Lecture 4: Terrorism and Ideology

Right-Wing Extremists

"Revolution in general - the overthrow of the existing power and the dissolution of the former relationships - is a political act."

American Terrorist

The Baader Meinhof Complex

The True Story of the Red Army Faction
"The terrorist revolution is the only just form of revolution"
-Nikolai Morozov (1880)
**Question:** What do you think Morozov means here?
In chapter 3, Cindy Combs makes the point that states throughout history have used terrorism on their citizens, on citizens of other nations, and as instruments of war.
Groups opposing and rebelling against such tactics used to condemn such tactics (Shining Path, PLO, People’s Will, the IRA and so on).
Dr Combs argues 20\textsuperscript{th} century revolutionary groups and terrorists began using similar tactics to achieve their political/ideological objectives.
Ergo, the point of this chapter is to explain how such groups justify the use of such tactics.
That is, what explanations, or ideological perspectives, do terrorists use to justify such violence?
In this brief discussion, we will examine the arguments made by religious, leftist, and rightist groups who regularly use violent tactics and tools to achieve their various objectives...
Definitions
1) **Ideology 1**: According to Dye (2010), ideology is an integrated and consistent view about who gets what, when, and how" (ie politics)
2) **Ideology 2**: Turetzky suggests that “ideology is a set of ideas, or vision, of how the world should look or function"
Dr Combs poses a dilemma on pp40-41

1) First, she rightly notes that the UN Charter in 1945 explicitly states that "people have a right to determine for themselves the form of state under which they choose to live"

* In other words, the UN Charter argues for the right to self-determination*
Dilemma = which people have this right and do they have the right to use terrorist tactics to achieve these ends?
Question 1: What happens if two peoples claim that their right to self-determination gives them the right to occupy and control the same piece of land? Who decides which group’s right should prevail?
Question 2: Is it ever justifiable for the group being "occupied" to use terrorist tactics to win their UN Mandated right to self-determination?
If yes, what about the other side's right to live in peace and safety and what about their rights of "self-determination?
Ideological Justifications for Terrorism

1) **Left-wing**: such groups have always stood for radical changes to the existing political, social, and economic arrangements of a given country.
Leftist groups have generally been inspired by Marxist ideology and practice, as well as anarchist philosophy.
Many operating in Europe and North America (Red Army Faction, Red Brigades, Weather Underground, Black Panthers) in the 1960s and 1970s no longer exist, especially in North America...
2) **Right-wing**: According to Combs, in the U.S., some radical right-wing groups believe that the U.S. constitutional system no longer reflects the design of the founding fathers, that the federal govt has taken away too many rights from the states, and that the UN and other intl. entities control politics in the US.

They also generally espouse xenophobic, anti-immigrant beliefs.
*Groups commonly associated with such extremist mindsets include the **KKK, the Aryan Nation**, and the **Christian Identity Movement**
The KKK Wants You!
Ideological Justifications for Terrorism

3) **Separatist/Nationalist**: Groups like *ETA (Spain)* or the *Quebec Liberation Front (Canada)* seek independence (or autonomy) from the larger controlling agency and use terrorist tactics to achieve those ends
Combs argues that nationalist groups (*IRA [Ireland] and Shining Path [Peru] are good examples*) are motivated to use terrorism b/c they are usually minority populations w/n a larger population who seek to gain control of the system of govt as well as control of state resources, though they usually do NOT seek independence or separation.
Front de Libération du Québec

Manifesto
Ideological Justifications for Terrorism

4) Single-Issue Oriented Terrorism: Combs says that such groups justify terrorism in the furtherance of one particular goal/objective.

*Examples include folks who bomb abortion clinics, place spikes in trees, burn down animal testing clinics and so on...
**Animal & Earth Liberation Fronts** are classic examples of single issue groups who use terrorism to attempt to achieve their goals...
Countless creatures kept to die, bash their brains to find out why. Electric shock includes stress void of results are these tests. It hasn't helped us in the past, so why do you make their suffering last, of course its case you're getting rich you don't care for life one bit, we've beat disease by changing ourselves, so take these cages off the shelves, we only want them to be free, a life's a life can't you see?. Test the limits of their mind, it sheds no light on humankind, the medical industry is a farce.

Here's where liberation starts. Placebos to keep you content, you know not where money's spent, you find the labs which kill to cure but are they sure? You can't be sure you didn't see what happens past those walls, if you did, you'd be appalled, our bodies are not structured the same, liberation our final aim... vivisection is scientific fraud!
Ideological Justifications for Terrorism

4) **Pathological Terrorists**: Combs also describes some terrorists as killing and terrorizing for the “sheer joy of terrorizing, not for any ‘cause’ or ‘belief’”.

*People like Charles Manson fit this mold. So don't the killers at Columbine, Aurora, CO movie theater, Sandy Hook Elementary etc*
Frederick Hacker calls such terrorists "crazies" whilst Combs describes them as "sick and twisted individuals"

Begs the question: are such people really terrorists OR just deranged, psychopathically motivated criminals?