely, although it seems that the key factor is "there is no separation without the separatists relying on the greatest powers of the 'new world order'" (Simeunović 2014, 143), considering all the factors

---

[1]   In the sense that Held conceptualizes them: "[...] Globalization is the central driving force behind the rapid social, political, and economic changes that are reshaping modern societies [...] governments and societies around the world must adapt to a world in which there is no longer a clear division between international and domestic, foreign and domestic affairs [...] However, the existence of a single global system is not taken as evidence of global convergence or the advent of a single world society [...] The global social structure can be represented in the form of three rows of concentric circles that intersect national borders and represent elite, middle, and marginalized strata [...] The reshaping of patterns of global stratification is linked to the growing territorialization of economic activities [...] they argue that a 'new regime of sovereignty' has replaced the traditional conception [...] sovereignty can now be understood 'less as a territorially defined boundary and more as a political bargaining over resources within a complex transnational network' [...] governments have become more external observers as they follow corporate strategies in creating international regulatory systems" (Held 2003, 55–60).

that drive tectonic geopolitical shifts requires a much broader scope and deeper analysis, and we highlight: "Globalism sees *nationalism* and the *nation-state* as its main *opponents* [...] However, the main problem arises in the form of *informal resistance*. It is not nation-states that can stop the onslaught of globalization simply because they are a smaller force than the countries that are the bearers of globalism. The problem is created by ethnic and religious *extremists* who position themselves as defenders of *faith and nation*, using violence, primarily in the form of *terrorism*, which has itself become *globalized*." (Simeunović 2014, 105).

It is clearly shown that globalization trends have expanded the possibilities of terrorist action due to the multidimensional process of global interdependence, overcoming the temporal and spatial components as a key feature of globalization (Vuletić 2006, 19–25; 53; 78–81), then (reactions and resistance to) the universalization of values (Vuletić 2006, 216–228), the changed character and role of mass and new media (Mitić 2020), and the enormous progress and spread of the application of new information technologies.

The problem of terrorism is, moreover, increasingly present in contemporary geopolitical shifts and the global information space as a problem of state terrorism. Let us start from the observation "that the absence of state terrorism from academic discourse functions to promote particular kinds of state hegemonic projects, construct a legitimizing public discourse for foreign and domestic policy, and deflect attention from the terroristic practices by Western states and their allies" (Jackson 2008, 1).

However, state terrorism has been the subject of scientific interest for a long time. Conceptualization comes first (with the refutation of the argument that terrorism is committed only by non-state actors), typologies are analyzed – and it "has been identified as a useful tool for the satisfaction of elite economic interests, including maintaining access to external resources or markets, or the suppression of socially progressive reform movements [...] state terrorism has also been linked to political and strategic interests [...] Thus, it may be employed to destabilize the ruling regime of a competitor state"; also, the framework of analysis consists of "a number of recent studies situating state terrorism within the power relations of the global political economy [...] they refocus the analyst's gaze away from particular acts of terrorism and toward 'deeper' structural and material relations that encourage and facilitate this form of violence […] present an effort to correct the perceived dominance

of constructivist or discursive analyses within much recent 'critical' literature on terrorism" (Jarvis and Lister 2014, 46–48).

Discourse and discourse analysis

The term discourse is complex and fluid, sometimes indefinite, carries a wide range of meanings, and is derived from several sources. The meanings are:
- a mode of social interaction, a communication event (it enables, it is the general framework of communication);
- a system of ideas (a privileged form of spreading ideas) and practices (regulatory practice – implies control, a mode of organization);
- or denotes the discourse of an entity, even an individual;
- a typical, common narrative, mainstream;
- generally accepted conventions and norms, codes, and rules of functioning;
- an institutionally shaped system of statements and practices;
- a space or process in which are created and focused meanings (of social relations) by using symbolic forms – and is a meaningful symbolic activity, encompassing meanings and encompassing sense that is subject to interpretation;
- discourse is the relationship of elements, the choice of sources of meaning, and the way of designing;
- form of expression of a point of view, determining the way in which a certain topic is treated;
- subtext – discourse is not only form but also content because it determines the content;
- socially constructed way of relating and presenting;
- form of social action;
- way of exercising power – expresses one's power, authority, and dominance;
- way of inclusion and exclusion (Perović 2014; Pavlićević 2020, 284–291; Ejdus 2012, 99).

From one theoretical perspective, "discourse analysis aims primarily to illustrate and describe the relationship between textual and social and political processes. It is concerned with the politics of representation – the manifest political or ideological consequences of adopting one mode of representation over another [...] I am concerned with the ways in which state terrorism is represented – or not represented, which is itself a kind

of representation" (Jackson 2008, 2–3). Moreover, discourse analysis encompasses "an understanding of language as constitutive or productive of meaning; an understanding of discourse as structures of signification which construct social realities, particularly in terms of defining subjects and establishing their relational positions within a system of signification; an understanding of discourse as being productive of subjects authorized to speak and act, legitimate forms of knowledge and political practices and importantly, common sense within particular social groups and historical settings; an understanding of discourse as necessarily exclusionary and silencing of other modes of representation; and an understanding of discourse as historically and culturally contingent, inter-textual, open-ended, requiring continuous articulation and re-articulation and therefore, open to destabilisation and counter-hegemonic struggle" (Jackson 2008, 3). The research includes textual analysis, namely:

- an immanent critique that "uses a discourse's internal contradictions, mistakes, misconceptions, and omissions to criticise it on its own terms and expose the events and perspectives that the discourse fails to acknowledge or address" (Jackson 2008, 3);

- "A second order critique entails reflecting on the broader political and ethical consequences – the ideological effects – of the representations [...] an exploration of the ways in which the discourse functions as a 'symbolic technology' that can be wielded by particular elites and institutions, to: structure the primary subject positions, accepted knowledge, commonsense and legitimate policy responses to the actors and events being described; exclude and de-legitimise alternative knowledge and practice; naturalise a particular political and social order; and construct and sustain a hegemonic regime of truth" (Jackson 2008, 4).

Also, note that discursive analysis does not have to be incompatible with other paradigms. It is also noted that discourse is used within a range of "different epistemological paradigms – poststructuralist, postmodernist, feminist, and social constructivist" – making "a set of theoretical commitments" (Jackson 2008, 3).

THE CONCEPT OF CRISIS AND
THE UKRAINIAN CRISIS

The crisis in Ukraine is developmental – it is not accidental – it is a set of changes in many spheres within the state of Ukraine – in a compound international context, global interdependencies, and complex

geopolitical constellations, in the sequence of events that led to increasing instability, which ultimately led to a special operation, armed intervention, and war. Concerning the events in Ukraine, one should consider the motives, doctrinal and ideological frameworks, the way of acting of the actors, the influence of a foreign factor, and geopolitical aspirations – which collectively have determined the crisis.

Namely, a crisis is not only a threat and a disruption, a special state and a deviation from the usual (way of functioning), a disruption of the regular sequence, and the collapse of the desired order (as well as the neoliberal global order). A crisis is a reflection, a manifestation of the factors that trigger it. The crisis is made up of causes – the consequences are human reactions – and in the global world of interdependence, the causes are multivalent and complex. When the crisis is deliberately provoked by systematic external and internal factors and influences, the beginning of the crisis is in the projects of its initiation. While the intention is – noticeably by nurturing the discourse of state terrorism – to show that the crisis (of global security, energy, supply chains) was caused (almost) only by a special operation of the Russian Federation or that, on the contrary, it is only a product of the strategic interests of the USA and the Political West. The discourse of the crisis is accompanied by an effort to show that only the Russian Federation (or the USA) aims to achieve geostrategic aspirations – which again indicates that the establishment of the desired new order produces the crisis. The epistemological framework is not only to analyze this crisis as a development of threatening factors, to see destabilizing changes leading to armed conflict – which should then be reacted to according to the principles of securitization, but to show that the order was precisely intended to collapse systematically (inside and outside) to establish the desired new project. Or rather, before new projects – which highlights the objective determinants of the causes of the crisis – because projects are a response to the reality of the global order. The basic problem is recognized in the fact that in some cases (on the occasion of international and domestic events, processes, or trends), qualifications are registered without establishing the factual situation, or that exactly the opposite – based on tendentiously selected facts and discourse-contextualized information – the truth is postulated in a way that supports the securitization agenda (qualifications are in function), and thus influences the further decision-making process, legitimizes further action and strategic action.

The discourse related to state terrorism of the actors involved in the crisis in Ukraine is an indicator, as well as an instrument of strategic projections and a relatively effective mode of action aimed at covering the information space, building public opinion perceptions, and creating a global media image of the adversary (Đorđević i Miljković 2025). It is also the basis for operational action – for example, raising issues in the Security Council, intensifying armed actions, or delivering armed and other assistance (*Politika* 2023).

The crisis in Ukraine is not accidental; it is a result of various changes within the country, influenced by global interdependencies and complex geopolitical factors. This instability has led to armed conflict. To understand the crisis, we need to examine the motives and actions of the involved parties, the impact of foreign influences, and broader geopolitical ambitions. All these elements played a role in shaping the situation. A crisis is more than just a threat or disruption; it reflects the underlying factors that cause it. The causes of the crisis are complex, and when intentionally provoked by internal and external forces, they can often be traced back to the projects that initiated the crisis. Discussions around state terrorism suggest that the crisis in global security and energy arises mainly from Russia's actions or the strategic interests of the U.S. and the West. This narrative implies that only certain countries aim to achieve geostrategic goals, indicating that the current order may have been designed to create this crisis.

We should not only view the crisis as an outcome of threatening factors or armed conflicts needing securitization. Instead, we should recognize that the existing order may have been set up to collapse, paving the way for new projects that respond to the realities of the global situation. A significant issue arises when international and domestic events are evaluated without a factual basis. There are also instances where selectively chosen facts support a narrative that aligns with a securitization agenda, impacting decision-making and legitimizing further actions. *Discourse is not only a carrier of meaning but also a geopolitical, geostrategic instrument. Therefore, the discourse on terrorism will also change (focusing on new targets, simultaneously producing and reflecting problems) in correlation with changes in the global power structure, strategic positions, and goals.*

CONTEMPORARY DISCOURSE ABOUT
STATE TERRORISM: UKRAINE CASE

The *expansion of the conceptual scope of the syntagm state terrorism* in global discourse is evident if we accept the view that the discourse on Ukraine has exceptional significance and influence on a global level. *Expanding the conceptual scope of the syntagm state terrorism concerns both the content and scope of the term – when its use is analyzed in the context of the goals sought to be achieved in a global context.*

To support the above statement we remind ourselves of the global importance of the Ukrainian conflict. Namely, based on the conclusions from the analysis of the discourse related to the mentioned conflict, they try to show the possible global outcomes, i.e., the possible impact of the change in the discourse on terrorism that accompanies the Ukrainian crisis.[2]

Ergo, the content and characteristics of the discourse framing the crisis and the armed conflict in Ukraine are determined by several research findings: First, *the discourse on terrorism is extremely polarized due to geopolitical interests* – which causes geopolitical aspects to be tied to the phenomenon of terrorism, both causes and consequences (cf. *Novine Info* 2023; *Espreso* 2022f; Mitrović Rašević 2022a); secondly, *current strategic interests determine the narrative*.[3] Moreover, in understandable foreign policy calculations, *the narrative is often covered by humanitarian reasons*;[4] the third basis for our initial claim is *mutual accusations of state terrorism between Ukrainian and Russian officials are an implied*

---

[2]   The author notes that he did not form a representative research sample; a comprehensive analysis was conducted on news articles, reports, and announcements from various newspapers. Although not every relevant source is listed in this paper, it's important to emphasize that the media often featured authoritative statements from officials and official state bodies, including those from the Russian Federation, Ukraine, the USA and the EU. Insights from leading scientists specializing in terrorism were also included. Furthermore, I consulted significant scientific discourse on the subject, ensuring a well-rounded examination of the issue.

[3]   For example: "Interestingly, the New York Times reported last week that the Ukrainian government was responsible for the murder of Darya Dugina and that the US had no involvement in the attack, either by providing intelligence or other assistance, and that it was not aware of official Kiev's intentions because it would have opposed it." (Mitrović Rašević 2022b).

[4]   For example: Powell 2022.

topos;[5] fourth, *when the aim is to enhance meaning, change the character of news, or mitigate media damage and failure, state terrorism qualifies as* nuclear terrorism (Walz 2022), energy terrorism (*Nedeljnik.rs* 2022; *Beta* 2022), and the phrase telephone terrorism also appears (*Sputnik* 2019) – and even it *reveals geopolitical constellations* (*Aloonline.ba* 2022b); fifth, *actions of the armed forces are characterized as terrorism*.[6]

Let us turn to the final statement, where we analyse the following points: Attacks on strategically important sites, such as the Kursk nuclear power plant and the Crimean Bridge, are of particular significance. These locations symbolize essential strategic points, delineate borders, and serve as grounds for potential retaliation.[7] The dissemination of specific information affects the formation of values, cognitive patterns, and the perception of state-sponsored terrorism, including the targeting of its perpetrators. The discourse has clearly revealed the relationships and interests at play, both geopolitical and geoeconomic, particularly in connection with the diversion of the Nord Stream pipeline.[8]

Namely, *the Russian special military operation was very quickly characterized as state terrorism, with the inclusion and emphasis of assessments of war crimes* by the Russian armed forces. Accusations of war crimes in Bucha have been in focus since the beginning of the armed conflict, with the construction of a dichotomous model of crime and justice.[9] *The narrative becomes the basis and calls for strategic gathering* (*Espreso* 2022d). At the same time, within the framework of strategic reactions, *efforts that publicly and officially stated qualifications, supported by "evidence" placed by intelligence services*, are noticeable (*Espreso* 2022c). *The absence of answers and reactions to questions that cast doubt on the information presented* is characteristic.[10] The designated reporting model – which includes official statements such as

---

5   For example: "Russia's only strategy is terrorism" (*Aktuelno* 2023) *versus* "Ukraine has chosen terrorism instead of peace, said Russian President Vladimir Putin" (*BN* 2016).

6   For example: "The Ukrainian Defense Ministry shared an image on the social media platform X (formerly known as Twitter), showing the damage caused by a Russian drone strike in the Chernihiv region. "Their only strategy is terrorism," the ministry said." (*Al Jazeera* 2023).

7   See: Mitrović Rašević 2022b; *Reuters* 2023; *FoNet* 2023.

8   See: *Sputnik* 2023; *Novinska agencija Republike Srpske* [SRNA] 2023; *Bilten.rs* 2022; *Okvir* 2023; *RT Balkan* 2023; *RT Balkan* 2024.

9   For example: *Espreso* 2022e.; *Espreso* 2022g.

10   For example: *Aloonline.ba* 2022a; *Espreso* 2022a; *Espreso* 2022b.

„EU: Russia's attacks on civilian infrastructure in Ukraine are terrorism" (*Anadolu Agency* [AA] 2022) – is a particularly effective mode since the global public does not have relevant information to assess, nor is it intended to broadcast it.

Neither the public nor the discourse analysis requires verification of truthfulness – what matters is the effect and achieving the goal of demonizing the enemy. As Jackson points out, immanent critique of discourse is carried out with the aim not necessarily "to establish the 'correct' or 'real truth' of the subject beyond doubt, but rather to destabilise dominant interpretations and demonstrate the inherently contested and political nature of the discourse" (Jackson 2008, 3). Additionally, as Jackson warns: "It is crucial to recognise that discourses are significant not just for what they say but also for what they do not say; the silences in a discourse can be as important, or even more important at times, than what is openly stated" (Jackson 2008, 4).

Here we recall one of the definitions of state terrorism: "It is similar to non-state terrorism in that it involves politically or ideologically or religiously inspired acts of violence against individuals or groups outside of an armed conflict. The key difference is that agents of the state are carrying out the violence." (Hewitt n.d.). Thus, the contemporary discourse on state terrorism knows no bounds "*outside of an armed conflict.*"

However, we need to indicate that "the term 'state terrorism' entered scientific circulation after the 102nd plenary meeting of the UN General Assembly on 17 December 1984, where the Resolution 'Inadmissibility of the policy of State terrorism and any actions by States aimed at undermining the socio-political system in other sovereign States' was adopted." (Krupenya and Podriez 2023, 248). The following statements and assessments are certainly not surprising, keeping in mind the authors' affiliations: "The Geneva declaration on terrorism indicates that state terrorism manifests itself in: police state practices against its own people [...] (e.g. in the case of Russia – kidnapping and killing of Crimean Tatar activists in Russian-occupied Crimea [...]); the introduction or transportation of nuclear weapons by a state into or through the territory or territorial waters of other states or into international waters (e.g., Russia has deployed 39 nuclear weapons carriers on the territory of occupied Crimea); military exercise manoeuvres or war games conducted by one state in the vicinity of another state for the purpose of threatening the political independence or territorial integrity of that other state [...]; the armed attack by the military forces of a state

on targets that put at risk the civilian population residing in another state (e.g., the bombings of Mariupol, Irpin, Bucha and other cities of Ukraine), the creation and support of armed mercenary forces by a state for the purpose of subverting the sovereignty of another state (e.g., Private Military Company Wagner funding by Russia); assassinations, assassination attempts and plots directed by a state towards officials of other states or national liberation movements, whether carried out by a military strike, special forces units either through covert operations by 'intelligence forces' or their third party agents (e.g., since the beginning of the largescale war, Russian special services have attempted 12 times to assassinate the President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy); covert operations by the 'intelligence' or other forces of a state which intend to destabilize or subvert another state, national liberation movements or the international peace movement (e.g., the Russian dictator announced the start of a 'special military operation' against the 'Kyiv regime' rather than a war against Ukraine); disinformation campaigns by a state, whether intended to destabilize another state or to build public support for economic, political or military force or intimidation directed against another state [...]; arms sales which support the continuation of regional wars and delay the search for political solutions to international disputes (e.g., since 2014, Russia has openly supported the armed formations of the terrorist organizations 'DPR' (Donetsk People's Republic) and 'LPR' (Lugansk People's Republic)." (Krupenya and Podriez 2023, 248–249).

When we look back at some of them, including the statement from the quote above (related to 'DPR' and 'LPR'), without entering deeper analysis, it seems important to recall some provisions from General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXIX), Definition of Aggression, Adopted by General Assembly, 2319 plenary meeting from December 14, 1974: "Article I: Aggression is the use of armed force by a State against the sovereignty, territorial integrity or political independence of another State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations, as set out in this Definition. [...] Article 3 [...]: (a) The invasion or attack by the armed forces of a State of the territory of another State, or any military occupation, however temporary, resulting from such invasion or attack, or any annexation by the use of force of the territory of another State or part thereof, (b) Bombardment by the armed forces of a State against the territory of another State or the use of any weapons by a State against the territory of another State; [...] (g) The sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or

mercenaries, which carry out acts of armed force against another State of such gravity as to amount to the acts listed above, or its substantial involvement therein." (UNGA, A/RES/3314(XXIX)).

We note that the same (violent) acts or (armed) actions that are often labeled as terrorist in the discourse related to Ukraine are constructed by invoking the Geneva Declaration. Some of the acts defined in this instrument should be differentiated from the acts of aggression defined in the General Assembly Resolution 3314 (XXIX).

A simple theoretical starting point for the distinction would be the goals of the activity, the perpetrators, and then the targets. It is difficult to argue that the basis for the distinction will always be political motivation among terrorists because geopolitical motivations are necessarily present in military strategic (and even tactical) actions. It is perhaps easier to distinguish the bearers of the activity, but only at first glance – not only because of special operations and false flag actions. The problem is also when it is not easy to separate citizens under the pressure of terror from the same citizens when they engage in armed actions and establish ties with foreign services in order to defend themselves from terror. It is also clear that in the Ukrainian conflict, we register "The sending by or on behalf of a State of armed bands, groups, irregulars or mercenaries." (UNGA, A/RES/3314(XXIX), Article 3). They participate in armed acts; thus, their political motifs and causing fear are irrelevant to their actions; on the contrary, their actions follow the military goals.

Thus, we conclude that public international law is necessarily within the framework of great power policies, while the modes of implementation depend on the circumstances and options for realizing geostrategic interests. The discourse on terrorism here fluctuates between aggression and terrorism depending on the moment and the narrator, obviously expanding its content.

Discourse frames and the accompanying narrative have *almost vulgarized communication between great powers*.[11] The construction of a certain narrative about terrorism aims to produce fear (as do the actions of terrorists themselves), but here, terrorism portrayed in the media as state violence is only an intermediate link in the information space within the framework of a strategic approach, with the main goal of mobilizing for action. Not only are certain state behavior and acts qualified as terrorism but the state, its policies, and especially the actions of the armed forces are labeled as terrorism. This is not such a new

---

[11]   For example: *Beta* 2014; *Logično.com* 2023.

strategy, nor is it even so new that such a discourse has become necessary. Using the qualification of state terrorism linked to the above-mentioned frameworks of state actions is a communication act (as is terrorism itself), but in global communication state actions become primarily a violent criminal form (and then qualify as a war crime) of strategic enemies – where the emphasis is on the state and not on terrorism.

RATIONAL DECISION-MAKING

Rational decision-making must respect the irrational determinants in the actions of the actors involved. This requirement is particularly necessary in the response to terrorism due to the nature of this phenomenon and its carriers, as well as when the discourse on terrorism is a strategic instrument – because strategies can also have irrational elements.

The problem of control (of crisis) and decision-making (concerning it) must be transformed into an effort to achieve a model of coordination accompanied with the rules (which strive for law) whose scope of validity will be not only the respect of power but also of interests to the limits that indicate the collapse of the security of the actors involved. In the current geopolitical constellations, the power game for the establishment of general rules is the direction in which the unipolar world is likely to change. Respect for multiple poles (the areas of control bearers) and centres of power is the direction.

The discourse on terrorism reflects the need to resolve many problems at the global level in several areas (economy, finance, energy, sustainable development, the character and effectiveness of international institutions, international law, and international security). The extremes in understanding discourse are whether discourse is socially determined or creates order. Specifically in the field of terrorism, it seems sustainable judgment that discourse exerts an influence on identities, social and political relations, beliefs, and systems of understanding reality – with the knowledge that it is simultaneously a practice of representing and constructing reality. However, constructing only one segment of reality, with the awareness that it occasionally gains great importance. Rational decision-making must accompany discourse as a regulatory practice – but in contrast to the targeting produced by the agenda and discourse of securitization, it is necessary to adopt a perspective that emphasizes the need for research into factual knowledge based on clear and proven procedures for establishing truth. Obviously, there's growing importance

of artificial intelligence whose multiple uses we are registering in the Russo-Ukrainian conflict (Đorić i Glišin 2023).

CONCLUSION

This work is preliminary research – this is because "Employing a 'grounded theory' approach, the analysis was considered complete when the addition of new texts did not yield any new insights or categories" (Jackson 2008, 3) – its limitation is that it only provides some research guidelines. However, the validity of the basic research problem was confirmed, and further possible problems were indicated. The results obtained provided good *initial grounds* for confirming the validity of the initial hypothesis: that current geopolitical shifts have influenced the actualization of the scientific applicability and expansion of the conceptual scope of the syntagm state terrorism in global discourse. Also, the analysis led to the conclusion that the actualization of the syntagm state terrorism is particularly noticeable in the context of the armed conflict in Ukraine, and that the discourse related to the armed conflict in Ukraine signifies tectonic shifts on the international stage and significantly changed determinants that determine globalization trends.

The key conclusion is that overcoming the discourse problem requires multi-sectoral involvement in the rational decision-making process and, thus, effective action in the international environment. However, it seems that the above-mentioned position is difficult to implement in decision-making practice due to the dominant influence of a number of supranational mechanisms, which makes this topic relevant for more in-depth research.

REFERENCES

Aktuelno. 2023. „Jedina strategija Rusije je terorizam." 11. septembar 2023. https://www.aktuelno.me/svijet/uzivo-zelenski-izvijestio-o-napredovanjima-na-jugu-i-pomaku-na-istoku-sabotaze-na-birackim-mjestima-u-okupiranim-ukrajinskim-regijama/

Al Jazeera. 2023. „Ukrajina kaže da je jedina strategija Rusije terorizam." 11. septembar 2023. https://balkans.aljazeera.net/news/world/liveblog/2023/9/11/putinova-stranka-dobila-pobjednik-izbora-u-anektiranim-regijama

Aloonline.ba. 2022a. „Dževad Galijašević tvrdi da se Rusiji podmeće kao nekad Srbiji "buča je montaža, Zapad hoće da napravi novi Račak! Šta očekivati od države koju vodi glumac?!"" 4. april 2022. https://www.alo.rs/vesti/ukrajina/615330/dzevad-galijasevic-tvrdi-da-se-rusiji-podmece-kao-nekad-srbiji-buca-je-montaza-zapad-hoce-da-napravi-novi-racak-sta-ocekivati-od-drzave-koju-vodi-glumac/vest

Aloonline.ba. 2022b. „Stručnjak za terorizam otkrio pozadinu jezivih dojava o bombama koje tresu region Galijašević: Na meti srpska djeca, Zapad ima jasan cilj!" 1. jun 2022. https://aloonline.ba/vijesti/dojave-o-bombama-pozadina-dzevad-galijasevic/

Anadolu Agency [AA]. 2022. „EU: Napadi Rusije na civilnu infrastrukturu u Ukrajini su terorizam." 20. oktobar 2022. https://www.aa.com.tr/ba/svijet/eu-napadi-rusije-na-civilnu-infrastrukturu-u-ukrajini-su-terorizam/2715140

Beta. 2014. „SAD: Nasilje u Ukrajini je terorizam." 29. april 2014. https://www.okradio.rs/m/vesti/svetske/sad-nasilje-u-ukrajini-je-terorizam_40187.html

Beta. 2022. „Ruska administracija: Herson bez struje i vode nakon napada." 6. novembar 2022. https://www.nedeljnik.rs/ruska-administracija-herson-bez-struje-i-vode-nakon-napada/

Bilten.rs. 2022. „Putin javno napade na Severni tok 1 i 2 ocenio kao međunarodni terorizam." 12. oktobar 2022**.** https://bilten.rs/35321-2/

BN. 2016. „Putin: Ukrajina igra veoma opasnu igru – Ukrajina je izabrala terorizam umesto mira, rekao je ruski predsednik Vladimir Putin." 10. avgust 2016. https://www.rtvbn.com/3828620/putin-ukrajina-igra-opasnu-igru

Đorđević, Marko, i Milan Miljković. 2025. „Povezanost hibridnog ratovanja i savremenog terorizma." *Politika nacionalne bezbednosti* 28 (1): 167–190. DOI: 10.5937/pnb28-57340

Đorić, Marija, i Vanja Glišin. 2023. „Upotreba veštačke inteligencije u Rusko-ukrajinskom ratu." *Politika nacionalne bezbednosti* 25 (2): 59–76. DOI: 10.5937/pnb25-47369

Ejdus, Filip. 2012. *Međunarodna bezbednost: teorije, sektori i nivoi*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik.

Espreso. 2022a. „Lavrov zagrmeo u UN kao nikad do sad: Obrušio se svom silom koju ima, slušajte samo ovo - ceo svet u šoku!" 23. septembar 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1143401/lavrov-o-buci

Espreso. 2022b. „Lešеvi danima leže na suncu! Mrtvačnice prepune, tela poginulih u Azovstalu premeštena u Buču." 30. jun 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1081041/tela-poginulih-u-azovstalu-premestena-u-bucu

Espreso. 2022c. „Masakr u Buči je bio planiran? Nemački obaveštajci presreli komunikaciju ruske vojske, evo šta tvrde!" 7. april 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1020085/bnd-presrela-komunikaciju-ruske-vojske-povodom-buce

Espreso. 2022d. „Ministri zemalja G7 složni: „Najoštrije osuđujemo ruske zločine u Buči i drugim gradovima"." 7. april 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1020237/ministri-zemalja-g7-slozni-najostrije-osudjujemo-ruske-zlocine-u-buci

Espreso. 2022e. „Mišel se oglasio, tiče se Ukrajine i Rusije: ove slike svi moraju da vide! (foto)." 20. april 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1029607/misel-se-oglasio-tice-se-ukrajine-i-rusije

Espreso. 2022f. „„Ne lažite za Buču, znamo ko je organizovao taj šou": Oglasio se Lukašenko." 6. maj 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1040801/lukasenko-najavio-sastanak-sa-putinom

Espreso. 2022g. „Predsednik Poljske o sukobu u Ukrajini: „Ovo nije rat, ovo je terorizam"." 13. april 2022. https://www.espreso.co.rs/svet/planeta/1024655/duda-ovo-u-ukrajini-nije-rat-ovo-je-terorizam

FoNet. 2023. „Rusija najavila odmazdu zbog „terorističkog napada" na Krimski most." *021.rs.* 12. Avgust 2023. https://www.021.rs/story/Info/Region-i-svet/349625/Rusija-najavila-odmazdu-zbog-teroristickog-napada-na-Krimski-most.html

United Nations General Assembly [UNGA], A/RES/3314(XXIX), Resolution 3314 (XXIX), Definition of Aggression, Adopted by the General Assembly at its 2319th plenary meeting, on 14 December 1974. https://iilj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/General-Assembly-Resolution-3314.pdf

Held, Dejvid. 2003. „Debate o globalizaciji." U *Globalizacija - mit i stvarnost: sociološka hrestomatija*, ur. Vladimir Vuletić, 48–60. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Hewitt, Steve. n.d. „Terrorism by the State is still Terrorism." *University of Birmingham*. Last accessed February 8, 2024. https://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/perspective/terrorism-by-the-state-is-still-terrorism.aspx

Hirst, Pol i Grejem Tompson. 2003. „Globalizacija – neminovan mit?” U *Globalizacija - mit i stvarnost: sociološka hrestomatija*, ur. Vladimir Vuletić, 119–132. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Jackson, Richard. 2008. "The Ghosts of State Terror: Knowledge, Politics and Terrorism Studies." Paper prepared for the International Studies Association (ISA) Annual Conference, 26–29 March 2008, San Francisco, USA. https://www.aber.ac.uk/en/media/departmental/interpol/csrv/ghost-of-state-terror-richard-5.pdf

Jarvis, Lee, and Michael Lister. 2014. "State Terrorism Research and Critical Terrorism Studies: An Assessment." *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 7 (1): 43–61. DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2013.877669

Krupenya, Iryna, and Yuliia Podriez. 2023. "State Terrorism Based on the Example of Putin's Regime: Present and History." *Review of Historical Sciences* 12 (2): 245–261. DOI: 10.18778/1644-857X.22.02.09

Logično.com. 2023. „SAD 'slijepe' za ukrajinski terorizam." 28. novembar 2023. https://www.logicno.com/politika/sad-slijepe-za-ukrajinski-terorizam.html

Mitić, Tamara. 2020. „Krizni menadžment i uticaj terorizma na elektronske medije." Doktorska disertacija. Univerzitet Edukons Sremska Kamenica: Fakultet za studije bezbednosti.

Mitrović Rašević, Biljana. 2022a. „Litvanija proglasila Rusiju terorističkom državom." *Politika*. 11. maj 2022. https://www.politika.rs/sr/clanak/506944/Litvanija-proglasila-Rusiju-teroristickom-drzavom

Mitrović Rašević, Biljana. 2022b. „Putinova osveta." *Politika*. 11. oktobar 2022. https://www.politika.rs/scc/clanak/520529/Putinova-osveta

Nedeljnik.rs. 2022. „Rat u Ukrajini: Zelenski optužio Rusiju za „energetski terorizam", Vašington najavio novi paket pomoći Kijevu." 5. novembar 2022. https://www.nedeljnik.rs/rat-u-ukrajini-zelenski-optuzio-rusiju-za-energetski-terorizam-vasington-najavio-novi-paket-pomoci-kijevu/

Novine Info. 2023. „Ukrajina je žarište terorizma, opasnost za svet." 24. april 2023. https://www.novine.info/ukrajina-je-zariste-terorizma-opasnost-za-svet.

Novinska agencija Republike Srpske [SRNA]. 2023. „Napad na Sjeverni tok državni terorizam." 22. novembar 2023. http://www.srna.rs/sr/novost/1154133/napad-na-%22sjeverni-tok%22-%22drzavni-terorizam%22

Okvir.net. 2023. „Rusija: Dokazi o krivici SAD za Severni tok „više od puške koja se dimi"" 22. februar 2023. https://okvir.net/svet/dokazi-o-krivici-sad-za-severni-tok-vise-od-puske-koja-se-dimi-rusija/

Pavlićević, Predrag. 2020. *Analitika u funkciji nacionalne bezbednosti*. Beograd: Akademija za nacionalnu bezbednost, Službeni glasnik.

Perović, Slavica, ur. 2014. *Analiza diskursa: teorije i metode*. Podgorica: Institut za strane jezike.

Politika. 2023. „Rusija uputila SB UN nacrt izjave o terorističkom napadu na Severni tok." 29. septembar 2023. https://www.politika.rs/scc/clanak/574464/Rusija-uputila-SB-UN-nacrt-izjave-o-teroristickom-napadu-na-Severni-tok

Powell, Anita. 2022. „Biden odlučio: Rusija neće biti označena kao država koja sponzoriše terorizam." *VOA*, 7. septembar 2022. https://ba.voanews.com/a/bijela-kuca-odbacuje-oznaciti-rusiju-kao-drzavnog-sponzora-terorizma/6734528.html

Reuters. 2023. „Krimski most: Zašto je važan i šta se s njim dogodilo?" *VOA*. 17. jul 2023. https://ba.voanews.com/a/krimski-most-objasnjenje/7183688.html

RT Balkan. 2023. „Herš: Eksplozija Severnog toka bila poruka Nemačkoj." 22. decembar 2023. https://lat.rt.rs/sport/68355-hers-severni-tok-sabotaza/

RT Balkan. 2024. „"Volstrit džornal": Poljaci sakrili ključne dokaze o napadu na Severni tok, napadači iz Ukrajine." 8. januar 2024. https://lat.rt.rs/svet/70575-severni-tok-poljska-terorizam-istraga/

Simeunović, Dragan. 2009. *Terorizam: opšti deo*. Beograd: Pravni fakultet Univerziteta.

Simeunović, Dragan. 2014. *Nacija i globalizacija: sa predgovorom Vladete Jerotića*. Beograd: Prosveta.

Sputnik. 2019. „Ukrajinci vode telefonski terorizam protiv Rusije." 12. jun 2019. https://sputnikportal.rs/amp/20190612/ukrajinci-vode-telefonski-terorizam-protiv-rusije-1120073917.html

Sputnik. 2023. „Napadi na gasovode „Severni tok" ─ akti međunarodnog terorizma." 5. oktobar 2023. https://sputnikportal.rs/20231005/napadi-na-gasovode-severni-tok--akti-medjunarodnog-terorizma-1162065350.html

Vuletić, Vladimir. 2006. *Globalizacija: aktuelne debate*. Zrenjanin: Gradska narodna biblioteka „Žarko Zrenjanin".

Walz, Christian. 2022. "Ukrajina optužuje Rusiju za „nuklearni terorizam"." *DW*. 4. mart 2022. https://www.dw.com/bs/ukrajina-optu%C5%BEuje-rusiju-za-nuklearni-terorizam/a-61011152

Предраг Павлићевић*
Универзитет Сингидунум, Београд

ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЈА, КРИЗА И ДИСКУРС О ТЕРОРИЗМУ**

Резиме

У раду се истражује дискурс о тероризму у контексту савремених глобализацијских токова. Проверава се основаност хипотезе да су актуелна геополитичка померања утицала на актуализовање научне примењивости и ширење појмовног опсега синтагме државни тероризам у глобалном дискурсу. Проблем је препознат у чињеници да се у низу случаја јављају квалификације без утврђивања чињеничног стања на основу јасних и проверених поступака утврђивања истине – напротив, тенденциозно изабраним чињеницама и дискурсно-контекстуализованим информацијама постулира се истина тако да подржава коришћене квалификације, чиме се легитимишу стратешки циљеви и оправдавају одређени методи и средства даљег деловања. Циљ рада је да се утврде потенцијални изазови и битни елементи који се могу јавити у поступку рационалног одлучивања поводом пласирања дискурса о тероризму. Основни метод примењен у истраживању је функционална анализа, док су анализа садржаја докумената и анализа дискурса основни оперативни методи. Тачније, назначују се неки аспекти у којима се испољава криза глобализације као глобалног процеса да би се истраживачка пажња усмерила на истраживање карактеристика феномена теоризма у савременом међународном окружењу, и на крају проблем рационалног одлучивања. Добијени резултати показује да су глобализацијски токови проширили могућности терористичког деловања услед вишедимензионалног процеса глобалне међузависности, универзализације вредности, промењеног карактера и улоге масовних и нових медија, огромног

---

* Имејл адреса: ppavlicevic@singidunum.ac.rs; ORCID: 0000-0003-1349-0136 Аутор такође има афилијацију при Академији за националну безбедност, Београд.

напретка и ширења примене нових информатичких технологија, да је актуализовање синтагме државни тероризам посебно уочљиво у контексту оружаних сукоба у Украјини – који означавају тектонска померања на међународној сцени и битно измењене детерминанте које одређују глобализацијске токове, а да превазилажење проблема дискурса налаже мултисекторско укључивање у процесу рационалног одлучивања и тиме ефикасно постављање и деловање у међународном окружењу.