The Dynamics of Terrorism and Extremism: Definitional Perspectives and Challenges

Ms. Sneha Kulkarni

Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Defence and Strategic Studies,
Bhonsala Military College,
Rambhoomi, Nasik (Maharashtra, India)
E-mail: snehakul796@gmail.com

Abstract:

The term "terrorism" has originated from its genesis; in state-sponsored violence during the French Revolution to encompass a wide range of activities and myriad actors channelizing it, including revolutionary movements, ideological extremists, and transnational networks. Each historical phase has added new dynamics to the concept, reflecting the changing dimensions of power, technology, and global politics. Understanding the etymology and historical precisions of terrorism is crucial for addressing its modern manifestations. By recognizing the term's complexities and the contexts in which it has been applied, researchers and policymakers can develop more nuanced and effective strategies to combat terrorism in all its forms. The research article will focus on definitional challenges and forming perspectives of Terrorism and Extremism.

Keywords: *Terrorism, Extremism, Radicalization, War Against Terror, State Sponsored Terrorism*

Etymology and Historical Definitions:

The term "terrorism" has evolved significantly over centuries, reflecting the shifting dynamics of power, politics, and societal fears. From its origins during the French Revolution to its modern usage in describing non-state actors and ideological extremism, the concept has undergone considerable transformation. This evolution is marked by key milestones that highlight how terrorism has been understood and applied in different historical and socio-political contexts.

Origins of the Term: The French Revolution and the Reign of Terror:

The word "terrorism" originated from the French term *terrorisme*, which emerged during the late 18th century in the context of the French Revolution. Specifically, it referred to the actions of the revolutionary government under Maximilien Robespierre during the "Reign of Terror" (1793–1794). This period was characterized by state-sponsored violence aimed at eliminating counter-revolutionaries and consolidating power. Public executions, most notably via the guillotine, were

used as tools of intimidation and control, instilling fear in both the populace and the regime's opponents (Tilly, 2004).

In its original usage, terrorism was linked with governance and authority, aloof from rebellion or insurgency. It was a vehement strategy channelized by the state to maintain order and suppress dissent. Robespierre himself justified these actions as necessary for protecting the revolutionary ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Apart from that, this early form of state terrorism was eventually condemned as oppressive, and the term began to take on a negative connotation.

19th Century: Political Movements and the Shift to Non-State Actors:

The 19th century saw a crucial shift in the application of the term "terrorism," as it began to highlight the actions of non-state actors challenging established authorities. This transition was marked by the rise of revolutionary movements across Europe, including anarchist and nationalist groups. For example, the Russian Narodnaya Volya (People's Will) employed targeted assassinations, such as the killing of Tsar Alexander II in 1881, to undermine the autocratic regime and promote political reform (Chailand & Blin, 2007).

During this period, terrorism was often seen as a tool of the disenfranchised, used to draw attention to political grievances and inspire broader societal change. Anarchists in Western Europe and North America adopted similar tactics, targeting political leaders and institutions in their fight against capitalism and authoritarianism. The term "propaganda of the deed" emerged, emphasizing the symbolic power of violent acts to inspire revolution and communicate resistance (Martin, 2020).

20th Century: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Ideological Conflicts:

The 20th century underlined new facets to the concept of terrorism, as anti-colonial movements and ideological conflicts reshaped its meaning. During the decolonization era, groups such as the FLN (Front de Libération Nationale) in Algeria and the Irgun in Palestine used guerrilla tactics and bombings to challenge colonial powers and demand independence. These groups often marked their actions as a fight for self-determination, gaining both local support and international attention (Mahan & Griset, 2012).

At the same time, the Cold War channelized an ideological layer to terrorism, as communist and capitalist blocs supported various insurgencies and resistance movements to advance their strategic interests. Proxy wars and state sponsorship of terrorism became very common, further complicating the term's definition. For example, the United States and the Soviet Union provided support to groups that aligned with their ideological goals, often overlooking their use of terrorist tactics.

During this period, terrorism also began to target civilians more frequently, as groups sought to maximize their psychological impact. High-profile incidents, such as the Munich Olympics attack

in 1972 by Black September and the airplane hijackings of the 1970s, demonstrated how terrorism could capture global attention and exert pressure on governments. These events contributed to the changing dimensions and association of terrorism with indiscriminate violence and ideological extremism.

21st Century: Transnational Networks and the Role of Technology:

The attacks of September 11, 2001, marked a paramount phase in the modern understanding of terrorism. Carried out by Al-Qaeda, a transnational terrorist organization, these attacks highlighted the global reach and sophistication of contemporary terrorism. Unlike earlier forms, which were often tied to specific geographical or political contexts, modern terrorism operates across borders, exploiting global networks and systems (Hafez & Mullins, 2015).

The uprising of digital technology has further transformed terrorism, enabling groups to evolving propaganda, recruit followers, and coordinate attacks with unprecedented efficiency. Social media platforms, encrypted messaging apps, and online forums have become central to the operations of groups like ISIS, which used these tools to attract recruits from around the world and establish a global presence (Montasari, 2024).

This period has also seen a proliferation of definitions and debates about terrorism. Governments, international organizations, and scholars continue to grapple with the challenge of creating a universally accepted definition that encompasses the term's diverse manifestations while addressing political and cultural sensitivities.

The Evolution of Terrorism as a Concept:

The term "terrorism" has originated from its genesis in state-sponsored violence during the French Revolution to encompass a wide range of actions and actors, including revolutionary movements, ideological extremists, and transnational networks. Each historical phase has added new dimensions to the concept, reflecting the changing dynamics of power, technology, and global politics.

Understanding the etymology and historical definitions of terrorism is crucial for addressing its modern manifestations. By recognizing the term's complexities and the contexts in which it has been applied, researchers and policymakers can develop more nuanced and effective strategies to combat terrorism in all its forms.

Contemporary Definitions:

The term "terrorism" remains one of the most contested and debated concepts in modern discourse. Contemporary definitions vary significantly across legal, political, and academic contexts, reflecting the complexity and multifaceted nature of terrorism. These differing perspectives highlight the challenges of establishing a universally accepted definition, as each approach is influenced by specific priorities, ideologies, and practical considerations. Understanding these diverse

interpretations is essential for addressing terrorism effectively in both theory and practice.

Legal Definitions: Codifying Terrorism in Law:

Legal definitions of terrorism are often shaped by the need to create enforceable frameworks for prosecuting and preventing acts of violence. These definitions vary across jurisdictions but typically include three key elements: the use or threat of violence, the intention to instil fear, and the pursuit of political, ideological, or religious goals. For example, the United Nations defines terrorism broadly in its General Assembly Resolution 49/60 as "criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes" (UN, 1994).

National laws often reflect local priorities and challenges. In the United States, the Patriot Act (2001) defines terrorism as activities that "involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws" and are intended to "intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence the policy of a government, or affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping." This definition emphasizes both domestic and international threats while granting broad powers to law enforcement agencies to address them.

In contrast, the European Union's Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism (2002) focuses on acts that "seriously intimidate a population" or "unduly compel a government or international organization to perform or abstain from performing any act." This definition highlights the psychological impact of terrorism while emphasizing the importance of protecting democratic institutions.

Political Definitions: Shaped by Context and Interests:

Political definitions of terrorism are highly variable, as they are influenced by the interests, ideologies, and strategies of individual states and international organizations. Governments often define terrorism in ways that align with their domestic and foreign policy objectives, leading to inconsistencies and biases in how the term is applied.

One of the most contentious aspects of political definitions is the selective labeling of certain groups or actions as terrorist. For example, during the Cold War, acts of violence committed by anti-communist insurgents were often overlooked or justified by Western powers, while similar actions by communist-affiliated groups were labeled as terrorism. This double standard reflects the role of power dynamics and ideological agendas in shaping political definitions of terrorism (Shanahan, 2016).

Additionally, political definitions often fail to account for state-sponsored terrorism, where governments directly or indirectly support acts of violence to achieve strategic goals. For example, the U.S. Department of State maintains a list of state sponsors of terrorism, which includes countries accused of supporting groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. However, the criteria for inclusion on this

list are often criticized as being influenced by geopolitical considerations rather than consistent principles (Crenshaw, 1987).

Political definitions also play a significant role in international relations. The United Nations and regional organizations such as the African Union and the Organization of American States have developed frameworks to address terrorism, but these efforts are often hindered by differing political priorities and definitions among member states. This lack of consensus limits the effectiveness of global counter-terrorism initiatives and underscores the need for greater alignment and cooperation.

Academic Definitions: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives:

In academia, definitions of terrorism are shaped by the need for conceptual clarity and empirical rigor. Scholars seek to develop definitions that capture the essence of terrorism while accounting for its diverse manifestations. These definitions often emphasize the strategic and symbolic nature of terrorism, framing it as a form of political communication that seeks to influence audiences beyond the immediate victims.

One widely cited academic definition comes from Alex Schmid and Albert Jongman, who describe terrorism as "an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal, or political reasons." This definition highlights the intentionality, psychological impact, and varied motivations of terrorism, offering a comprehensive framework for analysis (Schmid & Jongman, 1988).

Academic definitions also explore the blurred boundaries between terrorism and related phenomena, such as insurgency, guerrilla warfare, and organized crime. For instance, some scholars argue that terrorism is distinct from these activities due to its focus on symbolic violence aimed at generating fear and influencing public opinion. Others contend that these distinctions are often fluid, as groups may employ multiple tactics depending on their goals and circumstances (Martin, 2020).

Furthermore, academic debates often address the subjective nature of terrorism, emphasizing the adage that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." This perspective highlights how the label of terrorism is often contested and dependent on the observer's political and cultural context. By critically examining these dynamics, academic definitions contribute to a deeper understanding of terrorism's complexities and the factors that influence its perception.

The Need for a Unified Definition:

The lack of a universally accepted definition of terrorism poses significant challenges for both theory and practice. Legal definitions must balance specificity with flexibility to address diverse threats while protecting human rights. Political definitions must navigate the complexities of international relations and domestic priorities without undermining their credibility. Academic definitions must strive for conceptual clarity without oversimplifying the phenomenon.

Despite these challenges, efforts to harmonize definitions are essential for fostering

collaboration and coherence in counter-terrorism efforts. A unified definition would enhance legal accountability, reduce the potential for misuse, and strengthen the global response to terrorism. However, achieving this requires overcoming the political and ideological barriers that have historically hindered consensus.

Contemporary definitions of terrorism vary across legal, political, and academic contexts, reflecting the term's complexity and the diverse priorities of different stakeholders. While these perspectives offer valuable insights, they also highlight the challenges of achieving a unified understanding of terrorism. By critically examining and integrating these definitions, this research aims to contribute to a more nuanced and inclusive framework that addresses the evolving nature of terrorism and its global impact.

Implications of Lack of Universal Definitions: Misuse in Policy and Law Enforcement:

The term "terrorism" holds significant power in shaping public perception, policy, and law enforcement practices. However, its misuse in policy and law enforcement contexts has led to profound ethical, legal, and societal challenges. This misuse stems from the lack of a universally accepted definition of terrorism, political biases, and the discretionary power of law enforcement agencies. While counter-terrorism efforts are essential for maintaining security, the overreach and misapplication of these measures can undermine human rights, stigmatize communities, and erode public trust (Shanahan, 2016).

Political Exploitation of the Term:

One of the most pervasive forms of misuse lies in the political exploitation of the term "terrorism" to delegitimize opposition and consolidate power. Governments have historically labelled dissenting groups as terrorists to justify crackdowns on political opponents, activists, and minority communities. For instance, authoritarian regimes often equate peaceful protests or demands for autonomy with terrorism to suppress legitimate political movements. This tactic not only delegitimizes dissent but also shifts attention away from addressing the underlying grievances that fuel unrest (Mahan & Griset, 2012).

Similarly, international politics is rife with selective labelling, where certain groups are branded as terrorists based on geopolitical interests rather than consistent principles. For example, during the Cold War, the United States and its allies supported anti-communist insurgencies, even when these groups employed terrorist tactics, while condemning similar actions by leftist movements. This inconsistency continues to influence global counter-terrorism policies, undermining their credibility and effectiveness (Crenshaw, 1987).

Impact on Minority Communities:

The misuse of counter-terrorism policies has disproportionately impacted minority communities, particularly those defined by ethnicity, religion, or nationality. In the aftermath of the

9/11 attacks, Muslim communities in Western countries faced heightened scrutiny, with policies and practices often targeting individuals based on their religious or cultural identity rather than evidence of criminal activity. Racial profiling at airports, surveillance of mosques, and the use of "no-fly lists" exemplify how counter-terrorism measures can stigmatize entire communities (Hafez & Mullins, 2015).

Such practices not only violate civil liberties but also exacerbate societal divisions. They create an environment of fear and mistrust, where affected communities feel alienated from the state and its institutions. This alienation can have counterproductive effects, as it fosters resentment and hinders cooperation between law enforcement and communities, which is essential for effective counter-terrorism.

Expansion of Law Enforcement Powers:

Counter-terrorism laws often grant law enforcement agencies expanded powers, such as increased surveillance, preventive detention, and the ability to bypass traditional due process protections. While these measures are justified as necessary to prevent attacks, their misuse can lead to significant abuses of power. For example, surveillance programs introduced under the guise of counter-terrorism have been used to monitor political activists, journalists, and whistleblowers, raising concerns about the erosion of privacy rights and democratic freedoms (Deflem, 2010).

In some cases, counter-terrorism laws have been used to criminalize non-violent activism. Environmental activists, labor organizers, and human rights defenders have been labeled as terrorists for engaging in protests or advocacy that challenge powerful interests. This trend reflects a broader pattern of using counter-terrorism as a tool to suppress dissent and maintain the status quo.

Preventive detention is another area of concern, as individuals suspected of terrorism can be detained for extended periods without formal charges or trials. Such practices undermine the presumption of innocence and can lead to wrongful detentions, particularly when based on flawed intelligence or discriminatory profiling. The lack of transparency and accountability in these cases further compounds the problem, eroding public trust in law enforcement and judicial systems.

Overreach in Emergency Legislation:

In response to terrorist attacks, governments often enact emergency legislation that grants sweeping powers to law enforcement and restricts civil liberties. While these measures are intended to address immediate threats, their overreach and permanence can have long-term negative consequences. For instance, France's state of emergency following the 2015 Paris attacks allowed for extensive surveillance and house raids without judicial oversight. Although initially temporary, many of these measures were later codified into law, raising concerns about the normalization of exceptional powers (Van den Bos, 2018).

Such overreach risks creating a surveillance state, where citizens' rights to privacy, free

expression, and assembly are curtailed in the name of security. Moreover, emergency measures often lack adequate safeguards, leading to abuses of power and the targeting of marginalized groups. The balance between security and liberty becomes skewed, undermining democratic principles and the rule of law.

Lack of Accountability and Transparency:

Another critical issue in the misuse of counter-terrorism policies is the lack of accountability and transparency in law enforcement practices. Intelligence agencies often operate under a veil of secrecy, making it difficult to scrutinize their actions or hold them accountable for abuses. This lack of oversight enables misconduct, such as the use of torture, extrajudicial killings, and illegal surveillance, to go unchecked (Mahan & Griset, 2012).

For example, the use of drone strikes in counter-terrorism operations has raised significant ethical and legal questions. While proponents argue that these strikes are effective in eliminating high-value targets, they often result in civilian casualties and violations of international law. The secrecy surrounding these operations prevents meaningful public debate and accountability, perpetuating a cycle of impunity.

Recommendations for Mitigation:

To address the misuse of counter-terrorism policies and practices, several measures are necessary:

1. **Clear and Consistent Definitions**: Establishing a universal definition of terrorism can reduce selective labelling and ensure that counter-terrorism efforts are applied fairly and consistently.

2. **Oversight and Accountability**: Independent oversight mechanisms, such as parliamentary committees or judicial reviews, can ensure that law enforcement agencies operate within the bounds of the law and respect human rights.

3. **Community Engagement**: Building trust with marginalized communities through dialogue, outreach, and inclusive policies can reduce the alienation that fuels radicalization and improve cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts.

4. **Protecting Civil Liberties**: Safeguards must be in place to prevent the erosion of civil liberties, ensuring that counter-terrorism measures do not infringe on privacy, free speech, or due process.

5. **Transparency in Policy Implementation**: Governments should provide clear justifications and evidence for counter-terrorism actions, enabling public scrutiny and accountability.

The misuse of counter-terrorism policies and practices poses significant risks to human rights, social cohesion, and public trust in law enforcement. By addressing the root causes of misuse, such as political exploitation, discriminatory practices, and lack of accountability, policymakers can ensure that counter-terrorism efforts are effective, equitable, and aligned with democratic principles.

A balanced approach that prioritizes transparency, oversight, and community engagement is essential for safeguarding both security and liberty in the fight against terrorism.

Double Standards in Global Politics:

The issue of double standards in global politics is a persistent challenge, particularly in the realm of counter-terrorism and international relations. Double standards refer to the inconsistent application of principles, where similar actions or behaviors are judged differently based on political interests, alliances, or ideological biases. In the context of terrorism and extremism, these double standards undermine the credibility of global efforts, exacerbate grievances, and hinder international cooperation. Understanding the origins, manifestations, and consequences of these double standards is essential for promoting fairness and effectiveness in global politics (Shanahan, 2016).

Selective Labelling of Terrorism:

One of the most glaring examples of double standards is the selective labeling of terrorism. Governments and international organizations often categorize violent acts as terrorism based on the identity of the perpetrators or their geopolitical interests, rather than on objective criteria. For instance, attacks by non-state actors from marginalized or opposition groups are more likely to be labeled as terrorism, while similar actions by state actors or allied groups are justified as legitimate defense or counter-insurgency (Chomsky, 2007).

This inconsistency is evident in how Western powers have historically supported militant groups that align with their geopolitical goals while condemning others as terrorists. During the Cold War, for example, the United States provided support to the Mujahideen in Afghanistan to counter Soviet influence, despite their use of violence against civilians. In contrast, groups with similar tactics but opposing political alignments were branded as terrorist organizations. Such practices reflect the politicization of the term "terrorism," which is often weaponized to delegitimize adversaries and justify interventions.

Unequal Responses to Similar Conflicts:

Double standards are also apparent in the unequal responses to similar conflicts or crises. International interventions are frequently determined by the strategic or economic interests of powerful nations rather than by consistent humanitarian principles. For example, the global response to terrorism in the Middle East has often been more aggressive and well-funded compared to responses in regions like Sub-Saharan Africa, despite the significant presence of extremist groups in both areas (Bahgat & Medina, 2013).

This disparity extends to the treatment of state-sponsored terrorism. Nations accused of supporting terrorism, such as Iran or North Korea, face severe sanctions and international isolation, while allies engaged in similar activities, such as Saudi Arabia's alleged support for extremist groups, often escape comparable scrutiny. This selective enforcement of counter-terrorism measures

reflects the influence of strategic alliances and economic dependencies, rather than a commitment to impartial justice.

Human Rights and Counter-Terrorism:

The application of double standards is particularly evident in the intersection of human rights and counter-terrorism. Many countries, particularly powerful states, advocate for human rights in their foreign policy rhetoric while overlooking or justifying abuses by allied regimes. For example, Western nations often criticize human rights violations in adversarial states while ignoring or downplaying similar violations by allies engaged in counter-terrorism operations.

This hypocrisy is evident in the global response to surveillance programs, drone strikes, and indefinite detentions conducted under the banner of counter-terrorism. While these practices are condemned when employed by authoritarian states, they are often justified or excused when carried out by democracies, undermining the universality of human rights standards (Deflem, 2010). Such double standards erode the moral authority of states advocating for human rights and fuel resentment among those who perceive these actions as unjust.

Impact on Global Counter-Terrorism Efforts:

Double standards in global politics have significant implications for counter-terrorism efforts. They create mistrust among nations, particularly in the Global South, where many perceive counter-terrorism policies as instruments of neo-imperialism or selective intervention. This mistrust hampers international cooperation, as countries are less likely to collaborate with states they perceive as acting in bad faith.

Moreover, the perception of bias and injustice exacerbates the grievances that drive radicalization. Communities targeted by counter-terrorism measures, particularly those perceived as discriminatory or unfair, are more likely to feel alienated and resentful. Extremist groups exploit these feelings, framing their narratives around the idea of double standards to justify their actions and recruit followers (Van den Bos, 2018).

The Role of International Organizations:

International organizations, such as the United Nations, have a critical role in addressing double standards by promoting consistent and impartial frameworks for combating terrorism and extremism. However, these organizations often struggle to overcome the influence of powerful member states, whose geopolitical interests shape decision-making processes.

For example, the United Nations has made efforts to create a unified definition of terrorism, but disagreements among member states about what constitutes terrorism have hindered progress. Similarly, international sanctions and resolutions are often unevenly applied, reflecting the priorities of dominant powers rather than objective criteria (Mahan & Griset, 2012).

Recommendations for Reducing Double Standards:

Addressing double standards in global politics requires concerted efforts at multiple levels:

1. **Establishing a Universal Definition of Terrorism**: Developing a clear and universally accepted definition of terrorism would reduce the politicization of the term and ensure consistent application across cases.

2. **Strengthening International Oversight**: Independent oversight mechanisms within international organizations can help mitigate the influence of powerful states and promote impartial decision-making.

3. **Promoting Inclusive Policies**: Counter-terrorism measures should be designed to address all forms of terrorism, regardless of the perpetrators' identities or political affiliations.

4. **Enhancing Transparency**: Governments and international organizations must provide clear justifications for their actions, enabling public scrutiny and accountability.

5. **Building Trust Through Dialogue**: Engaging with marginalized communities and addressing their grievances can reduce the perception of bias and foster cooperation in counter-terrorism efforts.

Double standards in global politics undermine the legitimacy and effectiveness of counter-terrorism efforts. By selectively applying principles and prioritizing geopolitical interests, these inconsistencies erode trust, exacerbate grievances, and hinder international cooperation. A commitment to impartiality, transparency, and inclusivity is essential for addressing these challenges and building a fair and effective global response to terrorism and extremism.

References:

1 Lake, D. A. (2002). Rational extremism: Understanding terrorism in the twenty-first century. *Dialogue IO*, *1*(1), 15-28.

2 Mahan, S., & Griset, P. L. (2012). Terrorism in perspective. Sage Publications.

3 Montasari, R. (2024). The impact of technology on radicalisation to violent extremism and terrorism in the contemporary security landscape. In Cyberspace, Cyberterrorism and the International Security in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: Threats, Assessment and Responses (pp. 109-133). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

4 Ravndal, J. A., & Bjørgo, T. (2018). Investigating terrorism from the extreme right: A review of past and present research. *Perspectives on Terrorism*, *12*(6), 5-22.

5 Lea, C., Ines, M., Juan, O., & Mabel, E. (2024). Terrorism in Focus: The Conceptual Challenges of Definition and Interpretation.

6 Borum, R. (2011). Radicalization into violent extremism II: A review of conceptual models and empirical research. *Journal of strategic security*, *4*(4), 37-62.

7 Combs, C. C. (2022). *Terrorism in the twenty-first century*. Routledge.

8 Van den Bos, K. (2018). *Why people radicalize: How unfairness judgments are used to fuel*

radical beliefs, extremist behaviors, and terrorism. Oxford University Press.

9   Hogg, M. A., Kruglanski, A., & Van den Bos, K. (2013). Uncertainty and the roots of extremism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *69*(3), 407-418.

10 Martin, G. (2020). Understanding terrorism: Challenges, perspectives, and issues.

11 Archetti, C. (2015). Terrorism, Communication and the Media. *Terrorism and Political Violence (London: Sage)*, 134-152.

12 Moghaddam, F. M. (2006). From the terrorists' point of view.

13 Busher, J., & Macklin, G. (2015). Interpreting "cumulative extremism": Six proposals for enhancing conceptual clarity. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *27*(5), 884-905.

14 Min, A. Unveiling the Mind of Terrorists: A Brief Qualitative Analysis on Criminal Profiling and Terrorism.

15 LaFree, G., Jensen, M. A., James, P. A., & Safer-Lichtenstein, A. (2018). Correlates of violent political extremism in the United States. *Criminology*, *56*(2), 233-268.

16 Deflem, M. (2010). *The policing of terrorism: Organizational and global perspectives*. Routledge.