The way of the world is like this. You have a friend: you love him, sometimes so much that you even die for him. You have an enemy: you shun him, you fight against him and, if possible, kill him. The gospel of the revolutionaries is simple and straight. It is what has been since the days of Adam and Eve.

Bhagawati Charan (1929)

From the earliest history of the world humans have used evil and terror. By the beginning of the sixth chapter of the biblical history of human-kind we learn that within only ten generations, starting with Adam and ending when Noah was 500 years old (7,159 years), God looked upon creation and said that all of creation was corrupted and filled with violence. The violence was so extreme that God decided to destroy all creation, with the exception of one family and the proverbial two of every kind. Old Testament history informs the reader that between the great flood and the birth of Jesus there was no sin or debauchery that was unseen on the face of the earth. Since the eating of the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, mankind has demonstrated the ability to act upon that knowledge of evil.

Terrorism, as its root word ‘terror’ indicates, is about the use of fear. The history of terrorism, unlike war, is about the use of violence and indirect targeting to achieve objectives through the consequences of fear. The intended audience of the terrorist is the broader society from which
the actual victims are derived. This is not to say that within war terror does not occur, but what differentiates terrorism from the atrocities of war is that terrorism is designed to inflict violence on targets in order to cause fear and to force a change in the larger society. War inflicts violence on targets to break the will of an opponent or to destroy their ability to fight. This can involve injury of a civilian population but the purpose of the violence is not to intimidate and cause change through fear. This distinction also differentiates terrorism from insurgencies or guerilla warfare, for the latter are political movements and terrorism is a political tool. Insurgencies or guerilla forces may use terrorism as a tactic, thus making their members terrorists, but these movements are not terrorist movements per se. The distinction between acts of war and guerilla or insurgency movements and terrorist organisations is in the purpose of the act. For example, an insurgency or guerilla force that attacks military and governmental infrastructures to prevent them from operating or to force their withdrawal from an area is not engaging in terror but in warfare, because the targets are selected for their intrinsic value, not to cause fear in the society that employs them.

Terror has also been a tool of religious desires and dictates. The Zealots used terror to oppose Roman rule and the Nizari Isma’ilis used terror to resist Christian Europeans as well as to punish traitors, collaborators, infidels and apostates. Terrorists today share the same objectives that were sought by terrorists a century ago. They seek the overthrow of what they perceive as oppressive governments, an end to ‘economic and political’ imperialism of the West (today, especially the United States), the creation of governments that honour a specific religious viewpoint and the expulsion of invaders (today, especially Israel).

Groups that have used terror have come and gone in history but the tactic of terror has remained because terrorism is a political tool for change, it is not an ideology or a political movement. Social and political change can come from the ballot box or the bomb; the terrorist chooses the latter because it is seen as a more useful tool. But as Hamas demonstrated in the January 2006 Palestinian elections, a terrorist organisation can adjust to changes in the social and political landscape and find utility in the ballot box as well. History is not without examples of terrorist groups renouncing the use of terror after their aims are achieved. History
informs us that the terrorists of the Lehi\textsuperscript{3} and the Irgun\textsuperscript{4} were integrated into the new Israeli Defense Forces (1948) after the State of Israel was created and two of the leaders, Yitzhak Shamir and Menachem Begin, later became Prime Ministers. History has also shown that a terrorist group can adopt both the bomb and the ballot. Hezbollah, the group that forced the multinational peacekeeping force out of Lebanon with a terror campaign, culminating in the use of multiple suicide bombings of French and US barracks in October 1983 and followed by the systematic use of kidnappings, assassinations, aeroplane hijackings and bombings throughout the 1980s, is a coalition partner in the government of Lebanon today.

As all wars have their reasons, so do all terrorist organisations. But as the reason for war does not change the nature of war, the reason for terrorism does not change the nature of terrorism. Terrorism is not a spontaneous or inevitable event in struggles for independence or social change. It is a chosen tool. Its use always requires justification and there has never been a terrorist or terrorist group that has not been able to justify the use of terror to achieve their desired goals.

\textit{Two Centuries of Terror}

In today’s world, no one is innocent, no one is neutral. A man is either with the oppressed or he is with the oppressor. He who takes no interest in politics gives his blessing to the prevailing order, that of the ruling classes and exploiting forces.

George Habash, General Secretary
Popular Front for Liberation of Palestine

The use of terror and the tools of terror have evolved and developed through history. David Rapoport describes the history of terror in four waves. The first wave of terrorism was the anarchist wave (1880s–1914) followed by the anti-colonial wave (1920–60s). The third wave of terror, communist left terrorism, plagued Europe, beginning in the late 1960s and ending by the mid-1980s, leaving some groups still active in Sri Lanka, Spain, France, Peru and Columbia. The fourth wave, Islamic fundamentalist, began in 1979, and, ‘if it follows the pattern of its predecessors, it still has twenty to twenty-five years to run’.\textsuperscript{5} Although there are
differences between anti-colonial terrorism, which involved indigenous peoples seeking independence from European colonial powers both before and after World War II, and the left revolutionary terror of the late 1960s through to the mid-1980s, which involved middle-class youth who rebelled against the injustices of the capitalist systems of Europe, both were influenced by Marxist theory. Islamist fundamentalist terror is based on religious objectives reminiscent of those of the hashshashins of more than one millennium ago and the worldview of European anarchists a century ago.

I propose that the history of the use of terror can be understood as two waves of utilisation – ‘classic’ and ‘modern’ terrorism. I define classic terrorism as the discriminate use of terror and target selection. Classic terrorism encompasses Rapoport’s first three waves of terror. Modern terrorism involves the rise of Islamic fundamentalist-oriented terrorism. This wave is divided into two stages. The first stage (from 1979 through the 1980s), which plagued the Western democracies and Israel, involved bombings of populated areas of Israel, kidnapping of Western diplomats and journalists, and the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) support of the first intifada (1987–93). In the second stage (starting in the early 1990s) Hamas introduced high-casualty targeted suicide bombing of Israeli cities and by the late 1990s Osama bin Laden had implemented terror that was much less interested in creating social and political change and primarily focused on inflicting ‘punishment’ for perceived injustices. These two stages are what differentiate modern from classic terrorism: modern terrorism involves indiscriminate targeting with high-mortality impact.

This chapter provides a summary of the history of the use and rationalisation of terror over the last two centuries which is followed by a discussion of how the history of terror has shifted from cause orientation to a high-mortality orientation and why the change has occurred. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the utility of modern terrorism.
A Summary of the Historical Development of Terrorism

La terreur n’est autre que la justice prompte, severe, inflexible.\(^7\)

Maximilien Robespierre (1793)

Il n’y a pas d’innocents.\(^8\)

Emile Henry (1894)

Everything is moral which assists the triumph of revolution. Immoral and criminal is everything which stands in its way.

Sergey Nechaev (1869)

Unfortunately only those who have themselves risen by violence know how dangerous it is to tolerate its appearance. While those who have risen by legitimate means are puzzled by the inception of violent politics, and hesitate to deal with the peril in time.

Bertrand De Jouvenal

When the Jacobins, led by Maximilien Robespierre, took power on 5 September 1793 to protect the new French Republic of 1792, liberté, égalité et fraternité, ou la mort\(^9\) became an ironic but apt slogan behind a reign of terror in which thousands of heads met the end of the guillotine. The Reign of Terror was no more than a small group of leaders using force to maintain power; there is nothing new in this. The Jacobins sought to create a central government with control over the economy, which was in shambles, as well as oppose the counter-revolutionary forces of the aristocracy and the Church. The Terror was advanced not only as necessary to protect the revolution, but also as a just and required action to protect the goals of societal liberty, justice, and equality brought about through the Revolution. Maximilien Robespierre and the Jacobins initiated and implemented the widespread use of terror in order to purge the society of those who opposed the revolution of the people.

On 25 December 1793 Robespierre, in one of a series of speeches on the need for terror, explained:
The object of constitutional government is to preserve the Republic; the object of revolutionary government is to establish it... The principal concern of constitutional government is civil liberty; that of revolutionary government, public liberty. Under a constitutional government little more is required than to protect the individual against abuses by the state, whereas revolutionary government is obliged to defend the state itself against the factions that assail it from every quarter.

Thus a constitutional republic that protects the people and their liberties is subsequent to the revolutionary government, which creates the Republic. Robespierre explained that in establishing the Republic, the prerequisite revolution ‘is the war waged by liberty against its enemies; a constitution is that which crowns the edifice of freedom once victory has been won and the nation is at peace’. Terror is a necessary tool of the revolutionary government needing to ‘summon extraordinary activity to its aid precisely because it is at war. It is subjected to less binding and less uniform regulations [than a constitutional government], because the circumstances in which it finds itself are tempestuous and shifting, above all because it is compelled to deploy, swiftly and incessantly, new resources to meet new and pressing dangers’. Since it ‘is the function of government to guide the moral and physical energies of the nation toward the purposes for which it was established’; that is, the protection of the Republic founded on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, it is for the government, in the name of the people, to determine who the enemies are. As Robespierre expounded ‘to good citizens revolutionary government owes the full protection of the state; to the enemies of the people it owes only death’.

When the government of the revolution is threatened, the people are not the focus of protection; the focus of protection must be the revolution of the people. Terror is justified and required so the constitutional government can be established. While the battles against the people’s revolution are dealt with, the ‘binding’ and ‘uniform regulations’ of law are cast aside because of the ‘new and pressing dangers’. Terror must come before liberty in order to ensure and establish liberty. Robespierre would not be the last to make such claims, but he was the first.

The importance of the French Revolution as the beginning of ‘terrorism as tool’ is in the nature of its application as well as its justification.
The violence had a specific purpose and justification. It was systemic throughout France against a broad but specifically defined targeted social and political class. The violence was not done in the darkness of night but fully advocated and conducted in the open. The justification and reasoning for the Terror were published throughout France and its governing structures. More than 18,000 people are estimated to have been killed, jailed and tortured. But in the end, the Terror failed to protect the Revolution. The First Republic collapsed into the hands of a general who declared himself an Emperor.

The Terror was the first use of violence as a tool to create a new society rather than simply to change the leadership in an existing one. While Maximilien Robespierre and the Jacobins used systemic governmental terror after gaining power to reshape the governing and social structures of France and end the French monarchy, Russian revolutionaries and European anarchists used terror to oppose the industrial and capitalist governing structures of Europe. Marxist theorists and European anarchists refined the use of terror as begun by Robespierre by developing more detailed theories of ‘how’ as well as justifications for ‘why’ terror should be employed.¹⁰

Karl Heinzen in his 1849 essay Murder asserted that violence is a tool that creates fear in the hearts of those in government who use their power to oppress the people. The instillation of fear fosters weakness in those who oppress and results in the destruction of unjust societies. Heinzen begins his essay with an acknowledgment that the taking of human life is evil, but it is either wrong for all or not at all. Since the oppressors of the people use government to determine when murder is justified and when it is not justified and the result of murder is the same regardless of its justification, the taking of life is not evil from the perspective of the life lost. What determines if it is evil is who takes that life and why. Thus the evil of murder lies not on the legal or social level but on the political level. Since murder is political, not moral, the revolutionary – the terrorist – is not a murderer because the murder is just as political and necessary as murder by those in power. Murder, according to Heinzen, has historically been an essential tool of self-defence for those resisting tyranny and for establishing social change.

Heinzen concluded that those who rule and oppress justify their acts of murder and oppression through various means, including laws
defining what acts are worthy of the death penalty and the creation of war to attack those who oppose them. Heinzen concluded that this exclusive right claimed by the oppressors of the people to commit acts of murder and have them called other things, must be challenged and those who are oppressed must assert the same right to kill and not have their actions labelled as murder. Thus, a judgment as to whether the bomb that kills a tsar is an act of murder or justice, lies in the eyes of the observer. Heinzen asserted that the revolutionary act of murder is just, because it is an act of resistance to oppression. The oppressor’s act of murder is just that, murder. In the mind of the terrorist, Heinzen’s perspective, now more than a century and a half old, has never been lost. The self-serving rationalisation and false conclusion of the history of terrorism that ‘one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter’ has had a long life.¹¹

The single greatest contribution to the development of the tool of terror made by the anarchist movement was the concept of ‘propaganda by deed’, first developed during the northern summer and early autumn of 1876 by three Italian anarchists.¹² By 1881 propaganda by deed was a fully developed and accepted anarchist theory, which provided a framework for understanding how terror is effective in revolutionary movements. Propaganda by deed purports that people are motivated by action rather than by words and reason. Ideas are spread by action and through action society is changed. Acts of terror are ways to show the oppressed that the oppressor is not invincible and that the oppressed can change their position. This theory has been an unchanging aspect of terror ever since.

With the ascendancy of the industrial economies terrorists continued to use terror against specific targets to gain their objectives. As the nineteenth century concluded, terrorists combined propaganda by deed and assassination of leaders as the main tools to bring about the fall of capitalist governments in Europe and the United States. By the beginning of the war to end all wars both a President of the United States and various kings and other royalty in Europe had met violent ends at the hands of anarchists.

With the end of World War I, the subsequent fall of the Ottoman Empire, the ascendancy of modern nation states and national independence movements, propaganda by deed continued. Terror re-emerged in
Ireland, Russia and India. The Easter Rebellion and the subsequent war for Irish independence (1919–21) expanded the scope of terror from targeting specific individuals to the targeting of selected groups: police, soldiers, judges or any representative of the government structure. Individual terrorism, which focused on specific leaders to cause social and political change, shifted to selective terrorism focusing on random targeting of individuals within a specific group to achieve political freedom. The Russian Revolution, followed by the Soviet revolution under Stalin, reprised the French Reign of Terror for decades. And while the development of terrorist thought from Robespierre to the late nineteenth-century anarchists and Marxists provided explanation and justification for the use of murder and bombs as a necessary response to the forces of the oppressor, or to protect the results of a revolution, the Indian independence movement provided an intrinsic value of terror for the terrorist themselves.

In 1929 the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (HSRA) placed a bomb on the train of the Viceroy of India. The attempt to kill the Viceroy failed and the HSRA was condemned for the attempted assassination by various sections of Indian society, including Mahatma Gandhi. The HSRA then published its famous article, *Philosophy of the Bomb*, written by Bhagawati Charan and Chandra Shekhar Azad, to provide a response to Gandhi’s position that revolutionary violence was neither moral nor practical for the goal of an independent India.

The HSRA was a Marxist group which maintained that the struggle against Great Britain was a revolution that would ‘usher in a new social order. The revolution will ring the death knell of capitalism and class distinctions and privileges . . . it will establish the dictatorship of the proletariat and will forever banish social parasites from the seat of political power’. Marxism aside, the *Philosophy of the Bomb* was principally a response in the ongoing debate about the use of non-violence versus the use of terror and violence to achieve independence from Great Britain. But, at the beginning of the article, six basic principles on the nature and justification for the use of terrorism were asserted:

1. It is a phase, a necessary, an inevitable phase of the revolution. Terrorism is not the complete revolution and the revolution is not complete without terrorism. This thesis can be supported by an analysis of any and every revolution in history.
2. Terrorism instils fear in the hearts of the oppressors.
3. It brings hopes of revenge and redemption to the oppressed masses.
4. It gives courage and self-confidence to the wavering.
5. It shatters the spell of the superiority of the ruling class.
6. It raises the status of the subject race in the eyes of the world, because it is the most convincing proof of a nation’s hunger for freedom.

Thus terror is the natural result of oppression. Terrorism is an inevitable stage on the road to independence and the use of terror provides the oppressed with renewed faith in themselves and proves to the world that they are worthy of freedom because they refuse to accept oppression. Peaceful means do not, and have never, resulted in the freedom of an oppressed people. It is both ‘ridiculous and ignorant’ to believe that any nation achieves freedom without the use of the bomb. Those who seek negotiation with an oppressor through peaceful means will fail and only succeed in lowering ‘the national prestige by knocking at the gates of the government house with the beggar’s bowl in their hands and dominion status on their lips’.

It is this last concept of the oppressed who are made beggars in their own land and who through the use of terror prove they are worthy of freedom, as well as gaining redemption, courage, self-confidence and the attention of the world, that makes this article significant in the development of terror. Since the French Revolution terrorism had always been about social change and the theorists of terror postulated that propaganda by deed was the best way to awaken the masses to make change. But the HSRA asserted that the use of terror also regains lost self-respect and shows that an oppressed people, through the use of violence, proves to the rest of the world that they deserve freedom rather than simply desire it.

World War II fostered new conflicts and new uses of terror. Terror became a tool of choice for those who opposed the last two major remaining world colonial powers, Great Britain and France, in order to achieve independence. Jews seeking a Jewish state in Palestine after the results of Hitler’s final solution used terror to force the British to surrender its mandate of Palestine in order to encourage the creation of the state of Israel by the United Nations. The success of the Jews in creating Israel in 1948 was followed by actions on the African continent to force
the French and the British to accept independence from their colonial holdings in Kenya and Algeria. While the Irgun and the Lehi used selective terror on British and Palestinian targets, the use of terror in Kenya and Algeria was much more indiscriminate. The Mau Mau of Kenya and the National Liberation Front (FLN) of Algeria used terror in the form of killing, raping and mutilating thousands of people including entire villages to force out their colonial occupiers and maintain control of the rural areas of the country. Terrorism was successful in Algeria, in part because of the reaction of the world and French citizens at home to the news that the French government used torture on captured FLN operatives.

Revolutionary terror presumes that capitalist governments are evil perse and the use of terror will prove the latent evil of capitalists by making them act with equal terror. An overreaction by the capitalist government is sought so that its use of terror will turn public opinion against them as well as expose the hypocrisy of the capitalist proposition that they are just and obedient to the rule of law. Marxist worldview aside, the terrorist wins sympathy if their terror is met with equal or more severe terror. As the French learned in Algeria, the loss of the propaganda war can be the prelude to loss on the ground.

When independence was secured in Algeria and Kenya, 17,500 French and 150,000 Algerians as well as 13,500 Mau Mau and 2,000 British soldiers and citizens in Kenya were dead. Malayan terrorists also used the tactics of bombing and assassination to gain independence. The most famous act of terrorism was the roadside ambush and assassination of British High Commissioner, Sir Henry Gurney, on 6 October 1951. After twelve years of resistance and the death of 2,000 soldiers and 300 civilians, the English left Malaya.

The Six-Day War and the complete victory of Israel over the major Arab powers and the subsequent land acquisitions in 1967 saw the birth of the use of terror by the Palestinians and the end of the hope that Israel could be defeated on the battlefield. In 1968 the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) hijacked an Israeli aeroplane destined for Europe, forced it to land in Algeria and demanded that Israel release Palestinian prisoners. Thus began more than a twenty-year wave of air terrorism on European and American airlines by various
Palestinian and European Marxist terrorist groups. Air terrorism reflected the continued indiscriminate use of terror: specific planes (and, of course, the passengers) were chosen with regard to convenience and publicity shock value. The desired impact of air terror was to disrupt air travel and force world attention and policy change regarding the Palestinian cause.

While terror originating from the Middle East preceded the 1979 Iranian Revolution, the rise of a fundamentalist Islamist state in the Middle East marked the birth of Islamist fundamentalism, which within a decade had brought the modern terrorism of indiscriminate and mass-casualty targeting. In 1979 the Iranian Revolution instituted an Islamic regime that supported Arab and Islamic terrorist organisations, with the objectives of installing Islamic regimes throughout the Middle East, overthrowing secular Arab governments, countering if not removing Western social and political influence in the Arab world and, at the very least, pushing Israel back to its 1967 borders. Iran and Syria provided political, religious and financial support to terrorist groups like the PLO, Hamas and Hezbollah. These terrorist groups proceeded to unleash a wave of kidnapping of Western journalists, military and United Nation officials and American businessmen for the next decade and a half. First implemented by Hezbollah and Hamas and later by the PLO, the post-1979 Middle East terror wave also introduced the phenomenon of suicide bombing that plagued Israeli cities for a decade and eventually New York City in the United States.

The last decade of the twentieth century saw the full development of indiscriminate terror and the rise of al-Qa’ida, an international non-state terrorist organisation that would develop a worldwide reach culminating in the hijacking of three American aircraft, the destruction of the World Trade Centre and more than 3,000 dead in less than two hours. In 1989, after ten years of a failed attempt to defeat the Mujahadeen resistance, the Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan in defeat, after which Islamic fighters dispersed across the Middle East. The resulting spread of young fighters who believed that they had defeated one of the two remaining world superpowers had a great impact in the history of terrorism.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, attributed in no small part to its defeat in Afghanistan in 1989 at the hands of lesser-armed Muslims,
galvanised those who subscribed to the belief that the ‘paper tiger’ of the West, the United States, was prone to equal defeat. Destruction of the West, specifically the United States, was just because of its support of Israel, its historical hostility to and oppression of Islam, its military ‘crusade’ in the Middle East to protect its access to oil in 1991 and its building of a military base in the land in which Muhammad had ascended into heaven. The key person with this worldview to emerge out of the war with Afghanistan was Osama bin Laden with his organisation, al-Qa’ida. Al-Qa’ida, like Hamas and Hezbollah, opposes Israel and its control of the occupied territories resulting from the Six-Day (1967) and the Yom Kippur (1973) Wars. But while giving lip service to the goal of changing the policies of the United States and its support of Israel, al-Qa’ida’s true objectives are to overthrow apostate Arab governments and to punish the United States for supporting them. In the eyes of al-Qa’ida, the United States, by virtue of its existence, is an affront to Allah and must be treated as such. It is this view, that the West is of itself evil, that it should be destroyed and not negotiated with, plus the use of indiscriminate and mass-casualty targeting that separates al-Qa’ida from the past four decades of Middle Eastern terrorism.

*From Cause to Casualty: Tactical Change from Classical to Modern Use of Terror*

The problem we have in this war [on terrorism] is that all they’ve got to do is kill some innocent people by a car bomb, and it looks like they’re winning . . . the enemy has got the capacity to get on our TV with death and destruction. That’s what they’ve got the capacity to do.

President George W Bush (2006)

Few would argue that terrorism has not changed since 1979 or since 11 September 2001. The rise of mass casualty terror has replaced the classic use of terror that focused on selective, low-casualty and high-publicity-value targeting. Modern terrorists select indiscriminate high-casualty targets. Although bin Laden and his chief strategist, Ayman al-Zawahiri, would like to bring about the return of the Caliphate, their writings are more concentrated on lists of offences committed by the West and demands that the honour of Islam requires punishment of the
West. Walter Laqueur writes that it is this blending of religion and fanaticism that is the cause of the dehumanisation of the victims of terror. Laqueur explains that fanaticism-based terrorism and the indiscriminate use of terror were the logical results of a perception that the enemy was no longer a small segment of society but the society as a whole. Whereas in the 1890s Emile Henry stated that in terror there are no innocents and, according to Laqueur, such a view of terror was considered ‘a willfully paradoxical and wicked statement’ by his fellow militants, a ‘hundred years later indiscrimination had become commonplace [because today’s terrorist’s aim is] to kill as many people as possible’.14

The fanaticism of modern terror is amplified by religion. Religion, taken in moderation and calmness, still asserts moral absolutes and concepts of right and wrong, separating good from evil. The moral source for these absolutes is that God has said ‘thou shalt’ and ‘thou shalt not’. But religion taken to the extreme of fanaticism separates those who believe from all others; those who do not believe are outside God’s will and his protection and are subject to his punishment. It is not hard for the fanatic to conclude that those who believe are also called to be the sword in the hand of God against those who oppose his will. If one kills at the command of God, there is no moral barrier to indiscriminate killing; the deaths of the innocent and the guilty are by the will of Allah – and who is to question the will of Allah? But Laqueur reminds us that religion is not the only factor that feeds into fanatical terrorism: persecution paranoia also plays an important part in the new terrorism. To the terrorist constantly looking for enemies, the perceived enemy is omnipresent and their hand can been seen in all places. The greater the fanaticism and paranoia, ‘the greater the urge to destroy as many enemies as possible’;15 as bin Laden commanded ‘wherever they can be found’.

Prior to the 1990s, terrorism was propaganda by deed and Israel was the scapegoat of Muslim anger,16 but hardly the sine qua non of Islamic terror. As Laqueur writes, ‘it is quite unlikely that Israel’s retreat would reduce the hostility to the West of the radical Muslims in Western Europe. The radical Islamists have bigger fish to fry; they aim at the punishment and if possible the destruction of America and Western civilization’. While classic terror focused on the message – propaganda by deed – modern terror has little interest in persuading anyone. The aim is to ‘destroy as
many of the enemy forces as possible’, with ‘enemy forces’ referring to ‘all infidels, including small babies’. This is where the fanaticism of Islam changed the nature of Middle East terror.

The emergence of anger and rage along with religious fanaticism and a specific worldview has resulted in terrorism that allows organisations to recruit young men and women to use as living bombs. Although the use of bombing is one of the oldest tactics of terrorism, classic terrorists did not walk the bomb into a target and blow themselves up with it. Classic terrorists threw the bombs at their targets and sought escape. Classic terrorists of the late 1960s through to the 1980s hijacked planes for pure propaganda-by-deed objectives, not to turn them into missiles to destroy buildings populated with thousands of people. The classic terrorist asserted a political objective that, with time, could be achieved through negotiation; the modern terrorist does not. The classic terrorist was a tactician; the modern terrorist is a martyr whose only failure is in not dying with enough of the enemy. The main tactic of classic terrorism is fear; and the main tactic of modern terrorism is mass-casualty destruction. The classic terrorist saw the governing system or structure of a society as corrupt; the modern terrorist views the targeted society itself as corrupt.

**The Utility of Terror**

Today, the importance of explosives as an instrument for carrying out revolutions oriented to social justice is obvious. Anyone can see that these materials will be the decisive factor in the next period of world history. In giving dynamite to the downtrodden millions of the globe, science has done its best work . . . A pound of this stuff beats a bushel of ballots all hollow – and don’t you forget it.

Johann Most (1881)

The utility of terrorism is in its ability to foster change. Terror used against an occupier, or a people, or a society is about creating a sense of fear that produces insecurity. That fear and insecurity create social change and, according to revolutionary theory, awaken the people to rise up and oppose the government, either because of its inability to protect them, or to resist the terror that the government is inflicting upon them as a result.
of terrorist activities. In *Murder* Heinzen wrote that terror must be cold-blooded in execution but planned and focused:

... bring about a situation where the [targets of terror] are afraid for their lives every hour of the day or night. They must think that every drink of water, every mouthful of food, every bed, every bush, every paving stone, every path and footpath, every hole in a wall, every slate, every bundle of straw, every pipe bowl, every stick, every pin may be a killer.\textsuperscript{18}

Revolutionary terrorists view terrorism as part of the process to achieve revolution and the dismantling of capitalist oppression of the people. Struggles for national independence from the European colonial powers used terror to force the powers to abandon their colonies and grant independence. Following the fall of colonialism, within fifteen years of the end of World War II, and the fall of the revolutionary ideological left in the late twentieth century, by the early twenty-first century, with small exceptions in Latin America, terrorism has been adopted by Islamists, radical right-wing nationalists and single-issue groups.

But does terror as a tool achieve the desired objectives of those who use it? Did the left, through the use of terror in the late 1960s through to the 1970s, bring about the fall of capitalism and a people’s revolution in Europe? Clearly not. But the terror perpetrated by the PLO and other Arab terror groups has kept the world attention on Israel for almost forty years. The Terror of Robespierre not only failed to protect the First French Republic of *liberté, égalité et fraternité*, it put France on the road leading to Napoleon. But the terror of Stalin, in which millions were killed, jailed or simply disappeared, did bring about the Soviet empire from the ashes of a revolution and a civil war. In China, an estimated 34 million people were killed during the Great Terror, the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution ordered by Mao. But the use of terror and the resulting social and economic change increased the strength and stature of China. The anarchist dream of a world without oppressive government and its proposition that the downfall of an oppressive government can be initiated through assassination did not materialise, yet the anarchist movement gave birth to the fear, if not the reality, of worldwide terror systems and non-state organisations working collectively to undermine established governments, of which modern terrorism and al-Qa’ida are the heir. Although Algeria,
Cyprus, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Kenya, Malaya, Pakistan, Palestine and Yemen all received their independence from their respective British, Dutch or French masters in part or wholly because of the implementation of terror, it was World War II that ended European imperialism and colonialism, not the tools of Marxism and anarchism.

Classic and modern terror has been and continues to be a tool to capture world attention. This aspect of propaganda by deed remains true and successful. Regardless of one’s opinion of the Palestinian issue, almost forty years of terror has kept the world’s attention on that very matter. But the classic terrorist acts of the 1970s did not cripple air travel to the Middle East and September 11 not only did not force the US out of the Middle East, it provided the environment for the West to invade Afghanistan and Iraq. Thus, with some notable exceptions, terrorism does not achieve political goals. It can guarantee world attention, but it cannot produce tangible political results or long lasting peace. Rather than creating fear in targeted societies, modern terrorism only creates disdain and permanent enemies. Western democracies have historically reacted to terrorism, both classic and modern, with more effective law enforcement at home and military action abroad. Terrorism tends to make strong nations more aggressive, not more amenable to the goals of terrorists. But when terror is inflicted upon democracies, they must remain vigilant that they do not overreact to the terror. For it should not be forgotten that the Reign of Terror was born after a popular revolution was poisoned by fear from within as well as threats from without.

**Conclusion**

A history of Terror could be dated, in the manner of the history of Europe, not Before and After Christ, but Before and After Robespierre.

Andrew Sinclair (2003)

So we end with the beginning, the French Revolution. In *An Anatomy of Terror: A History of Terrorism* Andrew Sinclair traces the history of the use of terror and summarises its development as follows:

Until the French Revolution, terror had lacked definition. It was a method of using atrocities to frighten rulers and their subjects in order to plunder and
seize and maintain power. Its only philosopher had been Machiavelli... Yet with the ‘Terror’, instituted by the Jacobins in France after 1792, the politics of revolutionary violence were exposed.¹⁹

Leonard Weinberg in *Global Terrorism* wrote that the ‘French Revolution had a profound effect not only on the practice of political murder but also on its rationale. [T]he storming of the Bastille in 1789 had the long-term effect of secularizing the source of political authority. “The People” as an abstract entity became the ultimate source of authority. Governments that did not act in the name of the People or whose conduct was not in accord with the people’s will were thereafter regarded as illegitimate’. ²⁰ Every terrorist and terrorist group from then till now has claimed to represent the people and what they want. As Sinclair observed, ‘they formed the conspiracies of the next two centuries, leading to the downfall of the two major tyrannies of Russia and China as well as dozens of other governments’. ²¹ But governments born out of the use of terror built on the graves of tyrannies are rarely better replacements. The terror of Stalin replaced the Tsar and the social revolutions of Mao were no better than the carnage by the Japanese in World War II or the national government that replaced it.

The French Revolution brought more than the birth of systemic, planned and theoretically justified terror to the world: it was the first to demonstrate that internal societal fear due to hostile internal and external forces can bring about the devolution of a society in the name of societal protection. As James Anthony Froude observed, ‘fear is the parent of cruelty’ and ‘fear makes strangers of people who would be friends’, and of course it is easier to condemn a stranger as being an enemy of justice and society than a friend of whom one knows better. There are various reasons for the fall of the French Revolution: fear of internal conspiracies of the Church and the aristocracy; the arming of rural and urban militias; and military threats by Austria, Prussia and Spain were contributory factors. The failure of the rule of law and the lack of legal and political structures to protect the rule of law is another. These factors, with the abandonment of the principles of the Rights of Man and chronic political and economic instability doomed both the Revolution to the Reign of Terror (1793–94) and the First Republic (1792–1804) to the rise of Napoleon as the *Premier consul*
Jonathan White in *Terrorism: An Introduction* described the differences between the American Revolution in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789:

The American Revolution transferred power from the British upper classes to American upper classes. In France power was transferred between classes. The middle class wrestled power from the nobility and did so in an internal struggle dominated by ideological positions...If America represented a long-term evolutionary process toward democracy...France represented a radical shift in power structures. European governments not only took notice...They mobilized their armies to stop the French, and Europe was at war for 20 years.22

The American Revolution started with a declaration of independence relying on principles of natural law and theories of the social contract; the French Revolution started by the storming of a prison, under the rule of the mob. The American Revolution maintained the rule of law; the French Revolution abandoned the Rights of Man and the French Constitution in obedience to the law of expediency. The American Revolution did not seek to change the social, economic and class distinctions in American society but simply to end British-attempted dominance over the political structure of America. The French Revolution sought to end class distinctions, and reorganise the social, political and economic landscape. The American Revolution empowered its own ruling class; the French Revolution sought to remove power from its ruling classes. The American legal and political system prevailed over national threats and political divisions; the French Constitutions of 1791 and 1793 and the corresponding constitutional government were discarded and replaced by a revolutionary government whose goal was to secure the government from internal political divisions and external threats.

James McClellan, summarising Edmund Burke in *Liberty, Order and Justice*, wrote that the French Revolution failed because of its unfamiliarity with constitutional government, its lack of experience in parliamentary institutions and practices, and not having an understanding of the meaning and substance of the American and English legal and political
traditions that the Declaration of the Rights of Man reflected. 'As interpreted by revolutionary leaders, [the Declaration of the Rights of Man] called for a complete levelling of society, the abolition of all social classes and distinctions, including the elimination of the clergy, and redistribution of the wealth. In pursuit of these goals, the Jacobins plunged the nation into what became to be called the Reign of Terror'.

On 2 June 1793 a mob of 80,000 Parisians with the armed militia of Paris surrounded the National Assembly and demanded that the most prominent of the Girondins be arrested as sympathisers of the deposed king. The government acceded and arrested the deputies as enemies of the people; the Constitution that was written and passed by a national referendum in June 1793 was a dead letter three months later. On 5 September 1793 a resolution was passed that from that day forward terror would be used to protect the Republic. The mob prevailed and Robespierre and the Jacobins came to power. Such was the beginning of the Reign of Terror. On that day it must have been said by some, 'so this is how liberty dies, with thunderous applause'.

The idea that the state is the 'voice' of the people – it only being the arbiter of the people's aspirations and will – combined with the propositions of ending class distinctions, the removal of religion from society in favour of a state religion, the perfection of humankind through government-imposed equality and social control and that terror is a necessary stage of revolution, all survived the failed French Revolution and eventually found fertile ground in the minds of Marx and the Russian revolutionaries of 1917. The principles and lessons of the carnage of the French Revolution – the subjugation of the rule of law for the rule of the expedient; the use of special courts, tribunals and councils to implement the centralisation of governmental power; the utility and convenience of the principles of revolutionary government over those of constitutional government; wholesale governmental murder in order to safeguard the people's revolution; and the implementation of societal change enforced by a single governmental entity through systemic and organised fear and murder – found dutiful students and actuaries in Stalin, Mao and many others.

So what has terror taught the world over the past 200 years? What is its utility? What is its legacy? Sinclair offers these ten principles:
Terror is warfare by extreme means.
Terror is the lifeblood of tyranny.
Terror is the weapon of the outlaw against the oppressor.
Terror is murder on the cheap.
Terror is the lash on the back of the refugee.
Terror is victor by stealth for the few.
Terror is defeat by cowardice for the coward.
If we are terrorized, we may become terrible to those who make us fear.
Terror is measured by the scale of its victims, not the merit of its cause.
Tolerance of terror is no virtue.\textsuperscript{27}

While I agree with some of these principles and disagree with others, I propose these additional principles of terrorism:

All terrorists claim to speak for the people.
Terror is conducted by the extremist against all others.
The terrorist is victorious when answered with the same terror.
The terrorist is noble in their own eyes.
Terrorism is a tool to achieve a goal; it is not the goal.
Terror to achieve independence will see success before terror to punish.
Yesterday’s terrorist can become today’s politician and tomorrow’s Nobel Laureate.
Terror says the rule of law can be changed because we fear those who lay claim to it.
The emancipation of the unthinkable and undoable precedes terror.
Terror if ruthless enough can form a new society out of the old.
Victims of terror are easily remembered and easily forgotten.

Such is the legacy of terror and a man from Arras, France. The evil men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones. So let it be of Robespierre.
37. Pyszczynski et al., *The psychology of terror*, p. 196.
45. ibid.

**Chapter 2: The Theory and Application of Terrorism**

2. On 27 January 2006 Hamas won seventy-six out of the 132 seats in the Palestinian Parliament in open elections defeating the Fatah party, which had controlled the Palestinian government for ten years.
3. The Lohamei Herut Israel (the Fighters for the Freedom of Israel), also known as the Stern Gang, named after its leader, Avraham Stern. The Lehi was led by the future Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir. The Lehi rejected the legitimacy of the Jewish Authority and British rule of Palestine and used terror as a tool to eject Britain from Palestine in order to achieve the formation of Israel. On 6 November 1944 they assassinated the British representative Lord Moyne and on 17 September 1948 they assassinated the UN representative Count Folke Bernadotte. On 9 April 1948, with the Irgun, they attacked the Palestinian town Deir Yassin killing or forcing out the entire population.
4. The full name of the group was the Irgun Tsvai Leumi, Hebrew for ‘national military organisation’. The Irgun, beginning in February 1944 under the leadership of another future Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, conducted various attacks on British authorities and institutions. Their goals were to oppose and force out the British in Palestine as well as engage in attacks on Arab military forces and advance the principle that all Jews had a right to return to Palestine and form a Jewish state. On 22 July 1946 they bombed the British headquarters at the King David hotel killing 91 people and they participated in the attack on Deir Yassin.
6. ‘It shall not be hidden from you that the people of Islam had suffered from
aggression, iniquity and injustice imposed on them by the Zionist–Crusaders alliance and their collaborators; . . . . Their blood was spilled in Palestine and Iraq . . . . All this and the world watch and hear, and not only didn't not respond to these atrocities, but also with a clear conspiracy between the USA and its allies . . . the dispossessed people were even prevented from obtaining arms to defend themselves’. Declaration of war against the Americans occupying the Land of the Two Holy Places (1996). ‘The United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers . . . the aim is also to serve the Jews’ petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and murder [of] Muslims there . . . . The ruling to kill the Americans and their allies – civilians and military – is an individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it’. Jihad against Jews and Crusaders (1998).

7. ‘Terror is nothing other than prompt, severe, inflexible justice.’

8. ‘There are no innocents.’

9. ‘Liberty, equality, fraternity, or death.’


11. ibid.

12. ibid., p. 265.

13. In 1991 Iraq under Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait and a coalition of forces led by the United States forced Iraq to withdraw its forces.


15. ibid., p. 25.

16. Laqueur writes that it is the lack of educational opportunities, appropriate employment for those Muslims who have attained an education, social and economic stagnation of the Muslim world in general and in oil-rich Arab countries in particular, and the failure of the peace process to create a Palestinian state which have all helped create Muslim anger. ‘[T]he idea that surrender of the territories and the emergence of a Palestinian state would have a decisive effect on the incidence of global terrorism is far-fetched. For some . . . Israel is a crucial problem . . . it is unlikely that the radicals [will] accept its existence even within the borders of 1948. For the Muslim world at large, Israel is a symbol and a catalyst of their rage rather than the cause.’ Walter Laqueur, p. 21.

17. ibid., pp. 22, 25.


The “Terror” of the French Revolution was distinguished from all previous reigns of fear by its rationale and planning, however deranged. There were no precursors for such a new ideology – the supremacy of Reason, the unlimited power of the Will, and the indefinite change of society through unceasing action.

26. See William H Chamberlin, ‘The Jacobin ancestry of Soviet Communism’, *Russian Review*, 17(4), 1958, pp. 251–7, for a review of the historical and ideological similarities of the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution and between the Jacobins and the Soviets. Both Robespierre and Lenin believed in the restoration and refinement of mankind through the state and by the state. The state, according to both, was the reflection and the implementation of the will of the people. Those who opposed the state opposed the people and those who opposed the people were to be eliminated in order to protect the people and their collective will as defined by the state. Such concepts Robespierre taught Marx and Lenin and were implemented to the fullest by Stalin and Mao.

**Chapter 3: Early Modern Terrorism**

1. I am immensely grateful to Dympna Callaghan for her comments on this essay and to Charles Tilly for discussing his ideas on the notion of terrorism and the Gunpowder Plot. Thanks are also due to all those who participated in the Folger Institute workshop on the 400th anniversary of the Plot in 2005 and to the staff of the Institute.