

The Theoretical Foundations of Socialist Terrorism

by

Robert D. McKellar

M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1995

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of  
Political Science

© Robert D. McKellar 1995

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

April 1995

All rights reserved. This work may not be  
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy  
or other means, without permission of the author

APPROVAL

Name: Robert D. McKellar

Degree: Master of Arts

Title of Thesis: The Theoretical Foundations of Socialist Terrorism

Examining Committee:

Chair: Michael Howlett

David Laycock  
Senior Supervisor  
Professor of Political Science

Alberto Ciria  
Professor of Political Science

Alan Whitehorn  
External Examiner  
Visiting Chair, Institute for the Humanities  
From the Department of Politics and History  
Royal Military College, Kingston

Date Approved:

April 11/95

## PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

### Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Theoretical Foundations of Socialist Terrorism

---

---

---

---

**Author:**                     

(signature)

Robert Duncan McKellar

(name)

April 11, 95

(date)

## Abstract

This essay derives from the premise that socialist terrorism has theoretical bases in revolutionary socialist theory which have provided guidelines and rationales for socialist terrorist activity, such as that conducted by the Red Brigades in Italy, or the Red Army Faction in Germany. The objective of this enquiry is to discern and elucidate these theoretical bases. In so doing the analysis will shed light upon some of the common ideas and concepts which underlie many modern socialist terrorist movements.

The enquiry will consist of three chapters. The first two will constitute the theoretical analysis, drawing from revolutionary socialist thought those elements which have provided terrorists with rationales for terrorist action. This component will confine itself primarily to revolutionary anarchism, and Marxism-Leninism. Chapter One will examine the efficacy of terrorism in contributing to the socialist effort to achieve revolution.

Chapter Two will consider the ethical justifications for terrorism within revolutionary socialist thought. This chapter will construct a utilitarian argument justifying terrorism on the basis of a moral critique of the capitalist state and society. Terrorism will be portrayed as the lesser of two evils, which becomes an ethically sound weapon when employed towards the destruction of an extremely immoral establishment.

The third chapter will be a comparative case study, examining three modern socialist terrorist groups in an effort to illustrate the influence of the theory discussed in the first two chapters on the thought and behavior of modern terrorists. The cases will include the

Red Brigades of Italy, the Red Army Faction of Germany, and Direct Action of France.

The conclusion will point out some of the ways in which this analysis could be expanded in future study. A framework for the analysis of terrorist theory in general is presented, based on the organization of the preceding chapters. Finally, the future prospects of both socialism and socialist terrorism will be briefly considered.

### Acknowledgements

I extend my gratitude to all those who supported me in the process of writing this thesis, either directly or indirectly. In particular I would like to thank my supervisors, Professor David Laycock and Professor Alberto Ciria, for their generous guidance throughout this endeavour. As well, I would like to thank my mother, Diane McKellar, for, among other things, providing a place to live throughout my education, and my father, Bruce McKellar, for his support at key points in this endeavour.

## Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Contents	vi
 Introduction and Background	 1
I. General Introduction	1
II. General Background	9
1. Anarchism	9
2. Marxism	12
 Chapter I, Efficacy	 16
I. Introduction, The Revolution	16
II. Terrorism as a Means of Destruction	19
1. Violence as a Necessity	19
2. Terrorism's Destructive Capacity	22
III. Terrorism's Creative Role	27
1. Mass Participation, Inspiration and Organization	28
2. Terrorism's Creative Capacity	33
IV. Conclusion	46
 Chapter II, Ethical Justifications	 47
I. Introduction	47
II. Alienation	50
1.a. The State: Laws are Imposed without Consent	53
1.b. Dehumanization from Proliferation of Laws	60
2. Alienation in Capitalist Society	63
2.a. Intellectual Hegemony	63
2.b. Alienation in Economic Relations	72
3. Conclusions	80
III. Exploitation	80
1. The State	81
2. Society	84
3. Conclusions	90
IV. Violence	92
V. Conclusions of the Moral Critique	98
 Chapter III, Case Study	 99
I. Introduction and Background	99
II. Background	101
III. Aims	106
1. Red Brigades	107
2. Red Army Faction	112
3. Direct Action	114
4. Conclusions	116
IV. Reasons for Adopting Violent Means	116
1. Red Brigades	117

2. Red Army Faction	120
3. Direct Action	121
4. Conclusions	123
V. Strategy	123
1. Red Brigades	124
2. Red Army Faction	128
3. Direct Action	131
4. Conclusions	134
VI. Ethical Criticism	134
1. Red Brigades	135
2. Red Army Faction	140
3. Direct Action	145
VII. Conclusions	150
Conclusions	152
I. Summary	152
II. Future Contributions	154
III. Theoretical Framework	156
IV. Future Prospects	160
Endnotes	164
Bibliography	179

## Introduction and Background

### I. General Introduction

Political, anti-state terrorism is a phenomenon worthy of consideration for several reasons. Most obviously, it results in loss of life, and therefore human tragedy. Second, as it is doubtful that most terrorists kill simply because they take pleasure in killing, terrorism represents a profound, if often minority, perception of severe social and political ailments. Terrorism thus represents social discord, and raises the question of whether this discord stems from real injustices or inadequacies which the political leadership will not, or cannot, address.

Equally significant, terrorism in itself raises some fundamental issues concerning the values upon which a polity is founded. Political violence conducted by a non-state actor forces one to ask such questions as: should the state be the sole repository of legitimate force? Do the masses have an obligation as citizens to obey authority? Is authority itself a valid concept? These issues and similar ones raised by contemplation of terrorist acts will not be the subject of discussion here. Nonetheless, terrorism's power to stir such fundamental societal introspection adds to its significance as a focus of study.

Of the numerous varieties of terrorism, perhaps none provokes such questioning so forcefully as socialist terrorism, that which seeks to move society towards the ends defined within revolutionary socialist theory: revolution and eventual establishment of a stateless, communist or collectivist society (this conception would exclude left-wing

national liberation groups, whose primary aim is often national independence). Examples of such activity include the operations of the Japanese Red Army, the Red Army Faction in Germany, and the Red Brigades in Italy. This variety offers a unique challenge to the analyst. Socialist terrorism most often occurs in the Western industrial democracies, especially Western Europe. These countries have acquired the highest material standards of living in the world, and appear to be based on the consent of the governed more than any other current political system.

Socialist terrorism thus poses a challenging puzzle: it aims to dismantle the very structures, capitalism and liberal democracy, which have resulted in a standard of living that many countries can only dream about. Looking at only objective economic and political circumstances in the target countries is, then, by itself inadequate for any broader explanation of these groups' behavior. Some reference to the subjective outlooks and theoretical perspectives underlying this phenomenon is vital to a comprehensive understanding.

Examinations of the theory which underlies socialist terrorism are in fact uncommon in the mainstream literature on the wider phenomenon of socialist terrorism or terrorism in general. Yonah Alexander and Robert Kilmarx, two mainstream writers on the subject, shrug aside such a focus by labeling socialist terrorists "imitators in the Western industrialized societies" of liberation movements in developing countries.(1) As Richard Shultz and Stephan Sloan explain, quoting Vestermark, "[T]he usefulness of the literature on terrorism is limited by its overemphasis on `defining new and exotic terrorist possibilities, and in exploring the various legal and philosophical dilemmas in

defining the "terrorist"...Such displays implicitly affirm how "terrible" the problem of terrorism really is'."(2) The theoretical outlook which motivates socialist terrorism has thus not been sufficiently addressed in efforts to explain the phenomenon in general.

There are, however, comprehensive examinations of theory in some of the more thorough studies of particular terrorist groups. Several of these have been included in the case study in Chapter Three of this analysis. For example, Joanne Wright conducts a detailed examination of the theoretical influences on the Red Army Faction in Germany and the Irish Republican Army in her book, *TERRORIST PROPAGANDA* (1991). Similarly, Francois Furet et.al. include a thorough comparative account of the theoretical perspectives of the Red Brigades in Italy and the German Red Army Faction in *TERRORISME ET DEMOCRATIE* (1985). Another excellent analysis of terrorist theory in a case study comes from Luigi Manconi's chapter in *THE RED BRIGADES AND LEFT-WING TERRORISM IN ITALY* (Raimondo Cantanzaro,ed.1991).

It is clear, then, that terrorist theory is regarded by some analysts as having an important role in the explanation of particular periods of terrorist phenomenon. This analysis will attempt to move from the level of the case study in the examination of theory to the level of the general phenomenon of socialist terrorism. The objective of this analysis is, therefore, to elucidate the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism. The analysis begins with the hypothesis, then, that there are both practical and ethical rationales in revolutionary socialist thought which have provided terrorists with the theoretical foundations of this form of political struggle.

## 1. Definition

The operational definition of terrorism in this study is constructed on the basis of one already established which embodies at least some characteristics common to many notions of terrorism. This was devised by the ITERATE Project (International Terrorism: Attributes of Terrorist Events) of the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research in Ann Arbor. According to this definition, terrorism is:

...the use, or threat of use, of anxiety-inducing extra-normal violence for political purpose by any individual or group, whether acting for or in opposition to established governmental authority, when such action is intended to influence the attitudes and behavior of a target group wider than the immediate victims...(3)

This definition makes several important points. First, terrorism involves actual or threatened violence. Second, it does not involve violence for the sake of destruction, but as a psychological tool towards a political end. Third, this violence is not normal within the society or environment in which it is conducted. It is an anomaly, and as such its psychological impact is amplified. Fourth, terrorism can be applied either for or against the state. Finally, while the victims of terrorism can be its targets, this is not necessarily the case. Because terrorism is a psychological weapon, the targets of terrorist activity are not necessarily those killed or injured by it, but those who learn of the terrorist acts, and in turn suffer chronic anxiety, or terror, which will cause them to alter their behavior in some way which is amenable to the political interests of the terrorist movement.

This definition must still be modified to render it germane to socialist terrorism. Amending the original borrowed definition, socialist terrorism can be identified as the use or threat of anxiety-

inducing extra-normal violence by an individual or group operating outside established legal boundaries for the purpose of bringing about a fundamental change in the purpose and structure of the state. Such action is intended to influence the attitudes and behavior of a target group wider than the immediate victims in such a way as to increase the probability of achieving the end of revolutionary anti-capitalist political change. "Terrorism" and "socialist terrorism" will be used interchangeably in the analysis.

## 2. Approach and Method

The primary aim of the analysis is to elucidate the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism. This will involve an examination of relevant areas of theory, to draw from them those elements which provide these foundations. The selection of the theoretical material is based on the following consideration.

As the subject is socialist terrorism, the material will consist of socialist theory, but the selection can be narrowed further, as only those perspectives which advocate violent change are relevant. The principal theoretical perspectives considered are revolutionary anarchism and Marxism, the latter including Lenin's writings and limited input by modern Marxists. Together, these comprise revolutionary socialism. As they have much in common, they will be examined through a comparative approach which will minimize redundancy but allow for explanations of the major differences between the two ideologies. The focus will not extend to recent variations of revolutionary socialism, guerrilla warfare theory, or related areas of philosophy, such as the ideas of Jean-Paul Sartre and Frantz Fanon. An adequate basis for an

explanation of the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism can be found within Marxism and anarchism.

Given that revolutionary socialism was not devised specifically as a theory of terrorism, it contains much that is not relevant to the enquiry. Two parameters will guide the selection of pertinent material from the wider range of thought: the efficacy of, and ethical justifications for, terrorism. Thus, only those elements of the wider theories relevant to either of these aspects will be addressed.

The analysis must to some degree take the perspective of a socialist terrorist in the elucidation of the theoretical bases for terrorism in socialist thought. This is necessary because several key socialist theorists, especially in the Marxist stream, including Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Leon Trotsky, and even V.I. Lenin were ambiguous on the issue of terrorism. There are forceful arguments to be found in Marxist writings both for and against the use of this form of struggle. For example, Marx states, in a letter to Engels regarding the actions of Irish Fenian terrorists:

The last exploit of the Fenians...was a very stupid thing. The London masses, who have shown great sympathy for Ireland, will be made wild by it and driven into the hands of the government party...There is always a kind of fatality about such a secret, melodramatic sort of conspiracy.  
(4)

In contrast, Engels writes concerning the situation in Russia in 1885:

It is one of those exceptional circumstances when a handful of people can succeed in making a revolution...can liberate with one action, insignificant in itself, explosive forces which will subsequently be impossible to contain. And if ever the...vision of using a small explosion to shock a whole society had any foundation, then it is Petersburg. (5)

It appears as though faith in terrorism varied according to the specific situation. Nonetheless, some analysts, such as Leonard Weinberg and Paul Davis, believe that on balance the arguments, in Marxist thought at least, were against terrorism,(6) and this perspective is not unjustified. The indisputable fact remains, however, that socialist terrorism has been a widespread phenomenon, conducted by people familiar with socialist theory and committed to revolution. Therefore, it is clear that widely divergent interpretations of socialist theory exist on this issue, and no strong claim to theoretical purity is possible in searching for theoretical rationales for terrorism in socialist texts, especially of the Marxist stream.

In order to discern what terrorists regard as the theoretical bases for their behavior, we cannot, then, rely on a strict interpretation of the socialist texts, but must place ourselves to some extent in the minds of those who have utilized socialist theory as guidelines for terrorist action. In some cases this may result in minor transgressions from theoretical purity, if such a thing exists, but the result will be a more accurate elucidation of the theoretical rationales underlying the behavior of socialist terrorists. Obvious contradictions which arise between the terrorist interpretation and the foundational theory will receive some discussion all the same.

### 3. Structure

The analysis will proceed as follows. First, still within the introduction, a brief background on anarchism and Marxism will be provided. The two theoretical chapters will follow. The first will consider the contribution of revolutionary socialism to defining the

efficacy of terrorism in the socialist struggle. This will begin by describing the aim towards which terrorism is to be applied, the revolution to overthrow the capitalist state. The efficacy of terrorism in achieving this end will be considered in two components. The first will establish that the revolution can only be brought about by destruction of the old order, and then will examine terrorism's capacity to contribute to this destruction. The second component will establish that the revolution must be conducted by the efforts of the masses, and that the masses must be inspired and organized in these efforts. It will then illustrate terrorism's capacity to assist in this inspiration and guidance. The efficacy of terrorism within socialist thought will thus be established through an explanation of both its destructive and creative roles in the revolutionary effort.

The second chapter will examine the ethical justifications for terrorism. This chapter will begin with the premise that terrorism is a cruel weapon, and cannot be easily justified given the humanitarian tradition within socialism. It will then present an ends-means rationalization for terrorism, arguing that while terrorism is a cruel endeavour, when applied against such an immoral establishment as the capitalist state, it becomes a moral pursuit. This argument thus rests on a moral critique of the state and capitalism, divided into three components: alienation, exploitation, and violence.

The final chapter will be a comparative case study which illustrates the influence of the theoretical foundations of terrorism in socialist thought on modern terrorist movements. Three cases will be examined: the Red Brigades of Italy during the 1970's and 1980's, the Red Army Faction of Germany in approximately the same period, and Direct Action of France

in the 1980's. The Red Brigades will be the central case, while the other two will be included to provide an illustration of the major commonalities and divergences in the theories of modern socialist terrorist groups. The conclusion will offer an outline of a theoretical framework for the study of terrorist theory based on the organization of this analysis, and will consider the future of political violence inspired by socialist thought.

## II. General Background

### 1. Anarchism

Anarchism's roots can be traced to various strands of moral philosophy of the Ancient period and through the Middle Ages. Yet the nineteenth century was the time in which anarchism became a coherent political theory. Most of the foundational writings of anarchism were completed in this period, by theorists including such notables as Pierre Proudhon, Mikhail Bakunin, and Peter Kropotkin, and the first explicitly anarchist movements were also born in that century. Anarchist thought, through its inherent aversion to rigid structure, has never resulted in the establishment of a political party, which would be antithetical to anarchist principles. Hence, anarchism has not tied its existence to the fortunes of any single organization.(7) It has thus retained the capacity to endure periods of low popularity, and has remained an influence in Western political thought, and a source of inspiration and guidance for movements of protest even to the current decade. Several types of anarchism exist, but the most well developed and influential stream, and the one pertinent to this analysis, has been revolutionary

collectivist and communist anarchism,(8) as devised in particular by Proudhon, Bakunin and Kropotkin.

The basic premise of anarchism is that if left free from domination by higher authority, people have the inherent capacity to form the optimal political community for the realization of human potential and freedom. This would be based on voluntary cooperation, without any coercive authority. A larger society would become a loose federation of such communities, themselves being voluntary federations between free and equal individuals.(9) Following this premise, the state and government authority are unnecessary and evil, unnecessary because people have the capacity to devise optimal forms of cooperation without authoritative intervention; and evil because the state becomes a hindrance to the establishment of these optimal forms.

But the state is not regarded merely as an error, or an inanimate structure to be overcome on the path to freedom. The state is also an evil because it inevitably leads to excessive and arbitrary coercion. Anarchism turns the argument of the social contract theorists on its head. Early liberal contract theorists argued that people could not be trusted to rule themselves without infringing on each other's rights and safety, and thus had to cede at least some liberty to a higher ruling body with a coercive capacity to enforce rules in society. The anarchist would reply that people cannot be trusted to rule other people. If even some possibility exists for infringement upon rights between people who are free and equal, then how much greater the danger would be if some are actually granted the right and power of this infringement, while others are not. Inevitably, it is argued, this would lead to arbitrary

and cruel abuse of that power. Thus, Pierre Proudhon characterized government in this way:

To be GOVERNED is to be watched, inspected,  
spied on, regulated, indoctrinated, preached  
at, controlled...exploited...fined, harassed,  
vilified, beaten up ...judged, condemned,  
imprisoned, shot...dishonored.(10)

And all of this is committed by people who are in no significant sense superior to the people whom they are intended to govern. Thus, according to anarchists, "Government of man by man is slavery,"(11) and as such is the manifestation of severe injustice, indeed evil.

The anarchist critique does not stop at the state, but, like Marxism, extends to the predominant mode of economic interaction in industrial societies, capitalism. This critique is similar to that of Marxists, so it will be dealt with only briefly here. In very broad terms, the argument is that the accumulation of property, specifically private ownership of the means of production, leads to exploitation of the labourer by the non-productive owner. The labourer is dependent on the owner for the means to survive, and must endure low wages and poor living conditions, while the owner reaps the profits and lives in increasing luxury. Woodcock writes, "Hence, property [referring to capitalist ownership] is incompatible with justice, since in practice it brings about the exclusion of the majority of producers from their equal rights to the fruits of social work."(12)

Anarchism's evaluation of the established political-economic order is emphatically summarized in Bakunin's words: the capitalist state "...is like a vast slaughterhouse and an enormous cemetery, where under the shadow and the pretext of this abstraction all the best aspirations, all the living forces of a country, are sanctimoniously immolated and

interred.'"(13) To break human existence free from these cruel constraints, and to achieve the free and equal voluntary society, requires the dissolution of the state and all subsidiary forms of authority.

Unlike Marxism, anarchism does not perceive the dissolution of the state and capitalism to be inevitable, nor is this dissolution destined to take a particular form, such as the proletarian revolution. But there are certain commonalities within anarchist thought as to how people can overcome the state: as Woodcock writes, "its [anarchism's] method is always that of social rebellion, violent or otherwise.'"(14) In particular, violent insurrection aimed at the destruction of the state is often advocated. In the words of Bakunin:

Let us put our faith in the eternal spirit which destroys and annihilates only because it is the unsearchable and eternally creative source of all life. The urge to destroy is also a creative urge.(15)

## 2. Marxism

Like anarchism, some of Marx's socialist ideas have precedents as far back as the Ancient era, but, again, the period in which this stream of thought became a unified ideology was the 1800's, with the writings of Karl Marx, and to a lesser extent Friedrich Engels. Marx's theory was based on his interpretation of Hegelian philosophy, the notion of the evolution of spirituality and knowledge of both people and God through the process of the dialectic, or conflict and eventual synthesis between apparent opposites. Marx applied Hegel's philosophy to a materialist view of human evolution. The opposites in the dialectic thus became conflicting economic classes, which throughout history struggled for power. These struggles would result in new opposing classes and the

process would continue until a final stage of class struggle had been reached, after which the Hegelian synthesis would be achieved: class divisions would dissolve, and conflict in human society would be transformed into cooperation, freedom and equality.

Marx's ideas formed the basis of much subsequent socialist thinking. Numerous theorists, perhaps most notably Lenin, Trotsky, and Mao, modified Marx's ideas to fit particular cultural and material circumstances. Through these transformations Marxism has, more significantly than anarchism, remained a force in political thought since its inception.

To most who seek to apply socialist ideas, the wider philosophy of Marx's thinking is often secondary to the critical evaluation of modern industrial society, and the prescriptions for changing it. Marxism focuses on the same two sources of social ailments as does anarchism, the state and capitalism, but the order of importance is reversed. Capitalism is the central concern, while the state is a concern through its facilitation of the capitalist system.

The Marxist critique of capitalism is similar to that of anarchism, but more detailed and explicit. As with anarchism the critique begins by pointing out that within capitalism the proletarian class is exploited and dominated by another, the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie are the owners of the means of production, and the proletariat are compelled to work for them at subsistence wages, as they themselves own no means to produce the necessities of life. The bourgeoisie are driven by what Tucker calls the "capitalist profit mania"(16) which in turn is the result of the "relentless pressure of the competitive struggle"(17) with

other capitalists. The bourgeoisie thus reap the surplus value from the work of the proletariat.

The proletariat, on the other hand, do not only suffer through low wages which permit only the most meagre existence; they are also subjected to the dehumanizing effects of industrial labour. Under the industrial system of mass production, the wage labourer is, as Tucker writes, "...reduced to a mere detail worker bound down to a single mindless operation endlessly repeated." (18) As Marx puts it, the worker "...becomes an appendage of the machine," (19) losing their higher human qualities to the agonizingly mindless work, alienated both from their labour and from their humanity, manifested in their intelligence and creativity.

The state in capitalist societies is also criticized by Marxists, though for reasons differing in significant ways from the anarchist critique. The state is not regarded as an entity separate from the class structure of society, as it is in liberal theory. To Marxists, the state is seen as a tool of the bourgeoisie, and its laws and powers are applied to assist that class in repressing the workers. Indeed, capitalism could not exist without the help of the state, as its power of coercion is fundamental to sustaining the great imbalance in material conditions between the classes. As Marx writes, "The state is nothing more than a machine for the oppression of one class by another." (20) It is the capitalist state, existing for capitalism, and therefore it is as unjust as the capitalist mode of production itself.

The Marxist prescription for changing this unjust system is, unlike that of anarchism, as much a prophecy of change as a prescription. It is regarded as inevitable that, as in the past, the exploited class will

seek an end to its enslavement and rise up and destroy the establishment in a mass based revolution. Marx was most committed to this idea of inevitable change, but his later followers, in particular Lenin, saw the necessity of a large role to be played in consciously bringing about the revolution, including, as the anarchists advocate, violent anti-state insurrection. Regardless of the issue of the inherent inevitability of change, the commonality with anarchism is that change will be the result of violent conflict between classes. As Marx writes:

In depicting the most general phases of the development of the proletariat, we traced the more or less veiled civil war, raging within existing society, up to the point where the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat.(21)

The analysis can now turn to a consideration of how these fundamental tenets of revolutionary socialist thought contribute to the theoretical definition of the efficacy and ethical justifications for terrorism.

## Chapter One, Efficacy

### I. Introduction, The Revolution

An examination of revolutionary socialism's theoretical perspective on the efficacy of terrorism must begin by delineating the aims of revolutionary socialism, as terrorism's efficacy lies in its capacity to increase the probability of achieving them. The ends of both the Marxist and anarchist perspectives, the two streams of revolutionary socialism, are a violent revolution to overthrow the existing capitalist, statist establishment, followed by the creation of a just and free society.

It is the first of these which terrorism is applied towards achieving, and in broad terms it is the same goal in each case. Kropotkin aptly summarizes this aim: it is "...the demolition by violence of the established forms of property, the destruction of castes [or classes], the rapid transformation of received ideas about morality,"(1) only after which the new and just society can freely develop. The revolution thus entails the destruction of the established constraints on the creation of a better socio-political order. While this broad aim is common to both ideologies, important divergences should be noted.

First, anarchism's conception of the revolution is less deterministic than that of Marxism. Marxists argue that the revolution is the result of historical forces, and will inevitably come to pass. Furthermore, the next revolution will be the last, as it "...does away not simply with this or that specific form of the division of labour, but with all forms, and so with bondage as such."(2) Anarchists, on the other hand, have no solid notion of the inevitability of progress. As

Miller writes of Proudhon and Bakunin, "both were aware of retrogression in history, and neither thought in terms of a definitive resolution of the contradictions which have hitherto provoked change." (3) Revolutions are seen as necessary for progress, but one great, final revolution is not regarded as inevitable.

Another point of divergence is the relative importance of various classes in the revolutionary effort. Marxism insists, as Marx writes, that "Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class." (4) The peasantry have no significant role, and what Marx called the "social scum," or the criminal elements and the permanently unemployed, are more potentially tools of the bourgeois reactionaries than they are part of the revolution. (5) The anarchists, however, see a significant role for all disadvantaged classes, including the "social scum." (6) Bakunin argues that "Only a wide-sweeping revolution embracing both the city workers and peasants would be sufficiently strong to overthrow and break the organized power of the state." (7) This divergence between anarchism and Marxism has been attenuated by the contributions of several Third World socialists, in particular Mao, but between more classical Marxists and anarchists, the divergence remains.

The final divergence, though it concerns the immediate post-revolutionary situation and hence is not directly related to the use of terrorism as a means towards initiating the revolution, is crucial to an understanding of the differences between anarchism and Marxism. This concerns the question of establishing a transitional authority, or in Marxist terms a dictatorship of the proletariat, capable, as Lenin writes, of "...crushing the inevitable and desperate resistance of the

bourgeoisie, and of organizing all the working and exploited people for the new economic system.'"(8) There are differences between Lenin's and Marx's conceptions of the dictatorship of the proletariat: Lenin's was far more authoritarian and rigid than Marx's. Nonetheless, some degree of organized authority, while eventually to wither through lack of a *raison d'être*, is regarded within the wider rubric of Marxist thought as necessary for a temporary period after the initial destruction of the capitalist system.

Anarchists find this notion reprehensible. While Marxists' primary concern is capitalism, anarchists are concerned even more with the evils of coercive authority. Bakunin summarizes the anarchist perspective of the dictatorship of the proletariat as follows: "One can well see how, beneath all the democratic and socialist phrases of Mr. Marx's programme, there survives in his State everything that contributes to the truly despotic and brutal nature of all States, whatever their forms of government..."(9) The anarchists are in agreement with the intended end of Marxism, the stateless society based on equality and justice, but anarchists would rather see authority dissolve entirely, to create a situation in which people's natural inclination towards social cooperation can eventually create the optimal society, than risk the perils of establishing a coercive body capable of imposing such order.

While these significant divergences do exist, they do not affect the fundamental similarity that permits these two perspectives to be considered as a wider whole, the fact that both aim for a violent, mass-based revolution against the state and capitalism to establish a society in which human creative potential can develop freely. Terrorism is one of the means to achieve this aim, and there are two wider arguments for

the application of terrorism within the revolutionary socialist perspective. The first stems from the necessity of violence in achieving revolutionary change, and is based on terrorism's destructive potential. The second, conversely, arises from terrorism's creative capacity, focusing on its application as a means of inspiring and mobilizing the masses towards revolt. Both arguments are found in each perspective of revolutionary socialism, with important variations.

## II. Terrorism as a Means of Destruction

The argument for terrorism's efficacy stemming from its destructive capacity can be briefly summarized. The eradication of the established institutions that form the bases of oppression and injustice, specifically the state and capitalism, along with their underlying social values, can only be accomplished through violent means, for reasons that will be explained. Terrorism is a violent means, capable of weakening both established institutions and especially attitudes, and thus has a fundamental role in the revolutionary effort. This line of reasoning, then, constitutes the first argument for terrorism's efficacy as defined within the revolutionary socialist tradition. To begin the argument, the necessity of violence in achieving revolutionary change will first be established, and then terrorism's destructive potential will be considered.

### 1. Violence as a Necessity

The argument for the necessity of violence encompasses two lines of reasoning. First, the eradication of the state and capitalism cannot be achieved through peaceful means. Anarchists hold that even the most

viable peaceful recourse, effecting change within the legal parameters of the capitalist state, in particular gaining power through electoral politics and then implementing change as law, will only result in a weakening of the revolutionary movement. As the anarchist theorist, Emma Goldman, explains, "The means employed become, through individual habit and social practice, part and parcel of the final purpose...presently the means and ends become identical.'"(10) To use the legal power of the capitalist state, then, to achieve the eradication of that structure will inevitably result in the dilution of the revolutionary aims.

Marxists, too, have contended that if applied as the sole means of change, democratic efforts are "...really helping capitalists to retain their superior position, for they lead the working class to renounce the necessity for radical action and inhibit the growth of class consciousness.'"(11) Workers place all their faith in a system devised and in many ways controlled by the bourgeoisie.

However, democratic agitation does have a role in the Marxist revolution: democratic means are regarded as one way to facilitate the organization of the workers, thus creating a solid class consciousness. As Marx writes, "While these [democratic workers] movements presuppose a certain degree of previous organization, they are in turn equally a means of developing this organization.'"(12) Thus, Marxists do see a role for peaceful means in setting up the conditions for the eventual and necessarily violent clash.

Aside from democratic, legal means, even peaceful efforts which lay outside official politics, such as peaceful demonstrations or civil disobedience, cannot succeed, as the ruling class will never give up its economic advantages without a fight. Bakunin poses the matter

rhetorically: "Was there ever, at any period, or in any country, a single example of a privileged and dominant class which granted concessions freely... without being driven to it by force or fear?"(13) No amount of peaceful persuasion, then, can bring real change.

Again, Marxists would argue that if such efforts can have any benefit, then they should be added to the repertoire of means. Even so, as Marx writes, one of the primary aims of the revolutionary effort must be to "...destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of, individual property;"(14) in other words, remove the basis of established economic interests within the capitalist state, thereby allowing change to ensue. Ultimately, then, the violent eradication of the state and capitalism is the only means to change.

There is a second, even stronger, argument for the use of violence in the revolutionary effort: violence must be a fundamental ingredient because any serious threat to the establishment is certain to be met with a very violent reaction. If the revolutionary effort is not prepared to wage a campaign of offensive violence against the state and property, it will itself be destroyed.

This argument emphasizes the coercive capacity and practice of the capitalist state. The state is regarded as entirely an instrument of subjugation of the lower classes, through both violent coercion and manipulation through deception. It is very well equipped for the task of beating down its opponents. As Marx and Engels write, "[T]he forces opposed to you [addressing revolutionaries] have all the advantages of organization, discipline, and habitual authority."(15) This capacity will inevitably be turned against any serious challenge to the establishment, for the capitalist state, based as it is upon the

material interests of the ruling classes, will not allow its existence as such to be threatened. Thus, as Lenin writes, when the revolutionary effort gains momentum, and the ruling classes realize their predicament, the forces of reaction will fight "...with the desperation of the doomed.'"(16) So "to conceal from the masses the necessity for a desperate, sanguinary war of extermination as the immediate task of future revolutionary action means deceiving both ourselves and the people.'"(17) Violence is necessary, then, not only because peaceful efforts are ineffective, but because the existence of the revolutionary movement depends on it.

The necessity of violence in the revolution is established. To summarize, instead of seeking incremental change within the established institutional structure, the revolution must attack every foundation upon which the capitalist state rests. "Revolution," writes Bakunin, "means war, and that implies the destruction of men and things.'"(18) It is now possible to examine terrorism's capacity to bring about this destruction, thereby sealing the first argument in revolutionary socialism for the efficacy of terrorism: if the revolution requires the violent dissolution of the social structures of the capitalist state, and terrorism can contribute to this destruction, then it is indeed an efficacious means towards fulfilling the revolutionary aims.

## 2. Terrorism's Destructive Capacity

Direct references to terrorism do not occur often in anarchist and Marxist writings, perhaps as a result of the negative connotations which the word was acquiring in the eyes of those exposed to the establishment's press even in the time of the foundational theorists.

However, this does not prevent our discerning in these perspectives an outlook on the destructive potential of terrorism, because references to the psychological value of certain forms of violence appear frequently. Since the psychological effect of violence constitutes the central characteristic of terrorism, it is thus possible to discern indirect references to terrorism in the theoretical literature, and this is the rationale which socialist terrorists utilize for their violent activities. The destructive potential of terrorism as regarded in the Western radical tradition can be discerned both in its capacity to weaken the social foundation of the capitalist state, and in its capacity to inflict injury upon the state's coercive apparatus, which thereby hinders the anticipated reactionary backlash.

Terrorism weakens the social foundation of the establishment in two ways. First, terrorist acts committed against state targets undermine the authority of the state, by causing it to lose credibility in the eyes of the masses. This is one aspect of what anarchists call "propaganda of the deed," a phrase devised by Italian anarchists in the 1870's.(19) The phrase connotes the use of violent action against targets symbolic of state authority, to communicate the message of the revolutionary struggle to the masses. In the later 1800's, attacks of this kind were directed especially against heads of state, who both embodied the traditions which upheld upper class society, and symbolized the state's authoritarian power. More will be said on this concept when discussing terrorism's role in inspiring the masses, the creative aspect of propaganda by the deed. This component focuses on the destructive aspect of this tactic.

When the masses see agents or property of the state destroyed by small groups of dedicated individuals, through actions such as assassination or sabotage, the notion of the state as omnipotent rapidly withers. The masses then become less inclined to bend to the will of the state. Kropotkin describes the effects of such actions as follows:

The old order, supported by the police, the magistrates, the gendarmes and the soldiers, appeared unshakable...But soon it became apparent that the old order has not the force one had supposed. One courageous act has sufficed to upset...the entire government machinery, to make the colossus tremble.(20)

The general resignation to the state's power is questioned as the image of the "colossus" fades. People are not so inclined to lend their obedience to a fallible entity, to an organization shown to be unworthy of the masses' awe. Obedience and acquiescence is thus not so readily given, and the authority vital to the state's cohesion and thus its very existence declines.

The second way in which terrorist acts weaken the establishment's social foundations concerns specifically the social cohesion of the ruling class. As attacks against the establishment intensify, the ruling class will experience severe anxiety arising from both fear for their own physical and material security, and through having the credibility of their elite status questioned so dramatically. This situation will result in two divergent streams of sentiment among the ruling class. One will either have succumbed to the fear and will seek to appease the revolutionary threat in the interests of their safety, or else will have been forced into introspection and decided that the establishment is indeed not entirely just.

The other stream will cling with the "desperation of the doomed" to the old order, incapable of facing the harsh realities that the revolutionary attacks invite them to ponder, and seeing their salvation only in the destruction of the revolutionaries. The result, as Kropotkin states, is that "the general disintegration penetrates into the government, the ruling classes, the privileged..." and thus, "the unity of the government and the privileged class is broken." (21) Once the interests upon which the establishment is founded begin to diverge, the established social order becomes fragile, and its eventual destruction is facilitated.

Creating a divergence of interests within the ruling class while weakening the state's authority contributes to the disintegration of the social foundations of the establishment. This divergence of interests also shatters consensus on the issue of how to deal with the revolution, which incapacitates some of the coercive capacity of the state in its reactionary backlash. Yet more direct mechanisms through which terrorism weakens the state's coercive capacity deserve attention as well.

One is that terrorist actions demoralize the lower level troops of the state military. These troops are often composed of members of the same classes on behalf of which the revolution is being waged, and thus begin the counter-revolutionary effort at a psychological disadvantage. This disadvantage can be built upon, in Lenin's words, by "...the display of energy and strength in the first insurgent actions, demoralization of the troops by desperately daring attacks." (22) When the members of these forces, already lacking a strong will to fight, view the violent tenacity of the anti-state effort, and experience a sense of vulnerability in the face of the surprise tactics

characteristic of terrorism, their willingness to engage in a "sanguinary war of extermination"(23) against the revolution begins to crack. The very people that hold the weapons to be used in the reactionary effort are thus psychologically weakened, and the reaction loses force accordingly.

Lenin also suggested the assassination of military commanders as a more specific tactic for reducing the force of the reactionary onslaught. While the killing of heads of state was a popular anarchist tactic in the late 1800's (stemming from the notion of propaganda by the deed), it was conducted primarily in efforts to discredit the state and inspire the masses to revolt. The assassination of commanders has a more direct impact on the capacity of the state to resist, especially when combined with a wider effort to undermine the unity of the state forces. As Lenin writes, "We must proclaim...the need for a bold offensive and armed attack, the necessity at such times of exterminating the persons in command of the enemy and of a most energetic fight for the wavering troops."(24) Such a tactic can further demoralize the lower level troops, but it would also place the command in a condition of chronic anxiety, with each high level officer wondering when they would become the next target of the terrorists. Demoralization would thus occur at all levels of the state forces, and the reactionary capacity would be weakened by disunity and anxiety among decision-makers.

It is clear, then, that terrorism is regarded in revolutionary socialism as having efficacy by virtue of its destructive capacity. Terrorist acts weaken both the social foundations of the established order, and the reactionary capacity of the state. Revolutionary success

through the destruction of the old order is thus facilitated by terrorism.

### III. Terrorism's Creative Role

The argument for terrorism's creative capacity focuses on terrorism's capacity to inspire and organize the masses to revolt against the established order. We can begin by asking how a tool of conflict whose central characteristic is the imposition of chronic anxiety on a target populace can have any creative capacity. Is it not purely a weapon to be wielded in the effort to weaken enemies?

The reply is that terrorism, like any weapon, derives its positive benefit for some through its negative effects on others. A pistol, if wielded against one combatant by another, may result in one person's death, but in doing so it removes the threat to the other, and removes a constraint on the survivor's freedom of action. In the case of terrorism, the "target populace" are those who are killed and terrorized by the terrorists, but also those who derive emotional and material benefit from the fact that others are being weakened. As well, in some cases a populace could derive positive benefit from being terrorized, as this state of mind could result in heightened awareness concerning issues such as social justice. Thus, it is clearly no contradiction to discuss the creative capacity of terrorism.

To consider terrorism's inspirational and organizational roles, two preliminary issues must be addressed. First, the necessity of a mass-based revolution must be established, as opposed to a revolution effected by a small conspiracy or coup. Second, we must identify the reasons for which the exploited masses must be inspired and organized.

After establishing these premises, the role of terrorism in inspiring the masses to revolt and in organizing this mass-based effort can be examined.

### 1. Mass Participation, Inspiration and Organization

We have already seen that in the anarchist and Marxist perspectives, a violent overthrow of the old establishment is eventually necessary for real change to occur. This leaves two major alternatives, a violent takeover of the reins of government by a small, professional group of conspirators, who could then dismantle the system from the top down, or a revolution carried out by the masses, to eradicate the establishment beginning with the most fundamental aspects of society. It is the latter which is advocated within revolutionary socialist thought, both anarchist and Marxist. A conspiratorial seizure of power is shunned for several reasons.

To consider the anarchist perspective first, Emma Goldman's contention that the means employed have a fundamental effect on the outcome of the revolutionary effort, is one that applies to this argument.(25) In the creation of an anarchist society in which all people are to have equal access to political power, all people must contribute to the formation of this society. One small group acting on behalf of the masses, grabbing power from the previous rulers, will begin their role in the post-revolutionary environment with significantly more power than anyone else. Instead of eliminating disproportionate power by some over others, there will be a small group with a monopoly on the means of coercion, just as reluctant as the previous ruling class to relinquish its new-found advantages. Thus, a

conspiracy by a small minority will have resulted in rule by a small minority.

Bakunin articulates this point by drawing a distinction between political and social revolution. Political revolution is the takeover of the reins of power, while social revolution is a mass-based effort. Bakunin denounces the political revolution as a way to achieve fundamental change, claiming that it is but a veneer behind which the previous establishment still resides:

..every political revolution which takes place prior to and consequently apart from a social revolution, necessarily will be a bourgeois revolution...that is, it will necessarily end in new exploitation perhaps more skillful and hypocritical, but certainly no less oppressive.  
(26)

Bakunin does not reject the importance of political efforts in bringing about the social revolution, but does insist that to effect its advocated aims, the revolution must be social overall.

While Marxists do not share the anarchists' aversion to the use of a ruling body with a coercive capacity in implementing change once the old establishment has been deposed, specifically the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they do agree on the shortcomings of the conspiratorial takeover. While accepting that political revolution is a component of the wider effort to change, Lenin also argued that the revolution must be carried out by the same classes who stand to gain from it. "[T]his fight," he claims, referring to the revolution, "must be waged not by conspirators, but by a revolutionary party that is based on the labour movement...the fight against absolutism must be waged not in the form of plots, but by educating, disciplining and organizing the proletariat."(27) The end result will thus be rule by the workers for

the workers, not rule by a small minority detached from those on whose behalf they claim to act.

It is worth noting that Lenin contradicted himself somewhat on the matter of the conspiratorial takeover. For all his criticism of the Blanquists' advocacy of a coup by a small, secret communist conspiracy to gain control of the state,(28) Lenin advocated some very similar tactics. His vanguard revolutionary party was itself to consist of a small core of professional revolutionaries. In his own words, the party and its related associations were to be "A small, compact core...,"(29) and "The more secret such an organization would be, the stronger and more widespread would be the confidence of the masses in the Party..."(30) This organization was to lead the revolutionary effort, but one must ask whether a revolution led by such an organization is indeed a mass-based revolution, or one that has been carefully organized and manipulated by a small elite. The events of the Russian Revolution of 1917 seem to combine both aspects, and thus verify this ambiguity in Lenin's thought. However, it is clear that on a theoretical level Lenin does indeed stress mass participation as a vital component for the revolution's success, even if such participation is to be carefully controlled.

It becomes necessary at this point to explain the disagreement between anarchists and Marxists concerning which classes will participate in the revolutionary effort. Anarchists agree with the Marxists on the unique revolutionary potential of the industrial workers, which arises through their modern education and a higher level of class organization through exposure to a structured, technologically complex workplace. As Bakunin writes, "They combine in themselves, in

their comprehension of the social problem, all the advantages of free and independent thought, of scientific views....," which makes them "An Irrepressible Class.'"(31)

However, the anarchists argue that the Marxist tendency to mobilize only the industrial workers in the revolutionary effort will result in an outcome similar to that which arises from a political takeover by a small minority. As Miller states, "...even if the urban working class were able to carry through a revolution, they might do so at the expense of the peasants and the other dispossessed classes.'"(32) In such a scenario, the proletariat would become what Bakunin calls the "fourth governing class,"(33) simply another exploitive ruling class in a long lineage of ruling classes. Anarchists, then, attempt to make the revolutionary effort as wide as possible, to ensure that all classes, in effect, become the ruling class; in other words, there would be at no point a ruling class. Anarchists thus agree with the Marxists to some extent concerning the revolutionary potential of the workers, but not in this class's capacity to resist the inevitable corruption which afflicts any class placed in a dominant position.

Despite this significant distinction, it is clear that revolutionary socialist thought favours a mass-based social revolution over a conspiratorial, political takeover. The revolution is to be conducted by the masses themselves, to ensure that change occurs at all levels of society, with no structure or tradition left unturned. This is the first premise of the argument for terrorism's creative role in the revolution. But this by itself does not prepare the ground for a discussion of terrorism's efficacy in the revolutionary effort, for this efficacy lies in terrorism's capacity to assist in inspiring and organizing the masses

in this broad-based effort. The second premise for terrorism's use as a tool of creative potential must therefore be established: a vital prerequisite to success in the revolutionary effort is the inspiration and organization of the masses.

In both Marxism and the anarchism of Kropotkin and Bakunin, while the masses possess revolutionary potential, it is considered to be latent, not spontaneous, making conscious inspiration of the masses necessary. Marx calls this potential the "universal character and energy of the proletariat, without which the revolution cannot be accomplished." (34) Bakunin describes it as the instinct of the masses, an unconscious, defensive reaction to exploitation that "...naturally demands equality for all." (35)

However, the mere existence of this potential is not adequate to ensure a revolutionary outburst by the masses, for revolutionary potential has been diluted by socialization through religion and accepted norms, to the extent that the people resign themselves to exploitation before they rebel against it. (This notion of the dilution of revolutionary will and awareness later became a fundamental element of Gramsci's conception of "hegemony", the subtle control which the bourgeoisie exercise over the intellectual awareness of society. This will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter).

As a result of this subtle domination, the cultural and academic education of the underclasses would provide no intellectual framework for articulating frustrations concerning social inequity, and thus provide no way for the masses to fully grasp their predicament and act to emancipate themselves from it. This condition results in, as Bakunin puts it, the average person being "...endowed with stupidity,

obtuseness, lack of realization of his rights," all of which result in "...unperturbed resignation and obedience."(36) The dormant revolutionary potential must be awakened by those who possess insight into the injustices of the established socio-economic order.

Even once this latent energy is awakened, however, the revolution is still not assured success. Expressions of passion, despair and frustration by the people do not precipitate the commencement of a revolutionary effort. They are not yet a coordinated movement with a common aim and focus, and lack the organization to resist the power and manipulation of the ruling class. As Marx writes, "Where the working class is not yet far enough advanced in its organization to undertake a decisive campaign against the collective power, it remains a plaything in their hands."(37) Any effort to revolt before adequate organization has been carried out, if not halted by deceit, will result in disaster. Bakunin explains, in discussing the revolutionary potential in France, "But if, notwithstanding this miserable position, and driven on by this French energy which cannot easily resign itself to death, and driven on to an even greater extent by despair, the French proletariat revolts-- then of course rifles of the latest make will be put to use to teach reason to the workers."(38) To face the great coercive machinery of the capitalist state, the awakened passion of the masses must be organized into a unified, coordinated movement.

## **2. Terrorism's Creative Capacity**

The premises to this component are now established: the revolution must be a mass-based effort, and this is achieved through inspiration and

organization of the masses. Terrorism's role in facilitating these tasks is now examined. Inspiration is considered first.

This awakening of latent inclinations towards rebellious action is more prominent in anarchist than Marxist thought. Marx and Lenin seem to have regarded this awakening as occurring with the education and organization of the masses, and therefore did not regard the awakening of latent passions as a task unto itself. Anarchists, on the other hand, place more emphasis on the preliminary need to inspire the people to passion and a desire to take action. They were more concerned than early Marxists about a dilution of the natural rebellious urge by the cultural norms of the capitalist state, and therefore arguments for terrorism's inspirational role are mainly found in anarchism.

Anarchists saw propaganda of the deed, or terrorist acts, as more efficacious than propaganda of the word in inspiring the masses. One reason for this is that in trying to convey inspirational messages through words, the revolutionary movement would be competing with the already well established propaganda machine of the capitalist state, with its innumerable experts in legal discourse, and an often fervently anti-revolutionary press.(39) The state thus has the overwhelming advantage in the sphere of propaganda through word and discourse, and it is up to the revolutionaries to find a realm of communication in which the advantage rests with them.

Another factor in the preference for action, or the deed, is based on a realistic consideration of the situation of the classes for whom the inspirational propaganda is intended. As Brousse states, the masses "labouring most of the time eleven and twelve hours a day...return home so exhausted by fatigue that they have little desire to read socialist

books and newspapers.'"(40) Thus, what is required is a means of communication that is comprehensible even to tired, uneducated minds, one that will stir the deepest passions in the people by appealing to a more elementary level of human consciousness.

This, of course, is violent action, as Kropotkin writes, "Sometimes tragic...but always daring,"(41) committed "by the dagger, the rifle, dynamite.'"(42) "A single deed," he states, "makes more propaganda in a few days than a thousand pamphlets.'"(43) Why is this so?

To begin, terrorism stirs people's awareness, making them lift their gaze above the state of perpetual resignation in which they would otherwise exist indefinitely. The people live within an intricate web of regulations imposed in such a way as to keep them servile to the ruling class, but so subtle and complex is this web of constraints that the people fail to realize their predicament, perceiving the establishment simply as "the way it is and always has been." As Berkman states, "The vast majority of people live in contradiction with themselves and under continual misapprehension. They are generally unaware of it until some extraordinary event draws them out of their habitual somnambulism and forces them to look at themselves and to look around.'" (44)

With its atmosphere of drama, tragedy and shocking surprise, terrorism provides this extraordinary event, shaking the masses, if even against their own will, out of their mind-dulling routines long enough for them to consider their predicaments more clearly. Even if at first the terrorists are regarded as "madmen" and "fanatics", as Kropotkin writes, "indifference from this point on is impossible.'"(45) Thus, terrorism has achieved the first step in inspiring revolt: the initial elevation of the people's consciousness.

At this point, terrorist actions directed against symbols of the capitalist state arouse that latent urge to revolt which, the anarchists hold, exists within every subjugated person's consciousness. While at first the terrorist acts may not be understood, quickly it becomes evident that the target of these attacks is the same government and ruling class under which the people have feared and toiled for decades. As Berkman states, "In this atmosphere of force and violence...fear and punishment we all grow up,"(46) but suddenly the establishment that imposes this fear is under attack in a dramatic and daring way.

The terrorists articulate the latent desires of the people, and thus behave as a mirror, making the masses consciously aware of their own previously unconscious urges. As Joll writes, "the studied protests of the individual terrorists seemed to be the symbols of mass discontent and latent revolutionary passion."(47) Thus, this "sentiment of rebellion, this satanic pride, which spurns subjection to any master whatever"(48) is finally awakened. The people consciously realize that the capitalist state is the root of their hardship, and feel a need to end their subjugation to it.

The masses' awakened desire to strike against the state is, however, countered by their fear of it, and this fear must be sufficiently overcome before the aroused desire is translated to will. Terrorism accomplishes this in two ways. The first has already been considered to some extent: terrorism demonstrates the state's weaknesses, and thus the possibility of overcoming it. As Miller states, "Acts of violence directed against these [state] agencies exposed their vulnerability and gave heart to their victims."(49) The result, as Kropotkin writes, is that "hope is born in their [the masses'] hearts,

and let us remember that if exasperation often drives men to revolt, it is always hope, the hope of victory, which makes revolutions.'"(50)

Terrorism also overcomes fear of the state by demonstrating admirable courage on the part of the terrorists which the people, believing in the cause towards which the courage is directed, will seek to emulate. Kropotkin contends that the people "...secretly applaud their [the terrorists'] courage, and they find imitators.'"(51) Finally overcoming their fear, the people are ready to revolt. Terrorism has thus led the masses from stupor to awareness, resignation to passion, and from passion to the will to rebel. Thus, among the anarchists at least, terrorism is indeed regarded as an efficacious means in inspiring the people to take the first steps towards the revolution.

The role of terrorism in organizing the people in the revolutionary movement is found within both anarchist and Marxist theory. Yet the arguments for terrorism's capacity to organize are far less explicit in the theoretical writings than those concerning the inspirational role. Organization depends more on the manipulation of structure than it does on the manipulation of perception and will, whereas inspiration is almost entirely a psychological endeavor. Since terrorism is primarily a tool of psychological manipulation, its most direct impact in the revolutionary effort is naturally through its inspirational force. Nevertheless, terrorism contributes to the organization of the masses in two ways.

First, it establishes the leadership of the revolution, providing the masses with clear guidance in their efforts to overthrow the old regime. This guidance will coordinate the movement towards its aim. In periods of civil unrest and widespread discontent, there will be

numerous parties and movements advocating different approaches to remedy the grievances of the masses. While the aims of these movements may be broadly similar, the sheer number of voices vying for attention will result not in a single coordinated effort, but in the revolutionary potential of the masses being divided between the plethora of movements. Terrorism can transcend this problem. As Kropotkin writes, "The party which has made most revolutionary propaganda and which has shown most spirit and daring will be listened to on the day when it is necessary to act, to march in front in order to realize the revolution."(52)

This daring and spirit, which establishes the credibility of the movement in the eyes of the people, is manifested in particular in terrorist acts, which only the most dedicated party will be willing to commit. Thus, as Kropotkin explains, "The direction which the revolution will take...can be predicted in advance, according to the vigor of revolutionary action displayed in the preparatory period by the different progressive parties."(53) Terrorism, then, acts as the tool by which the most dedicated movement can present itself as the most credible leadership of the revolutionary effort, and thus offers the guidance necessary for the coordination of the masses' efforts.

Terrorism also plays a role in defining the nature of the revolutionary movement, setting the approach and strategy which will carry the effort to victory. First, terrorism establishes that the revolutionary effort will be a violent one. That violence is deemed necessary in this effort has already been made clear, but while this may be evident to the organizers of the revolutionary movement, it may not be to the masses.

Terrorism thus sets the tone of the revolution by example, providing the masses with a clear and dramatic image of the nature of the means which must be employed. As Lenin writes, "...the guerrilla warfare and mass terror that have been taking place throughout Russia practically without a break since December, will undoubtedly help the masses to learn the correct tactics of an uprising." (54) Thus, continues Lenin, the revolutionary movement must "...recognize this mass terror and incorporate it into its tactics" (55) as a means to organize the power of the masses.

"Mass terror" is certainly not the same as terrorism conducted by small, covert groups such as the modern terrorist groups in Europe. However, while this reference appears to mean mob violence, such as rioting and violent demonstrations, combined with armed insurgence, the use of the word "terror" makes it clear that Lenin was discussing the psychological impact of violence to influence the political behavior of a target group, in this case the masses. Thus, this passage, while varying somewhat from the conception of terrorism applied in this study, does reflect the definition of terrorism put forth in the introduction of the analysis.

As well as defining the nature of the means, terrorism also defines the targets of the masses' revolutionary efforts. Written and spoken propaganda can be useful in explaining to the people who the targets of their efforts must be in order to effect real change, but these modes of communication are not entirely reliable, for reasons already discussed. The leadership of the movement must establish the targets by clear and dramatic example as well. In attacking agents and institutions of the capitalist state, the revolutionary leadership makes

clear that these are to be the targets of the masses' efforts. Such attacks "...urge the workers and peasants to advance still further forward...to the complete destruction of the autocratic gang which is now fighting with the desperation of the doomed." (56) Terrorism, then, helps to strategically channel the masses' efforts against a specific set of targets, ensuring that this power is not scattered and wasted.

Lenin sums up the organizational role of terrorism succinctly in the following passage:

...the leaders of the revolutionary party must ...present their tasks in a wider and bolder fashion, so that their slogan may always be in advance of the masses, serve them as a beacon and reveal to them our democratic and socialist ideal in all its splendor, [and] indicate the shortest, the most direct route to complete, absolute and final victory. (57)

This passage refers to all tasks of the revolutionary party, but also provides a clear rationale for terrorist actions by the professional vanguard party which help guide the masses in the revolutionary effort.

While a detailed examination of the tactics and methods of terrorism lies beyond the scope of this analysis, it is worth briefly considering what the foundational theorists recommended as the optimal form of organization to carry out these destructive and creative roles of terrorism. Lenin wrote much about the organization of the revolutionary party which would, among other revolutionary activities, such as dispensing written propaganda, carry out these roles, and thus his work reveals the organizational characteristics considered most suitable for terrorist activity. Four general characteristics are

relevant here, drawn primarily from Lenin's essay, ``What Is To Be Done?''.

The first is that the party must operate in secrecy. This is vital to its survival. If the party tries to operate openly, for example forming overt study groups for the masses and openly agitating in the effort to inspire rebellion, it will be easily penetrated by the state's ``perfectly equipped detachments of agents-provocateurs, spies, and gendarmes.'' (58) The result, as Lenin writes of Russia in the late 1800's, is that ``[police] raids [against the party] became so frequent...that the masses of the workers lost literally all their leaders.'' (59) Therefore, asserts Lenin, ``strict secrecy is essential.'' (60)

The need for secrecy dictates two of the other necessary characteristics of the organization. One is that the leadership of the party is small and highly centralized, and remains stable through time. ``To concentrate all secret functions in the hands of as small a number of professional revolutionaries as possible'' is necessary because, as Lenin writes, ``it is far more difficult to unearth a dozen wise men than a hundred fools...by `wise men', in connection with organisation, I mean *professional revolutionaries*.'' (61; Lenin's emphasis) The police, then, will have a far more difficult time finding and penetrating a small, compact core of professionals than it would an open, mass organization.

Lenin also asserted that ``no revolutionary movement can endure without a stable organisation of leaders maintaining continuity.'' (62) The leadership cannot change frequently, or the work towards revolution will never achieve momentum. With every change in leadership comes a

change, however slight, in the party's policy, and a steady momentum of learning from past failures and building on past successes will not occur. As well, and tying in with the imperative of secrecy, a stable leadership over time will ensure that there is a minimum of people who are intimately acquainted with the workings of the party, and therefore a minimum of people who may at some point be arrested and interrogated by the police. If the leadership changed frequently, new leaders would always be learning the party's structure and methods, increasing the number of those who possess this knowledge, and thus the probability of the police laying hands on it.

A third characteristic of the party is that it will have localized sub-units, connected to the leadership by secret lines of contact. If the leadership is to be a small core, then by itself it is not capable of carrying out enough operations in all of the locations necessary to achieve any significant impact in the fight against the state. The party, then, must consist of sub-units beyond the leadership core. These units, however, must rigidly adhere to the same principles which guide the leading core: they must be small, and operate in secrecy. As Lenin writes: "The smaller each separate 'operation' in our common cause...the more difficult it will be for the police to 'net' all these 'detail workers', and the more difficult it will be for them to frame up, out of an arrest for some petty affair, a 'case' that would justify the government's expenditure on 'security'." (63) Again, then, minimal membership means minimum risk of arrest and defeat.

The existence of these sub-sections does not mean that the party is to be decentralized. The central leadership will still maintain control through regular contact with its subsidiaries. This contact, of

course, is to be secret. The "responsible agents in the principal districts," writes Lenin, are to be "connected by all the rules of strict secrecy" to the central leadership,(64) receiving orders and thereby acting in a coordinated fashion, but not at the expense of clandestinity.

Finally, the party is to consist of hardened professionals, trained in combat and willing to be as ruthless as necessary to achieve the party's aims. The members must be well versed, through training and then experience, in "the art of combatting the political police." (65) These members will be confronting the full fury of the state apparatus, and anything less than total and professional commitment will be inadequate to safeguard the party, and thus the revolution. Lenin addresses potential revolutionary terrorists: "...you are given a rifle and a splendid quick firing gun constructed according to the last word of engineering technique -- take this weapon of death and destruction, do not listen to the sentimental whiners who are afraid of war. Much has been left...that must be destroyed." (66) Only a true professional, one committed entirely to revolution, can take this painful but necessary step towards the defeat of the established order.

This, then, broadly outlines the form of organization envisioned by Lenin which would carry out terrorist actions. It is to be clandestine, small, divided into sub-sections, or cells, and entirely devoted towards revolution, even at the cost of human life. While conceptions of the ideal revolutionary party have varied since Lenin, his description has provided the basis for most later ideas on the subject, and thus it is worthy of some consideration even in an analysis

focusing on the broader theoretical questions of the efficacy of and ethical justifications for terrorism in socialist thought.

After considering Lenin's arguments for this structure, it is clear that he would respond to the contradiction between the need for mass participation and a secret, conspiratorial party by pointing to the dangers posed by effective police reaction. The vanguard which he defines here is to be the enduring backbone of a larger movement. Nonetheless, the blatant contrast between the elitist conception of the party and the notion of mass participation renders Lenin's own preference somewhat ambiguous, as many of his contemporaries pointed out (he responds to several of these in "What Is To Be Done?").

Before concluding this section, we should consider another apparent contradiction which has arisen in the preceding discussion. This concerns the anarchists' belief in the need for some form of coherent organization in the revolutionary effort, as evident in Kropotkin's statements in this discussion on organization. Kropotkin uses the word "party", a leading organization which will "march in front" of the masses.(67) Anarchism, however, very opposite to Lenin, is known to shun organization and the notion of rigid leadership. How is this apparent contradiction to be resolved? There are two possibilities. One is that the use of a revolutionary party is the anarchists' bow to necessity: they know the forces arrayed against them, and are willing to risk some form of organization in order to establish the coherence and focus needed to overcome the state.

There is another possibility. Anarchists view cooperation and structure as morally acceptable as long as the members in any organization are participating voluntarily, without any coercive or

authoritarian compulsion. It is likely, then, that an anarchist revolutionary organization could exist without sacrificing principles as long as the organization was kept entirely voluntary, and maintained a highly consensual, egalitarian structure of authority. Even the possibility that the anarchist version of the vanguard could become a new ruling clique, as Emma Goldman fears, would be significantly reduced, as the development of a culture of authoritarianism, rigidity, and permanent leadership would be severely inhibited by maintaining a consensual, voluntary and cooperative structure. The endurance of such an organization after the revolution would be far less likely than with a rigid hierarchical structure such as Lenin proposes.

Whether such an organization would be successful is a question not easily answered. Anarchists, though, with a conception of people as naturally harmonious and self-disciplined, would likely argue that such a structure would stand the same chance of success as Lenin's vanguard. The issue of the possible contradiction in anarchist prescriptions can thus be resolved to some extent by bearing in mind that organization and anarchism are not incompatible, given certain structural limitations on the form of organization.

This discussion on the creative capacity of terrorism makes clear that in revolutionary socialist thought, even while a terrorist campaign is rendering the old regime weak, facilitating its destruction by mass revolution, it is simultaneously assisting in creating a new cohesion in the revolutionary movement. Terrorism destroys, but in doing so it also creates. It is clearly not regarded, then, as entirely a destructive weapon by those responsible for its theoretical definition in the

socialist tradition, and it is this paradox which is so often overlooked in modern evaluations of this means of political struggle.

#### IV. Conclusion

This chapter has presented arguments for the efficacy of terrorism in the socialist struggle. Terrorism is regarded as having both destructive and creative potential. It can help to weaken the old establishment, thereby increasing the chances of the revolution's victory over it, and it facilitates the creation of the mass revolutionary struggle itself. While a wide variety of means are to be employed in the revolutionary effort, terrorism is accorded a high level of significance. Terrorist action is merely the periodic, surprise destruction of specific material and human targets, usually by a small, clandestine organization of professional activists. But the psychological shockwaves that emanate from these acts of destruction lend them a power far beyond their immediate effects: terrorism can destroy hope and will, and yet can also create ideas and conditions that build revolutionary momentum. Through judicious application these effects can be directed at certain segments of the population, weakening the rulers and empowering the powerless, thereby causing tangible shifts in the psychological balance of power in the revolutionary struggle, shifts which could well be crucial to the final outcome.

## Chapter II, Ethical Justifications

### I. Introduction

The previous chapter has examined the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism which stem from the perception of its efficacy in facilitating the socialist revolution. But the normative aspect of socialist theory, its focus on improving the conditions of life for the great majority in society, means that such a mechanical assessment in itself is inadequate to justify terrorism in the socialist struggle.

This is so because terrorism itself is morally questionable, as it inflicts suffering, both physical and psychological, upon not only oppressors of the masses, but also upon many who may not wish to be involved in the revolutionary struggle on either side, such as conscripted soldiers and low level police officers, and even ordinary citizens. Terrorism thus involves a degree of indiscriminate killing, clearly a moral weakness according to the general norms of Western civilization. The apparent paradox thus arises: how can socialism, which is concerned with the freedom, harmony, and creative fulfillment of all people, advocate the application of a murderous instrument? The theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism cannot be constituted by merely a dispassionate assessment of how well terrorism works, given the strong moral concerns of socialism.

The most significant ethical justifications for socialist terrorism arise from the socialist moral critique of the capitalist state, and this critique will be the focus here. These essentially utilitarian arguments, which pose terrorism as a moral endeavour when applied against the greater evil of the old establishment, will be identified

within Marxist and anarchist theory, with distinctions between them offered where appropriate.

The broad outline of the moral critique upon which the ethical justification for terrorism is based is as follows. Socialism strives to implement an ideal society in which all people will be free and creatively fulfilled. This society will be built on the principle of social justice, with no group gaining advantage at the expense of others, and with people free to choose how they contribute to both their own and the social good. If socialists aspire to an ideal not yet realized, it follows that they perceive flaws in the current socio-political system. Indeed, these flaws are regarded as so horrendous as to justify the use of even cruel means in the effort to destroy this establishment. The structure of the ethical justification for socialist terrorism is essentially an ends-means argument: terrorism is the means, the lesser of two evils, applied towards the end of destroying the greater evil. Thus, terrorism is morally justifiable, despite its own inherent moral flaws.

This argument, like the word "terrorism" itself, while not explicit in socialist theory can nonetheless be discerned by relating two aspects of socialist theory. First, as shown in the previous chapter, terrorism is an important means in the necessary revolutionary struggle. Second, throughout socialist theory there is a strong moral critique of the state and capitalism. These two strands of argument, presenting terrorism as a means and its target as extremely morally flawed, form the utilitarian justification of terrorism. The moral critique thus forms a part of this wider argument.

The qualification made in the introduction of the analysis must be reiterated: in order to elucidate the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism, it is often necessary to take the perspective of the terrorist in our interpretation of the socialist texts. While many socialists would regard the moral weaknesses of the capitalist state as an argument for revolution or democratic change, socialist terrorists regard them as justifications for terrorist violence. A strong argument could be made that Marx, for example, was not advocating terrorism when he wrote his critiques of exploitation in capitalist relations of production. Nonetheless, terrorists have utilized such criticisms to justify their actions, and it is the terrorists' interpretation which must be the focus if the theoretical outlook underlying socialist terrorism is to be understood. This qualification will not lead to theoretical inconsistency in the explanation of the criticisms of the capitalist state, but it will lead to a significant divergence from many socialists in the conclusion drawn from these criticisms, that terrorism is morally justifiable. This is an essential point to bear in mind in the reading of this chapter.

The moral critique will focus on three aspects of the capitalist state deemed most morally deficient in socialist writings: alienation, exploitation, and state violence. Within each of these, the critique will be divided between the capitalist state and capitalist society, the latter including both cultural-intellectual institutions, and economic relations. It is analytically efficacious to separate the state from society as the state forms a distinct entity within the wider capitalist system. As Ralph Miliband writes, "while there are many men who have power outside the state system and whose power greatly affects it, they

are not the actual repositories of state power; and for the purpose of analysing the role of the state in these societies, it is necessary to treat the state elite, which does yield state power, as a distinct and separate entity.'"(1) The state is understood here as those bodies which are legally sanctioned to create and implement law on behalf of society. This would include "...the government, the administration, the military and the police, the judicial branch, sub-central government and parliamentary assemblies...whose interrelationship shapes the form of the state system.'"(2)

To regard capitalist society as both cultural-intellectual institutions, and economic relations within the capitalist mode of production is equally useful. The mode of production and class structure are inseparable from cultural life in the eyes of socialists. Economic relations between classes are the basis of the evolution of culture, which takes forms supporting the class structure of the mode of production. Together, economic relations and cultural-intellectual life form capitalist society. Thus, while the forthcoming critique will separate cultural and intellectual institutions from economic ones according to the focus of particular criticisms, both will be dealt with under the broader heading of capitalist society.

## II. Alienation

Alienation is a broad concept, but specific meanings can be identified which are relevant to this analysis. The most general meaning, and the predominant usage here, is the individual's loss of a sense of social and political efficacy. To phrase this in more manageable terms, alienation is loss of freedom, and the resultant dehumanization. It

involves a process: individuals lose the most significant human trait, freedom, or the ability to consciously and reasonably decide their circumstances, and thus they lose their human identity. They are estranged from both their own humanity, and therefore from human society as well. Alienation, then, is the single process by which people lose freedom, and become dehumanized.

As well, and related, alienation means the sense of estrangement of the individual from the wider human community. This is also dehumanization, for if people lose a sense of attachment to, or integration with, their fellow humans, they no longer feel themselves to be part of humanity. The individual begins to regard other people as only "...means to his own private ends, and fails to accord them the sort of respect that he must accord them if they are not to regard him antagonistically." (3) People view each other as objects, and in turn feel that they themselves are objects in the eyes of others, objects to be overcome on the road to personal gain. People are alienated from the human community, and thus their own human identity.

This latter conception, while more specific, is linked to a loss of freedom, for in the eyes of socialists people will naturally seek harmonious relations with others unless constrained from doing so by conditions beyond their control. The first conception is thus the root from which the latter arises, but the latter will become germane when considering Marx's discussion of alienation of workers from the human species and other workers, later in this section.

Marx also applied the term to describe the process by which people lose their freedom, and thus human identity, to their own mental and physical creations. In this conception, alienation, as Kamenka

summarizes, lay in "...man's subjugation to social idols, ends, and institutions he himself has created.'"(4) This usage of the term will be important in the forthcoming analysis as well. In general, however, alienation will be applied in this section in the broader sense of a loss of freedom and the subsequent dehumanization, but the more specific forms will be applicable at several points in the argument.

Socialists assert that the capitalist state results in alienation, and this is one of the pillars of the moral justification for terrorism. Freedom, and in some specific cases social integration, are alienation's opposites; they are some of the qualities which the socialist revolution will instill in the new society: people will be free to choose how they contribute to the social good, and thus how they live and work, and free to seek harmonious ties with the wider human community. This, in turn, will give them a strong identification with themselves as human beings, and with human society in general, which no longer will be the source of their misery, but instead an environment in which to fulfill themselves. From this perspective, the wider ethical justification for terrorism is that it helps to bring about the end of alienation and the arrival of true freedom, and this provides ample moral counter-weight to offset terrorism's character as a morally questionable weapon.

Alienation arises from both the capitalist state and society. From within the state, alienation stems from two sources: first, people have no control over the laws which are imposed on them; second, the laws themselves become a tight web of constraints, stifling freedom. From within capitalist society, alienation arises from, first, intellectual hegemony, the subtle but pervasive control that the ruling class

exercises over the thoughts of the people; second, alienation is a result of working for wages within the capitalist mode of production.

#### 1.a. The State: Laws are Imposed without Consent

The first source of alienation within the capitalist state is the creation and imposition of laws without the consent of the masses. Laws are constraints; they are parameters of acceptable behavior beyond which the individual is subject to violent sanctions. Laws clearly have a great effect on citizens' lives, yet, according to this socialist argument, those who must endure these effects have no means to shape the laws in accordance with their interests, and thus control over their lives is lost. This means that their freedom is lost, which deprives individuals of realizing their human potential, or humanity. This, then, is alienation. The argument that laws are imposed without consent consists of two strands, each of which counters a liberal argument to the contrary. The first counters the liberal concept of the social contract. The second attacks arguments that liberal democracy offers the masses a means to alter the system if they regard it as detrimental to their interests. The social contract will be dealt with first, relying on Proudhon for the socialist critique.

In his "Fourth Study" of The General Idea of the Revolution, Proudhon contends that the liberal's social contract is entirely devoid of meaning in real interactions between the state and people. The social contract, an agreement between the people and state, allows the people to relinquish some liberty to the state in return for the protection and services of the state in the public sphere. Agreement is not expressed explicitly by each individual, but is regarded as given tacitly, in the

citizen's continued habitation within the state, and adherence to the state's laws.

Proudhon argues that when this concept is applied to the reality of the capitalist state, it becomes meaningless; any true social contract would be signed by all members of the society, and would benefit each equally. The liberal social contract amounts, instead, to "...neither an act of reciprocity, nor an act of association...It is an act of appointment of arbiters, chosen by the citizens, without any preliminary agreement...the said arbiters being clothed with sufficient force to put their decisions into execution, and to collect their salaries.'"(5) Proudhon further explains:

...I cannot do better than to compare it with a commercial agreement, in which the names of the parties, the nature and value of the goods... involved, the conditions of quality, delivery, price...everything in fact which constitutes the material of the contracts, is omitted, and nothing is mentioned but penalties and jurisdictions.(6)

In reality, then, the contract is entirely one-sided. The state makes only vague promises, while citizens are held to fulfill their obligations by threat of coercion. It is absurd to consider such a relationship as a contract, for no intelligent person would ever sign it. "You expect me to sign an agreement," asks Proudhon, "in virtue of which I may be persecuted for a thousand transgressions...and in this agreement I find not a word of either my rights or my obligations, I find only penalties!"(7) Indeed, the people, except for a small elite, do not consent, in fact are excluded from the process of legislation in the first place. As Proudhon writes, the ideal is that "...the citizen,

in obeying the law, obeys his own will." (8) The reality, he claims, is extortion:

But the law has been made without my participation, despite my absolute disapproval, despite the injury which it inflicts upon me. The State does not bargain with me: it gives me nothing in exchange: it simply practices extortion upon me. (9)

The concept of the social contract, then, completely fails to convince socialists that the masses have any control over the laws they must endure; instead, this contract is regarded as only a crude justification for the continued ruling class dominance. People have no control, and thus alienation occurs.

It is worth noting that Proudhon's argument is entirely against the state, and not capitalism indirectly. Had a Marxist made an argument against the social contract, while it may have been similar in basic structure, it would no doubt have focused to a larger extent on the capitalist class who control the state, rather than the state in a general sense. Anarchists recognize that in capitalist states the state is linked to the economic ruling class, and thus that the social contract is used as a justification for continuing their economic dominance through the state. But by keeping the argument focused against the state in a general sense, Proudhon levels against all states his critique of the social contract as a justification for control.

This focus reflects the centrality of the abhorrence of all forms of domination, economic and political, within anarchist thought. Proudhon would not want to exclude non-capitalist states from his critique, should some ever rely on the social contract argument to justify their existence. In any case, to the extent that his critique of the social

contract is aimed at capitalist states, it can be considered general to socialism. However, the social contract in an abstract, or implicit form, also underlies the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat: the majority of people want change towards freedom and justice, and grant the vanguard the power to initiate it, in exchange for temporarily relinquishing a degree of their freedom through acquiescence to rule by the revolutionary party. Proudhon's critique can thus be considered a socialist critique when leveled against the capitalist state, but it can be extended to criticize Marxism as well, or indeed any ideology advocating any form of authority endowed with a coercive capacity.

The second argument which socialists seek to invalidate in order to prove that the process of alienation stems from the capitalist state is that democracy is a means by which the masses can change the current order if they see it as harmful to their interests, and thus that the continuation of the system is evidence of the masses' support. In the last chapter a divergence was noted in the anarchist and Marxist views on democracy: anarchists see any democratic participation in the established system as harmful to their cause, while Marxists see it as a means of achieving minor changes and organizing the masses, and indeed in some special cases as a viable means of instigating revolutionary change. There is agreement, however, that in most cases democracy is ineffectual as a means to achieve significant change, and primarily acts as a veneer covering the political domination of the masses by empowered class. There are two strands to this argument.

The first of these is that despite electoral competition, the dominant classes, including the property-owning capitalist class, will invariably be, or choose, the elected political leaders, and the effect

is that choices of policy are severely curtailed, and the masses eventually lose sight of alternatives to the capitalist order. The terms of this argument are stated concisely by the Marxist theorist Ralph Miliband. To begin, then, those who succeed in obtaining democratic positions are most often of the property-owning ruling class. This is so because only this elite has the money, education, and powerful social connections to achieve any success in the expensive and time-consuming process of running for office.(10) Even the few members of the lower class who do become political leaders will be socialized by the elitism of their peers, and will embrace the attitudes of the dominant class.(11) Thus, the great majority of leaders will possess the socio-economic outlook of the upper class.

The range of choice for the masses is restricted not only by the choice of leaders, but in another sense as well: as the upper class forms the leadership, policy options put forth to the public will be confined to those defined by the upper class's concerns and beliefs. Leaders of major political parties, regardless of their ideological labels, will share a core of class interests and attitudes which creates commonality between the policy issues they put forth. As Miliband states, "...these men, whatever their political labels or party affiliations, are bourgeois politicians."(12) Thus, all leaders in the capitalist state, regardless of party, "...have either genuinely believed in capitalism...or have accepted it as far superior to any possible alternative economic and social system, and...have therefore made it their prime business to defend it."(13)

Regardless, then, of whom a person may vote for during the elections, the outcome will be the implementation of policies designed

to facilitate and perpetuate the capitalist system. Real choice does not exist in the range of potential leaders for whom people can vote, nor does it exist in the range of policies offered by the different political parties. Perhaps most importantly, however, the constraints on choice condition the masses into accepting capitalism and the state as the only viable path for society. At this point, the argument departs from Miliband's, and reference to Antonio Gramsci's work is necessary.

To the masses, the political elite appears to be the result of the choice of the people. This image, however false, is inspired by the democratic ideal. As Gramsci writes, "...the ideologues of liberal democracy have managed to pull the wool over the eyes of the popular masses...convincing them that the right to vote would eventually result in their liberation from all the chains that bound them." (14) If the masses believe that who their leaders are is indeed the result of the people's free choice, and that they rule largely in the interests of the people, then when the leadership continually presents policies which serve and perpetuate the capitalist state, the masses will be conditioned to take for granted that the current order is the only viable choice. Thus, choice is constrained in another, more significant sense: the people are not free to choose an alternative to the establishment, because they are led to believe that no alternative exists. This argument is closely linked to Gramsci's concept of intellectual hegemony, which will be discussed in more detail later in this section.

Turning to the second strand of the socialists' argument against democracy, Gramsci adds another dimension to the issue of choice, questioning whether democracy would even survive if the people

recognized their condition of subjection. It is not inevitable that the masses will forever remain ignorant of their true class interests. Through the efforts of radical agitators and even education, the people could begin to lend support to the fringe parties offering major alternatives which previously had little chance of electoral success. However, it is questionable whether the ruling class would retain their adherence to the legality of the democratic system if it began to fail to uphold their status. As Gramsci states, referring to the Italian case, "Reality has shown quite incontrovertibly that there is only one true fact to legality and that legality exists only within the boundaries set by the interests of the ruling class..."(15)

The dominant class's reaction to a democratic blow to their interests could be military intervention to uphold power by force, as has occurred in numerous cases, including Gramsci's native Italy,(16) or it may be the application of economic pressure on the revolutionary regime, as the dominant class would still control much of the country's wealth. Some modern variations of these types of reactions may be seen in Iran in 1953, Chile in 1973, or Guatemala in 1954. In any case, the survival of a democratically elected leadership that was not in the interests of the ruling class is considered questionable, and thus so is the degree of choice offered by liberal democracy.

It is clear, then, that revolutionary socialists do not see democracy as offering any significant capacity to the masses to change the establishment, or to control the laws that are imposed on them. First, according to Miliband's arguments, the choice of elected leaders is limited to members of the ruling class, and the policies which leaders offer, regardless of party, will aim at perpetuating the

capitalist state. As well, building on this argument, the masses will eventually be conditioned through the democratic system to take for granted that the capitalist state is the best possible system, and thus will not be capable of even imagining other alternatives. Finally, in cases where the democratic system does begin to work for the true interests of the masses, democracy itself will be attacked by the elite capitalist class, who will abandon democratic deception and begin to rule through coercion, as in Iran or Chile, as mentioned above. Thus, socialists fervently refute the liberal argument that if democracy exists, then so does the people's consent for the laws under which they live.

Revolutionary socialists believe that there is neither a social contract, nor meaningful democracy. With people subject to the will of the economic and political rulers, and consequently with little freedom in their own lives, people are defined by rules and parameters beyond their control. Constrained from defining themselves, they are clearly alienated. The following section examines an even more explicit argument for alienation arising from the capitalist state.

#### **1.b. Dehumanization Arising from Proliferation of Laws**

Within the state apparatus, laws are regarded as the means by which to achieve any change in society. Those inculcated within this system regard laws this way, for the primary function of the system is the creation and implementation of laws. Every perceived problem will be addressed by a new law, and this habitual reaction leads to a vast multiplicity of laws. The ill-effects of laws are themselves countered with yet more laws.(17) The result, as Proudhon writes, is that "laws,

decrees, edicts, ordinances, resolutions, will fall like hail upon the unfortunate people.'"(18)

This multiplicity of legal constraints channels the lives of the masses within confusing and restricting parameters. As Proudhon asks, "Do you suppose that the people, or even the Government itself, can keep their reason in this labyrinth?"(19) Exceeding these parameters will result in punishment, and thus the people try not to do so, but such effort is required to be law abiding that people are stupefied, unable to flex their creative capacities for fear of breaking a law, however obscure it may be. The result is that natural creativity and forms of association between people are warped and stunted. As Gramsci writes, "All civic activity is controlled, riddled, regimented, and ruined by authority...[in] a terrible, asphyxiating bourgeois reality..."(20) Over the long term, obedience to the legal web becomes unconscious, and creative capacities, passions, and spirit are lost as law conditions people to remain within narrow parameters of "acceptable" behavior.

As a whole, this process has tragic results. People are rendered servile and docile by having their lives guided by a vast and impersonal legal machine. "...[W]e are so perverted," asserts Kropotkin, "by this existence under this ferule of a law, which regulates every event in our life...that, if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves.'"(21) Thus, people are dehumanized from this extreme yet subtle deprivation of freedom. They are alienated from themselves and other humans as they are forced to bend their efforts and will to obedience to the state.

As socialists argue, the capitalist state is responsible for a high degree of alienation among the people. Within the state, and arising

from its structure, people are denied control over their own lives, deprived of the basic freedom to choose which makes them human. Neither the social contract nor liberal democracy carry any weight in the face of this cruel reality. As well, the sheer number and complexity of laws necessitates the abandonment of individual will if one is to successfully obey. Humanity is lost as alienation proceeds unchecked. This is the fate that awaits a society living within the rigid confines of the capitalist state. Freedom must replace the state to effect salvation from this fate, and in the perspective of socialist terrorists, terrorism, which can help destroy this horrendous regime, is morally permissible. The alienation arising from the capitalist state thus clearly contributes to the ethical justification for terrorism in the socialist struggle, according to those who resort to this method.

Before proceeding to the next section, we should note that there is a significant gulf between the anarchist and Marxist critiques of alienation imposed by the state. Marxists criticize the state because it is a tool of class domination; anarchists criticize the state to some degree for the same reason, but even more so because the state is a dominator in itself. However, the anarchists' primary focus on the state can be regarded as complementing the Marxist argument that the state is a tool of class domination, by illustrating in more detail the specific ways in which the state is a repressive instrument. Conversely, the anarchist critique, which is concerned with capitalism as well as the state, is enhanced by the Marxists' more detailed focus on the economic relationships which contribute to the repressive character of the state. Thus, while the significant schisms between the two perspectives cannot

be ignored, there is common ground in their critique of the state as a cause of domination, and thus alienation.

## **2. Alienation in Capitalist Society**

The state legal apparatus is responsible for much of the alienation experienced by the people in capitalist society. Aspects of society itself, however, consisting of intellectual-cultural and economic relations, also contribute to alienation. There are two arguments here. First, arising from the structure of intellectual relations is what Gramsci called intellectual hegemony, the control exercised over the thoughts of the masses by the dominant class. This brings about alienation as people's thinking, and therefore freedom, is constrained. Second, within economic relations, those who perform labour within the capitalist mode of production are alienated further as a result of the inhuman working conditions, and the expenditure of energy and will on efforts which primarily benefit the owners of the means of production. The workers' freedom to think creatively, to fulfill themselves in their work, is removed, and alienation results. Thus, socialists regard capitalist society as sharing with the state the responsibility for the alienation of the masses.'

### **2.a. Intellectual Hegemony**

This discussion of intellectual hegemony will refer primarily to Antonio Gramsci's argument, and rely on Herbert Marcuse's writings for detail on the process of extending control over thought. Gramsci is relevant in this analysis because of the socialist terrorism that afflicted his native Italy in the 1970's, carried out by the Red Brigades (this case

will be examined in the third chapter). Gramsci was, in fact, a founding member of the Italian Communist Party, and posthumously became a profound influence within both Italy and Europe in general, and Latin America as well. As James Joll writes:

[W]ithin ten years after his death [in 1937], with the emergence of the Italian Communist Party as one of the most important political forces in postwar Italy, the influence of his writings had become considerable...in view of many, [he was] the most important European theorist since Lenin.(22)

Among those influenced by his thought were members of the Red Brigades, and other such groups in Europe. Gramsci's concept of hegemony in particular found favour in the outlooks of these later groups, as will be seen in Chapter Three.

Herbert Marcuse, a German-born American Marxist, was one of the most outspoken and well known critics of capitalism and US foreign policy in the 1960's and 1970's. Marcuse had a profound influence on several European terrorist groups, in particular the Red Army Faction of Germany. As Joanne Wright states, Marcuse's work helped to formulate "...a rationale through which the RAF could link together these various strands to form its eclectic yet distinctive ideology."(23) Clearly, both Gramsci and Marcuse are relevant to a discussion of socialist terrorism.

Before proceeding with the argument, it is necessary to indicate what Gramsci, and Marcuse in the later part of this argument, regard as the ruling class, those who impose hegemony. The forthcoming arguments make clear that this is, generally, the traditional Marxist conception of the capitalist class and state elite cooperating to uphold

capitalism. Thus, there is an implicit assumption that the corporate leaders and state elite share similar interests in maintaining the status quo. The ruling class, then, can be considered those elements of society who aim or desire to perpetuate the status quo in which they hold advantaged positions in economic and political terms. This class both gains from the capitalist system, and works to maintain it.

From a revolutionary socialist perspective, the general argument concerning intellectual hegemony is that the ruling class manipulates the thinking of the masses in order to obtain their compliance with the status quo. This manipulation is carried out by supportive intellectuals, who mold ideas and traditions to create a cultural and intellectual environment conducive to the maintenance of the status quo.

The basic premise upon which Gramsci's argument is constructed is that people form their consciousness and self-awareness through interaction in the social environment: "If individuality is the whole mass of these [social] relationships, the acquiring of a personality means the acquiring of consciousness of these relationships.'"(24) This premise sets up the idea that consciousness can be controlled, and thereby dominated, by a ruling class. In discussing consciousness, Gramsci has in mind specifically class consciousness, the identification with a particular economic stratum of society. Class identification does not occur spontaneously, but, as Gramsci writes, "A worker is only a proletarian when he 'knows' himself to be one, and acts and thinks in accordance with this 'knowledge'," (25) and this knowledge, like all knowledge, is learned, as opposed to instinctual.

As there is a process of learning involved in the development of class consciousness, there is a process which can be manipulated. The

dominant class can thus hinder, through manipulation of learning, the development of class consciousness, to inhibit the development of class awareness of domination by an elite, which would otherwise result in calls for change by the self-aware lower classes, the proletariat in particular. The manipulation of this learning is how domination can occur without constant recourse to violence, and this manipulation is the main focus of Gramsci's argument.

The manipulation of learning is carried out by a particular section of the dominant class, the supporting intellectuals. There are, of course, intellectuals who do not support the ruling class, and some who are directly opposed, as was Gramsci himself. These are called the organic intellectuals; they are organic to, or integrated with, the masses, as opposed to the capitalist minority. The existence of these counter-intellectuals will not, in many cases, significantly hinder the work of the supporting intellectuals, as the latter have the apparatus of the state working with them, including easy access to mass communication and the state education system. For the sake of simplicity, from this point forth the word "intellectual" will refer to those who support the ruling class, as they are the focus of Gramsci's argument examined here.

Professional intellectuals, as opposed to lay persons with intellectual interests, have the task of forming the moral and cultural framework of any predominant mode of social organization, a framework which to a large extent justifies the social order. As Gramsci writes, intellectuals are the "specialised representatives and standard bearers" of any dominant social order.(26) He elaborates on this idea, in the context of the capitalist state:

Every social class, coming to existence on the original basis of an essential function in the world of economic production, creates with itself, organically, one or more groups of intellectuals who give it homogeneity and consciousness of its function not only in the economic field but in the social and political field as well: the capitalist entrepreneur creates with himself the industrial technician, the political economist, the organiser of a new culture, of a new law, etc. (27)

"Traditional" intellectuals who existed before the latest mode of social organization are either assimilated into the new intellectual elite, or become increasingly irrelevant.(28) The end result is that intellectuals, who formulate fundamental cultural and intellectual concepts, are creating the image of the social order which will be presented to the masses through education, official statements, or, in the case of academics or writers, through publications as well. They are thus "...'officers' of the ruling class for the exercise of the subordinate functions of social hegemony...of the 'spontaneous' consent given by the great masses of the population to the direction imprinted on social life by the fundamental ruling class..."(29) Unless there is a strong and organized sector of counter-intellectuals, the result is that the masses, with no alternative perspectives available to them, accept the status quo, as it will have been continuously presented to them as the "natural and good" order.

If the current of popular opinion diverges from this acceptance as a result of the efforts of counter-intellectuals, the supporting intellectuals will take one step ahead, and attempt to channel this sentiment towards acquiescence once again by subverting and manipulating the ideas of the counter-trend. In the case of the capitalist state,

this means forging a tactical affiliation with Marxist ideas; Gramsci writes, "The 'pure' [supporting] intellectuals, as elaborators of the most developed ruling-class ideology, were forced to take over at least some Marxist elements...in order to provide new weapons for the social group to which they were allied.'"(30)

Consciously or otherwise, the intellectual "officers" of the ruling class gain or maintain the image of independence from this class, and thus credibility in the eyes of the masses, which makes the continued intellectual domination of the masses possible. This, then, is the broad argument of intellectual domination, or hegemony, presented by Gramsci. Instead of viewing class domination as possible only as a result of economic handouts, or coercive repression, he regards it primarily as the result of intellectuals presenting the masses with certain images and ideas of the social order which portray acquiescence to the establishment as natural, morally correct and practically beneficial.

Gramsci did not consider this domination to be permanent. He did have faith in an eventual revolution, which would come about in part through the efforts of intellectuals working against hegemony, such as committed Marxists. However, the supporting intellectuals have the initial advantage, as they have at their disposal the power and pervasiveness of the state to disseminate their ideas. Thus, for an indefinite period the masses will endure the effects of deception on a massive scale, kept unaware of the extent of their subjugation, and thus deprived of the freedom to take control of their own lives.

Marcuse's work provides a less abstract elucidation of how domination occurs within this wider structure. Language, according to

this argument, is controlled to a large extent by the dominant class, who can manipulate meanings of words to their advantage, using value-laden terms to support their status and behavior.

The metaphorical aspect of language is what renders it vulnerable to manipulation. Words, especially those relating to human interaction, do not have meanings which exist beyond interpretation, and they can become metaphors for different objects or ideas as the interpretation of their meanings change. The metaphors can, then, be manipulated: changes in meaning can be carried out by those who have the power to make these changes and disseminate the new meaning to a large segment of the population. Of the organizations which have the resources to do this, none can rival the modern state or the large corporation, both pillars of the modern capitalist establishment, which can, through mass communications and local agents, communicate with the great majority of society whenever they wish.

The ruling class, then, can produce gradual shifts in the meaning of words which will, through tradition, retain their normative implications, but which will denote different objects, groups, or concepts. The establishment would do this for two reasons: first, to discredit its opponents, by labeling them with negatively charged terms. Thus, protesters are often labeled as "clownish" or "childish" in official and public pronouncements, while "'Maturity'-- by definition -- rests with the Establishment, with that which is..."(31; author's emphasis)

Second, the ruling class will attempt to instill compliant behavior within the masses on a regular basis. The terms of capitalism in particular have come to denote success and well-being, and the regular

use of these terms have driven capitalist principles into the masses' consciousness as symbols, metaphors, of success as human beings. As Marcuse writes, the language of the capitalist state creates "...a population which has introjected the needs and values of their masters and managers and made them their own, thus reproducing the established system in their minds, their consciousness, their senses and instincts."(32) Defining their lives in terms provided by the established order, people thus act in accordance with the establishment's interests, both politically and economically. They strive for cost efficiency in the workplace and accumulation of material goods at home, acting as both producers and markets for the capitalist establishment. Thus, within the capitalist social structure, language is a vital tool of depriving the masses of the freedom to choose their own circumstances, rendering them subject to the will of the ruling class.

Through intellectual domination, then, capitalist society constrains the people's freedom to decide their own lives, and to choose a life of self-control over one of subjugation. It imposes constraints by deception and persistent social conditioning, making the people blind to the alternatives, living within narrow confines of thought and behavior which they will eventually regard as natural. As intellectual domination is nearly undetectable, like an odourless poisonous gas, it is all the more perfidious, slowly eroding the people's freedom, and thus dehumanizing them, alienating them from their human qualities of self-awareness and the capacity to make conscious decisions about their own lives. As noted in the first chapter, one objective of terrorism was to shake the people free of their complacency. This seems all the more crucial after considering that this complacency actually arises from an

effort on the part of the dominant class to alienate the masses. Terrorism may be a cruel weapon, but its proponents contend that it is justifiable if it can counter this insidious process.

Anarchists would generally agree with what Gramsci and Marcuse argue, with some variation. Bakunin claimed that while people naturally demand equality and justice, and have the capacity for introspection and critical awareness, after being continually exposed to the barrage of socialization from the established order, they become "...endowed with stupidity, obtuseness, lack of realization of [their] rights", which result in "...unperturbed resignation and obedience." (33) Berkman further explains the anarchist view of hegemony: after prolonged exposure to social norms advocating the maintenance of the establishment, the "...vast majority of people live in contradiction with themselves and under continual misapprehension. They are generally unaware of it until some extraordinary event draws them out of their habitual somnambulism..." (34)

As this makes clear, propaganda of the deed to awaken the masses, as discussed in the first chapter, would itself not be seen as necessary unless hegemony was regarded as a problem in the anarchist perspective. Thus, despite their great faith in the intellectual and moral strength of humans, anarchists agree in general with Gramsci's and Marcuse's perspective regarding intellectual domination. The distinction which should be drawn, however, is that anarchists place more importance than Marxists on prolonged fear imposed by the state as a factor in establishing hegemony. To turn to Berkman again, "In this atmosphere of force and violence...fear and punishment we all grow up," (35) and this fear will play some role in numbing the awareness of the masses,

rendering them subservient and unquestioning over long periods of time. Thus, while Gramsci and Marcuse regard hegemony as possible through control of information, anarchists see fear as having a role as well.

## 2.b. Alienation in Economic Relations

For the working class in capitalist society, alienation is not only the result of state-imposed regulation and intellectual domination, but also of the economic relations of capitalist society, specifically the conditions within which labour occurs. The capitalist mode of production necessitates cost efficiency in production to increase profit gained from selling the product, or commodity, on the free market. This cost efficiency is achieved by maximizing efficiency in labour. While this benefits the capitalist, it has drastic effects for the workers.

Marx's 1844 essay on labour alienation, drawn from Eugene Kamenka's translation, will be the focus of this argument. Marx divides the alienation process in labour into four categories: the worker's alienation from the product; alienation from the act of production; alienation from other people; and alienation from the human species. Before proceeding with this argument, it is necessary to provide a general definition of capitalism.

Capitalism is the mode of production which involves, as Kamenka writes, "private property in the means of production, production for a market, and the use of money as pervasive features of the economy and...the rule of the bourgeoisie." (36) Capital itself is defined by Marx in this way:

Capital consists of raw materials, instruments of labour and means of subsistence of all kinds, which are utilised in order to produce new raw

materials, new instruments of labour and new means of subsistence.(37)

Capitalism is, then, the mode of production in which a particular class, the bourgeoisie, owns the means of production and utilizes them in order to produce surplus value, which is then reinvested as capital in an effort to increase productivity to obtain yet more surplus value. This surplus is obtained by selling products for more money than was expended in the production process. The non-owners, the proletariat and in some cases the peasantry, provide the labour in the production process, and the exploitation of this class is necessary in order for profits to be made.

To begin with Marx's argument, within this mode of production the workers are alienated first from their products. This is the case because the worker has no control over the product, but is instead controlled by it. The worker, as Marx writes, "puts his life into the object [product]; but now it [his life] no longer belongs to him, it belongs to the object.'"(38) This control over the worker lies in the worker's need for the object as a means to life, as Marx states, "The high point of this bondage lies in the fact that he can maintain himself as a physical subject only in so far as he is a worker and that only as a physical subject is he a worker.'"(39; author's emphasis) The worker has no control over the object, as it belongs to someone else, the capitalist, and yet needs to be able to produce the object, and therefore needs its existence, in order to survive. The relationship between the product and the worker is thus entirely one-sided.

Not only is the relationship one-sided, but it is confrontational: the product consists of what Marx calls "sensuous nature,"(40) that is,

material originating in nature which can be applied as a means to life. The more the worker produces, the less he has for his own consumption, as someone else, the capitalist, owns the product. Furthermore, as the worker is being paid a wage, which is not dependent on the amount nor quality of the products, the more the worker produces and the better the quality, the more the worker is degraded, as his work is worth less and less.(41) Therefore, not only is the worker a slave to the product, but he is also harmed by it; there is absolutely no personal affinity or identification with the object upon which the worker labours for a majority of the day. Thus, as Marx writes, "...the life he has given the object confronts him as something hostile and alien."(42) The object requires the worker's effort and, more importantly, will, but it is entirely estranged from him. The worker, then, in being alienated from the product is alienated from his own will, and thus his humanity.

The second aspect of the alienation of labour is closely related to the first. This is alienation from the act, or process of production. If the worker is alienated from the product of labour, "...then production itself must be active externalization, the externalization of activity, the activity of externalization."(43) In other words, workers are alienated from their own activity. Having no personal connection to the product, labour is not an act of self-fulfillment; instead, in working, the worker "...does not affirm himself but denies himself."(44) In working, the worker is expending energy and will, but does not obtain personal satisfaction from doing so; the capitalist who sells the product gains the satisfaction. The work is thus "labour of self-sacrifice, or mortification."(45) In working, then, the worker "...does not belong to himself but to someone else."(46) This last statement is

indeed the definition of alienation on an individual level: the worker, in being a worker, abdicates control over himself, his freedom, and thus his humanity.

The first two aspects of alienation pertain to the worker's identification with their own humanity on an individual level. The next two relate to the worker's relationship to human society. These call into focus the conception of alienation as being estranged from the wider human community, as discussed in the introduction to this section. The worker is, first, alienated from the human species in general. This argument begins by illustrating the universal interrelation between all people through their mutual dependence on nature, and their effects on each other through their effects on nature. How people affect nature is through their production, which is something they are consciously capable of deciding, as Marx writes, "Conscious life activity [production] distinguishes man directly from the life activity of the animal,"(47) which is unconscious. Once immediate material needs are satisfied, people do not stop producing; their products at this point gain a wider significance, because they are no longer made simply as a means to live, but to affect nature and thus the species. They are also no longer based on the law of survival, but instead on "the laws of beauty,"(48) which are universal to the species. Thus, human production, life activity, becomes the individual's link to the human species, to human society.

Within capitalist production, this is changed. As people work only to subsist, and have no control over what they produce, nor how they produce, they are no longer affirming themselves as members of the human species in their production. Marx writes:

In so far as alienated labour tears the object of his production away from man, therefore it tears him from his species-life...Similarly, in degrading spontaneous activity, to a level of a means, alienated labour makes man's species-life a means to physical existence.(49; author's emphasis)

The worker therefore sinks to the level of the animal, who produces only to subsist day by day. The worker's activity is no longer a contribution to the species, but only to himself. The worker, then, is denied that crucial link with human society which arises from freedom in deciding how and what to produce, and the loss of human identity is thus intensified.

Finally, the worker is alienated from other individuals. This follows from the above line of reasoning: "Generally, the proposition that man's species-being is alienated from him means that one man is alienated from another, just as each of them is alienated from human nature."(50) The worker is not producing for the species, but only for his own survival, and so is everyone else; they no longer see each other as contributing to each other's quality of life.

Furthermore, although Marx does not discuss this here, people are alienated from each other because they are in competition with each other for work, and thus for life itself. Labour is a commodity in the capitalist mode of production, and producers of commodities compete for their market share. Those who produce more cheaply will sell, the others will lose the competition. When subsistence is the prize, the stakes are high, and those who compete for it are bound to see each other as enemies. This effect, of course, will not endure as class consciousness develops, but until that time alienation of individual from individual

is intensified. Thus, not only are people alienated from the wider human species, but also from other humans: social atomization will ensure a sense of dehumanization.

This, then, is a brief summary of Marx's concept of the alienation of labour. In other writings Marx also discusses the effects of the division of labour, illustrating how it contributes to the alienation of labour. The division of labour, dividing the production of a commodity into many, very simple manual operations, allows products to be made more cheaply, as each worker becomes very skillful at their particular function, and thus very fast. Being paid by the hour, and not by the amount produced, the cost of each unit goes down as labour speed goes up, and thus the division of labour reduces labour cost and increases the profit margin of the commodity. However, the results for the worker are intensified alienation. As Marx states, "...a labourer who all his life performs one and the same simple operation, converts his whole body into the automatic, specialised implement of that operation.'"(51)

This results, then, in the alienation of the worker's own body from himself. For at least the whole working day the human body is "an appendage of the machine"; the worker is "daily and hourly enslaved by the machine."(52) Freedom is lost to a factory tool as it deprives the worker of control over her own body. The body is eventually "ossified"(53) into the optimal form for performing that particular function in the division of labour. Thus, the body itself is dehumanized, and as the worker has lost control over it, and can no longer freely decide her own body's fate, the worker is dehumanized in a more general sense as well. This sub-argument thus illustrates one of the more concrete processes through which alienation occurs within the

capitalist mode of production, and complements the wider argument of Marx's alienation essay.

While the anarchists have more to say regarding exploitation in economic relations than about alienation, there is explicit concurrence concerning the effects of the division of labour. Kropotkin writes:

That a smith condemned for life to make the heads of nails would lose all interest in his work, that he would be entirely at the mercy of his employer with his limited handicraft, that he would be out of work four months out of twelve, and that his wages would fall very low down, when it would be easy to replace him by an apprentice, [Adam] Smith did not think of all this when he exclaimed, "Long live the division of labour".(54)

It is likely that the anarchists would not entirely agree with the concept of alienation from product, as for many anarchists the economic order was to be more collectivist than communist. The wage system was not unjust as long as it reflected work done, not time spent working. Thus, the product does not have to be the result of the worker's free creation: the worker can work for a wage, and produce whatever the factory produces, as long as the factory is owned collectively, and as long as the wage directly reflects the worker's labour output.

However, anarchists would agree with Marxists to the extent that the criticism of alienation from product is a critique of the private ownership of the means of production; that is, people are alienated from their product because it belongs to someone else. The same applies for the point concerning alienation from the activity of production. It should be noted that while Bakunin and Proudhon were collectivists, as Kropotkin makes clear in The Conquest of Bread (Chapter 13), Kropotkin

was, like Marx, a communist, and thus this assessment varies to some degree with the branch of anarchism under consideration.

Alienation from species and other humans would be points of stronger agreement, as anarchism places much emphasis on the general universality and natural harmony between people, and spontaneous, voluntary cooperation. The notion of people compelled to work to support only themselves while disregarding wider humanity in their endeavors would thus appall the anarchists. With some qualification, then, Marx's essay on the alienation of labour can be considered general to socialism, both Marxist and anarchist streams.

Alienation thus arises from capitalist society as well as the state. Under the direction of intellectual-cultural institutions, people are deceived by the ruling class, and deprived of control over their lives by being blinded to the alternatives to their situation of subjugation. Economic institutions of capitalism alienate people from both themselves and other humans by meaningless and tedious labour. In each case, freedom is lost. It is lost through intellectual control in the sense that people cannot choose better conditions for themselves, as they lack the knowledge that better conditions are possible, and are kept in this state of ignorance by the upper class. Unable to choose, they are not free. Through labour the individual cannot choose how to spend one's productive time, and cannot choose what happens to their own body. They are deprived of freedom to make these fundamental choices. As conscious choice and free will are the most significant and unique characteristics of humans as a species, the people, having lost this, are thus alienated from their own humanity.

### 3. Conclusion

The socialist arguments for alienation arising from the capitalist state system have now been considered, and it is clear that in the eyes of revolutionary socialists, if left unchecked, this establishment will inevitably result in the alienation of the great majority of society. People will lose their freedom, and their human identity, both individual and collective. The state deprives the people of control over their own lives, both through their lack of control over laws which constrain their freedom, and through the sheer extent and complexity of the laws. At the same time, the social institutions, both intellectual-cultural and economic, further deprive the people of freedom. They are kept blind and servile through deception, and confined in time, space, and activity by working within the capitalist mode of production.

Alienation is the fate of the masses unless intervention in this process occurs. In the minds of socialist terrorists, such a heinous fate calls for the use of even cruel means if they can contribute to the revolution to overthrow the system which alienates. Terrorism can help bring the system which perpetrates this societal atrocity to its knees, and thus is regarded as an ethically justifiable weapon in the fight against the capitalist establishment.

### III. Exploitation

Exploitation, the second aspect of the moral deficiency of the capitalist state, is defined here as an elite's use of a subjugated class for the elite's own gain, and any activity which may facilitate such use. Kamenka renders Marx's definition of exploitation in less abstract terms, as "The process by which the appropriators of the means

of production extract surplus value from the labour of those who work these means, thus appropriating what is not theirs.'"(55) Exploitation, in the socialist perspective, is synonymous with the capitalist mode of production, whose imperative is surplus value, which can only be gained by the exploitation of workers. The critique of exploitation centers upon the relations of production in capitalist society, but even so the critique must consider the role of the state in facilitating exploitation, for it is essential to this process. Thus, the critique will be divided again between state and society. The state will be considered first, as that discussion will provide the legal backdrop for the consideration of exploitation in capitalist society.

#### 1. The State

The state does not normally directly exploit, but instead it facilitates exploitation by providing a conducive legal framework. The law of the capitalist state facilitates exploitation by upholding the inequality which both allows exploitation to occur, and which is the result of exploitation. There must be an imbalance in material security before one class can be exploited by another, so that the ruling class has leverage to effect the exploitation. This imbalance can only be maintained by a power capable of defending the exploiters against the exploited, and of protecting the appropriations resulting from exploitation. Upholding inequality is, then, the role of the state in the exploitation process.

To understand the extent to which the law of the capitalist state is linked to inequality created by the capitalist system, it is necessary to examine their parallel development. The development of the law of the capitalist state in fact arose from the development of

capitalism, as a necessary adjunct, and thus law is integral to the capitalist system from which inequality arises. Kropotkin points to the period in Europe in which absolute monarchies began to give way to the rule of law as the beginning of the co-development of law and capitalism, starting with the French Revolution.(56)

This period saw the ascension of the early bourgeoisie as the political elite, as their economic power gained predominance over the ascribed authority of the nobility. The new parliamentary regimes arising from the bourgeoisie's claims to power brought representative government based on the rule of law, which, compared to the rule of the monarchs, seemed to offer relief to all from arbitrary power. Thus, as Kropotkin writes, "...they [the masses] bowed their heads beneath the yoke of law to save themselves from the arbitrary power of their lords.'"(57)

What was not evident to the masses, however, was that the new form of law would prove to be as one-sided as the old. The bourgeoisie wasted little time in the effort, as Kropotkin writes, to, "...strengthen the principle upon which their ascendancy depended", (58) to paraphrase Marx, pitilessly tearing "...asunder the motley ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors'..."(59)

What replaced the old order was enshrinement of rights and freedoms, but these grand concepts were defined in such a way as to uphold the economically advantaged class, for, as Marx writes, "The practical application of the rights of man to freedom is the right of private property," and "...the right of man to property is the right to enjoy his possessions and dispose of the same arbitrarily, without regard for other men, independently from society, the right of selfishness.'"(60)

These rights became the basis of law, codifying the protection of the property owners from incursions against their right to ownership. Thus, Gramsci writes, "The...sovereignty of law, voted in by the representatives of the people -- was, in reality, the beginning of the dictatorship of the propertied classes, their 'legal' conquest of state power.'"(61) The law of the capitalist state developed in parallel, then, with the capitalist system itself, at every step being molded to serve the interests of the dominant class.

The result of this co-development is that law is now defined in terms of supporting the capitalist system by upholding inequality and exploitation. "But what are all these laws at the bottom?" asks Kropotkin; "The major portion have but one object -- to protect private property, i.e., wealth acquired by the exploitation of man by man.'"(62) The official state, then, being the creator and executor of laws, is, as Marx writes, "...nothing more than the form of organization which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests.'"(63)

This argument makes clear the strong link between the state and exploitation within the socialist account of the capitalist system. A distinction that arises between anarchism and Marxism is that while both regard the state as guilty of upholding exploitation, anarchists regard all centrally organized, coercive bodies as detrimental to humanity, regardless of whether or not the organization is tied to capitalism. In the case of the capitalist state, anarchists strongly agree that the state's ties to an unjust mode of economic organization become another aspect of the state's moral deficiency, but no form of state would be free of an anarchist moral critique. Marxists, on the other hand, have

faith in the long-term justice to be rendered by the establishment of the temporary dictatorship of the proletariat, which is a tool to reverse and then end exploitation. Regardless of this divergence, both strands of socialism clearly view the capitalist state as morally deficient as a result of its protection by laws of the exploiters of the masses. This argument has illustrated the legal backdrop which makes exploitation possible in capitalist society.

## 2. Society

There are two closely related aspects to the critique of exploitation in capitalist society. The first points to exploitation of society as a whole as a result of the ownership of private property. This is based on Marx's labour theory of value. The second aspect brings the discussion to the class level, and considers wage labour and the growth of capital in the exploitation of the working class specifically. Both are reflected in anarchist thought. The broader aspect will be considered first.

Private property is one crucial aspect of exploitation for socialists. The private ownership of property, specifically that which is or could be applied as a means of production, is tantamount to the exploitation of society. In the socialist perspective, a commodity is worth only the labour, the efforts and toil of workers, that went into producing it. As Marx explains:

In calculating the exchangeable value of a commodity we must first add to the quantity of labour last employed the quantity of labour previously worked up in the raw material of the commodity, and the labour bestowed on the implements...with which such labour is assisted.  
(64)

No one but workers has contributed to the commodity's production, but it is society as a whole that actually has the rightful claim of ownership.

This is so because in a modern society there is a very high degree of interdependence between producers. For example, some produce machinery used in other production processes; some produce the food necessary to feed all producers; some provide the education of the workers in productive techniques; and some build the roads used in transporting products. The ultimate producer, then, is the entire society, as Marx writes, "Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of...all members of society, can it be set in motion." (65) It follows, then, that commodities are the rightful property of society as a whole.

Within capitalism, however, property is not owned by society as a whole, but instead is privately owned by individuals. Those who own property produced by society have no plausible claim to it, but they own it all the same as a result of having money. As Marx states, those who can obtain property are "...the owners of money, means of subsistence, who are eager to increase the sum of values they possess, by having other people's labour power," (66) or the value produced by this labour power. And as for money signifying the right to own, Marx asks, "Whence arose the illusions of the monetary system?" (67) Property, then, is taken from the society which produced it into the exclusive possession of the owners of capital, who then rent it back to society at exorbitant rates. Thus, private property, the foundation of capitalism, is exploitation of society as a whole.

While this argument is most prominent in Marx's writings, it also appears in anarchist thought. Kropotkin, for example, agrees that a commodity belongs to society as a whole, and that private ownership is exploitation. This perspective is illustrated in the following example, which, while not sharing exactly the same reasoning as Marx's argument, does reflect the same principle of social ownership:

A house in certain parts of Paris is valued at many thousands of pounds sterling, not because many thousands of pounds' worth of labour have been expended on that particular house, but because it is in Paris; because for centuries workmen, artists, thinkers, and men of learning and letters have contributed to make Paris what it is today -- a center of industry, commerce, politics, art and science...because it is the fruit of eighteen centuries of toil, the work of fifty generations of the whole French nation... Who, then, has the right to sell to any bidder the smallest portion of the common heritage? (68)

Thus, as long as private property exists, society will be made to pay a "heavy tribute to property holders" for the use of that property for production or living, and therefore "...well-being can only be temporarily guaranteed to a very few; it is only to be bought by a large section of society.'"(69) The broader aspect of the exploitation argument can thus be regarded as general to both streams of revolutionary socialism.

The second aspect of exploitation applies specifically to the working class, and is the result of both wage labour and the growth of capital. In Marx's essay, "Wage Labour and Capital,'"(70) wage labour is defined as the means by which the capitalist exploits the worker. The worker receives a constant wage, regardless of the amount of goods produced, while the capitalist obtains additional value from the sale of

the product which far exceeds the amount paid to the worker in wages. This is the root argument concerning wage labour. Two questions arise at this point. First, why are wages so low in relation to the profit reaped by the sale of the product? Second, why do workers lack the economic power to bargain for higher wages?

To consider the first question, wages are, in fact, the price of a commodity, and this commodity is labour power. Labour power is not the same as labour, as it is not the activity of labouring, but the amount of work, or production, that this activity can provide in any given period of time.(71) As Marx writes, "Labour power, therefore, is a commodity, neither more nor less than sugar. The former is measured by the clock, the latter by the scales."(72) The price of this commodity is established by "...the cost required for maintaining the worker as a worker and of developing him into a worker."(73)

With modern production techniques involving an extensive division of labour, almost anyone is capable of being a worker with very little training or education, as the various tasks in the production line are extremely simple. Thus, the second half of the equation in calculating wages is reduced to a negligible level, and all that is left is the first: maintenance, or subsistence. Workers, therefore, who commit their time, will, and energy to the production process, receive only enough to survive day by day, while the capitalist, who commits far less of each, receives the great bulk of the profit.

Wages are thus as low as possible, despite the profit gained by the capitalist, and therefore a high degree of exploitation is assured. But it is not yet clear why workers do not have the capacity to bargain for higher wages. If they sell a commodity, labour power, then could they

not set the price of this commodity to gain a profit for themselves, just as capitalists do when they sell some manufactured commodity? In fact, workers may have some capacity for bargaining for a limited period, but the inevitable growth of capital will eventually demolish this capacity, and bring exploitation to new heights.

The growth of capital is a process which begins slowly, but then proceeds logarithmically. Surplus value is extracted, and reinvested in production to increase productive output and efficiency. More surplus thus increasingly becomes available for reinvestment, and eventually capital expands significantly. This process has positive effects for the working class in the earlier stages, as the need for workers expands; for a short time the labour supply is below demand, and wages and job security will increase. But other results of the growth of capital quickly manifest themselves.

One is that the competition between capitalists increases. As Marx states, "The increasing extent of the capitals provides the means for bringing more powerful labour armies with more gigantic instruments of war into the industrial battlefield." (74; author's emphasis) As soon as a capitalist has acquired these means, production must increase, because such means are expensive, and can only be sustained by selling more products. This occurs, then, as the efficient producer can sell more cheaply and thus acquires a larger share of the market. In the process, however, "He drives them [the competition] from the field, he wrests from them at least a part of their sales, by underselling them." (75; author's emphasis) Production increases, leading to increased competition, and thus increased numbers of losers in that competition.

These developments generate intensified exploitation. First, as Marx writes, "In addition, the working class gains recruits from the higher strata of society...Thus the forest of uplifted arms demanding work becomes ever thicker..."(76; author's emphasis) Increased productive efficiency through technological development also leads to an expansion of the unemployed, as fewer workers are used to do more work, and therefore fewer workers are needed. Thus, an "industrial reserve army"(77) is created, a pool of readily available, desperate recruits for capitalists to draw upon.

Intensified exploitation of labour ensues. Those who still hold jobs are being exploited more because they are producing far more as a result of the productive technology, yet they are not being paid more. The capitalist gets more profit, while the workers' share relatively decreases. At the same time, workers who have jobs are deprived of bargaining power, and on an absolute level must work harder for less. There is an army of hungry, desperate people ready to replace them for half the wage if they do not please their capitalist employers. Thus it is clear why workers will not be able to seek profits in the sale of their labour power: the game shifts from profit to survival at an exponential rate as capital expands. It is also clear how this expansion results in intensified exploitation in general.

While Marxism was the focus here, exploitation is also a concern of anarchism. Kropotkin again provides a concise example of the anarchist outlook on this issue, reflecting Marx's notion of the "industrial reserve army":

If all the men and women...had their daily bread assured, and their daily needs already satisfied, who would work for our capitalist wage of half a crown a day, while the

commodities one produces in a day sell in the market for a crown or more?...the poor quarters of our towns and the neighbouring villages are full of needy wretches...So, before the factory is well finished, the workers hasten to offer themselves. Where a hundred are required three hundred besiege the door...(78)

The similarity to the Marxist perspective is clear, and thus exploitation is a concern common to both anarchist and Marxist streams of revolutionary socialism.

### 3. Conclusion

In the revolutionary socialist tradition, exploitation and alienation stand as major moral deficiencies of the capitalist order. The state, the laws of which are tied inextricably to capitalism, provides the legal framework in which exploitation can occur. Few would be able to endure the conditions of the worker within the capitalist relations of production unless they were legally constrained from any other route, such as simply taking what they needed to live reasonably well. Laws protect the capitalists from such action, and ensure that those who do not own property have only one choice: work for the capitalist or lose the means to subsistence. The relations of production within capitalist society directly effect the exploitation. Workers are compelled to work for a wage that is divorced from any calculation of the amount of production accomplished by their labour, and the growth of capital results in an increasingly desperate situation for the workers, bringing exploitation to its cruel extremes.

Exploitation is also a major source of alienation. Workers will certainly be alienated from their product and the process of production

if they cannot earn their fair share in their work. As well, exploitation to the degree which occurs in the capitalist system is the reason why workers submit to the alienating labour process in the first place. They will never earn enough to extricate themselves from wage-labour, and thus are compelled each day to return for hours to an activity which they find personally meaningless and dehumanizing.(79) Exploitation thus overlaps with alienation, and as such is all the more perfidious. Justice cannot replace exploitation until the capitalist system is destroyed, as it is based on exploitation. Terrorism, though it may kill indiscriminately, can contribute to this destruction and thus the end of exploitation. This, again, renders it ethically justifiable in the minds of its socialist perpetrators.

It is necessary to mention before moving on that modern terrorist groups, such as the ones discussed in Chapter Three, not only focus on exploitation within states, but also between states, as exploitation of ex-colonies by major capitalist powers. Lenin's essays on imperialism provide the foundation of this focus, and while an examination of international exploitation lies beyond the scope of this study, it is an area relevant to modern terrorism, and thus one to be pursued in more detailed analyses. Two of Lenin's essays in particular are relevant in this regard, "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination," and "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" (see Robert C. Tucker, ed., 1975).

These essays provide the root of more recent bodies of thought, such as international structuralism and dependency theory, which pose the Third World as dominated by the industrialized capitalist West, for the purpose of exploiting the natural resources, cheap labour, and

markets of these regions. The notion of exploitation remains similar in essence to that which has been discussed in this section, but the focus is expanded to include relations between societies, not only those between classes within a single society. Thus, while not discussed here, the notion international exploitation can be understood and built upon by the general overview of exploitation in this section.

#### IV. Violence

The capitalist system alienates and exploits the masses. Standing aside these crimes is yet another, far more overt, with more immediate effects on the people. This is the violence perpetrated by the capitalist establishment, specifically the state. Violence could be considered to be any form of harm inflicted on people, and such a broad definition would certainly include alienation and exploitation. But for the purposes of this section, violence will be understood as consciously applied coercion, that is, threat of force or force, resulting in direct physical or mental harm to the target person or group. This form of violence is clearly within the realm of the state, and thus the state will be the focus of this component.

The following discussion begins by examining the general forms and effects of state violence. The forms of violence include the invasion of privacy through surveillance; incarceration; and direct physical reprisal. This will be followed by an illustration of how this harm is unreasonable and excessive, and thus all the more ethically flawed. As the state is the central focus of the anarchist critique, anarchism will provide the primary source for this discussion, with some consideration of the Marxist perspective.

An invasion of privacy resulting from surveillance of potential transgressors often involves paying informants to report on activities of those with whom the informant is acquainted. The harm in such a case is two-fold. First, the informant is compelled to spy on someone who has their trust, and thus to commit a moral crime in which the informant betrays the target of the surveillance. Informants are compelled through payment, which is compulsion because they suffer materially as a result of the legally supported inequalities of the capitalist system. Thus, their desperation forces them to accept the task of informing.

Informants are dehumanized, as they are forced to act in an unnatural and morally depraved manner. As Kropotkin writes, "Only estimate the torrent of depravity let loose in human society by the 'informing' which is countenanced by judges, and paid in hard cash by governments, under the pretext of assisting in the discovery of a 'crime'." (80)

The other side of this equation is of course the person under surveillance. This person is being violated. First, their actions are being watched, and thus they are deprived of a basic aspect of human dignity: privacy. Second, their actions are being judged by those whose different set of interests and values are tied to the capitalist state through employment, and thus who are far from objective. The victims, however, have no recourse to justify or defend their actions, as they are unaware that judgment is taking place. Surveillance, then, dehumanizes on the one hand, and violates on the other. It is in itself a moral crime, though of course not a crime in the eyes of the capitalist state, whose interests it supports.

It should be noted that the use of paid informants has occurred for decades far less in industrialized capitalist states than in other varieties of states, such as military dictatorships and totalitarian states. Informing is no longer typical of Western capitalist states, and therefore the impact of this criticism applied to industrialized democracies has weakened with time. However, the practice does persist to some degree, and it must also be born in mind that Kropotkin's anarchist criticism would be directed at all states, not just those of the capitalist West.

Incarceration is another category of coercion. This involves placing people in highly restrictive confinement for long or indefinite periods of time, often in the same place as other victims. Such a condition is tantamount to torture: it deprives people of basic pleasures and human contact, and it places people in unnaturally cramped and monotonous surroundings. Again, Kropotkin's writing illustrates the harm of this form of violence: "By a refinement of cruelty, those who planned our prisons did everything they could to break all relationships of the prisoners with society...In the sombre life of the prisoner which flows by without passion or emotion, all the finer sentiments rapidly become atrophied." (81) Demoralization, emotional agony, is thus followed by dehumanization. The cruelty is clear.

Finally, the legal system of the capitalist state also inflicts direct physical harm upon the masses. In many jurisdictions those who kill are in turn killed, which only adds to the number of unnaturally dead. But, as well, violence is applied against those who openly protest against the injustice of the capitalist state. Herbert Marcuse writes, "Today, every demonstration is confronted with the ever-present

(latent?) violence of suppression...This society strives to impose the principle of nonviolence on the opposition while daily perfecting its own 'legitimate' violence, thereby protecting the status quo.'"(82) State violence against political protest takes the forms of beating and killing. The harm is clear, as well as the cruel irony: people protest against injustice and cruelty, and the state's response is to injure or kill them.

Briefly considering why transgressions which invite coercive responses occur at all in the capitalist system will illustrate the unreasonable excessiveness of the violence inflicted by the state. First, it is clear from the preceding discussions on the alienating effects of law, that it is not easy to adhere to the complex network of laws. It requires conscious and detailed awareness. As Proudhon writes, ``Do you suppose that the people, or even the government itself, can keep their reason in this labyrinth [of law]?'"(83) It would thus be easy enough to simply forget to obey a certain law, and the result could well be one or more of the types of reactions outlined above. Clearly, it seems absurdly excessive to punish someone for forgetfulness or ignorance of the laws.

Laws could also be broken through a desire to alter society to mitigate injustice, through political agitation and protest. The result of violence seems, as Proudhon writes, to be more an act of vengeance than necessity: "The [legal] Code is constructed, not for justice, but for the most iniquitous and atrocious vengeance; the last vestige of the ancient hatred of the patrician for the servile classes.'"(84) The state elite regards protest not as a sign of problems to be addressed, but as an affront against its privileged status. The reasons for hurting people

are again without a moral basis, especially in the case of crimes which protest against inequality and cruelty.

Finally, people commit crimes against each other, usually through forms of theft or violent assault. Kropotkin points out that people steal not only through a need to achieve material security, but crimes are often the result of the dehumanization process inflicted by the state and capitalism. As he writes, "Year in and year out we see thousands of children grow up in the midst of the moral and material filth of our great cities...we can only be astonished that so few of them become highwaymen and murderers," (85) and yet some do lose their humanity to the extent that they turn on fellow humans. "Crime" in many cases thus represents social problems which desperately require addressing, but the reaction of the legal system is to inflict yet more violence.

While not every crime is caused by these reasons, it is nonetheless evident that the violence of the state is in most cases entirely disproportionate to the transgression. As well, in many cases pressures inflicted by the legal and economic systems themselves have led to the transgressions. The violence inflicted, then, is suffering heaped upon suffering. It is compounded. The masses live within an unjust system constrained by tight legal parameters, suffering the effects of inequality. The system seems designed to ensure that transgressions will occur. Inevitably, people slip from the narrow path of legality, and when they do, the state's coercive apparatus is ready, its violent designs on hand.

Despite the incongruity between Marxists and anarchists on the issue of the transitional revolutionary state, classical Marxists also

regard the state as imposing violent repression and cruelty upon the masses. While Lenin believed that state violence had a morally justifiable role in ensuring the survival of the post-capitalist order, Engels captures the classical Marxist view of the state as inherently repressive and cruel, even if necessary at some point, in this passage:

In reality, however, the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy; and at best an evil inherited by the proletariat after its victorious struggle for class supremacy, whose worst sides the victorious proletariat...cannot avoid having to lop off at once as much as possible until such time as a generation reared in new, free social conditions is able to throw the entire lumber of the state on the scrap heap.(86)

It is clear that Engels at least was skeptical that the state could ever shed its inherent cruelty, and thus this classical Marxist perspective is shared to some extent with anarchists. As well, Marxists would also regard the state as responsible for much of the cruelty inflicted on the masses through alienation and intensified exploitation: the state upholds the class structure that allows these to occur. While the classical Marxist criticism, Lenin's outlook aside, of state violence is expressed less directly than in anarchist critiques, it is clear all the same that the anarchist sentiment is shared to some extent.

Thus, in the eyes of revolutionary socialists, compounding the plight of the masses is the violence of the capitalist state. Unreasonable and excessive, for socialist terrorists it contributes to the ethical justification for terrorism in the socialist struggle. Terrorism will not only contribute to the effort to bring freedom and justice, but also a peaceful, harmonious society in which violence will

exist only in the memories of those who endured life under the capitalist system.

## V. Conclusions of the Moral Critique

The moral critique outlined in this chapter has illustrated the three central aspects of the ethical deficiency of the capitalist system: alienation, exploitation, and violence. Each of these causes suffering and humiliation for the great majority of society, all for the purpose of upholding the exclusive status and material wealth of the ruling class. Terrorism is itself a cruel weapon, as it kills, and even kills some who are not directly involved in the revolutionary struggle on either side, but in the outlook of terrorists, terrorism is still far less cruel than the capitalist establishment. Terrorism is thus seen as the lesser of two evils employed to destroy the greater, and it is clear that in this perspective, if terrorism can make a significant contribution to the demise of the establishment, then it is indeed a morally justifiable weapon in the socialist struggle.

### Chapter III, Case Study

#### I. Introduction and Background

The analysis so far has considered some major theoretical rationales for socialist terrorism. These relate both to the practical benefits of terrorism for the wider socialist struggle, and the reasons why terrorism is considered ethically justifiable. However, political ideas rarely exist only on paper, and to fully comprehend any set of ideas requires an examination of their active manifestations. This is especially so as an idea in its written form seldom corresponds directly to the same idea implemented in society. This chapter's aim is to illustrate how the theories examined have manifested themselves as actions, to shed more light on both the ideas and their active expressions in modern society. Such an illustration will reinforce the argument that modern socialist terrorism has deep roots in theory.

The discussion will be based on three cases. The Red Brigades of Italy will be the central example, while the Red Army Faction of Germany and Direct Action of France will be the secondary cases. This method permits a more in depth focus on a single group, while at the same time allowing for an illustration of the major similarities and variations within the wider socialist terrorist movement in Europe.

The choice of the Red Brigades as the central case arises from its significance among socialist terrorist groups. Of all of the groups formed within industrialized capitalist states with the purpose of facilitating a socialist revolution, the Red Brigades were by far the

most active and posed the highest threat to the state.\* As Alexander and Pluchinsky write, "During the 1970's it was the largest, most active and most lethal of all the European 'fighting communist organizations'." (1) The secondary cases have been chosen for their relative prominence, and because they, too, arose in independent, industrialized states. The aims of the case groups were thus predominantly oriented towards changes in the structure of the capitalist establishment, and not national liberation as well, as has been the case with many socialist terrorist groups in the developing world. Thus, their socialist character was uncoloured by nationalist aspirations, and is therefore more clearly expressed in the literature produced by these groups.

The case study will be organized loosely within the parameters provided by the theoretical analysis, but the organization will be revised to allow a focus on those aspects of the case groups' theory which are most clearly defined. Thus, the format of this analysis will include the following components: aims; reasons for resorting to violence; strategy in implementing violence; and ethical critique. Within each of these sections, the Red Brigades will be examined first, followed by the secondary cases. Each section will conclude with a brief examination of the major divergences between the theoretical positions of the case groups. The analysis in this section relies on secondary literature which often reproduces primary materials - such as

---

\* The list of socialist terrorist groups operating in industrialized democracies in the 1970's is extensive. Some of the more active, aside from the cases here, were the Japanese Red Army, the Revolutionary Organization 17 November in Greece, the First of October Anti-Fascist Resistance Groups in Spain, and the Fighting Communist Cells in Belgium. In both Germany and Italy there were several other socialist terrorist groups as well, including the German Revolutionary Cells, and Front Line in Italy.

communiqués and statements of the terrorists - that will receive special attention.

## II. Background

We can begin setting the context for the case studies by noting that the general political and social atmosphere in the industrialized liberal democracies, and in particular Western Europe, was becoming increasingly radicalized throughout the 1960's, culminating in what Weinberg and Eubank refer to as the "culture of 1968." (2) The roots of this radicalization lay in support for national liberation struggles in the Third World, such as Cuba and Algeria, (3) the anti-Vietnam War movement, (4) and recent works by critical thinkers, including Sartre and Marcuse, strongly criticizing capitalism and imperialism. (5)

The most notable manifestation of this political mood were the student revolts in France (1968), which were in fact only the most sensational of similar student movement activities in Europe and the United States. This atmosphere was characterized by student political activism focused on intense criticism and scrutiny of the moral foundations of liberal democracy, capitalism, and what was considered to be the neo-imperialist foreign policies of the industrialized West. Criticism came primarily from socialist perspectives, taking the form of demonstrations, rioting, and anti-establishment publications.

The period resembled in many ways the mid to late 1800's in Europe, a time in which political dissent, often guided by socialist thought, including anarchism, raised the hopes of revolutionaries that the revolution had arrived. The revolts of 1968 seemed to be evidence once again that capitalism was nearing its demise, as Drake writes, "The two

years 1968 and 1969 had proved this much to the satisfaction of every honest Marxist...."(6) Extraparliamentary political groups seeking to take advantage of the turbulence to contribute to radical political change, varying in the degrees of their faith in violence, were spawned throughout the West, and Italy was no exception. One such group, the Metropolitan Political Collective formed in Milan in 1969, would by 1970 become the Red Brigades, the most serious terrorist threat to any Western state.

In such an atmosphere, political violence was becoming less and less of an anomaly. It was increasingly accepted by those on the radical left as an appropriate means of seeking political change. Thus, as Wright states, "1968 is usually given as the starting point of modern political terrorism."(7)

However, it is not so clear why terrorism became so much more serious a threat in Italy than in other Western states. In comparison to the worst cases elsewhere in the industrialized democracies, Italy's experience was far more severe and enduring. As an example, there were over 13000 terrorist attacks in Italy between 1969 and 1982, ranging from short-term abductions to assassinations and bombings, most of which were the work of socialist groups, in particular the Red Brigades.(8) Obviously, exposure to the wave of radical sentiment was not the only factor in Italy's case. If all Western states were affected by the international political mood, then the reasons for Italy's anomalous condition must be sought in its own unique political and social characteristics.

In fact, Italy in the late 1960's and 1970's was an archetypal model of political decay. It had a long legacy of political violence,

including its violent unification; the anarchist terrorism of the late 1800's; fascist and communist counter-fascist violence before and during World War Two; and finally the sporadic continuation of violence from both the left and right following the War.(9) As well, Italy's economic situation in the 1960's and 1970's was volatile. After a post-War boom which raised the expectations of the people, in the late 1960's the economy was sliding into stagnation. Employment opportunities were not keeping pace with the numbers of youth graduating from schools, and the swollen industrial working class was a potentially vast army of unemployed.(10) Increasing labour unrest only made the situation worse,(11) and in 1973 the oil crisis substantially multiplied Italy's economic problems.

The roots of unrest were also political. Italy's fragile government regularly consisted of the conservative Christian Democrats and the Socialists, who barely managed to survive as a government, given the vast ideological gulf that separated them, let alone achieve significant changes in society.(12) By the 1970's, there was a widespread sentiment in Italian society that the democratic system as it stood was virtually useless for the country.(13) The only significant alternatives to the centrist coalition were either the neo-fascists or the Italian Communist Party (PCI).

Many students and workers would have gladly supported the PCI, but by the late 1960's it was apparent that it had taken the reformist path, what its leader Enrico Berlinguer called the "historic compromise,"(14) toning down its revolutionary character. As leftists at the time believed, this notion "...boldly amounted to revisionism, to a betrayal of the working class."(15) Thus, party politics was not regarded as a

viable path for change by radicals of the period. Change would have to come from outside the system.

On top of the mounting frustration among leftist radicals regarding the social and political stagnation, there was a sense of desperation arising from the threat posed by the radical right. Neo-fascist terrorism was already present by the late 1950's, and this was a cause of concern and anger among the radical left. More importantly, there were alarming hints of collaboration between the state security services and the neo-fascists,(16) which were intensified by an alleged neo-fascist coup attempt in 1970.(17) Whether or not such allegations are based on fact is difficult to substantiate, although there is some evidence that the state security forces did make conscious efforts to blame neo-fascist terror on anarchist groups in an episode in 1969.(18) Regardless, it is clear that leftist fear of the right-wing threat would have been strong, and this was another significant motivating factor in both the creation and sustainment of a violent socialist movement.

Thus, it is clear that Italy was unique among the industrialized democracies for its potential for political violence in the 1960's and 1970's. Not only were socialist radicals influenced by the wider political atmosphere in the West, but also by a frustrating and precarious domestic environment which seemed to demand action which the government would not or could not provide. This volatile atmosphere explains to some degree why the Red Brigades arose in Italy, and especially why they were so dangerous a threat to the state compared to similar groups in other Western countries. This, then, roughly defines the context in which socialist terrorism was born and thrived for over a decade.

The Red Brigades originated in 1970 from the Metropolitan Political Collective, a socialist activist group established by Renato Curcio and Margherita Cagol in 1969. By 1974 the Red Brigades were engaging in assassination, knee-capping and kidnapping, and their reign of violence intensified for the next six years, reaching a peak in 1979. Targets included business executives, factory floor managers, members of the legal system, police, right-wing journalists, and politicians.(19) In 1978 the Red Brigades committed their most notorious action, the kidnapping and subsequent assassination of ex-prime minister and chairman of the Christian Democratic Party, Aldo Moro. Violence continued unabated until 1981, when the group began to feel the effects of repeated blows from the police and secret service. As Weinberg and Eubank write, "The revolutionaries were by now clearly on the defensive, with hundreds of them being arrested during 1981-1982." (20) By 1982, the group was rendered insignificant, and despite periodic and infrequent strikes against its old enemies, it continued to be little more than a shadow of its former self until about 1988, after which the group became inactive.(21)

The Red Army Faction (RAF) was West Germany's most active socialist terrorist group. It was created in 1970 out of the same international environment which contributed to the founding of the Red Brigades. The RAF perpetrated actions similar to those of the Red Brigades, but on a much reduced scale. The major difference between the two groups is that the RAF focused as much against the international capitalist, "imperialist" order, represented by the United States and NATO, as it did against the German state,(22) while the Red Brigades focused predominantly on instigating a class revolution within Italy.(23) As

well, the RAF's actions were often carried out beyond Germany's borders, and included close affiliation with other terrorist groups, such as the radical Palestinians.(24) Like the Red Brigades, the RAF began to lose impetus as a result of police activity. This decline began sooner than in the Italian case, roughly by 1977, but the RAF managed to maintain a higher overall level of activity into the mid 1980's and beyond.

Direct Action of France bears more resemblance to the RAF than to the Red Brigades, both in size and ideological outlook. Beginning its career in 1979, Direct Action focused on "imperialism and capitalism" as its major concerns, "in France and elsewhere." (25) Despite the espoused international focus, this group confined its actions for the most part to France, and never achieved the international links of the RAF.(26) Perhaps as a result of a split into two smaller factions early in its life, Direct Action's operations have generally been less frequent and somewhat cruder than those of its counterparts, and its impact on the French state does not even approach that of the Red Brigades in Italy. However, the group did remain active until 1987, when "both factions were completely neutralized by police arrests." (27)

The analysis will turn to consider the influence of the foundational theory on the case groups, examining the groups' aims, reasons for resorting to violence, strategies for using violence, and ethical critiques of the establishment.

### III. Aims

Before considering the aims of the subject groups, we should recall that within revolutionary socialist theory, the ultimate goal is revolution, the overthrow of the existing socio-political and economic order and

ruling class, achieved via the destruction of the state and capitalism, the two central pillars of the modern class structure. Anarchism gives more emphasis to the state as a target, and Marxism focuses more on capitalism. The concrete aim of terrorism is to expedite the initial revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist state. The following will examine the ways in which the modern revolutionary groups discussed here have made this goal their own.

### 1. Red Brigades

Unlike many other socialist movements, the Red Brigades adhered quite closely to classical socialist theory, with a primarily Marxist-Leninist orientation, in the formation of their central aim.(28) As it announced in one of its communiqués in 1978, this aim was to lead the "proletarian initiative" towards the "Revolutionary Class War."(29) One of the earlier publications of the group defines its aim in classical Marxist-Leninist terms:

...organize our proletarian power in this attack, establishing armed political nuclei in the proletarian neighbourhoods of the city; because the attack and the destruction of bourgeois power, and the establishment of proletarian power are part of the same transition in the revolutionary process.(30)

As well as adopting the central aim of classical socialism, the Red Brigades demonstrated faith in the principle of historical determinism, which reflects some adherence to Marx's own views. They regarded their role in facilitating the revolution as a historical imperative. As one of the group's strategic directives from 1978 states: "Une nécessité irresistible rend irresistible le processus de la révolution sociale et

parmi toutes les forces productives, nous, l'avant-garde organisée du proletariat metropolitain, sommes la principale."(31) Significant in this passage is the phrase ``revolution sociale," which makes it clear that the group's aims were more than a simple political takeover, but were, instead, total social transformation, as advocated by the foundational revolutionary theorists.

The Red Brigades, however, believed that their ultimate aim of revolution was still far ahead in the future; as Meade states, their focus was "...the pursuit of the early stages of the civil war of long duration against capitalism."(32) The immediate task was to prepare the path for this revolution, and this entailed the achievement of what can be regarded as two shorter-term goals. These were to counter the creation of the Imperialist State of the Multinationals (SIM); and the creation of a preliminary revolutionary movement, broader than a few scattered terrorist organizations, but still less than a full mass movement. Each of these will be briefly examined.

The idea of SIM conceives of the Italian state as an integral unit within the broader structure of global imperialism, a system dominated militarily by the United States and NATO, and economically by multinational corporations. The events from which this idea arose included the oil crisis of 1973, which struck Italy severely, and compelled the Italian government to go "...hat in hand...to ask the United States, West Germany, and IMF for emergency loans."(33) Loans were conditional, and included the exclusion of the Italian Communist Party from sharing power in the coalition.(34) As well, there was substantial evidence that the US government and several large multinationals, including Exxon and ITT, were funding the center-right

Christian Democrats (CD), and bribing Italian politicians to vote in the interests of these corporations on issues of trade and commerce.(35)

It seemed, then, that the Italian state, inseparable from the reigning CD Party in the eyes of the radical left, was selling out the Italian proletariat and Italy itself for handouts from the global capitalists. This would only benefit the Italian bourgeoisie, that could take advantage of integration with the global market using the cheap labour supplied by a severely underrepresented and disempowered proletarian class to make profits from exports to the capitalist centers. "Perhaps more significant," Salvioni and Stephanson point out, "it was believed, along the lines of classical Leninist theory, that Italy had become the weakest link in the international system, and would, in the retrospective words of BR-[co]founder Roberto Ognibene, 'go the way of Lebanon, the dissolution of national power'."(36)

If left to its own devices, then, the current CD-dominated regime would doom the Italian proletariat through its efforts to restructure the state in the interests of global capitalism. Thus, a major secondary aim was to prevent the rise of the SIM. As the Red Brigades stated in a strategic resolution in 1977, they were thus compelled to "ATTACK, HIT, LIQUIDATE AND DEFINITELY ROUT THE CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT PARTY, AXIS OF RESTRUCTURING OF THE STATE AND OF THE IMPERIALIST COUNTER-REVOLUTION."(37)

The Red Brigades' other aim was to organize a broad-based revolutionary organization to fight the establishment, less than a mass revolutionary movement, but more than a few covert groups. The organization of the final revolutionary movement was still in need of preparation, but there was a middle ground between clandestine action by

small groups and ultimate mass struggle which the Red Brigades felt was currently attainable. It was necessary and possible, then, to "intensify and organize the mobilization of the masses and their vanguards against the economic and war-mongering policy of the government." (38) It is significant that this was not to be an organization of the revolutionary forces directly, but only an organization of the "mobilization" of these forces. However far from the revolution itself, such a step was crucial.

The intention was that this organizational effort would result in a broad-based opposition, called the Offensive Proletarian Resistance Movement (MPRO), led by a vanguard, the Communist Combatant Party. (39) The MPRO would be composed of the various student movements, socialist feminist groups, (40) and radical worker movements, while the Combatant Party would consist of, as Furet et.al. explain, "Les franges marginales du proletariat...qui pourra canaliser sa violence spontanée vers la lutte révolutionnaire." (41) These "marginal fringes" would consist of those already broken out of the established social structure, criminal elements living outside the law and already operating against the state in random, spontaneous outbursts of violence, but not yet approaching the level of sophistication of the Red Brigades. This movement as a whole, itself under the leadership of the Red Brigades or a future manifestation of the Brigades, would eventually lead to the ultimate revolutionary clash. Attaining these developments thus became another secondary aim of the Red Brigades, an aim often repeated at the end of its communiqués: "UNIFY THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT BUILDING THE FIGHTING COMMUNIST PARTY." (42)

It is worth noting that the Red Brigades' hopes of relying on the "marginal fringes" reflects an anarchist influence. Bakunin in

particular believed that the fringe classes, those who did not have any meaningful role or position in capitalist society, were natural socialist activists, and would make ideal revolutionaries: "The drudge-people have nothing to renounce and nothing to break away from; they are socialists by virtue of their position...[this class] becomes by instinct the representative of all indigent people, all the injured and down-trodden." (43) Thus, while Marxism-Leninism was the main source of theoretical influence on the Red Brigades' aims, anarchism appears to have had some impact as well.

It is clear that the group's ultimate aim of revolution was strongly influenced by the founding socialist theorists. The influence of Lenin is especially apparent in the term "class war," and the prescription of forming "armed proletarian nuclei" in urban areas. The Red Brigades' secondary aims are closely related to the aim of revolution, as the achievement of each would be another step closer to this final goal, yet these do not all stem from conventional Marxist-Leninist doctrine, and these divergences will now be examined.

First, the goal of preventing the formation of the Imperialist State of Multinationals, while based to some degree on Lenin's theories of imperialism, diverges from the traditional aim of proletarian revolution. This divergence can be explained with reference to the social and historical context of Italy during the Red Brigades' active lifetime. As already discussed, the SIM appeared to be a reality by 1973. Italy's increasingly dependent economic situation was a concern to many Italians. By focusing on the SIM and the threat of global capitalist domination, the Red Brigades could gain wider acceptance in Italian society as a whole, appearing to some extent as the defender of

the Italian people against an uncaring government manipulated by foreign hands.

Turning to the aim of the formation of an intermediate movement to help lead the way to the revolution, we see another divergence, but again one understandable with reference to circumstance. Lenin advocated the formation of revolutionary activist groups at every stage of the struggle, but regarded these as the same avant-garde within a single, long-term process. The Red Brigades, however, were in a unique situation in relation to their primary mentor, Lenin. They were deeply engaged in a long-standing armed struggle in a state where the revolution was not visible on the horizon. They could not simply end their struggle, and begin again at a more propitious time. That would have fatally wounded their credibility and negated years of effort. The logical step would thus be to define their specific task as achieving a major step on the longer road to revolution. This would still maintain their *raison d'être*, but would place their struggle in a manageable historical framework. Again, then, we see a general reliance on original theoretical tenets, mitigated by strategic adaptation to the current socio-political context. This pragmatic adherence to the foundational theory will appear again in other aspects of the group's theoretical outlook.

## 2. Red Army Faction

While any call for communist revolution has its roots in classical socialist theory, the Red Army Faction (RAF) adhered indirectly to the original theorists, basing their ideology on more contemporary revolutionary thinkers. In particular, Mao, Ernesto Guevara, and Carlos

Marighella provided the theoretical foundations for the RAF,(44) inspiring a concern with global capitalist imperialism which would make the RAF the only international terrorist group of those with European origins.(45)

◊ The central aim of the RAF was "world communist revolution."(46) Achieving this aim meant fighting capitalist domination, usually conducted by the US and its proxies, wherever it occurred. As Ulrike Meinhof, a founder of the RAF, writes, "La lutte contre l'impérialisme ici n'est pas et ne saurait être une lutte de libération nationale... [elle] n'est pas: le socialisme dans un seul pays."(47) This central goal was supported by others. First, the RAF regarded itself as obliged to assist in anti-imperialist struggles, and the one chosen as especially relevant was that of the Palestinians. Thus, anti-imperialism took on a focus "singulièrement anti-sioniste,"(48) with defeat of Zionism becoming a prominent sub-aim. Second, and more important, was the aim of defeating the US-dominated NATO, whose "strategic project of imperialism" was to "homogenize the European states under its control."(49)

Despite the international emphasis, the German state did not escape the plans of the RAF. To begin, it was regarded by the RAF as the "simple création de l'impérialisme américaine,"(50) an integral and well entrenched component of the global imperialist regime. As well, apart from its strong ties to NATO and the US, the German state was seen as a potential imperialist force in its own right, "pursuing the same goals and imperialist plans in their step towards Greater Germany as neo-fascism."(51) On a purely domestic level, the state was regarded as "proto-fascist,"(52) not only expediting capitalist exploitation within

the state, but seeking "...progress towards the perfect fascist state-security state." (53) Thus, the destruction of the German state and capitalist institutions within it was integral to the wider aim of world revolution.

It is clear that the aims of the RAF differed significantly from the Red Brigades. While the Red Brigades adhered closely to classical socialist theory, and sought a class revolution, the RAF focused on the much broader aim of world revolution, defined in terms of anti-imperialist guerrilla war. The RAF thus focused on the inequities between regions and nations as much as the traditional socialist concern of class conflict. This distinction could be explained by noting the widely divergent domestic situations of the states of origin. Italy was much closer to the brink of a revolutionary situation than Germany, whose economy and government were far from unstable. The RAF, founded as an expression of solidarity with socialist principles, had to situate itself ideologically in the international context in order to establish a valid *raison d'être*. If this is true, then it would seem clear that while the Red Brigades originated through an effort to halt the perceived social degeneration of their own country, the RAF was more of an expression of a sentiment of rebellion. Despite these differences, the similarities between the two groups are also clear: communism was the end goal, with capitalist and imperialist oppression as central concerns.

### 3. Direct Action

The other secondary case, Direct Action (AD) of France, also differed substantially from the Red Brigades. The ideological roots of this group

were an eclectic blend of Marxism-Leninism and anarchism, with substantial influence from recent guerrilla warfare theorists.(54) The overall aim of AD was the achievement of their "projet communiste,"(55) which, as Moxon-Browne states, was "...an unusually wide assortment of ideological themes normally associated with the extreme left."(56) One of the most prominent was anti-imperialism. One aim was to pressure the French government to halt its own imperialist efforts overseas, in particular Africa. AD thus saw themselves as having to "take up arms against the slave-making state."(57)

Aside from France, the US and NATO were regarded as the most prominent forces of global imperialism, and thus another aim was to launch "[1]'attaque des préparatifs de guerre de l'impérialisme et de l'OTAN...renverser l'ordre impérialiste pour construire une société communiste."(58) Like the RAF, AD adopted the Middle East as its main overseas focus, and Israel was, again, regarded as the main imperialist power there. Of particular concern was, as the RAF themselves stated, the "genocide of Palestinians by Israeli troops."(59)

Domestically AD had a variety of aims, ranging from forcing the state to make changes in housing and employment policies,(60) to the reduction in the use of computers as weapons of intrusion by the state.(61) The word "revolution" seldom occurs in AD's communiqués and statements compared to the Red Brigades. AD was by far the most eclectic of the three cases, with little long-term consistency in their aims, and little overt reliance on a coherent theoretical framework. In comparison to the Red Brigades, the RAF appeared to have to search harder for a justification for its existence, and this is especially true for Direct Action. Their diverse and often inconsistent aims lend the impression,

as Darntell writes, that they were engaged in a "search for a revolutionary subject." (62)

The rebellious sentiment was aroused, but never found a well-defined target. Darntell suggests that AD felt that stirring the French and European people to revolt was a task which had to precede revolution, and that the group took up whatever cause was in fashion in order to maintain a following until revolutionary consciousness was awakened. (63) The result, though, was that no clear ideological focus could be discerned, completely unlike the Red Brigades, whose aims remained consistent for most of their active life.

#### 4. Conclusions

To summarize this section, the Red Brigades were the most traditionally socialist of the three groups discussed, diverging from the central goal of class war and revolution only when necessary to accomodate modern conditions. The Red Army Faction and Direct Action were as much concerned with international issues concerning peace and justice as with class war, and did not maintain the same consistency in their aims as did the Red Brigades. However, the broad similarities between the three groups are clear: the enemies were capitalism, imperialism, and oppression in general. We will now consider why violence was the chosen means of overcoming these enemies.

#### IV. Reasons for Adoption of Violent Means

The foundational revolutionary theorists advanced two general arguments for the reliance on violence as the central means in the revolution. The first is that non-violent means will usually be inadequate. The

established ruling class has too much to lose to acquiesce to peaceful demands for change, and democratic politics will only weaken the revolutionary movement, diluting its resolve to attain victory. The second is that as soon as the established order senses real threat from the revolutionary movement, it will lose any semblance of civility and strike at the revolutionaries with all of its considerable coercive might. The revolutionary movement must, therefore, strike first, and try to weaken its opponent before the movement is crushed. This section will examine the ways in which these theoretical rationales influenced modern socialist terrorism, beginning again with the Red Brigades.

### 1. Red Brigades

The Red Brigades had two reasons for choosing to rely on violence as their central means of achieving revolutionary change. The first relates closely to one of the classical reasons: democracy was regarded as a useless diversion. Since the Second World War, the Italian parliament was dominated by the Christian Democrats until very recently, "...thus creating a situation in which there is no political alternation.'"(64) This did not, however, result in stable rule and effective leadership. Because of the fragility of the coalitions led by the CD, stagnation and regular political collapse were the norm. To the Red Brigades, this situation was simply a verification of the old theorists' claim that democracy was largely useless for real change. As they state in a communiqué from 1986, "And it is true in any case that bourgeois politics in our country are most of the time reduced to palace skirmishes, and it is well known that the working classes cannot get

anything out of this hell-hole, this eternal merry-go-round..."(65)  
Violence was, then, the alternative.

The sell-out of the PCI was regarded as further evidence of the dangers of engaging in the political "merry-go-round". When the PCI decided to compete for power according to the rules of parliamentary democracy, a decision enacted in 1973 but made years before, they were perceived as acquiring a stake in the very system which they claimed to want to change. The Red Brigades, as Janke et.al. state, were more certain than ever that their chosen path was the only viable one: "Not the least important were the democratization and 'Westernization' of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), a process which led the BR to accuse the PCI of betraying the proletariat and to portray itself as the true representative of the working classes.'"(66) Thus, not only was the day to day absurdity of the political system apparent, but also a clear example of the degenerative effects of a revolutionary party's acquiescence to the rules of such a system.

The second reason for choosing violence was, as the traditional theorists wrote, that repressive reaction by the state was imminent. The 1973 coup in Chile had a significant impact on the thinking of the Red Brigades.(67) In that case, a socialist government had come to power through elections and enacted leftist reforms, only to be violently ousted by a military coup backed by an imperial power, the US, and multinational corporations. The result was a quasi-fascist dictatorship of exceptional brutality, and the crushing of left-wing political movements. As Salvioni and Stephanson state, "The [Chilean] situation was deemed... to have striking similarity to Italy: both Chile and

Italy, for example, had big Christian Democrat parties and manifested the potential, realized in the latter case, of a right-wing coup.'"(68)

As has been made clear, the Red Brigades were already highly suspicious of the reactionary tendencies and neo-fascist links of the CD Party. The Chilean case was simply a vivid illustration of the dangers of being complacent about the use of violence in the revolutionary effort, dangers perceived from the start of the movement. A Chilean-style reaction would have had disastrous effects on the Italian left, as the Red Brigades made clear in this statement: "...a secret effort towards the restoration of an authoritarian and conservative system...will fatally threaten many of the achievements of the labour movement...and substantially restrict the already very limited possibilities of the social opposition.'"(69) Thus, violence was necessary not only because democratic politics did not work, but because the life of the revolutionary movement depended on it.

The reasons the Red Brigades chose for relying on violence clearly reflect the thinking of the classical revolutionary theorists: democratic politics is both mainly useless as a means of change, and any effort to engage in it will result in a loss of revolutionary ideals. As well, violence is vital in warding off the reaction by the dominant establishment. The degree of convergence could again be explained by the Italian context at the time. Unlike other Western states, Italy was far closer to being in a revolutionary situation, with labour unrest, widespread student revolts, and political stagnation. The foundational theorists were no doubt writing with a similar situation in mind, and as their hypothetical scenarios became increasingly realized in the Italian case, so too did theory and practice converge.

## 2. Red Army Faction

The RAF also had two reasons for engaging in violence as their central means. The first stems from the RAF's conception of their enemy as a global imperialist conspiracy. While the German state, for logistical reasons, was the primary target of the RAF, the state was, to reiterate, "un simple appendice de l'Impérialisme américaine...et de son armée." (70) American imperialism was regarded as a massive machine programmed for military and economic expansion. It could not be dealt with in a peaceful political arena, and efforts to resist it which were not backed up by covert methods and force were destined to fall under its vast military and propaganda might. Germany was seen as an inextricable part of this, and thus beyond peaceful change. As Furet et.al. write, "la représentation de l'État allemand est essentiellement celle d'un appareil militaire...dont les fonctions sont analogues à celles des régimes...du Sud-Vietnam et du Corée du Sud: c'est là un premier argument pour justifier la choix stratégique de la lutte armée et de la 'guerilla'." (71)

The second justification is somewhat closer to that of the Red Brigades: the German state was regarded as not having completely shed its previous fascism. It was reactionary in its own right, and would, if approached without force and protection of arms, stamp out its opposition. The RAF had to avoid, then, the "weakness of broad legal forms of organization against fascism," (72) and take a more direct, forceful approach to change, the route of the "urban guerrilla", or terrorist. As they state in an essay from 1971, "The 'urban guerrilla' signifies armed struggle, necessary to the extent that it is the police

which make indiscriminate use of firearms, exonerating class justice from guilt and burying our comrades alive unless we prevent them. To be an 'urban guerrilla' means not to let oneself be demoralized by the violence of the system.'"(73) Violence, then, was necessary to defend against the reactionary tendency inherent in the culture of the German state, as well as the imperialist machine.

Once again, the international concern of the RAF is evident in their theoretical outlook, and creates the central divergence from both the Red Brigades and classical theory. That German democratic politics was not regarded as a justification for violence points to the relatively high efficiency of the German political system. The reactionary aspect of the state was a rationale, but the main one was the imperialist conspiracy. Again, the RAF, unlike the Red Brigades, had to look outside their immediate social and political environment for their main reason to use violence as a primary means. A global capitalist conspiracy is far more abstract than a visibly decrepit political system and a neo-fascist threat. However, while the average German worker may not have perceived the US and NATO as a machine of domination, the RAF certainly did, and thus from their perspective the reasons for using violence were entirely sound.

### 3. Direct Action

Direct Action's reasons for relying on violence resemble those of the RAF more than the Red Brigades. The central reason for AD was, like the RAF, the global imperialist conspiracy. The oppression of the working class was not a problem that could be solved by peaceful means in a single country, because the apparatus which ultimately controlled it lay

far beyond the borders of any one state. As well, this control was exerted by a force that would not succumb to peaceful pressure, and which would not hesitate to employ force against opponents. The struggle was thus against a global machine, as AD writes: "la lutte des communistes [est]...contre la globalité du système d'exploitation et d'oppression." (74) The conspiracy manifested itself in NATO, "...the most advanced complete imperialist structure of domination oppression," (75) which, as an entirely military organization, could only be dealt with through the language of force.

The other major rationale was that the threat of global war was so close that to be restrained in the efforts to stop imperialist aggression at this stage was tantamount to resignation to worldwide destruction. AD viewed many developments in the 1980's with alarm, including the placement of powerful American nuclear missiles in Europe, the continued arms race under Reagan, the SDI project and its European version called Eureka, and continued arms exports to volatile regions of the Third World. (76) This was "Reaganism gone mad," (77) and a systematic effort to dominate, even at the expense of global peace. As it was leading the world to the brink of disaster, this effort had to be stopped for the good of humanity. As the AD stated, "The only reply to the tendency towards imperialistic war is general class war." (78) Thus, while AD agreed with the RAF that the imperialistic conspiracy could only be stopped through violence, they added to the costs of inaction the fate of destruction should the conspiracy not be stopped quickly.

#### 4. Conclusions

It is apparent from this examination that the Red Brigades were, in the area of rationales for violence, again the most traditionally socialist. The RAF and AD were operating in very different social and political contexts than those conceived by the foundational theorists, while Italy was much closer to a revolutionary situation, and thus the Red Brigades could rely more directly upon the foundational theory for guidance. The concerns generating the rationales for violence for the RAF and AD should not be understated, however. The international linkages between capitalist centers had strengthened and multiplied exponentially since the time of Marx or Bakunin, and compared to that earlier period capitalism had indeed become a global machine. Thus the international focus, while abstract and somewhat divergent from classical theory, cannot be said to be lacking force as a concern among modern socialists. AD's concern of global war, a real possibility in the post-World War Two era, had even more power to generate resort to arms.

#### V. Strategy

Violence in a general sense was to be the means of change, but precisely how the case groups intended to apply it to move toward their revolutionary aims will now be considered. The foundational theorists stated that terrorism was to have two broad applications, destruction of the old order, and creation of the revolutionary movement. Destruction entails discrediting the establishment in the eyes of the masses, weakening its reactive capacity through intimidation, and creating divisions within the leadership. The creative aspect includes arousing

the often complacent masses, and organizing them into a coherent revolutionary force.

### 1. Red Brigades

The Red Brigades, to begin, included two methods in the destructive effort: discrediting the establishment, and causing what they referred to as dislocation of the state, or breakdown of consensus and efficient operation within the ruling apparatus. The effort to discredit consisted of exposing both the weakness of the establishment, and its repressive character. Exposing weakness was carried out in a variety of ways.

One method was to conduct "...their actions in cluster form (e.g., time and/or geographical context, classes of targets, rotation of targets, targets representative of multiple institutions)."(79) For example, a frequent tactic was to target three members of a particular sector, either capitalist or state, and strike all three at different locations within the same forty-eight hours.(80) This included high level members of the coercive apparatus, such as judges or high level police officers.(81) One effect, of course, was fear, which will be discussed later. Another, and relevant here, was an illustration of the ability to harass the establishment at will, showing the frustrated masses just how easily the class enemy could be hurt, how weak the presumably powerful establishment really was.

Another tactic of exposing the weakness of the system was kidnapping high officials. This occurred several times between 1974 and 1981, the most famous case being that of Aldo Moro, an ex-prime minister, in 1978. Each time, the Red Brigades would "...conduct their own `people's trial'...thus parodying the state judicial system and demonstrating the

existence of a parallel form of justice.'"(82) There were other beneficial results for the revolutionaries. A crucial one was that the establishment would inevitably become divided over how to handle the ransom demands.

The case of Moro is most instructive in this regard. The Brigades allowed Moro to write, without compulsion, to his family and the CD Party. His letters were made public. Naturally, Moro made impassioned pleas for the party to give in to the terrorists' demands, and the result in the government was bitter disagreement and antipathy between those who wished to surrender to spare Moro, and those who would not deal.(83) Following Moro's death on May 9, 1978, the Moro family publicly broke with the CD, and at Moro's private funeral his wife prayed for both his assassins, and the CD leaders, "who, for reasons of jealousy, cowardice, fear, stupidity, ratified the condemnation to death of an innocent man.'"(84) The prayer shortly made it to the newspapers. Similar tactics were used in other kidnappings, and each time the state was left humiliated, appearing weak and divided.

The other element of the effort to discredit, exposing the repressive nature of the state, was to be a bi-product of operations with more direct objectives, but it was an important part of the strategy all the same. In taking violent action against the state, the Red Brigades hoped to force it to respond violently, "...thus revealing the 'true' nature of a state based on the arbitrary repression of 'dissent'.'"(85) In fact, the group was partially successful at this: repressive laws were enacted,(86) and manipulation of the press,(87) along with the state's use of "...terrorism as a focus for mobilising the society against its enemies and for silencing its critics..."(88)

did occur to some extent, with humiliating effects for the government when such cases were exposed.

The other side of the destructive strategy was far more direct: the attempt to dislocate the state, to use the Red Brigades' term for weakening the state through direct attack.(89) As Caselli and Porta state, "...the BR attempted to engage in a confrontation with the state based on the military logic of the maximization of the real losses of the enemy.'"(90) This process involved primarily assassination and knee-capping in an effort to render key sections of the legal and political establishment paralyzed with fear; the word "terrorism" becomes most apt in this context. Not only were high officials targeted, such as judges, prosecutors, and CD leadership, but the middle level of the CD and legal bureaucracy became victims as well. Sole explains the reasoning: "Les terroristes veulent empoisonner les rapports des 'petits chefs' avec leurs superieurs (accusés de ne pas les défendre) et avec leurs subordonnés (soupçonnés de couvrir les violents).'"(91) In this way, the system was to be rendered dysfunctional, or dislocated. As the Red Brigades write, the strategy aimed "...at upsetting the political equilibrium which allows the imperialist bourgeoisie programs to continue to function, making the contradictions ungovernable.'"(92)

Destruction thus took the forms of discrediting, and direct attack to paralyze the establishment. However, there was another aspect to the Red Brigades' use of terror, the creative one. Violence was to be applied towards building the revolutionary movement, both by mobilizing the masses to revolt, and organizing them into a revolutionary force with a single direction. Mobilization was to be accomplished through "armed propaganda,"(93) a term strongly reminiscent of the anarchists'

"propaganda by the deed." The Red Brigades would violently intervene in specific, highly publicized conflicts between the proletariat and capitalists, drawing attention to the given case in an effort to show to the working class the violent alternative as a means of liberation. As Wieviorka states, "This process was the sole means by which to speed up both the consciousness-raising process and contribute to the formation of...a truly combatant communist party."(94)

The task of organizing those members of the proletariat already mobilized was also to be accomplished through the language of violence. While there were several leftist terrorist groups in Italy besides the Red Brigades, such as Front Line, and a plethora of small, loosely organized activist groups, the Red Brigades did not believe that they added up to adequate conditions for a movement towards revolution. Disorder in the revolutionary effort would mean that no single path or strategy would be the focus of all possible strength. Thus, as Janke et.al. write, "Almost from the start it [Red Brigades] set out to form an armed, clandestine vanguard...It rejected the spontaneous violence advocated by others on the extra-parliamentary left."(95)

Violent acts against symbolic targets were regarded as the way to achieve unity of the left under the Red Brigades' leadership, as Caselli and Porta state: "Various actions were aimed at influencing these social groups and at 'hegemonizing' the clandestine groups born after the 1977 movement."(96)\* Illustrations of its prowess in fighting the class

---

\* The 1977 movement refers to a series of clashes between the authorities and violent student and worker activist groups loosely coordinated within an umbrella organization called Autonomia (Autonomy). Along with these groups, which fought police and fascists on the street, there were several other terrorist groups in the late 1970's, including the Armed Proletarian Nuclei and, as mentioned, Front Line. None of these groups,

enemy, and striking at targets common to the entire radical left, would thus transform "...la guerre civile rampante, encore dispersée et inorganisée, en une offensive générale." (97) Thus, along with the task of mobilizing the working class, the Red Brigades sought to become the vanguard to organize and lead the angry masses, once aroused, in a single combined effort to achieve their collective aims.

Once again it is clear that the Red Brigades adhered closely to the theoretical prescriptions of the past revolutionaries. They sought to destroy as far as possible the established regime, by attacks on both its credibility and key personnel. They also sought to mobilize the masses and construct a coherent revolutionary movement.

## 2. Red Army Faction

The RAF, too, adhered quite closely to the theory in this aspect, again with some variations arising from the very different conditions in Germany. The destructive aspect of the RAF's use of violence was aimed at both discrediting the German regime, and at inhibiting its functioning. The imperialist enemies were also targeted in this regard, though less so, as they were far less accessible and too massive to be significantly damaged. But Germany was part of the global conspiracy, and thus to attack it was to attack imperialism as well.

Attacks within Germany, as mentioned, often involved targeting high level business and state officials, as well as leading members of the US military. (98) Many of its targets were exceptionally well guarded, and appeared for the most part impregnable to anything but a

---

however, came close to achieving the organization or effectiveness of the Red Brigades.

military attack. For example, in 1989 the RAF killed Alfred Herrhausen, Chairman of the Deutsche Bank. In this case the target had been protected by bodyguards, an armoured vehicle, and a supporting motorcade of security personnel.(99) The logic of such actions is summarized in the words of the RAF: "The urban guerrilla's aim is to attack the state's apparatus...to destroy the myth of the system's omnipresence and invulnerability,"(100) and in discrediting it, as Wright states, they "...demonstrated [that] the destruction of the current West German regime was possible."(101)

Like the Red Brigades, the RAF sought to discredit the regime by revealing its repressive tendencies to the masses. Attacks on high level officials were aimed in part at eliciting a reaction from the state which would demonstrate to the masses that the regime had not overcome its fascist lineage. Along with showing the state's weakness, attacks would portray "...the state in a crisis to which it reacts by becoming even more repressive. The terrorists are therefore only defending themselves and society against the overwhelming odds opposing them."(102) Simultaneously, then, the state was portrayed as weak and blundering, and "overwhelming" and repressive. The combination of the two would play differently on the minds of different sectors of society, in each case, it was hoped, lowering support for the regime.

Less systematically, the RAF also aimed at inhibiting the regime's functioning. This was not direct confrontation, as in Italy; the RAF was never as strong as the Red Brigades, and could never have made such a concerted effort to cause dislocation by attacking all levels of the system. However, the RAF stated that: "The urban guerrilla's aim is to attack the state's apparatus of control at certain

points and put them out of action..."(103) A campaign of attacks on specific establishment individuals noted for their expertise and leadership qualities would, in the long run, wear down the regime, instilling fear and anxiety into the elite of the system. As RAF theorist Horst Mahler states, "only a lengthy armed struggle which progressively enfeebles the state will enable it to be ultimately destroyed.'"(104)

The constructive aspect of the RAF's use of terror included two broad elements, similar to the Red Brigades. The first was focusing awareness on social issues relevant to the leftist cause. This was not the same as the Red Brigades' task of mobilizing the masses, as mobilization comes after the masses are already politically aware to some degree. In Germany, with a more stable society and far less worker unrest, the process had to begin at a more elementary level. Attacks and the communiqués which followed were thus aimed at arousing public interest in issues such as imperialism and class inequities. The RAF sought to overcome the tight but subtle lock which the regime maintained on people's thinking. As RAF founder Meinhof writes, "La guerrilla permet a chacun de déterminer pour soi où il se situe, de trouver...sa place dans la société de classes, dans l'impérialisme, de se déterminer pour lui-même."(105; author's omission)

While Germany was far more stable than Italy by the mid-1970's, there was all the same a radical leftist fringe, and this was also the focus of the RAF's efforts to influence thinking. Regarding this sector, the aim was to mobilize and organize those already aware, to provoke action against the state. Alexander and Pluchinsky explain how this was conducted:

The RAF organization has always desired to be seen as the operational vanguard of the militant German left...Whenever the possibility exists, the RAF auditions for this role by monitoring those issues that excite the militant left. Then the RAF assassinates a person who can be symbolically linked to that issue.(106)

Terrorist attacks would, then, not only initiate reflection among the uninformed, but would mobilize the left into the "revolutionary counter-power,"(107) a crucial step on the long road to revolution.

The RAF, then, did apply terror largely in accord with classical revolutionary theory. Divergence from the Red Brigades is evident, however, in the lack of a concerted RAF effort to take the initiative in a war with the state's coercive forces, and the more elementary focus of the constructive aims of the violence. The pattern by now is clear: the German state and society were far less fragile and volatile than Italy's. The RAF simply could not find the necessary membership and support to be able to act and plan as the Red Brigades. The lack of a revolutionary mood meant that not only did the RAF have to look beyond Germany for a complete *raison d'être*, but they had to limit their application of violence to tactical and strategic goals within their reach.

### 3. Direct Action

Direct Action conformed somewhat loosely with the foundational theory in its strategic use of terror. The destructive effort again focused on discrediting and hindering the system. An effort to illustrate the state's repressiveness was largely absent from the discrediting campaign, but demonstrating the state's inability to overcome resistance

was important. AD would make efforts to strike after having received major blows from the security forces, to portray the state's efforts against them as futile and inept, however successful they may have appeared at first. The following statement, issued before an attack, illustrates the strategy:

Terroristes, oui, nous le sommes! Vous pouvez nous interdire, vous pouvez nous emprisonner, vous pouvez désigner des cibles aux balles fascistes comme vous le faites pour notre camarade Jean-Marc Rouillan, jamais vous ne pourrez entraver la marche vers le communisme jusqu'à la victoire. Action Directe vit et lutte.(108)

The other destructive aspect, attacking to hinder the regime's functioning, was also part of AD's strategy. Even more than the RAF, however, AD had to avoid direct confrontation; they were small, and would have been badly hurt as a group by even a few arrests or deaths. Targets, including state officials, government property, and businesses, especially arms companies, were none the less attacked in an effort to inhibit the operation of the imperialist and state system. As AD writes in 1984, "Therefore, hit at every level of preparation, harass their administrative centers, and sabotage their projects." (109) One target which gained AD's attention was Interpol; it was seen as the primary coercive apparatus of NATO imperialism, and thus worthy of efforts to hinder its functioning. (110) There was, then, a strategy of attacking the "heart of the military-industrial complex," (111) which, while limited, did play a role in shaping the activities of AD.

The creative aspect of AD's terror campaign contained both an effort to draw public attention to relevant issues, and to mobilize leftists for action against the state and imperialism. Efforts to raise public

awareness included drawing attention to imperialist domination in the Third World, with attacks often coinciding with the occurrence of what were deemed to be imperialist actions. As this Agence France-Presse statement illustrates, in reference to several 1982 AD attacks: "Il n'est pas inutile de préciser que ces actions ont été perpétrées à l'occasion des événements du Liban [the Israeli invasion] et de l'intervention militaire [French] au Tchad." (112) The importance of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was also emphatically publicized through terror attacks, in this case against Israeli targets in France. (113) It was hoped that terror would draw these issues to public attention, inspiring people to pressure the government towards a revision of policy which would favour the aims of AD.

A less prominent AD focus entailed attempts to mobilize both the French left and the European left in general under AD guidance for combined action against the state and imperialism. On the home front, as Darntell writes, "AD said its attacks embodied reconstruction of an authentic working class political struggle." (114) French activism, however, was seen by AD as only one component of the larger struggle to be inspired through terrorist actions. As this passage from an AD communiqué illustrates, the focus of the effort to mobilize was very broad: attacks were to "...construire l'organisation communiste à partir des usines et des quartiers; guerre de classe contre guerre impérialiste, pour l'unité des communistes dans l'offensive contre le capital; unité [sic] stratégique des organisations communistes combattantes." (115)

In general AD did adhere to traditional theoretical models for the application of terror, but its strategy was less focused than that of

either the Red Brigades or the RAF. One can discern common elements of strategy in both the destructive and creative aspects, but the group itself wrote little that provides a definitive illustration of its wider strategic planning. Where details do appear, the focus seems very broad, or somewhat vague. Violence was considered necessary, but plans for its precise application were never developed to the same extent as with the other groups.

#### 4. Conclusions

In this section we have seen that the foundational revolutionary theory had a significant impact on how these groups applied terror. In other words, modern socialist terrorists were strongly influenced by the original theorists in their perception of terrorism's efficacy in the revolutionary effort. The Red Brigades, whose country was closer to a classic revolutionary situation, adhered most closely to the theory, especially in the use of terror to strike directly at the regime. The RAF followed in the degree of adherence, with consistency in their strategic use of terror, and clear statements of their strategy, while AD interpreted the theory more loosely.

#### VI. Ethical Criticism

As noted in Chapter Two, socialist revolutionaries' perception of the overall moral depravity of the established order can be usefully understood under three conceptual headings: alienation, exploitation, and violence. Both the state and capitalist society bear responsibility for alienation and exploitation, while the state is responsible for most of the violence. Alienation arising from state action is the result of laws being imposed on the masses without their consent, and the

imposition of a complex and impersonal legal system. Within capitalist society, alienation arises from two sources: intellectual hegemony, and labour in the capitalist mode of production. The state's role in exploitation is its legal support of the capitalist system, and exploitation in capitalist society arises out of wage labour and the growth of capital. Finally, violence is the result of the excessive and brutal coercive means applied by the state.

### 1. Red Brigades

While the foundational revolutionary socialist theory addresses two ways in which the state fosters alienation of the masses, the Red Brigades focused primarily on one: the imposition of laws without the people's consent. Italy's liberal democratic system was the primary target of this critique. The inadequacy of this system as a means to real social change has already been examined (Section II). The discussion here will emphasize its immorality more than its impracticality.

Playing by the rules of liberal democracy was not only seen as a waste of revolutionary effort, but the immorality of liberal democracy was a result of its use as a facade to conceal the continued domination of the masses by a small dominant class. As one former Brigadist stated, "...I considered democracy a mere formality, a simple legalistic [sic] for the system."(116) The evidence to support this view was strong. As Salvioni and Stephanson note, "At any rate, the regime [the ruling alliance headed by the CD for nearly two decades] came to represent almost 95 percent of the established political forces..."(117) Despite this apparent broad consensus among the established parties, "In fact none of the public demands for social change expressed by a strong

popular movement had been accepted within the political system.'"(118) The only conclusion the revolutionaries could draw was that democracy was not there to effect change; it was strictly "pro forma,"(119) a thin veneer to conceal the true machinations of a system built on greed and power lust. It was anything but a legitimate means of bringing the will of the people into the legislative process, leaving the masses alienated from the very system which directly affected their daily lives.

The state imposed laws on society without consent, but there was another source of alienation within the perspective of the Red Brigades, hegemony. As the founder Renato Curcio states, one aspect of the emancipation of the proletariat was "the movement of the proletariat's liberation from the complex hegemony of the bourgeoisie.'"(120) This hegemony was imposed not only through the democratic system, which lent the masses a false sense of political efficacy,(121) but also through the myriad of reformist, pro-system unions, labour organizations, and perhaps most importantly the press and electronic media. The media was in fact largely owned by members of the ruling class with strong ties to the parties of the established regime.(122) The result was that "...the media became a major 'institutional protagonist'", leading the state's efforts of "legitimation through popular mobilisation, and the 'de-legitimation' of certain forms of opposition."(123)

The PCI, too, was regarded as a crucial component of the effort to impose hegemony. Its acceptance of the rules of the capitalist establishment vindicated Gramsci's idea that the ruling class would employ radical ideas as tools to channel the working class into political attitudes compatible with the maintenance of capitalism. As the Red Brigades describe the party's role, "...the PCI can be seen in

the role of peerless controller of the proletarian struggles, alternating the brake of street action with the demagogic accelerator of parliamentary opposition, all on a field of institutional compatibility.'"(124) The intended result of the intellectual and cultural bombardment by elements of both the state and capitalist society was a "deadening pacification"(125) of resistance against the system, rendering the masses blind to alternatives, and unable to conceive of their own subordinate role in the order in which they lived.

The combined effect of the dominant class's manipulation of democracy with efforts to impose hegemony was, in the eyes of the Red Brigades, alienation. The masses were having their freedom constrained and their will subtly crushed. The Red Brigades perceived themselves as one of the few leftist groups which had not been tainted by the system, and thus they felt that they had an obligation to try to emancipate those who had been overcome, even if assassination and maiming were the only means left.

Exploitation was another area of concern to the Red Brigades, in particular the state's role in supporting it. The Red Brigades perceived the role of the state, which they equated to the seemingly permanent CD-led alliance, to be the enforcement of "bourgeois justice.'"(126) The state thus played a regular part in maintaining exploitation through laws and legal coercion. But with the rise of the Imperialist State of the Multinationals (SIM; see Section I), the Italian component of the global imperialist bloc led by the US, exploitation would intensify, and the state's efforts in maintaining it would have to increase as well. The state would thus become "...the direct expression of the big imperialist multinational groups, with a national pole."(127)

In facilitating intensified exploitation, which would inevitably result in greater dissent among the working class, the state would have to "modifier et adapter les systèmes de domination." (128) "A cet effet," writes Sole, "il forme un personnel adéquat; centralise tous les pouvoirs (qui passent progressivement du Parlement à l'exécutif); organise la 'contre-révolution préventive' pour démolir toute 'velleité révolutionnaire'." (129) The state, under the CD regime, was thus regarded as anticipating the workers' backlash against the heightened exploitation which would occur as Italy was brought deeper into the sphere of the global imperialist bloc. It was restructuring to be able to subvert this backlash in its nascent form, increasing its coercive capacity and decreasing any possible hindrance from parliamentary opposition by subtly channeling power to the executive. To the Red Brigades, the state clearly had a "role as guard dog of the bourgeoisie," (130) and the moral imperative to destroy it was thus made all the more acute.

The final area of ethical criticism leveled against the established order was its infliction of violence, in particular in the effort to halt social progress. Violence was primarily the domain of the state, which was seen as willing to go to any length to safeguard the status quo. Towards this aim, the state, as the Red Brigades write, "...spread a cloak of counterrevolutionary terror over the entire society." (131) The aim of this effort was not simply to deter revolution through terror, but in fact "...d'annihiler les militants révolutionnaires pour prévenir le risque de la Révolution." (132) To this end, as Sole explains, the state "...prépare 'un génocide' qui a même déjà commencé. A preuve: 'les camps de concentration' ou des centaines de prisonniers

communistes sont condamné à la mort lente."(133) Cruelty and violence were thus regarded as regular tools of state control. Such a system could lay no claim to humanitarian concern for its subjects. Instead, for the Red Brigades, "...humanitarian acts are all those acts of revolutionary war that directly or indirectly hasten the ruin of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its state,"(134) thereby ending the brutality that the establishment inflicts.

It is clear that the Red Brigades had ethical concerns within each of the broader categories outlined within the foundational theory. It is also clear, however, that the group's moral critique was far simpler than those of the original theorists. The Red Brigades focused only on a few key concerns, while leaving out other seemingly crucial areas, such as the alienation of labour. It cannot be expected that any one terrorist group will apply or adopt the entire theoretical framework of social criticism which resulted from the work of several different theorists. It is likely that the Red Brigades focused instead on those elements of the wider critique which applied most directly to the Italian context. The emphasis on hegemony, for example, is understandable in a political setting in which the only truly communist party shed its alternative stance and adopted a pro-system outlook. To take another example, democracy as a veneer for rule by the capitalist class seems more viable as a concept where the political system had been dominated for decades by a party known for its close ties to the corporate sector. Once again, then, the Red Brigades can be seen as remaining within the parameters set by the foundational theorists, while adapting the theory to suit the unique aspects of their social and political environment.

## 2. Red Army Faction

In its ethical critique the RAF follows the pattern which was noted in the other aspects of its theoretical outlook, the division of focus between the domestic and international spheres. The RAF's moral critique contained domestic and global aspects: in the domestic sphere, the RAF held alienation and violence as its primary concerns; in the international one, exploitation and again violence were the focuses.

Domestically, alienation occurred through a general loss of human conscience. This was both an individual and societal alienation, arising from the relatively luxurious and hyper-convenient life-style which came with the post-Second World War economic growth in Germany, and the integration of technology with every aspect of daily life. The result was a society, "...which they [the RAF] felt had lost all contact with human values...and was only interested in the production of capital and wealth.'"(135)

Furet et.al. explain the RAF's perspective as based on Marx's concept of commodity fetishism, which led to a society under "la domination de la rationalité technologique."(136) The majority of Germans had a lifestyle centered around the comforts and benefits of technology, and became influenced by the same imperatives which drove technological development: the profit motive and the lust to possess. Those aspects of life which were not directly related to the search for convenience and material gratification were discarded, and these included social awareness and humanitarian compassion. The result was that German people were apathetic and indifferent to issues concerning social justice, and even to their own powerless condition. They would

not, in other words, face up to "the impossibility of being the master of one's own actions in a framework that is controlled and manipulated by the state,"(137) nor take action against injustice on an international level.

The concept of hegemony ties in closely with this discussion. Like Gramsci, the Red Brigades regarded hegemony as the result of intellectual manipulation. The RAF were closer to viewing hegemony as imposed by material manipulation: all that the state and the capitalist class had to do to ensure that people bowed to the establishment was to provide luxury. As Meinhof claims, "The chance for everyone to improve his standard of living gave rise to a feeling of satisfaction which was not suited to a concern about the limits of one's freedom; it made one happy...and little inclined to criticize."(138) The RAF's perspective places some responsibility, however, on the German masses as well as the rulers: the people in a sense sold out to the system for material rewards, and in exchange would refrain from criticizing the establishment on matters of justice, freedom, and peace. They were enticed to relinquish their freedom and humanity, and thus they participated in their own alienation.

To the RAF, this situation was approaching the height of moral depravity: the system had gained the acquiescence of the masses; the next step was total control. If the RAF did not act to awaken the German people, they would fall prey to a "normality" in which they would be brought "...to feel nothing, to think nothing, to understand nothing."(139) To prevent total alienation, even cruel means were justifiable.

The other domestic concern of the RAF was violence committed by the state. The RAF's outlook in this regard was similar to that of the Red Brigades: violence and cruelty were applied by the state in response to movements for social progress, instead of any effort to implement real change. The German state was regarded as particularly prone to violent reaction as a result of its fascist lineage. As an RAF member stated, "This is the Auschwitz generation and there's no arguing with them." (140) Like the Red Brigades, imprisonment was regarded as the most cruel violence inflicted by the regime, with conditions of imprisonment "...which, in their duration and their harshness, weren't even employed by the state police of the Third Reich." (141)

According to the RAF, torture was common for political prisoners, including prolonged and total isolation; psychological torment; being totally immobilized for days; deprivation of daylight; deprivation of mental stimulation with books, paper, or radios; intrusive observation and body searches, etc. (142) (In fact, these are not all the product of the RAF propaganda machine: independent sources, including Amnesty International, verified that treatment at least bordering on torture was regular for militant communist prisoners [143]). For the RAF, a system that would resort to such violence before listening to demands for change was clearly a threat to humanity, and had to be destroyed by all available means.

Violence and alienation constituted the domestic focus of the RAF's moral critique. The international focus was on exploitation and a different variety of violence. Exploitation by Western capitalist imperialism was practiced against the people of the Third World. In need of both markets and sources of cheap supplies and labour, the

imperialist bloc dominated by the US and NATO sought to bring the Third World under its control to be able to maximize exploitation of its peoples.

To effect this exploitation, global capitalists wanted to "...turn back the clock to the time before the offensive of the wars of liberation,"(144) imposing a rigid neo-colonial control. Such efforts, writes the RAF, "...extend and intensify even further the suffering of the [Third World] peoples."(145) The disadvantaged masses of the world, already victims of a colonial past, were made dependent on serving foreign capital for subsistence, providing labour or producing primary goods for the multinationals. As a result, whole societies were enslaved, unable to break out of the cycle of subsistence to develop their own communities in ways that would benefit them. Thus, as RAF member Mahler writes:

all together the imperialistic Monopoly Capital  
-- [is] the most monstrous criminal association  
in history. To destroy this with all necessary  
and obtainable means is a necessity for more  
than three billion people. (146; editor's  
brackets)

Violence was the second point of the international aspect of the RAF's moral critique. The imperialist bloc, in striving to impose its control worldwide, was seen as using violence as a regular tool of expansion. Expansion, as Furet et.al write, was an aggressive endeavour,(147) and included outright war against those societies which resisted the imperialist yoke. As the RAF claim, "The oppressed of this earth have not forgotten...how much death and misery the dropping of thousands of tons of bombs and the carpet-bombing of the American B-52 bombers can cause."(148) Another aspect of this violence was the

imposition of repressive puppet regimes on Third World societies, such as Pinochet's in Chile, or Reza Shah's in Iran after 1953. The worst tyrant, the RAF states, "...is a friend as long as he serves the interests of international capitalism, no matter by what means." (149)

Genocide committed against such groups as the Kurds and Palestinians was regarded as another tactic of global domination. (150) Those who orchestrated the use of these means were considered "...armchair murderers who daily go over dead bodies and who in the interest of power and profits plan the misery and death of millions of human beings." (151) It is clear that the RAF had an image of violent destruction wreaked by global imperialism which more than justified the use of revolutionary terror by its opponents.

The RAF's interpretation of the moral flaws of the established system was clearly very different from that of the Red Brigades. The ethical outlook appears to vary with the difference in standard of living between Italy and Germany. The Red Brigades, for example, never considered material prosperity to be a means of domination, as did the RAF. Many Italian workers, especially in the South, lived at a level far below that of the average German, and thus to emphasize material well-being as a tool of oppression is a trait of a terrorist group working in a more prosperous setting. As well, in the view of the RAF exploitation was brought to extremes by the imposition of imperialism on the people of the Third World. The Red Brigades, of course, regarded Italian industrial workers as intensively exploited. It seems likely that even for the RAF, the level of exploitation within German society appeared to be low, and thus not a point of criticism that would have much appeal in Germany. Given the higher levels of prosperity in German society, the

RAF had to be more creative in their use of the socialist critique than the Red Brigades, and this could account for the differences between the two groups' moral outlooks.

### 3. Direct Action

Like the RAF, AD's ethical critique focused on both domestic and global concerns: domestically the concerns were alienation and exploitation, and internationally, alienation and violence.

Alienation was regarded as arising from an excessive reliance on computers, and through hegemony in the classical sense. In the 1980's, AD believed that computers were rapidly becoming one of the dominant features of Western society. There were two alienating effects of the expansion of this form of technology. One was its use as a tool of control by the establishment. The computerization of financial and personnel records, banking and business transactions, the air travel industry, and state security data, along with a myriad of other activities and information, made the computer more than just a tool of convenience. Computerization provided an easily accessible record of an individual's past and personal life, and a way to monitor the behavior of people on a daily basis. Computers had thus become, as AD states, "the favoured tool of people who dominate. They serve to exploit, to document, to control and to punish." (152) Through computers, the state had easy access to a variety of details about an individual's personal life, and this access could quickly translate into direct control.

The second alienating aspect of computerization was its effect on the social conscience and personalities of people who utilized them. AD regarded computers as "...epitomizing the materialist, profit-oriented

and dehumanizing ethos of Western capitalism."(153) Like the RAF in their critique of the technological rationale, AD regarded the constant reliance on computers as instilling a social outlook that would incline their users to be little more than "an appendage of the machine". Computers existed to make society more efficient, and to match the new efficiency humans themselves would have to become more like computers, utilizing information quickly to make cost-benefit decisions.

The end of all this efficiency was, of course, profit, and thus people were becoming the slaves of their own inventions simply to maximize their capacity to contribute to capitalist profit. The rampant spread of computerization thus had the effect of alienating people not only by exposing their personal lives to those who might wish to control them, but by instilling capitalist values, homogenizing people in their search for efficiency.

For Direct Action, hegemony was seen as being imposed in two ways. The first was the existence of a variety of labour and political organizations which caught the attention of the workers by espousing pro-labour concerns, but in fact were still pro-establishment. The workers thus fell prey to these "...tentations du réformisme et de l'idéologie bourgeoise."(154) The other way in which hegemony was imposed was through social democracy. The reign of the Socialist Party, as AD viewed it, "...simply guarantees French capitalism through... excluding political or moral change to economic behavior."(155) Social democracy removed the need for fundamental reform by covering the gaps in the logic of capitalism with ideas borrowed from socialism, leaving capitalism to function relatively unimpeded while at the same time ensuring that the masses were never so dissatisfied as to revolt.

If not overturned, these two streams of influence would produce a "consensus de pacification et d'exploitation." (156) Hegemony thus added to the threat of alienation posed by the use of computers for profit and control. The masses faced domination by both technology and subtle deceit, and would befall this fate if it was not reversed by whatever means necessary.

Exploitation was seen as another domestic aspect of the moral weakness of the capitalist system. AD considered exploitation to be a result of both organizational restructuring in productive enterprises, and the increasing use of automation, which closely follows Marx's view. The exploitive effects of restructuring were "...evident in lay-offs, increased work pace, new means of control, [and] reduced job security." (157) Automation contributed to unemployment as workers were replaced by machinery. (158) AD also regarded the growth of multinationals and overseas production to be a factor in increasing exploitation, as jobs were transferred where the labour was cheapest. (159) The result of these developments was that workers had less bargaining power in relation to corporations, and were thus being rendered defenceless against an intensification of exploitation. AD, in its privileged position as an outsider, could see what even the workers could not, and had an obligation to fight on their behalf.

The international focus of AD's moral critique included alienation and violence. Alienation was being inflicted upon the peoples of the Third World through domination by the imperialist West, under the leadership of the US and NATO. This domination was primarily to ensure exploitation of the Third World, but AD focused more on the loss of control and cultural identity which occurred in the victim societies.

The loss of cultural identity was inflicted by a relentless barrage of Western cultural symbols through the media, leading the dominated peoples to accept the Western consumerist dream as their own, a development with obvious benefits to Western corporations. As AD states:

...si les normes culturelles occidentales ont réussi à écraser toute résistance, les classes populaires y accéderont, mais en sacrifiant leur vie entière à ce rêve: les habitants des bidonvilles d'Amérique Latine possèdent souvent ainsi T.V. et pick-up, voiture quelquefois; pendant de temps, leurs enfants meurent de faim et les adolescents vont se prostituer dans les quartiers riches.(160)

Subtle control was also achieved through technology. In the eyes of AD, the West held a monopoly on technological development and production, yet as a result of their success at reorienting and restructuring Third World societies, these societies developed a dependence on technology for day to day life. This was especially true regarding communication and information technology. Thus, as AD writes, domination could be achieved "...par le contrôle des systèmes de communication et d'information lui assurant le maintien de son emprise idéologique dans les territoires d'outre-mer."(161) The result of exporting both the consumerist dream and dependence on technology was "imperialist hegemony,"(162) domination based on subversion of entire societies. In the minds of AD, this was alienation on a grand scale orchestrated for profit; it obliterated any moral justification for the existence of capitalism.

Violence in the global context was another concern of AD. NATO, the coordinating body of the imperialist bloc, had the function of the "coordination de la répression."(163) This repression included, in the

words of AD, "...les attentats/provocations sanglantes/ assassinats organisés par les services Secrets et barbouzes de tout poil,"(164) as well as outright war against the enemies of capitalism.(165) Along with direct attacks, capitalism provoked and fueled violence through its reliance on military production. As AD states, "...militarism may be pointed to as the lifebelt to which capitalism desperately clings each time the forces inherent in the system are on the verge of letting it sink into the abyss of crisis."(166)

The development of weapons which had the potential for destabilizing the nuclear balance, such as the MX missile and the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), were attributed to global capitalism's need for expansion.(167) As well, arms produced and sold to the Third World were used in bloody regional and civil conflicts. Capitalist arms production was thus considered an "enterprise criminelle."(168) Capitalism and imperialism, then, were regarded as having destructive, repressive, and destabilizing effects throughout the world, and for the good of humanity they had to be stopped.

AD's ethical concerns varied significantly from both the Red Brigades and the RAF. It is possible that some of the variation is the result of a conscious effort to focus on original issues. AD was a relative latecomer as a terrorist group, and many socialist concerns would already have been expressed by its German and Italian counterparts. AD's lack of focus on violence as a domestic concern may be related to the absence of a fascist state in the history of France, contrasted with Germany and Italy. The focus on domestic exploitation, however, is shared with the Red Brigades, while the RAF stands alone in excluding it from their critique. Perhaps Germany's higher standard of

living made such a focus unappealing, while in the latter two domestic exploitation as a publicized concern still had the capacity to draw followers. In general, AD's eclecticism is somewhat less evident in its moral critique than elsewhere in its theory. Technology was a consistent theme, and while AD was very creative in its application of classical thought, the broad aspects of the foundational socialist critique are clearly evident.

## VII. Conclusions

The analysis in this chapter makes clear that the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism did indeed have significant influence on later terrorist groups. The Red Brigades followed the writings of the original theorists as closely as possible, varying only to suit the unique aspects of their temporal setting. The RAF and AD did not appear to follow the theory as closely, but the broad theoretical framework of the original critique is often evident. The RAF and AD did not operate in a social and political setting which was ready for serious contemplation of a domestic communist revolution. They had to adapt to their respective audiences, looking for causes beyond their own borders, and causes unique to the current era. As well, the global focus of the secondary cases can be attributed in part to the influence of guerrilla warfare theory, a significant inspiration of socialist terrorism since the 1960's.

The underlying commonality of all three groups based on their varying degrees of adherence to the theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism is none the less clear. All three were committed, if extreme, socialist movements. They shared an abhorrence of capitalism, the state,

and imperialism, and believed that violence was a morally justifiable response to such a corrupt and inhumane system. The words of Ulrike Meinhof, co-founder of the RAF, aptly summarize the moral outlook of modern socialist terrorists concerning the use of terror:

[1]love for human beings is possible today only  
in the death-dealing hate-filled attack on  
imperialism-fascism(169; author's brackets)

## Conclusions

### I. Summary

The analysis has elucidated some significant theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism within revolutionary socialist thought. In so doing, it has made a start towards bridging the gap in the study of socialist terrorism, and terrorism in general, this gap being the frequent underemphasis of the theoretical outlook of terrorists in efforts to explain this phenomenon. The analysis thus illustrates that socialist terrorism is guided by a comprehensive, coherent and sophisticated body of theory. Without an understanding of this guidance, analysis of the subject cannot offer a satisfactory explanation.

The findings of the analysis can be briefly summarized. First, the theoretical roots of the efficacy of socialist terrorism were considered. Terrorism was found to have a role in contributing to the achievement of the revolution in two ways. First, it contributes to the destruction of the establishment, attacking both its credibility, and the personnel of the coercive apparatus, reducing its reactionary capability. Second, it assists in inspiring the masses to revolt, and in organizing them into an effective revolutionary movement. Terrorism thus has both destructive and creative applications in the wider socialist struggle.

The ethical justifications for socialist terrorism were examined next. It was found that terrorism is considered a justifiable weapon in the socialist struggle, despite its own inherent moral flaws. This is so because it helps to destroy a system which commits far worse crimes, through imposing alienation, exploitation, and violence upon the great

majority of society in the interests of a ruling class eager to maintain its status and prosperity. Terrorism is the lesser of two evils applied to destroy the greater one, and is therefore a morally justifiable weapon in the socialist struggle.

Finally, the case study demonstrated that these theoretical foundations have indeed had a significant impact on modern socialist terrorists. They have retained the theory as a guide to their activities, while adapting it to their unique historical and cultural contexts. The Red Brigades adhere most closely to the original theory. The Red Army Faction and Direct Action adhere to the wider principles, but make several modifications arising from concerns about neo-imperialism and the exponential spread and development of technology. In all three cases, the original theory is still clearly applicable to an understanding of the groups' theoretical outlooks.

The analysis has thus illustrated that socialist terrorism is not the random violence of unbalanced fanatics. Nor is it simply an imitation of liberation struggles in the Third World, as Alexander and Kilmarx would have us believe,(1) posing socialist terrorists as lost youth trying to live up to the romantic image of the Latin American or Arab guerrilla. Instead, socialist terrorism is the active manifestation of a complex and sophisticated theoretical perspective, and those perpetrating it are aware of the theory and entirely committed to its implementation. Analysts who ignore this are consigning themselves to superficiality in their efforts to explain this important form of terrorism, and missing the questions it raises regarding our own social and political system: does the citizen have an obligation to obey the state? Should the state be the sole repository of legitimate force?

While not considered here, these issues become visible in the study of terrorism only when theory is taken into account. The conclusion will now consider some of the broader implications of this study.

## II. Future Contributions

The objectives of this study were, of necessity, rather limited. The study has dealt primarily with the influence of the foundational theory of revolutionary socialism, the works of the early anarchists and Marxists, with limited reference to more recent thinkers. While these foundational roots are an indispensable beginning to any understanding of socialist terrorism, they do not explain all of the major theoretical influences on this phenomenon. At this point it would be useful to briefly illustrate some of the ways in which this study could be expanded to provide a more comprehensive analysis.

First, the case study made clear that imperialism is a major concern of modern socialist terrorists. There have been numerous modern thinkers on this issue, but even within the foundational socialist texts there are discussions of capitalist imperialism. Lenin, in particular, contributed to the socialist perspective on imperialism; his writings on the subject have clearly had an impact on modern terrorists. Thus, one point of expansion would be an explanation of how references to imperialism in the foundational socialist writings contribute to the ethical critique of the capitalist system, and thus the overall theoretical foundations of socialist terrorism.

Another area in which further contributions appear necessary is an examination of modern guerrilla warfare theory, which, as the case study illustrated, has had a significant impact on socialist terrorism. The

RAF in particular referred to themselves as "urban guerrillas," a term often used by some Latin American guerrillas and terrorists. In both the moral critique of capitalism on an international level, and the tactics and strategy of terrorism, this body of thought has made a number of contributions. Thus, an inclusion of this range of theory, for example the works of Carlos Marighella, is another necessary step towards a more comprehensive analysis of the subject.

Finally, the analysis could be enhanced with a discussion of philosophical justifications for socialist terrorism. Existentialism, in particular the works of Jean-Paul Sartre, has made a contribution in this regard. Sartre emphasizes the notions of individual choice in deciding one's values, and then the responsibility to put one's principles into practice, or face the anguish of becoming a hypocrite according to one's own standards. Sartre also wrote on the benefits of use of violence in efforts to achieve liberation from oppression. Writing in the context of colonialism, he states, "For in the first days of a revolt you must kill: to shoot down a European is to...destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time," by which he meant that the oppressed would be reborn with his human dignity intact.(2)

Nihilism as well, with its total philosophical negation of all belief systems, and the obliteration of value constraints on the individual imposed by the dominant belief system, has relevance in explaining the destructive aspect of terrorism. For example, as Nietzsche writes, "He who considers more deeply knows that, whatever his acts and judgments may be, he is always wrong,"(3) and therefore, "There...is no one to command, no one to obey, no one to

transgress.'"(4) Finally, some streams of relativist philosophy, such as interpretivism or post-modernism, are germane to discussions of the manipulation of thought and language by the dominant system. Thus, some discussion of these philosophical perspectives is another opening for later study.

These are only a few possibilities for expanding the analysis of socialist terrorism. There are undoubtedly more. It is clear, though, that the study of this phenomenon is far from exhausted, and future analysts have a wide range of opportunities to add to our theoretical awareness of it.

### III. Theoretical Framework

Based on its application to several cases in Chapter Three, it seems likely that the analytical framework developed in this study could be useful in organizing interpretations of the theoretical outlooks of other varieties of terrorism as well, such as religious or nationalist terrorism. A brief illustration of a possible framework based on the organization of this analysis will thus be provided, along with some discussion of how it could be applied to a further case study. In outline form, then, the framework would appear as follows.

#### I. General Ideological Orientation

- the broad theoretical parameters of the group's beliefs and values

#### II. Aims

- the ultimate ideological goal of the group

- the more immediate aims, the achievement of which the group views as its task in the struggle towards the ultimate goal

#### III. Reasons for Resorting to Violence

- constraints on the efficacy of peaceful efforts to change
- possible moral or spiritual benefits to using violence. For example, certain streams of Islamic fundamentalism regard the killing of enemies of Islam as a means to gaining acceptance by God.

#### IV. Strategy in Applying Violence

- the destructive use of violence
- the creative use of violence
- if possible, comments on the organization and structure of the terrorist group best suited to achieving the desired effects

#### V. Ethical Justifications for Terrorism

- utilitarian justification based on a moral critique of the existing establishment, in relation to the envisioned, desired order
- philosophical or religious rationales (this may include the spiritual benefits of violence, as noted above)

This, then, is a broad framework for examination of the theoretical perspective of a terrorist group. What is applicable will vary with the type of group under consideration. A classification of anti-state terrorist groups falls outside the scope of this study, but such a scheme would be a useful companion to the framework.

It is worth noting that the framework appears to have application to the study of state terrorism, as well as anti-state. While the range of theories applicable to state terrorism are often different from anti-state terrorism, there is nothing within the framework which renders it specific to only the anti-state variety. A brief illustration of the framework's application to state terrorism will demonstrate its potentially wider efficacy. The example will employ the case of state terrorism in revolutionary Iran. The information here is very general

and in some places hypothetical, but it will serve for the purposes of illustration. We will begin with the question, and then see how the model can help to respond to it: "Why did the Islamic regime in Iran use terrorism?"

First, the Islamic regime's ideological orientation was radical Shiite Islam. The aims of the regime fell within this orientation. The ultimate goal was the establishment of a universal, global Islamic society. The immediate tasks of the current leadership, necessary steps for reaching the end goal, were the consolidation of the Islamic Republic in Iran, and the export of the revolution within the region.

In achieving these aims, violence was necessary for two reasons. First, the secular opposition inspired by the enemies of God and Islam were certain to try to reverse the revolution, and thus had to be preempted by force to save the Islamic state. Second, God demanded that His opponents be shown no mercy, as they were inspired at heart by Satan, and therefore could not be taught true virtue.

The strategy in using violence contained both destructive and creative elements. In the destructive role, terrorism, in the form of public executions, disappearances, torture, and constant invasion of privacy, would intimidate the opposition, rendering it weak and ineffectual. As well, terrorism would directly result in the death of opposition members, which would contribute to the opposition's general decline. Creatively, terrorism would provide a clear illustration to the virtuous masses of exactly who Islam's enemies were, and exactly how to deal with them. Furthermore, terrorism illustrated who the most powerful leaders were, mobilizing the masses behind the regime for continued progress in the revolution.

The ethical justifications for terrorism were based on both a moral critique of the old establishment, and spiritual principles. The old society under the Shah was suffering extreme cultural and religious degradation through an insidious invasion by Western culture and secular ideology endorsed and desired by the Shah. The old ruling authority was entirely degenerate, having long ago fallen prey to materialistic temptations. The old society also suffered the effects of economic and military imperialism at the hands of the US. To bring Iran towards justice, peace, and divine harmony, the revolutionary regime was obliged to take any measure to ensure that proponents of the old system did not manage to re-implement vestiges of the evil past. From a spiritual perspective, the revolutionary regime had an obligation to God to purify His world by subduing or eliminating infidels. Thus, ample justification existed for the use of terrorism.

The Islamic regime's use of terror was thus largely consistent with its ideological outlook. The strategy for implementing the revolutionary aims depended on the use of violence, and terror was an indispensable means of achieving these aims, through both its destructive and creative roles. Ethically, terrorism was entirely justified within the ideological orientation of the regime. The answer to the question, "Why did the Islamic regime in Iran use terrorism?", has thus been provided at least in part with reference to a conceptual framework focusing analysis onto the theoretical outlook of the terrorists.

This framework, then, has potentially wide application in the analysis of both anti-state and state terrorism. This focus illuminates the subjective factors in the explanation of terrorism. Of course, for a full explanation of any given case, objective factors would have to be

examined as well, such as socio-economic conditions, international influence, and structural characteristics of the established political system. The subjective focus, however, is clearly useful and even indispensable in explanations of terrorist phenomena, and it is hoped that the framework offered here can benefit later analyses of the subject.

#### IV. Future Prospects

Terrorism, both anti-state and state, appears likely to continue for the indefinite future. Socialist terrorism, however, and even the ideologies behind it, appear to have declined significantly over the last decade. The relevance of this study could thus be somewhat limited in the current setting. It is necessary to consider, then, the future prospects of both socialism and socialist terrorism. Considering the theory first, it appears upon superficial examination that the spokesmen of the right are correct in their pronouncements that socialism is dead. The demise of communism as a political system, the shift away from social democratic social and economic policies in Europe and North America, the acceptance of the free market in developing countries, and the rise of the Republican right in American politics seem to indicate that socialism is a historical relic.

Is this view accurate, or is it premature? The suggestion here is that it is premature. Socialism, both anarchist and Marxist streams, is far from irrelevant because despite the apparent failure of communism as a political system, there is still no more coherent a platform for a critique of the established order than that offered by the theoretical enemies of capitalism and the state. The capitalist system, including

the governments of capitalist states, have not escaped the sophisticated and often painful criticism of such recent theorists as the late George Woodcock, or Noam Chomsky, both committed to anarchism and "libertarian socialist" ideals.(5) Socialism, both anarchism and Marxism, clearly has an indispensable role in the process of educating the public about injustices and false freedoms which would otherwise be quietly brushed aside as embarrassments, or simply not noticed by anyone. To claim that socialism is dead is thus to ignore the popularity of modern socialist critiques of the establishment.

Furthermore, one must ask if capitalism has truly overcome socialism as the most viable means of distribution and production. First, capitalism does not exist anywhere in its pure form. It has, as Gramsci predicted, survived through integrating elements of socialism which removed the most blatant injustices of the capitalist system. Now that socialism is allegedly dead, and faith in capitalism is at a peak, the world's political and economic leaders appear to be reverting back to a purer form of capitalism. Social welfare is taking massive cuts in Western states, the old Eastern bloc is letting capitalism run largely unchecked, and developing states are placing their bets on this system as well, often in the hope of obtaining IMF loans or Western aid. If periods have previously arisen in which there was a need to mitigate capitalism with elements of socialism, such as during the 1930's global depression, it seems likely that such periods will arise again. The pendulum may be swinging to the right, but there is little evidence that the future will lack a time when capitalism's survival in any recognizable form will again depend on integrating socialist policies.

Socialism is thus far from buried. What about socialist terrorism? There are, of course, remnants of the past groups which still conduct token operations, but they are mere ghosts of their previous manifestations. Is this reason to believe that they are permanently removed from the world scene? It seems more likely that as long as flaws within the capitalist and state system exist, this form of terrorism as a Western mode of violent expression against it has a chance for revival. There are no structural or institutional impediments to the rise of such groups any more now than at any time in the past.

Some might argue that the demise of the Eastern Bloc ensures the end of socialist terrorism, but in fact the bloc was never a significant boon to these groups in the first place. The existence of the "Evil Empire" could well have hindered the development of sympathy for socialist terrorism, as it may have been associated with the threat from behind the Iron Curtain. If such a group was to arise in the next ten years, there would be no possibility of laying responsibility for its existence at the hands of a communist power. It would have to be accepted for what it was: a violent, radical rejection of the legitimacy of the existing capitalist order among at least some sectors of the populace. Thus, support for any future socialist terrorists may, depending on the socio-political context, be even greater than in the past. Furthermore, even if socialist terrorism per se does not recur, there is little doubt that it has played a role in inspiring violent activism in Western states. Recent eco-terrorists or animal liberationists could be regarded to some degree as the legacy of socialist terrorism.

The definitive demise of socialist terrorism is, then, not a plausible scenario. Like the ideology behind it, this phenomenon and its legacy could well be with the world for the indefinite future. There is nothing to prevent its recurrence, and in fact if the current wave of capitalism goes too far, and evokes a desperate backlash, one of the most telling signs may well be the revival of socialist terrorism. The phenomenon is dormant, not dead, and an understanding of it remains important as long as capitalism and the state, its old enemies, remain.

## End Notes

### Introduction

1. Yonah Alexander and Robert A. Kilmarx, **POLITICAL TERRORISM AND BUSINESS**, (New York: Praeger, 1979), 35.
2. Richard H. Shultz and Stephan Sloan, **RESPONDING TO THE TERRORIST THREAT**, (New York: Pergamon Press, 1980), 1.
3. Martin Slann and Bernard Schecterman, eds., **MULTIDIMENSIONAL TERRORISM**, (USA: L. Rienner, 1987), 4.
4. Walter Laqueur, ed., **THE TERRORISM READER**, (USA: Temple University Press, 1978), 200.
5. Ibid., 208.
6. Leonard B. Weinberg and Paul B. Davis, **INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL TERRORISM**, (USA: McGraw-Hill Inc, 1989), 29.
7. George Woodcock, ed., **THE ANARCHIST READER**, (USA: Harvester Press, 1977), 15.
8. Lyman T. Sargent, **CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES**, (USA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1983), 182.
9. Woodcock, (1977), 25.
10. Pierre Proudhon, **THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION**, trans. John B. Robinson, (New York: Haskell House, 1969), 294.
11. Richard Suskind, **BY BULLET, BOMB, AND DAGGER -- THE STORY OF ANARCHISM**, (New York, Macmillan, 1971), 22.
12. George Woodcock, **ANARCHISM -- A HISTORY OF LIBERTARIAN IDEAS AND MOVEMENTS**, (USA: Meridian Books, 1962), 114.
13. Mikhail Bakunin, **THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN**, ed. G.P. Maximoff, (New York: Free Press, 1953), 207.
14. Woodcock, (1962), 9.
15. Ibid., 151.
16. Robert C. Tucker, **THE MARXIAN REVOLUTIONARY IDEA**, (New York: Norton, 1969), 19.
17. Ibid., 23.
18. Ibid.

19. Karl Marx, MARXISM, ESSENTIAL WRITINGS, ed. David McLellan, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 26.

20. Robert N.C. Hunt, THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM, (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), 94.

21. Karl Marx, KARL MARX, ed. Eugene Kamenka, (USA: Viking Penguin, 1983), 216.

## Chapter I

1. Peter Kropotkin, KROPOTKIN'S REVOLUTIONARY PAMPHLETS, ed. Roger N. Baldwin, (New York: Dover Publications, 1970), 3-4.

2. Robert C. Tucker, THE MARXIAN REVOLUTIONARY IDEA, (New York: Norton, 1969), 30.

3. David L. Miller, ANARCHISM, (London: J.M. Dent, 1984), 70.

4. Karl Marx, MARXISM, ESSENTIAL WRITINGS, ed. David McLellan, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 29.

5. Ibid.

6. Miller, 84.

7. Mikhail Bakunin, THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN, ed. G.P. Maximoff, (New York: Free Press, 1953), 379.

8. Marx; ed. McLellan, Op.Cit., 164.

9. George Woodcock, ed., THE ANARCHIST READER, (USA: Harvester Press, 1977)), 143.

10. Gerald Runkle, ANARCHISM OLD AND NEW, (New York: Delacorte Press, 1972), 93.

11. David E. Ingersoll and Richard K. Matthews, THE PHILOSOPHIC ROOTS OF MODERN IDEOLOGY, (USA: Prentice Hall, 1986), 147.

12. Karl Marx, THE MARX-ENGELS READER, ed. Robert C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1978), 520.

13. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 377.

14. Marx; ed. McLellan, 30.

15. William J. Pomeroy, GUERRILLA WARFARE AND MARXISM, (New York: International Publishers, 1968), 53.

16. V.I. Lenin, LENIN READER, ed. Stefan T. Possony, (Chicago: H. Regnery, 1966), 349.

17. Ibid., 357.

18. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 372.
19. Miller, 99.
20. Kropotkin; ed. Baldwin, 40.
21. Ibid., 41.
22. Lenin; ed. Possony, 354.
23. Ibid., 356-357
24. Ibid., 357.
25. Runkle, 93.
26. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 372.
27. Lenin; ed. Possony, 449.
28. Pomeroy, 88.
29. Lenin; ed. Possony, 316.
30. Ibid., 319.
31. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 201-202.
32. Miller, 85.
33. Ibid.
34. Karl Marx, THE ESSENTIAL WRITINGS OF KARL MARX, ed. David Caute, (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 206.
35. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 368.
36. Ibid., 370.
37. Marx; ed. Caute, 196.
38. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 371.
39. Robert Hunter, VIOLENCE AND THE LABOUR MOVEMENT, (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916), 52.
40. Ibid.
41. Kropotkin; ed. Baldwin, 40.
42. James Joll, THE ANARCHISTS, (London: Methuen, 1979), 109.
43. Hunter, 52.

44. Woodcock, (1977), 87.
45. Kropotkin; ed. Baldwin, 40.
46. Woodcock, (1977), 185.
47. Joll, 120.
48. Bakunin; ed. Maximoff, 380.
49. Miller, 118.
50. Kropotkin; ed. Baldwin, 41.
51. Ibid., 40.
52. Ibid., 42.
53. Ibid.
54. Pomeroy, 83.
55. Ibid.
56. Lenin; ed. Possony, 349.
57. Ibid.
58. V.I. Lenin, THE LENIN ANTHOLOGY, ed. Robert C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1975), 62.
59. Ibid.
60. Ibid., 77.
61. Ibid., 76.
62. Ibid.
63. Ibid., 80.
64. Lenin, ed. Possony, 316.
65. Lenin, ed. Tucker, 78.
66. Lenin, ed. Possony, 316.
67. Kropotkin; ed. Baldwin, 42.

## Chapter II

1. Ralph Miliband, THE STATE IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1969), 54.

2. Ibid.
3. Richard Schacht, ALIENATION, (New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1970), 262.
4. Karl Marx, KARL MARX, ed. Eugene Kamenka, (USA: Viking Press, 1983), 559.
5. Pierre Proudhon, THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION, trans. John B. Robinson, (New York: Haskell House, 1969), 115.
6. Ibid., 116
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid., 133.
9. Ibid.
10. Miliband, 66.
11. Ibid., 64.
12. Ibid., 69.
13. Ibid., 70.
14. Antonio Gramsci, PRE-PRISON WRITINGS, ed. Richard Bellamy, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 231.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Peter Kropotkin, THE ESSENTIAL KROPOTKIN, eds. Emile Capouya and Keitha Tomkins, (New York: Liveright, 1975), 127.
18. Proudhon, 133.
19. Ibid., 132.
20. Gramsci; ed. Bellamy, 88.
21. Kropotkin; eds. Capouya and Tomkins, 27.
22. James Joll, ANTONIO GRAMSCI, (New York: Viking Press, 1977), 21.
23. Joanne Wright, TERRORIST PROPAGANDA, (London: Macmillan, 1991), 27.
24. Antonio Gramsci, THE MODERN PRINCE AND OTHER WRITINGS, ed, trans. Louis Marks, (New York: International Publishers, 1959), 77.

25. Gramsci; ed. Bellamy, 78.
26. Gramsci; ed. Marks, 113.
27. Ibid., 118.
28. Ibid., 114.
29. Ibid., 124.
30. Ibid., 83.
31. Herbert Marcuse, COUNTERREVOLUTION AND REVOLT, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), 51.
32. Ibid., 80.
33. Mikhail Bakunin, THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN, ed. G.P. Maximoff, (New York: Free Press, 1953), 370.
34. George Woodcock, ed., THE ANARCHIST READER, (USA: Harvester Press, 1977), 87.
35. Ibid., 185.
36. Marx; ed. Kamenka, 561.
37. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, THE MARX-ENGELS READER, ed. Robert C. Tucker, (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1978), 207.
38. Marx; ed. Kamenka, 134.
39. Ibid., 135.
40. Ibid., 134.
41. Ibid., 135.
42. Ibid., 134.
43. Ibid., 136.
44. Ibid.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid., 136-137.
47. Ibid., 139.
48. Ibid., 140.
49. Ibid.

50. Ibid., 141.
51. Marx and Engels; Tucker, 390.
52. Ibid., 479.
53. Ibid., 392.
54. Peter Kropotkin, THE CONQUEST OF BREAD, ed. Paul Avrich, (London: A. Lane, 1972), 197.
55. Marx; ed. Kamenka, 567.
56. Kropotkin; eds. Capouya and Tomkins, 29.
57. Ibid.
58. Ibid.
59. Karl Marx, KARL MARX, SELECTED WRITINGS, ed. David McLellan, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 223.
60. Ibid., 53.
61. Gramsci; ed. Bellamy, 88.
62. Kropotkin; ed. Capouya and Tomkins, 37.
63. Marx and Engels; ed. Tucker, 187.
64. Marx; ed. Kamenka, 398.
65. Ibid., 220.
66. Ibid., 463.
67. Ibid., 460.
68. Kropotkin; ed. Avrich, 106.
69. Ibid., 119.
70. Marx and Engels; ed. Tucker, 203-217.
71. Ibid., 204.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid., 206.
74. Ibid., 211.
75. Ibid., 212.

76. Ibid., 216.
77. Ibid., 422.
78. Kropotkin; ed. Avrich, 74.
79. Marx; ed. Tucker, 205.
80. Kropotkin; eds. Capouya and Tomkins, 42.
81. Ibid., 47.
82. Marcuse, 52.
83. Proudhon, 132.
84. Ibid., 258.
85. Kropotkin; ed. Capouya and Tomkins, 53.
86. Marx and Engels; ed. Tucker, 628-629.

### Chapter III

1. Yonah Alexander and Dennis Pluchinsky, eds., EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, (London: Frank Cass, 1992), 194.
2. Leonard Weinberg and William Eubank, THE RISE AND FALL OF ITALIAN TERRORISM, (USA: Westview Press, 1987), 19.
3. Richard Drake, THE REVOLUTIONARY MYSTIQUE AND TERRORISM IN CONTEMPORARY ITALY, (USA: Indiana University Press, 1989), 8.
4. Joanne Wright, TERRORIST PROPAGANDA, (London: Macmillan, 1991), 22.
5. Ibid., 47.
6. Drake, 9.
7. Wright, 21.
8. Weinberg and Eubank, 108.
9. Ibid., 20-25.
10. Robert Meade, RED BRIGADES: THE STORY OF ITALIAN TERRORISM, (London, Macmillan, 1990), 17-18.
11. Vittorfranco Pisano, CONTEMPORARY ITALIAN TERRORISM, (Washington D.C: Library of Congress, 1979), 38.
12. Ibid., 39.

13. Weinberg and Eubank, 15-16.
14. Meade, 28.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid., 37.
17. Weinberg and Eubank, 42.
18. Meade, 36.
19. Weinberg and Eubank, 109-111.
20. Ibid., 72.
21. Yonah Alexander and Dennis Pluchinsky, eds., EUROPEAN  
TERRORISM TODAY AND TOMORRO, (USA: Brassey's Inc., 1992), 154.
22. Hans Josef Horchem, TERRORISM IN WEST GERMANY, (UK: Institute  
for the Study of Conflict [ISC], 1986), 1.
23. Weinberg and Eubank, 4.
24. Horchem, 4.
25. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 134.
26. Ibid., 134-136.
27. Ibid., 134.
28. Luigi Manconi, ``The Political Ideology of the Red Brigades'',  
THE RED BRIGADES AND LEFT-WING TERRORISM IN ITALY, ed. Raimondo  
Cantanzaro, (London: Pinter Publisher, 1991), 118.
29. Robin E. Wagner-Pacifici, THE MORO MORALITY PLAY, (Chicago:  
University of Chicago Press, 1986), 201.
30. Manconi, 126.
31. Francis Furet, Antoine Liniers, and Phillipe Raynaud,  
TERRORISME ET DEMOCRATIE, (France: Fayard, 1985), 120.
32. Meade, 178.
33. Daniela Salvioni and Anders Stephanson, ``Reflections on the  
Red Brigades'', ORBIS 29, (Fall 1985): 495.
34. Ibid.
35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.
37. Allison Jamieson, THE HEART ATTACKED, (London: Marion Boyars, 1989), 108.
38. Vittorfranco Pisano, ``Terrorism in the Italian Case'', POLICE CHIEF 52, (March, 1985): 141.
39. Meade, 126.
40. Furet, Liniers, and Raynaud, 121.
41. Ibid., 122-123.
42. Wagner-Pacifici, 304.
43. G.P. Maximoff, THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN, (New York: Free Press, 1953), 359.
44. Wright, 44-46.
45. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPEAN TERRORISM TODAY AND TOMORRO, Op.Cit., 44.
46. Wright, 80.
47. Furet, Liniers, and Raynaud, 46.
48. Ibid., 44.
49. Wright, 115.
50. Furet, Liniers, and Raynaud, 52.
51. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 73.
52. Furet, Liniers, and Raynaud, 52.
53. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 59.
54. Michael Darntell, THE REVOLUTIONARY TERRORISM OF DIRECT ACTION, (Toronto: York University, 1989), 3.
55. Ibid., 6.
56. Edward Moxon-Browne, TERRORISM IN FRANCE, (UK: ISC, 1983), 24.
57. Edward Moxon-Browne, ``Terrorism in France'', THE THREAT OF TERRORISM, ed. Juliet Lodge, (UK: Wheatsheaf Books, 1988), 218.
58. Alain Hamon and Jean-Charles Marchand, ACTION DIRECTE, (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1986), 149.
59. Moxon-Browne, 1983, 23.

60. Darntell, 10-11.
61. Moxon-Browne, 1988, 218.
62. Darntell, 34.
63. Ibid., 33-34.
64. Wagner-Pacifici, 40.
65. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 208.
66. Peter Janke, et.al., TERRORISM AND DEMOCRACY, (London: Macmillan, 1992), 139.
67. Salvioni and Stephanson, 494.
68. Ibid.
69. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 209.
70. Furet, Liniers, and Raynaud, 61.
71. Ibid., 55.
72. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 60.
73. Walter Laqueur, ed., THE TERRORISM READER, (USA: Temple University Press), 178.
74. Darntell, 31.
75. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, Op.Cit., 142.
76. Ibid., 140-145.
77. Ibid., 137.
78. Ibid.
79. Pisano, ``Terrorism in the Italian Case'', 139.
80. Vittorfranco Pisano, THE RED BRIGADES: A CHALLENGE TO ITALIAN DEMOCRACY, (London: ISC, 1980), 8-9.
81. Gian Carlo Caselli and Donatella Della Porta, ``The History of the Red Brigades'', THE RED BRIGADES AND LEFT-WING TERRORISM IN ITALY, ed. Raimondo Cantanzaro, (London: Pinter Publisher, 1991), 90-91.
82. Jamieson, 110.
83. Meade, Chapter 9.

84. Ibid., 171.
85. Caselli and Porta, 93.
86. Salvioni and Stephanson, 499.
87. Bob Lumley and Philip Schlesinger, ``The Press, the State and Its Enemies: the Italian Case'', THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW (30, no. 82): 622.
88. Ibid., 620
89. Caselli and Porta, 90.
90. Ibid., 91.
91. Robert Sole, LE DEFI TERRORISTE, (Paris: Seuil, 1979), 109.
92. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTES, 216.
93. Michel Wieviorka, THE MAKING OF TERRORISM, trans. Gordon White (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 84.
94. Ibid.
95. Janke, et.al., 135.
96. Caselli and Porta, 92.
97. Sole, 82.
98. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPEAN TERRORISM TODAY AND TOMORRO, 45.
99. Ibid., 55.
100. Laqueur, ed., 178.
101. Wright, 109.
102. Ibid., 86.
103. Laqueur, ed., 178.
104. Wright, 109.
105. Puret, Liniers and Raynaud, 95-96.
106. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPEAN TERRORISM TODAY AND TOMORRO, 54.
107. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 73.

108. Hamon and Marchand, 87.
109. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 137.
110. Moxon-Browne, 1988, 217.
111. Darntell, 31.
112. Hamon and Marchand, 119.
113. Moxon-Browne, 1983, 23.
114. Darntell, 31.
115. Hamon and Marchand, 128.
116. Manconi, 119.
117. Salvioni and Stephanson, 498.
118. Manconi, 120.
119. Pisano, CONTEMPORARY ITALIAN TERRORISM, 70.
120. Drake, 9.
121. Ibid., 87.
122. Lumley and Schlesinger, 608.
123. Ibid., 607.
124. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 205.
125. Ibid., 204.
126. Jamieson, 81.
127. Caselli and Porta, 84.
128. Sole, 81.
129. Ibid.
130. Wagner-Pacifici, 304.
131. Ibid., 305.
132. Furet, Liniers and Raynaud, 125.
133. Sole, 82.
134. Manconi, 130.

135. Wright, 189.
136. Furet, Liniers and Raynaud, 103.
137. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 60.
138. Julian Becker, HITLER'S CHILDREN, (London: Pickwick Books, 1989), 120.
139. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 62.
140. Wright, 110.
141. Ibid., 116.
142. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 61.
143. Wright, 180-181.
144. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 66.
145. Ibid., 68.
146. Wright, 80.
147. Furet, Liniers and Raynaud, 57.
148. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 76.
149. Ibid., 75.
150. Ibid., 76.
151. Ibid., 79.
152. Moxon-Browne, 1983, 23.
153. Moxon-Browne, 1988, 218.
154. Darntell, 7.
155. Ibid., 12.
156. Ibid., 33.
157. Ibid., 13.
158. Ibid., 11
159. Ibid.
160. Ibid., 9.
161. Hamon and Marchand, 131.

162. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS, 146.
163. Darntell, 27.
164. Ibid., 27-28.
165. Hamon and Marchand, 128.
166. Alexander and Pluchinsky, EUROPE'S RED TERROSISTS, 137.
167. Ibid., 142.
168. Hamon and Marchand, 118.
169. Wright, 110.

### Conclusions

1. Yonah Alexander and Robert A. Kilmarx, POLITICAL TERRORISM AND BUSINESS, (New York: Praeger, 1979), 35.
2. Joanne Wright, TERRORIST PROPAGANDA, (London: Macmillan, 1991), 51.
3. Friedrich Nietzsche, A NIETZSCHE READER, ed., trans. R.J. Hollingdale, (London: Penguin Books, 1977), 198.
4. Ibid., 201.
5. Noam Chomsky, LANGUAGE AND POLITICS, ed. Carlos Peregin Otero, (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1988), 23,25,30.

## Bibliography

### Introduction and Chapter I

- Alexander, Yonah, and Kilmarx, Robert A. POLITICAL TERRORISM AND BUSINESS. New York: Praeger, 1979.
- Bakunin, Mikhail. THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN. Ed. Maximoff, G.P. New York: Free Press, 1953.
- Carter, April. THE POLITICAL THEORY OF ANARCHISM. London: Routledge and K. Paul, 1971.
- Fleming, Marie. THE ANARCHIST WAY TO SOCIALISM. London: Croom Helm, 1979.
- Hunt, Robert, N.C. THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNISM. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Hunter, Robert. VIOLENCE AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916.
- Ingersoll, David E. and Matthews, Richard K. THE PHILOSOPHIC ROOTS OF MODERN IDEOLOGY. USA: Prentice Hall, 1986.
- Kropotkin, Peter. KROPOTKIN'S REVOLUTIONARY PAMPHLETS. Ed. Baldwin, Roger N. New York: Dover Publications, 1970.
- Joll, James. THE ANARCHISTS. London: Methuen, 1979.
- Laqueur, Walter, ed. THE TERRORISM READER. USA: Temple University Press, 1978.
- Lenin, V.I. LENIN READER. Ed. Possony, Stefan T. Chicago: H. Regnery, 1966.
- Lenin, V.I. THE LENIN ANTHOLOGY. Ed. Tucker, Robert C. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1975.
- Marx, Karl. THE ESSENTIAL WRITINGS OF KARL MARX. Ed. Cate, David. New York: Macmillan, 1967.
- Marx, Karl. KARL MARX. Ed. Kamenka, Eugene. USA: Viking Penguin, 1983.
- Marx, Karl. MARXISM, ESSENTIAL WRITINGS. Ed. McLellan, David. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. THE MARX-ENGELS READER. Ed. Tucker, Robert C. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1978.
- Miller, David L. ANARCHISM. London: J.M. Dent, 1984.
- Pomeroy, William J. GUERRILLA WARFARE AND MARXISM. New York: International Publishers, 1968.

- Proudhon, Pierre. THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION. trans. Robinson, John B. New York: Haskell House, 1969.
- Runkle, Gerald. ANARCHISM OLD AND NEW. New York: Delacorte Press, 1972.
- Saltman, Richard B. THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THOUGHT OF MIKHAIL BAKUNIN. USA: Greenwood Press, 1983.
- Sargent, Lyman T. CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES. USA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1983.
- Shultz, Richard H. and Sloan, Stephan, eds. RESPONDING TO THE TERRORIST THREAT. New York: Pergamon Press, 1980.
- Slann, Martin and Schecter, Bernard, eds. MULTIDIMENSIONAL TERRORISM. USA: Lynn Rienner, 1987.
- Suskind, Richard. BY BULLET, BOMB, AND DAGGER -- THE STORY OF ANARCHISM. New York: Macmillan, 1971.
- Trotsky, Leon. THE AGE OF PERMANENT REVOLUTION: A TROTSKY ANTHOLOGY. Ed. Deuschter, Isaac. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1954.
- Tucker, Robert C. THE MARXIAN REVOLUTIONARY IDEA. New York: Norton, 1969.
- Weinberg, Leonard B and Davis, Paul B. INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL TERRORISM. USA: McGraw-Hill Inc. 1989.
- Woodcock, George. ANARCHISM -- A HISTORY OF LIBERTARIAN IDEAS AND MOVEMENTS. USA: Meridian Books, 1962.
- Woodcock, George, ed. THE ANARCHIST READER. USA: Harvester Press, 1977.
- Chapter II**
- Bakunin, Mikhail. THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN. Ed. Maximoff, G.P. New York: Free Press, 1953.
- Gramsci, Antonio. PRE-PRISON WRITINGS. Ed. Bellamy, Richard. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Gramsci, Antonio. THE MODERN PRINCE AND OTHER WRITINGS. Ed. Marks, Louis. New York: International Publishers, 1959.
- Joll, James. ANTONIO GRAMSCI. New York: Viking Press, 1977.
- Kropotkin, Peter. THE CONQUEST OF BREAD. Ed. Avrich, Paul. London: A. Lane, 1972.
- Kropotkin, Peter. THE ESSENTIAL KROPOTKIN. Eds. Capouya, Emile and Tomkins, Keitha. New York: Liveright, 1975.

Marcuse, Herbert and Popper, Karl. REVOLUTION OR REFORM? Ed. Ferguson, A.T. Chicago: New University Press, 1976.

Marcuse, Herbert. COUNTERREVOLUTION AND REVOLT. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Marx, Karl. KARL MARX. Ed. Kamenka, Eugene. USA: Viking Penguin, 1983.

Marx, Karl. KARL MARX, SELECTED WRITINGS. Ed. McLellan, David. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. THE MARX-ENGELS READER. Ed. Tucker, Robert C. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1978.

Miliband, Ralph. THE STATE IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.

Proudhon, Pierre. THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION. trans. Robinson, John B. New York: Haskell House, 1969.

Schacht, Richard. ALIENATION. New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1970.

Woodcock, George, ed. THE ANARCHIST READER. USA: Harvester Press, 1977.

Wright, Joanne. TERRORIST PROPAGANDA. London: Macmillan, 1991.

### Chapter III and Conclusion

Alexander, Yonah and Pluchinsky, Dennis, eds. EUROPEAN TERRORISM TODAY AND TOMORRO. USA: Brassey's Inc., 1992.

Alexander, Yonah, and Pluchinsky, Dennis, eds. EUROPE'S RED TERRORISTS. London: Frank Cass, 1992.

Bakunin, Mikhail. THE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY OF BAKUNIN. Ed. Maximoff, G.P. New York: Free Press, 1953.

Becker, Julian. HITLER'S CHILDREN. London: Pickwick Books, 1989.

Catanzaro, Raimondo, ed. THE RED BRIGADES AND LEFT-WING TERRORISM IN ITALY. London: Pinter Publisher, 1991.

Chomsky, Noam. LANGUAGE AND POLITICS. Ed. Otero, Carlos Peregrin. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1988.

Clutterbuck, Richard; Jamieson, Alison, and Lodge, Juliet. COUNTER-TERRORISM IN EUROPE: IMPLICATIONS. UK: Research Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism (RISCT), 1991.

Darntell, Michael. THE REVOLUTIONARY TERRORISM OF ACTION DIRECTE. Toronto: York University, 1989.

Drake, Richard. THE REVOLUTIONARY MYSTIQUE AND TERRORISM IN CONTEMPORARY ITALY. USA: Indiana University Press, 1989.

- Francis, Samuel. "Terrorist Renaissance: France, 1980-1983". WORLD AFFAIRS, 146, No.1, 1983, pp 54-58.
- Furet, Francis; Liniers, Antoine, and Raynaud, Phillipe. TERRORISME ET DEMOCRATIE. France: Fayard, 1985.
- Hamon Alain and Marchand, Jean-Charles. ACTION DIRECTE. Paris: Editions de Seuil, 1986.
- Horchem, Hans Josef. TERRORISM IN WEST GERMANY. UK: Institute for the Study of Conflict, 1986.
- Jamieson, Allison. THE HEART ATTACKED. London: Marion Boyars, 1989.
- Janke, Peter, et.al. TERRORISM AND DEMOCRACY. London: Macmillan, 1992.
- Laqueur, Walter, ed. THE TERRORISM READER. USA: Temple University Press, 1978.
- Lodge, Juliet. THE THREAT OF TERRORISM. UK: Wheatsheaf Books, 1988.
- Lumley, Bob and Schlesinger, Philip. "The Press, the State and Its Enemies: The Italian Case". THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 30, No.82, pp 603-623.
- Meade, Robert C. RED BRIGADES. London: Macmillan, 1990.
- Moxon-Browne, Edward. TERRORISM IN FRANCE. UK: Institute for the Study of Conflict, 1983.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. A NIETZSCHE READER. Ed., trans. Hollingdale, R.J. London: Penguin Books, 1977.
- Pisano, Vittorfranco. CONTEMPORARY ITALIAN TERRORISM. Washington D.C: Library of Congress, 1979.
- . THE RED BRIGADES: A CHALLENGE TO ITALIAN DEMOCRACY. London: Institute for the Study of Conflict, 1980.
- . "Terrorism, the Italian Case". POLICE CHIEF, 52, March, 1985, pp 138-141.
- . "Terrorism in Italy: from Dozier's Rescue to Hunt's Assassination". POLICE CHIEF, 51, June 1984, pp 35-38.
- Salvioni, Daniela, and Stephanson, Anders. "Reflections on the Red Brigades". ORBIS 29, Fall 1985, pp 489-506.
- Sole, Robert. LE DEFI TERRORISTE. Paris: Seuil, 1979.
- Taylor, Peter. STATES OF TERROR. London: BBC Books, 1993.
- US Government. TERRORIST GROUP PROFILES. USA: US Government Printing

Office, 1988.

Wagner-Pacifici, Robin E. THE MORO MORALITY PLAY. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Weinberg, Leonard and Eubank, William. THE RISE AND FALL OF ITALIAN TERRORISM. USA: Westview Press, 1987.

Wieviorka, Michel. THE MAKING OF TERRORISM. trans. White, Gordon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Wright, Joanne. TERRORIST PROPAGANDA. London: Macmillan, 1991.