State and non-State Violence in World Politics

Edwin Emeka Ajaero

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts
in
International Relations

Eastern Mediterranean University
July, 2010
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Elvan Yılmaz
Director (a)

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erol Kaymak
Chair, Department of International Relations

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in International Relations.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Sozen
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmet Sozen   _____

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. M. Moncef Khaddar   _____

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Erol Kaymak   _____

ABSTRACT

State and non-state violence in world politics is a common phenomenon. The Roman Empire which serves as an epitome of state violence and terror in the primeval times has revealed the duration state violence has existed, notwithstanding the fact that it is only one of the recorded events of state violence in antiquity. Many years after the demise of the Roman Empire, state and non-state violence have increased beyond imagination in various forms. The advancement in technology and the "Global War on Terror" have made it to increase in its direct or physical form. On the other hand, corruption, occupation, hard policies and class domination have made it to increase in its indirect or structural form.

However, physical or direct form of violence which is often use by some non-state actors is used to cover other forms of violence. This thesis contends that the indirect or structural form of violence which is often caused by state actors is more harmful to humanity. This structural or indirect violence has lead to the impoverishment and agony of majority of world population. And in most cases the direct violence that emanate from some non-state actors is due to frustration and repression. It has also become a way of expressing their grievances, and the ultimate way to respond to the socio-economic conditions.

State and non-state violence in world politics might continue to be a big problem to humanity if the majority of world population hesitates to ensure that leaders with better human nature and perceptions are in power. And this study stress the need for policy makers to identify the root causes of non-state violence in order

to develop appropriate political and socio-economic programs for the poor, repressed, marginalized, discontented and discriminated groups in our world. Such measures will definitely ensure the demise of state and non-state violence in world politics.

Keywords: State and non-state, Violence, Actors, World politics.

ÖZ

Devlet ve dünya siyasetinde devlet dışı şiddet yaygın bir olaydır. Antik çağlardaki devlet içi şiddet ve teröre bir örnek teşkil eden Roma İmparatorluğu, aslında antik çağlardaki devlet içi şiddet olarak kaydedilen olaylardan sadece biri kayıtlarda olmasına rağmen böyle bir sürecin varlığını ortaya çıkarmıştır. Roma İmparatorluğu'nun yıkılışından sonra, devlet ve devlet dışı şiddet, çeşitli şekillerde hayal gücünün ötesinde bir şekil kazanarak hızla artmıştır. Teknolojik gelişmeler ve "Terörle Küresel Savaş", şiddetin doğrudan ve fiziksel etkinliğini arttırmıştır. Öte yandan, yolsuzluk, işgal, sert politikalar ve sınıf egemenliği, şiddetin dolaylı ve yapısal etkinliğinin artmasına yol açmıştır.

Ancak, şiddetin fiziksel ve doğrudan şekli bazı devlet dışı aktörler tarafından şiddetin diğer formlarını örtbas etmek için sıklıkla kullanılmıştır. Bu tez, genellikle devlet aktörlerinin neden olduğu dolaylı veya yapısal şekildeki şiddetin insanlık için daha zararlı olduğunu idda etmektedir. Bu yapısal ya da dolaylı şiddet yoksullaşmaya ve dünya nüfusunun çoğunluğunun acı çekmesine sebep olmuştur. Ve çoğu durumda bazı devlet dışı aktörlerden kaynaklanan şiddet, karmaşaya ve baskıya sebep olmaktadır. Bu aynı zamanda onların şikayetlerini ifade etmenin bir yolu ve nihai bir şekilde bulundukları sosyo-ekonomik koşullara cevap olmuştur.

Dünya politikasındaki devlet içi ve devlet dışı şiddet, eğer dünya nüfusunun çoğunluğu seçtikleri liderleri daha iyi insan doğası ve algılamaları ile iktidara getirme konusunda tereddüt halinde olursa insanlık için büyük sorun olmaya devam edecek. Bu çalışmada politika yapıcıların, dünyamızdaki bastırılmış, dışlanmış, hoşnutsuz, yoksul ve ayrımcılık yapılan gruplara uygun politik ve sosyo-ekonomik

programlar geliştirebilmesi amacıyla devlet dışı şiddetin köklerinin tanımlanmasına ihtiyaç duyduğu vurgulanmaktadır Bu tür önlemler devlet dışı ve devlet içi şiddetin dünya siyasetinden kesinlikle yokolmasını sağlayacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devlet ve devlet dışı, Şiddet, Aktörler, Dünya siyaseti.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that the history of world politics has been characterized by wars and conflicts. Many decades and centuries ago kingdoms, nations, states and groups were engaged in battles or wars against each other. Even kingdoms or groups that showed noa interest in wars have become victims of war. Bartoleme de Las Cases in the Brief Account of the Devastation of the Indies explained how the Indies were massacred by Spaniards. The Spaniards who intended to acquire gold, and to swell themselves with riches in a very brief time and thus rise to a high estate disproportionate to their merits[1] did not hesitate to destroy the Indies completely.

The Indies are by nature most humble, patient, and peaceful, holding no grudges, free from embroilments, neither excitable nor quarrelsome.[2] Even when they tried to resist the Spaniards their weapons were very weak and of little service in defense and still less in defense.[3] Because they were not inclined to wars, the wars of the Indians against each other are little more than games played by children.[4] Against this background one could conclude that war is common and strive is justice. If the Indies had made great effort to defend themselves they wouldn't had been massacred by Spaniards. However, there is other school of thought that believes war could be

---

[1]Bartoleme de Las Casas. *Brief Account of the Devastation of the Indies*. Retrieved 10/31/2007.http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/02-las.html. p.3.
[2] Bartoleme de Las Casas. *Brief Account of the Devastation of the Indies*. Retrieved 10/31/2007.http://www.swarthmore.edu/socsci/bdorsey1/41docs/02-las.html. p. 1.
[3]Ibid. p. 4.
[4]Bartoleme de Las Casas. *Brief Account of the Devastation of the Indies.* Retrieved 10/31/2007.http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/02-las.html. p. 4.

avoided. According to Kenneth Waltz, wars result from selfishness, from misdirected aggressive impulses, from stupidity.[5] Therefore, wars could be eradicated via giving better knowledge and understanding to human beings. On the other hand, Thomas Hobbes claimed that man was wolf to man (Homo homino Lupus) in the state of nature. Then, he advocated for the Leviathan or the Sovereign. Under the Sovereign (states/kings) lives ought to be more secured. The cruelty and brutish nature of man will be checked, hence, there is security.

Nevertheless, Hobbes failed to foresee the inequality, oppression and repression that could emerge under states or kings. Definitely this could bring back the cruelty and brutish nature of man that could possibly result to wars and conflicts, thereby taking us back to the state of nature. History has shown that when men are pressed to the walls, then, they are compelled to fight back. These have refuted both the ideas of Waltz and Hobbes in the sense that well-informed minds (men) with all the security in the world when oppressed or repressed will probable resort to violence. This could occur primarily as response to frustration.[6] As frustration is an interference with goal-directed behavior, and the perception of frustration is said to arouse anger, which functions as a drive.[7] And the occurrence of aggression as a result of deprivation is an inherently satisfying response to that anger.[8]

According to Ted Gurr, the necessary precondition for violent civil conflict is relative deprivation, defined as actors' perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and their environment's apparent value capabilities.[9] Value expectations

---

[5]Kenneth Waltz. *Man, the State and War*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 13.

[6]Ted Gurr. *Psychological Factors in Civil Violence*: *World Politics*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Stable. 1968. P. 249.
[7]Ibid.
[8]Ibid.
[9]Ted Gurr. *Psychological Factors in Civil Violence: World Politics*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Stable. 1968. P.253.

are the goods and conditions of life to which people believe they are justifiably entitled, whereas value capabilities are to be found largely in the social and physical environment: they are the conditions that determine people's perceived chances of getting or keeping the values they legitimately expect to attain.[10]

Violence is inherent in wars. Therefore, there is no war without violence. Violence can occur absent of war because war itself is collective violence. Violence can also occur in anticipation. For instance, the Indian food riots in the spring of 1966 were certainly not instigated by the onset of starvation but by its anticipation.[11] In addition, apart from wars and revolutions, violence can occur through coups d'état, guerrilla war, and mass rioting as well as through indirect or structural forms of violence, which include poverty and hunger. Violence is any act in its physical or structural form intended to hurt, damage or kill. Therefore, it is the intention of this study to scrutinize violence that emanates from state and non-state actors as a factor that has intensely affected world politics.

States engage in aggressive acts against other states like we have seen in the history of the Peloponnesian war. They could as well extend it to non-state actors when they deem it necessary. The last century witnessed numerous cases of state violence that led to mass murder, genocide or ethnic cleansing. Good examples include the Khmer Rouge regime in Cambodia that waged a brutal terror war against Cambodians that claimed close to one million lives,[12] and the totalitarian regime in Soviet Union under Stalin that annihilated many thousands of ideological rivals.[13]

---

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ted Gurr. *Psychological Factors in Civil Violence: World Politics*. Johns Hopkins University Press. Stable. 1968. P. 256.

[12]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspective, and Issues*. Sage Publishers. California. 2003. P. 101.

[13]Ibid. p. 102.

States could also engage in violent acts as a result of power they possess or allocated to them. The Greek historian Thucydides in 461 B.C. found not only that uneven rates of development and level of power create tension between nations but that generally "strong states do what they have the power to do and weak states accept what they must".[14] And with no international government in place to preserve law and order, as well as the right of the weak, it is understandable that power – its acquisition and preservation – becomes an important commodity.[15] For instance, the predominance of U.S. power could be attributed to the 2003 Iraqi war. With no state willing to back Iraq militarily, the United States (as the largest global military power) was free to attack Iraq without fear of a large-scale military response.[16]

The nature of states or governments can force them to engage in aggressive acts. The cold war and most conflicts during the period were as a result of basic distinctions between communist states and capitalist democracies. In fact, Francis Fukuyama argues that different types of governments do behave differently and that democracies are, indeed, less likely to go to war than authoritarian or totalitarian regimes.[17] He believes that democracies are likely to recognize the need for human rights, the respect for international law, and to resolve conflict via negotiation. Furthermore, democratic leaders are accountable to the people because they must face elections. Therefore, they always try as much as possible to stick to these principles.

The groups within a state or bureaucratic machine can also force a state to engage in violent acts. The rise of the Neoconservative during President George W.

---

[14] Marc Genest. *Conflict and Cooperation: Evolving Theories of International Relations*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 6.
[15] Marc Genest. *Conflict and Cooperation: Evolving Theories of International Relations*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 6.
[16] Joshua Goldstein and Jon Pevehouse. *International Relations*. Pearson Longman. New York. 2006. P. 17.
[17] Marc Genest. *Conflict and Cooperation: Evolving Theories of International Relations*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 8.

Bush administration is said to be one of the reasons for the administration intervention in Iraq in 2003. In addition, it is assumed that high level of Jewish lobby in the United States had forced previous U.S governments to either support Israel, or intervenes on its behalf during conflicts. For example, in 1982, the United States under President Reagan administration intervene in Lebanon because of a common interest shared with Israel.

The nature and perception of an individual leader could as well force a state to engage in aggressive acts. Adolf Hitler is a typical example of such leader. Hitler's anti-Semitism, and his forceful nature is said to be one of the reasons for the Second World War. Most states engage in such acts when their interest is threatened. This interest could be political, economical or ideological. On the other hand, non-state actors might resort to violence if they feel oppressed or intimidated. Though there are some violent acts carried out by non-state actors out of selfishness or stupidity. Basically non-state actors in this study mean groups that clashes or engage in violent conflicts with state actors or states. Many cases of violent acts by non-state actors have been recorded as well. Notable ones include, the violent attack at Luxor in Egypt that claimed the lives of 68 western tourist and Egyptians,[18] and the Pan AM 103 explosion over Lockerbie.[19] All these are acts of violence carried out by state actors and non-state actors either because of political, economic, religious or ideological reasons.

Ironically, most times violent acts perpetuated by state actors is considered as undesirable when noticed, and even on many occasions it go unnoticed. In short, under this condition violence is legitimized, therefore, it has become cultural

---

[18]Mark Salter. *Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations.* Pluto Press. Virginia. 2002. P. 2.
[19]Robert Kelly. *Armed Prophets and Extremists Islamic Fundamentalism*. Sage Publications. 1998. P. 28.

violence in the words of Johan Galtung.[20] Whereas the violent acts committed by non-state actors is presented as inhuman and vicious. In most cases it is on the headlines of news. This has become one of the major concerns of this study. The ruinous violence that emanates from state and non-state actors inflicting unbearable pain to unprotected civilians should concern a study like this. This study intends to examine these issues carefully. The historical evolution and the present state of state and non-state violence will be considered by this study, as well as its political, economic and social effects on the society.

The issue of whose act could be classified as terrorist act comes in here. And who is a 'terrorist'? The first group that called themselves terrorist was the Narodnaya Volya that emerged in Russia in 1879.[21] The Russians engaged in unusual violent acts with the purpose to break traditions that control violence. In fact, guerrillas aim the military but this group was not concerned with this idea. They sought to depart from traditions in order to change the society. They felt that their violent acts (terrorism) could be used to uplift the awareness of the people. This group might not have achieved their main goal but their ideas and mode of operations gave birth to other groups elsewhere.

Prior to the emergence of Narodnaya Volya, some architects of the French revolution believed that what is known today as terrorism was perceived as vital tool to establish a democratic order.[22] Many years after the Narodnaya Volya other groups with similar mode of operation have emerged. But none of these groups wants to bear the name terrorist. Since the name has such negative connotations that is very difficult to define in an analytically neutral and consistent way that

---

[20]Johan Galtung. *Cultural Violence:* Journal of Peace Research. Vol. 27, no. 3, 1990. P. 1.
[21]David Rapoport. *The Fourth Wave: September 11 in the History of Terrorism*. Current History. 2001. P. 419.
[22]Ibid.

commands general acceptance.[23] In addition, many groups describe the actions of their adversaries as such and not theirs. These issues are also Paramount to this study. This study argues that from the examples cited above both states and non-state actors engage in terrorist acts. And who is or not a terrorist depend on the people using the word. Since another man's freedom fighter could be another man's terrorist.[24] The study will have a close examination on these issues.

Nonetheless, Hamas is a group that believes in the use of violence just like the Narodnaya Volya. However, Harakat al-Maqawama al-Islamiya also known as Hamas sees itself more as a liberation movement, notwithstanding the fact that Hamas has been labeled a terrorist group by some western countries; it has gone through a lot of transformation. The group believes that in so far as the occupation, the restrictions, blockage and indiscriminate Israeli air raid continues. Then, there is the tendency that the use of violence is inevitable. This single position of this group has brought it firm and more recognition among Palestinians and some Arab neighbors. This manifested itself strongly when the group won the 2006 elections. Today Hamas parade itself as the legitimate government in Gaza. This has raise the question, whether Hamas is first a liberation movement, political group, terrorist group or government. On the other hand, the Israelis have capitalized on self defense and the 'global war on terror' to unleash hell on the Palestinians and Gazans in particular. Early last year Israeli air raid in Gaza killed 1,387 people.[25] Constant roadblocks, electric fences, constant closure of the frontiers of Gaza and indiscriminate air raids are what Gazans have become used to. This has crippled the

---

[23]Robert Keohane. *The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and "the Liberalism of Fear".* Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 177.
[24]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: is One Man's Terrorist another Man's Freedom Fighter?* Police Practice and Research. Routledge. 2002.. vol. 3, no. 4, p. 287.
[25]Nicolas Pelham and Max Rodenbeck. *Which Way for Hamas*. The New York Review of Books. 2009. P. 2.

economy of Gaza. All these are done in the name of self-defense and war on terror. As a result of this, it is the intention of this study to consider the use of violence by states and non-state actors, as well as to investigate the extent a state could use force in the name of self-defense (state terrorism). The study argues that the manner states are handling the war on terror has gone out of hand. It has resulted to the violation of human rights and the victimization of innocent civilians. These have forced many non-state actors to be more violent. In addition, this study strongly argues that the position and roles of many scholars in this conflict between state and non-state actors will not help the society as a whole. Rather it will definitely escalate the violence, unless there is drastic change, and the use of violence in most cases by non-state actors is as a result of oppression and repression by state actors.

1.1 Literature Review

There are many literatures on this field of study. But most authors their works are available have used different concepts to denote state and non-state violence (state and non-state actors). The reason remains that some authors don't want to fall into the trap of labeling freedom fighters or those who oppose states policies terrorist. Since some governments have insisted that some groups that oppose their policies and even freedom fighters are terrorists, knowing very well that the only way to fight these groups is to label them terrorist. In all, these concepts this section will reveal denotes state and non-state actors respectively.

Formal and informal violence the brain child of Robert O. Keohane simply denotes state violence and non-state violence respectively. That is to say formal violence is that violence that emanates from state actors, whereas informal violence is that violence that emanates from non-state actors. Robert keohane used informal violence instead of terrorism to replace non-state violence. He maintained that

terrorist or terrorism has such negative connotation that is very difficult to define it in an analytical neutral and consistent way that commands general acceptance.[26] Even the United Nations the only organization close enough to be perceived as world government does not have the skill, means, strength or opportunity to define the phrase (terrorism) in such a way it will be accepted by everyone. There is no doubt that almost everyone is against terrorism and terrorist acts. The argument has moved to its definition. That is who is a 'terrorist' and what entails the acts of terror? This is so because parties (state and non-state actors) that participate in this act only describe the acts of their adversaries as such and not theirs. Direct or indirectly Keohane has made his statement, which shows that state and non-state actors engage in terrorist acts. Therefore, Keohane was extremely careful in choosing his word in order not to be perceived as mainstream authors that write in favor of state actors (formal violence). In addition, Keohane declared that the violent attacks carried out by some non-state actors in the United States on September 11 2001 showed how mainstream theories of world politics have neglected the impact of religion in world politics, notwithstanding the fact that religion has been a vital factor in world politics. He argues that the idea of geographical space as a barrier should be questioned, since that of the United States was unable to prevent the violent attacks of September 11 2001.

Once again, the informal violence has gone global in its activities since their actions are being introduced and regulate in far location and carried out in another location. This has become easier due to the advancement in modern technology and the decrease in the cost of transportation and communication if compared with the 1950s when formal violence globalized its violence. While formal violence will rely

---

[26]Robert Keohane. *The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and "The Liberalism of Fear"*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 177.

on its huge resources (economic, military and modern technologies) and legitimize its violence through institutions like the United Nations. Informal violence will rely on obsolete weapons, secrecy and surprise to inflict great harm with small material capabilities.[27]

Charles Webel did not hesitate to go straight to the point by using the words, 'state' and 'non-state' violence. He came out with another 'phrase' terrorism from above (TFA) and terrorism from below (TFB). Charles Webel in a more courageous manner declared that both state actors and non-state actors carry out violent acts that could be described as terrorist acts. Therefore, what terrorism or terrorist is or not, depend on the people using the word. In addition, there is no general agreement concerning the meaning of these words. What really matters is that catastrophic violence emanates from states and non-state actors which hurts, damages or kill people with the purpose of changing their adversary beliefs or actions. Following all these Charles Webel concluded that using the word 'terrorism' or 'terrorist' for a particular group, and overlooking violent acts of others might be considered as unfair. This does not mean that these words must not be used. There are groups such words suits, and if I should put it in the words of Webel. They are called 'criminal terrorist'.[28] In all, Webel preferred to use the concept terrorism from above (state violence) and terrorism from below (non-state violence).

Mark Salter decided to go back to the roots, or to conceptualize from the etymology. He used the words 'Barbarians and civilized', that is violent confrontation between state and non-state actors. The Barbarians which signify non-state violence, In fact, were perceived as dangerous as well as the absence of

[27]Robert Keohane. *The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and "the Liberalism of Fear"*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 178.
[28]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition.* Palgrave Macmillian. 2004. P. 9.

civilization.[29] The main distinction between Keohane, Charles Webel and Mark Salter is that even when the Barbarians (non-state actors) were not within the territories of the Civilized (state actors). The Civilized by any means extends their rules to the Barbarians since they perceived the Barbarians as naturally violent and irrational. According to Mark Salter, this could be found during Greco-Roman Empire and this idea inspired the colonial masters (imperial rule). The Barbarians were also perceived as big threat to their civilization or culture. Nevertheless, the Barbarians most times resisted the rules of the Civilized. In other words, the Barbarians resorted to violence as their only means of defense, and in the words of Mark Salter. This is what he called barbaric violence and civilized violence.[30] He compared the barbarians and the civilized with imperial rulers and Natives. When the violence from the Natives caused massacres it was portrayed as barbaric.[31] On the other hand, when the violence from the colonial rulers caused massacres it was portrayed as regrettable.[32] This particular situation is the quintessential of the present day clash between state and non-state actors. Therefore, there are no better words that Mark Salter could use rather than barbarians and the civilized which also fits into the present situation.

Gus Martin initiated the concept of antistate dissident (non-state violence) and state terrorism (state violence). Antistate dissident rebels are non-state movements that carry out violent acts against governments, ethno-national groups, religious groups, and other perceived enemies.[33] Whereas state terrorism are violent acts from

---

[29]Mark Salter. *Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations*. Pluto Press. London. 2002. P. 28.
[30]Ibid p. 36.
[31]Ibid.
[32]Ibid.
[33]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues.* Sage Publications. California. 2003. P. 33.

above committed by governments against perceived enemies.[34] Gus Martin maintained that these violent acts from antistate dissident and states could be classified as terrorist acts. This again depicts the fact that states and non-state actors engage in violent acts that could hurt, damage or kill. Still each group defends its actions. He stated that states engage in violent acts when their interest is at stake, whereas non-state actors engage in violent acts when they are treated unfairly by state actors. This made Gus Martin to conclude that one person's terrorist could be another person's freedom fighter.[35]

Noam Chomsky in his work shed light on the use of violence by state and non-state actors. Chomsky noted that the idea that terrorism is the arsenal of the weak (non-state actors) is a wrong notion. It is perceived as such because the strong (state actors) control the doctrinal systems and their terror doesn't count as terror.[36] He concluded that violence has become part of world politics and it could be use to achieve certain goals. Therefore, it is mainly use by the strong (state actors) in the name of low intensive conflict or counter terror. Ilan Pappe put emphasis on ethnic cleansing as a decision of a number of people from another area to annihilate another from different area base on religious, ethnic or national background.[37] He noted that ethnic cleansing is most times politically motivated, and it is achieved through violent means. It involves the violation of human rights and international humanitarian law. Furthermore, David Whittaker asserted that violent groups and some states participate in terrorist acts.[38] Whittaker work though bias to an extent since he mentioned states in confrontation with the United States as states that

[34]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. California. 2003. P. 33.
[35] Ibid. p. 9
[36]Noam Chomsky. *The New War Against Terror*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 245.
[37] Ilan Pappe. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oneworld. Oxford. 2006. P. 4.
[38] David Whittaker. *Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World*. Routledge. New York. 2004. P. 8.

engage in acts of terror. These states include Afghanistan, Syria, Libya, Sudan and North Korea. Nevertheless, he claims that terror has been an instrument of states right from French revolution. It was later adopted by anti – colonial states for their own emancipation from colonial rulers. Robert Gellately and Ben Kiernan focus on mass murder or genocide which the claimed that most of these genocides were engineered by states. In their book 'the specter of genocide' (2003), genocide is defined as acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group.[39] Most genocide that took place in the last century was during the two World Wars, some revolutions, colonial and anti-colonial wars.

Brain Levin used the concept of Patriot antigovernment movement to denote non-state violence. Locally these groups were the biggest danger the United States government had to confront towards the final part of the 20th century. Their acts were violent in nature to the extent Brain Levin described it as terrorist acts. Some of these Patriot antigovernment movements went into fraud and used intimidation as well as violence when necessary. However, Brain also acknowledged the fact that some of these antigovernment groups resorted to violence with reasons. Poor Massachusetts farmers dispossessed and disenfranchised launched violent attacks on commonwealth courts and federal military arsenals in 1786.[40] Immediately the bone of contention was addressed the violent attacks stopped. Violent acts carried out by state and non-state actors is a matter of interest, decision and as well as policy from Brain Levin perspective. Since the United States government once embarked on a violent act that led to the death of three million Native Americans during the 1800s.[41] This violent

---

[39]Robert Gellately and Ben Kierman. *The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 3.
[40]Brian Levin. *The Patriot Movement Past, Present, and Future*. Sage Publications. London. 1998. P. 99.
[41]Mark Hamm. *Terrorism, Hate Crime, and Antigovernment Violence*: A Review of the Research. Sage Publications. London. 1998. P. 60.

act or genocide carried out by the United States government was done in its own interest which also could be termed as an act of terror.

Ronaldo Munck focus on insurgent organizations (non-state violence) and state terror (state violence). His work suggested that more attention to be given to such groups (insurgent organizations) in terms of their motivations as well as to consider their own accounts.[42] Their dedication to their cause is unbelievable. Therefore, we should rethink on how we deal with such issues. Violent acts that could be described as terrorist act is not just something of insurgent organizations, rather such acts are an instrument of states and non-state actors alike.[43] Ten Irish Republican Army (IRA) members held at the long Kesh or Maze prison in Northern Ireland died in a drawn-out and dramatic hunger strike.[44] This lays bare what I meant by dedication to a cause. Whether we like it or not what these Irish men did can barely be actions of unscrupulous people.

On the other hand, Munck's work revealed the massive violent terror acts committed by most dictatorship governments in Latin America in the 1970s. These violent acts Is an epitome of state terror. The general Jorge Rafael Videla military government in Argentina was the most dreadful. The massacres and tortures carried out by this repressive government cannot be exaggerated. These violent acts were carried out against opposition. This was done according to Videla to restore order. How can one restore order out of chaos? Following these evidence one could as well ask the question, who is the terrorist, Videla or opposition groups?

---

[42]Ronaldo Munck. *Deconstructing Terror: Insurgency, Repression and Peace.* Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 8.
[43]Ibid. p 6.
[44]Ibid. p. 4.

Gerardo Munck and Dexter Boniface have a unique concept they called El Salvadorian Armed Left[45] (non-state violence). Actually, this is a group in El Salvador that believed in achieving socialism without any conflict. However, under tyranny they were compelled to take arms, and finally became a violent group. Their violence got to the level in what some authors could describe as terrorist group. Their aim was to actualize revolution since the repressive regime was brutal. However, they realized it was impossible to achieve this. Through negotiation they laid down their arms. Consequently, the El Salvadorian Armed Left became a successful democratic party in El Salvador. Nevertheless, Gerardo Munck and Dexter Boniface understood the situation on ground in El Salvador as at the time of this violent conflict between the repressive regime and the El Salvadorian Armed Left. This helped them to propound such concept (El Salvadorian armed left) in order not to victimize anyone.

Boaz Ganor used these words 'nongovernmental organization' that clashes with state actors. According to Ganor, example of such organization is guerrilla groups. Guerrilla groups appear to be 'freedom fighters', and should be distinguished from terrorist groups. The reason for this is simple. The guerrilla fighter's targets are military ones, while the terrorist deliberately targets civilians.[46] Therefore, a terrorist cannot pretend to be a freedom fighter. Consequently, a guerrilla or freedom fighters are not terrorists, and should not be regarded as such. The use of such concepts as nongovernmental organizations or guerrillas helps the reader to distinguish criminals (terrorist) from freedom fighters.

---

[45]Gerardo Munck and Dexter Boniface. *Political Processes and Identity Formation in El Salvador: From Armed Left to Democratic Left.* Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 38.
[46]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: is One Man's Terrorist another Man's Freedom Fighter*? Police Practice and Research. 2002, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 287.

Maria Matilde Ollier also conceptualized what he called the Revolutionary Left (RL). Actually, this is from the Argentine perspective. The Revolutionary Left (non-state actors) was a violent opposition group in Argentina that strictly adhered to revolutionary ideologies. On the other hand, their presence helped in the transition from military rule to democratic government. From 1974 until 1978, they were among the groups that suffered repression.[47] In fact, most of them were killed by the brutal regime in Argentina. Nevertheless, the survivors of the brutal regime were transformed following the introduction of democracy.

Ollier conceptualization of such words (Revolutionary Left) could help us to have a glaring and crystalline picture of the situation in Argentina during this period. In fact, such concepts backed with facts opens the eyes of the reader or parties that are concern regardless of any propaganda. Such concepts will definitely remove any obscurity or fairytale that could mislead any interested reader or concerned party insofar the concepts are properly analyzed. These concepts separate these authors understanding of state and non-state violence from many other groups. These concepts are barely use by most mainstream authors, who send wrong messages to concern parties thereby victimizing or destroying the images of oppositions.

1.2 Methodology

My research method involved qualitative data analysis based on existing scholarly literature, such as books, journals, articles and documents. Primary source of information such as interviews with scholars who have research agenda on the relevant topic could be used (to the extent possible). Other primary and secondary sources of information such as books, articles, journals and documents from various organizations and departments were utilized, as well as the use of case studies.

---

[47]Maria Matilde Ollier. *Private, Public and Political: Learning Processes of the Revolutionary Left in Argentina*. Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2002. P. 15.

1.3 Thesis outline

The study is divided into five chapters with chapter one being the introductory chapter. Chapter two examines the historical evolution and contemporary state of state violence and non-state violence, with emphasis on its economic, political and social impacts on the society.

Chapter three deals with violence and the use of violence by state and non-state actors. The chapter will also put emphasis on the use of force beyond the limits of states (state terrorism).

Chapter four deals with justifications for the use of violence by state and non-state actors. The chapter ponders on the question, who is a 'terrorist', and what is the position of a group like Hamas in this context? It will attempt to answer the question, why do non-state actors use violence against civilians? In addition, the chapter focuses on a discussion on the issue of how scholars have very narrow or broad ideas of state and non-state violence?

Chapter five is the conclusion on the relationship between state and non-state violence.

Chapter 2

STATE AND NON-STATE VIOLENCE: FROM HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE TO CONTEMPORARY STATE

2.1 Historical Background

Historically, political violence has always been part of humanity for ages. It has existed for centuries and decades ago. The more open and recorded ones could be traced back to the Roman Empire which also includes most parts of the Middle East. During this period the Roman Empire carried out terror acts against oppositions without sympathy. This kind of terror could be classified as what we know today as state terrorism. The brutal suppression of Spartacus's followers after the servile war of 73 – 71 B. C. and the elimination and enslavements of the Dacian Nation in A.D. 106 illustrates the violent nature of the Roman Empire.[48] The Roman officials were delighted to use violence and force in occupied territories.

Elsewhere, there were cases of political violence like assassinations and murders of political opponents. The murder of Julius Caesar by Brutus and other political opponents like Casius in 44 B.C. inspires some present political antagonist to engage in such acts. There were political assassinations carried out against some Roman

---

[48]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. California. 2003. P. 4.

Emperors like Domitian who was killed in A.D. 96 and Galba who was murdered by the Praetorian Guard in A.D 68.

2.1.1 State and non-State Violence in History

It is of great importance in understanding the characteristics and significance of state and non-state violence if some of its historical roots are thought about. Political violence in antiquity was catastrophe itself. One could imagine an age without human rights and no respect or recognition for political opponents. In fact, the situation could be best described as the winner takes all, no matter how you win it doesn't count. Roman soldiers used violence and intimidation to compel those who fight against Roman rules to submit to Roman authorities. On the other hand, the quest of Roman Empire to build, extend its territory and protect the Empire was resisted by some Roman citizens, the Barbarians, slaves and early Christians. These groups carried out counter violent attacks against Roman soldiers and officials to show their dissatisfactions with the status quo. Sometimes they attack relatives or neighbors they perceived as Roman stooges. Most of these groups were humiliated, exterminated or annihilated in their quest for liberations. Since power was in the hands of the Roman officials. And this form of violence from the Roman officials was legally backed by the officials themselves.

Apart from the previous account, there are other accounts from the Bible and Islam perspectives respectively. These are political violence fueled by religion. According to the Bible, Israel was at war on different occasions with different kingdoms. These wars led to extermination of kingdoms and groups. In most cases Israel was proclaimed the victor. And sometimes when Israel lost, their leaders were killed and others enslaved. The book of Joshua highlights one of the occasions Israel was in violent confrontation with other groups. Joshua wrote:

> So Joshua came, and all the people of war with him, against them by the waters of Merom suddenly; and they felt upon them". "And the Lord delivered them into the   hands of Israel, who smote them, and chased them unto great Zidon, and unto Misrephothmaim, and unto the valley of Mizpeh eastward; and they smote them, until they left them none remaining[49]

In the province of Judea, there was a significant case of guerrilla warfare between a guerrilla group led by Barabbas against Roman soldiers. This group launched several violent attacks against Roman officials. Their leader Barabbas was later captured and convicted. During the trial of Jesus Christ, the governor of Judea, Pilate, brought out Barabbas to be crucified instead of Jesus Christ. He knew the havoc Barabbas and his group had caused the empire, since he could not find anything wrong with Jesus. In fact, the book of Mathew described Barabbas as a 'notable prisoner'. However, upon the people's request Barabbas was released and Jesus was crucified. The Bible made us to understand that this is the will of God, and there's nothing anyone could do to stop it. Nevertheless, there should be a question, whether Barabbas is a criminal (terrorist) or freedom fighter. Since from all indications, Jesus was not a criminal, the high priests charged him for blaspheming and persuaded the people to insist on his crucifixion. If you put the life of a criminal that terrorizes the public and a blasphemer for me to spare anyone, I will spare the life of a blasphemer since what he say are not earthly things. Therefore, let God judge him because He made us to understand that judgment is for Him only. The criminal might decide to attack my neighborhood any time. As a result of this, let him die. In all, Barabbas appears to be a threat to Roman authorities, than the people. This could be the reason Pilate (governor of Judea) preferred him to die.

From the account given by Charles Webel, the universe is divided into two by a continuous struggle between the dar al Islam (the united house of Islam) and dar al

---

[49]The Holy Bible. *Book of Joshua*, 11: 7 – 8.

harb (the house of the infidel).[50] Therefore, violent conflicts and the Holy war (jihad) in particular are inevitable, which is the obligation of true Muslims to participate in this war. At the inception of Islam, Muslims who didn't take part in jihad were perceived as those that don't deserve anything from religion, whereas those who were killed in wars were assured instant entry into heaven. Prophet Muhammad was a courageous warrior as well as spiritual savior. The prophet who was sent on exile because of his new found belief came back with allies and defeated his adversaries. After the prophet, violence has rocked the Islamic world on several occasions. Uthman, one of those who succeeded the prophet (Muhammad) adopted nepotism as part of his government. He was murdered by Muslims from other background. Even his successor Ali (Prophet Muhammad's son-in-law) was killed by Uthman cousin Muawiya who was the commander in chief of Syrian army. Muslims in antiquity had also engaged in violent confrontations with infidels. Assassins were devotees of a Muslim cult, the Shi'ite Order of Assassins, sworn to expel Christian invaders of Palestine during the eleventh and twelfth century crusades.[51] This group roared throughout countries of current Middle East searching for infidels, Christians and even Sunni Muslims they disliked their belief systems.

2.2 State and non-State Violence after the Renaissance

The Renaissance is the artistic and intellectual awakening that took place in central Europe and manifested itself first and strongly in Italy. In fact, Renaissance is a turning point in history. People broke away from the shackles of myths, religion and traditions. It took place between the fourteenth and the sixteenth centuries. Before this time political violence was mainly fueled by religion. Monarchs or kings

---

[50] Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillian. New York. 2004. P. 18.
[51] David Whittaker. *Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World*. Routledge. New York. 2004. P. 19.

were rigidly attached to one belief system or the other. During and after the Renaissance people started thinking differently. There were mass movements mainly among Europeans to other continents. It should be noted that within this period the idea of statehood had emerged. Therefore, non-state actors were not allowed to possess heavy arms in modern states. Most notable violent acts were either carried out by state actors or their agents whom they supplied arms.

In 1542, the movement of Spaniards to the island of Hispaniola was highly welcomed by the native Indies. After four decades of settlement in this area the Spaniards turned to beast. The atrocities Spaniards committed against the Natives was unimaginable. The Spaniards who disguised themselves as Christians had no other intention than to exploit and exterminate the Natives. Since they found out that their land was fertile and rich with minerals like gold and others. There was massacre here and there, rape, tortures and so on. This island that was once densely populated was forcefully depopulated by the Spaniards. More than two million people were killed. The Spanish authorities were witness and part of these unholy acts, as Bartoleme de las Cases put it, "this is a well-known and proven fact which even the tyrant governors, themselves killers, know and admit". "And never have the Indians in all the Indies committed any act against the Spaniards, until they have first and many times committed countless cruel aggressions against them or against neighboring nations". Only after the Spaniards had used violence against them, killing, robbing, torturing, did the Indians ever rise up against them". "And the men died in the mines and women died on the ranches from the same causes, exhaustion and hunger. And thus was depopulated that island which has been densely populated".[52] In short, the Indies in their natural state were unable to defend

---

[52]Bartoleme de las Casas. *Brief Account of the Devastation of the Indies*. Retrieved 10/31/2007.http://www.swarthmore.edu/socsci/bdorsey1/41docs/02-las.html.

themselves with little or no weapon they had. For the Spaniards with their arsenals devastated the native Indies.

The French revolution marked another turning point in the history of state and non-state violence. The French revolutionary government was an epitome of terror. From June 1793 to July 1794, the regime de la terreur popularly known in English as the reign of terror carried out vicious acts of violence against thousands of opponents. The aim of the Jacobins was to make strong a delicate and vulnerable government by frightening and murdering those they felt might challenge or overthrow the government. During la terreur, 250, 000 people were arrested, 17, 000 were tried and guillotined, 12, 000 were executed without trial, thousands were jailed, with a total of 40, 000 death attributed to the revolutionary government.[53] In the 1830s, British settlers in Tasmania annihilated the whole Natives; Portuguese also achieved the same goal in the Canary Islands in the fifteenth century. Elsewhere, the United States government carried out violent attacks against Native Americans in which three million died in the 1800s. As the American civil war broke out in 1861, the Ku Klux Klan group lynched more than 2,000 black males.[54]

2.3 State and non-State Violence in Twentieth Century

The twentieth century was marked with series of calamities. It was really decades of revolutionary wars, colonial and anticolonial wars, as well as the two World Wars. Robert Gellately has described the century as an age of extremes.[55] We all have been (to certain extent) part of this history. In fact, it is catastrophe at its peak. The advancement in science and technology has not really helped in these conflicts. The weapons used during wars in the twentieth century as a result of

---

[53] Paul Medhurst, *Global Terrorism,* UNITAR, 2002, p. 32.
[54] Mark Hamm. *Terrorism, Hate Crime, and Antigovernment Violence: A Review of Research*. Sage Publications. London. 1998. P. 60.
[55] Robert Gellately and Ben Kierman. *The Study of Mass Murder and Genocide*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 3.

advancement in science and technology contributed to the annihilation of nations and groups, by state and non-state actors. New bureaucratic patterns that increased the power of states, new ideologies that turned the masses into instruments of experiments, and placed them rigidly according to race and ethnic backgrounds, all these contributed to the increase of violence in the twentieth century. In fact, the Nazis and Serb leaders described their adversaries in terms of race or ethnic background.

Wars in which the winners completely destroy the whole city, killing and taking the population into captivity were features of ancient history. This kind of action or plan was used by kings in the ancient time to destabilize their adversaries. The twentieth century witnessed same situation as many cities were completely destroyed. Many people were removed from their homes either to concentration camps (which have become major feature of the century), killing fields, gas chambers or extermination camps. These processes had led to mass murder, ethnic cleansing or genocide. The word genocide appeared for the first time during the Second World War. It was used by Polish law expert who used it to describe the mass killing of people. Other features include, deportation, random shootings, mass shootings, torture and beatings, all marked a century that nearly put humanity to extinction.

From Europe where the two major wars of the century started. There were two major revolutions prior to the two world wars. The Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917, on January 22, 1905, as a result of poor living conditions and deteriorating social lives, provoked by the Russo-Japanese war, more than hundred and fifty thousand Russians went on peaceful demonstration. The guards of Czar Nicholas II slaughtered many of these protesters. Czar Nicholas II was able to survive the 1905

24

revolution because the peasants weren't interested in overthrowing him. Therefore, he managed to destroy completely the radical revolutionary groups. However, he signed the October manifesto in October 1905 which turned Russia into a constitutional monarch. The failure of Czar Nicholas II to fulfill all the clause of the October 1905 manifesto sprang another revolution in 1917. Finally, the Bolshevik party led by Vladamir Lenin, on November 7, 1917, through a coup d'état took absolute control of the country.

Nevertheless, violence was internationalized from 1914-1918 as a result of the First World War. The sum of the vectors of international violence was greater in 1914-1918 than any previous war.[56] Radical war, biological warfare, ethnic cleansing was on the map in 1918 in a way that went beyond the experience of earlier conflicts.[57] From all fronts there were casualties, in May 1915; Germany sank the Lusitania 1, 200 civilians died, including 190 Americans.[58] Elsewhere, Russian soldiers raided several towns and villages killing Jews suspected of helping the Germans, close to 250, 000 Jews were either expelled or fled from Galicia.[59] By the end of 1915, 1 million Armenians had died in the hand of the Turks,[60] a case which the present Turkish state has denied. It was also reported that by 1918, 9 million men had died in uniform.[61]

Prior to World War II Stalin had caused mayhem in Russia intimidating and annihilating political opponents and ordinary civilians. There have been arguments over the exact number of people killed by the totalitarian regime. The estimated

---

[56]Jay Winter. *Under Cover of War: the Armenia Genocide in the Context of Total War*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 190.
[57]Ibid. p. 191.
[58] Jay Winter. *Under Cover of War: the Armenia Genocide in the Context of Total War*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 192.
[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid. p. 193.
[61]Ibid.

number of arrest made is 6 to 7 million people, 2 to 3 million deaths in camp, over a million executed.[62] The official documents released after his death during Nikita Khrushchev regime showed that eighty five percent out of all the people found guilty of punishable offences were killed.

The Second World War will always be remembered for incidents, such as the holocaust, the nuclear incineration of Hiroshima and Nagasaki,[63] the massacre of more than three thousand Americans at Pearl Harbor, extermination of the Gypsies by the Nazi and indiscriminate killing of millions of the Poles by the Nazi. In addition, estimated number of soviet deaths rose from 25 to 50 million,[64] including uniform men and civilians. In fact, there were casualties in almost all the places the war affected. This was the zenith of state violence. However, some non-state actors capitalized on the war to exterminate some targeted groups. For instance, in the case of the Jews, since they have been victimized by the war, as a result of Hitler's anti-Semitism. Other Jews living in other countries in Europe were either rounded up or killed.

After the Second World War, the United States emerged as the only remaining world power. Since most European countries were devastated by the war. Furthermore, the United States threatened to use atomic bomb on any state that threatened what they called 'world peace'. Therefore, the level of international conflicts decreased, until in the late 1950s when Soviet Union acquired nuclear weapons. Then, the cold war started, and gave birth to many revolutionary wars around the globe. Other state and non-state violence emerged as a result of

---

[62]Nicolas Werth. *The Mechanism of a Mass Crime: the Great Terror in the Soviet Union, 1937 – 1938.* Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 216.
[63]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspective, and Issues*. Sage Publications. California. 2003. P. 6
[64]Robert Gellately. *The Third Reich, Holocaust, and Visions of Serial Genocide*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 261.

oppression and repression by some regimes. There were revolutionary wars in almost all the continents. In fact, violence has triumphed. The cold war was perceived as such because the two super powers did not confront each other directly. But it was really hot because the super powers used the 'low intensive conflicts' via non-state actors in order to achieve their goals.

In Nicaragua, the Sandinistas succeeded in overthrowing the Somoza dynasty supported by the United States. The United States will never give up because the Sandinistas were going closer to the communist states (Cuba and Soviet Union). The United States through the CIA encouraged the Contras to fight the Sandinistas in a war that crippled Nicaragua economy, thereby taking many Nicaraguans to their untimely grave. From the 1970s until the late 1990s, the Peruvian government fought a deadly battle with two revolutionary groups. The Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) and the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement tormented the lives of Peruvian by carrying out violent attacks against the state and individuals. These two groups had Marxist inclinations. Their violent acts cost Peru more than 30, 000 lives.[65] The Peruvian government managed to destroy the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement completely. But the Sendero Luminoso still have some of their die hard members partaking in violent acts notwithstanding the capture and denunciation of their leader Abimael Guzman. In Argentina, towards the end of 1960s and beginning of 1970s many armed groups manifested due to the political climate in the country after the Second World War. These armed groups later became part of either the Montoneros or the Marxist People's Revolutionary Army. These groups caused mayhem in Argentina in their quest for a better political climate under President Juan Peron. There were shootings, bombing, and assassinations in all the corners of the

---

[65]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 146.

country. In fact, the Montoneros became skillful kidnappers and extorted an estimated $60 million in ransom payments.[66] The death of President Juan Peron in 1974 created an uncertain political climate in the country. This situation helped to usher in the new terror government under President Videla. The new regime used terrorist tactics to annihilate all oppositions, including members of the People's Revolutionary Army and the Montoneros.

Asian countries witnessed many state and non-state violence in twentieth century. Afghanistan was a notable case of state and non-state violence. The Mujahidin's backed up by the CIA was determined to remove the puppet government in Kabul backed by Soviet Union. The CIA provided the Mujahidin's all necessary facilities and funds to contain the spread of communism. As a result of Soviet withdrawal in late 1980s the Mujahidin's overthrew the puppet government. The United States spent US$ 4 to 5 billion in aid[67] to the Mujahidin in a conflict where thousands of lives were lost.

The Somalia case is a unique one, most countries that suffered state and non-state violence always managed to have a central authority. In the case of Somalia the repressive regime of Siyad Barre was overthrow by armed groups. This led to the breakup of the central authority; thereby bring to an end the existence of the state of Somalia. Nevertheless, the violent conflict between the military government and armed factions, that besieged Somali since 1970s brought disaster to the entire country. Eventually, the ensuing carnage, unprecedented in the history of Somalia,

---

[66]Ibid. p. 147.
[67]Richard Saull. *The Uneven Ends of the Cold War and the Origins of Contemporary Conflict in World Politics*. Routledge. New York. 2006. P. 79.

resulted in more than 30,000 combat - related deaths, while another 300, 000 died of starvation and famine – related diseases.[68]

Italians witnessed an incredible scenario in 1978 when former Italian Prime Minister was kidnapped. Aldo Moro was kidnapped by a group known as the Red Brigades. This group that operated from 1969 to mid 1990s launched violent attacks on targeted victims throughout Italy. They were involved in sadistic acts like shootings, bombing, kidnapping and other infamous acts. They had a Marxist inclination, and intended to cause a revolutionary climate in Italy through aggressive means. The Red Brigade committed about 14, 000 violent attacks,[69] including the kidnapping of the former Prime Minister Aldo Moro whom they later killed. There are no better words to describe the level of brutality that emanated from state and non-state actors in the twentieth century than appalling, horrifying and terrible. It was really a disaster of the highest order. If the world could survive the century with all these aggression, conflicts and wars, then, the destruction of the universe might be in the hands of a supernatural being.

2.4 State and non-State Violence in Contemporary Time

The twenty-first century has witnessed a more open confrontation between state and non-state actors. The September 11 2001 attacks in the United States signified a new phase in the conflict between state and non-state actors. As a result of this episode the United States had declared war on terror. This single resolution by President George W. Bush administration has escalated the intensity of state and non-state violence in some countries, including Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Twenty-first century might witness more increase in the level of violence if things

---

[68]Abdullah Mohamoud. *Somalia after the Cold War: Anarchic Factionalism, Intervention or Peacemaking*? Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 148.
[69]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 150.

are not well handled. The abuse of human rights in the name of combating terror has not helped the situation. The alarming findings about the impact of counter-terrorism policies worldwide calls for remedial action.[70] The consequences of notorious counter-terrorism practices such as torture, disappearances, arbitrary and secret detention, unfair trials, and persistent impunity for gross human rights violations in many parts of the world.[71] Consequently, the figures of insurgent groups have increased in places like Afghanistan and Iraq. In Afghanistan, there was increase in the level of hostility between 2005 and 2006. During this period, the number of insurgent-initiated attacks rose by 400 percent and the number of deaths from these attacks by more than 800 percent.[72] In addition, the number of suicide attacks quintupled from 27 to 139; and armed attacks nearly tripled from 1,558 to 4,542.[73] Even groups that have been under the cooler for years have broke out from the ice, like the Pakistani Taliban's. This group has remained calm over the years due to the agreement they reached with the Pakistan government. Following the new war on terror hostilities have resumed between them and the Pakistan government. Consequently, a lot of casualties have been reported, and the majority is undefended civilians.

Though the events of September 11 2001 are hideous but the approach towards combating terror lacks merit. Many governments around the globe saw it as opportunity to clamp down political oppositions. It has become an avenue to nail those who fight against repression and oppression. The truth remains that human beings have refused to learn from history. The selfish nature of man has blinded the

---

[70]Mary Robinson. *Report: Leading Jurists Call for Urgent Steps to Restore Human Right in Efforts to Counter Terrorism*. 16 February 2009. P. 1.
[71]Ibid.
[72]Seth Jones. *The Rise of Afghanistan Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad*. International Security, Spring 2008, vol. 32, no. 4, p. 7.
[73]Ibid. p. 7 - 8.

educated as well because most politicians that indulge in these acts are educated as well. Last century revealed a lot of cases where freedom fighters were cruelly dealt with. However, some were clever to gain their freedom at the end like in the case of South Africa. Internationally, researches have shown that cases of violent behavior from non-state actors have increased. The data published by RAND Corporation implies, in the year 1999 there have been 74 incidents of non-state violence on international level, in the year 2002 there have been 290.[74] The approach and tactics of 'war on terror' only portrays those targeted persons (perpetrators of non-state violence) as evil, satanic, and does not go to the roots of the conflict.[75] Therefore, the war on terror should be discarded and improved approach toward combating criminals be taken.

Nevertheless, the twenty-first century conflict between state and non-state actors does not end in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. Elsewhere, brutal clashes are going on every day. Most of the groups involved are people that perceived themselves as revolutionary or liberation entities. Some have taken their battle from last century into the new millennium. They consist of such minority separatist fighting their local authorities like the Basque separatists of Euskadi ta Askatasuna (ETA), the provisional IRA and Tamil Tigers. These groups have fought their governments over the years in their quest for liberty or independence. A man whose father was victim of ETA affirmed that if giving the Basque movement their independent could bring to a halt the violence, then, the Spanish authorities should consider the issue. Since the struggle between ETA and the government has led to the deaths of thousands of innocent civilians. He noted that this could not be found anywhere in Spanish

---

[74]Cornelia Beyer. *"Structural Violence as one cause for International Terrorism"*. Counter Terrorism in Perspective: friedenspolitischer ratschlag Kassel, October 10, 2004, available at http://www.uni-kassel.de/fb5/frieden/themes/terrorismus/beyer.html accessed 16/03/2009 07:30. p. 1.
[75] Ibid.

constitution, however, constitution is made by men, could as well be amended by them.

Another set are revolutionary groups that fight indigenous government like die-hard members of Shining Path in Peru. These groups have engaged in a number of violent confrontation with their adversaries over the years, and have insisted on change, rather than giving up. Nonetheless, we have witnessed a new pattern of warfare from non-state actors at the beginning of this century. Violence has escalated due to the 'global war on terror'. First-class measures should be taken in addressing conflicts involving state and non-state actors, or we might observer more tragic situations in this century. The upheaval might not emanate from states as we witnessed in the Second World War. Rather from state and non-state actors, the end of it, yet untold.

2.5 The Political, Economic and Social effects of State and non-State Violence

Political violence most times has depressing effects on the society as a whole. However, in some cases political violence does favor either the actors involved in the violence or the masses. It is factual that violence is not good since it hurts or kills. But the end product of this violence could be encouraging only to those that survived it. This is one of the reasons both states and non-state actors engage in it. There is no doubt that people might pass on, infrastructures are ruined and so on. But sometimes it is good to lose your life so you can have it. This is the philosophy of most non-state actors who engage in political violence against states, even when they knew that the state has resources and military capabilities to obliterate them. Still they will never give up because they feel their cause worth dying for, and the end result remains paramount which might be liberty or freedom. For instance, in Hamas, they

believe that their struggle with Israel is not simply a struggle for territory, rights, or dignity: this is a metaphysical struggle where life and death are at state.[76] Therefore, a true believer, who comprehends the profound consequences of success and failure in this task, will be prepared to fight and die to ensure[77]that all the expectations which take in spiritual and physical are achieved. This kind of philosophy makes it hard for participants in violent acts to identify or see the negative effects of their violent acts. In fact, they see more of the end which is triumph or success, rather than the depressing effects of their violent acts. Mark Ayyash argues that violent actors can never know precisely what they speak when pronouncing and employing political violence.[78] They fail to comprehend their violence because the fail to understand 'something else' created through their violent acts.[79] Therefore, all the catastrophes that come with violent conflicts do not matter. The only thing that matters is the objectives of the actors involved. And the objectives most likely will either favor the actors involved or the masses.

Political violence could lead to change in a regime or total removal of a government. For instance, the uprising in Russia in 1905 altered the monarch into a constitutional monarch, thereby giving the people more liberty and rights. The subsequent revolt in 1917 caused the downfall of of Czar Nicholas II. This particular event brought new principles in Russia. In most cases, violence perpetuated against a state by states or non-state actors, politically, undermines the incumbent government. The inability of President George W. Bush administration to respond to the September 11 attacks properly weakened his administration and later led to the land slide victory of the democrats in the last presidential election. The administration

[76]Mark Ayyash. *Hamas and the Israeli State: A 'Violent Dialogue'*. European Journal of International Relation. Sage Publications. 2010. P. 107.
[77]Ibid.
[78]Ibid. p. 104.
[79]Ibid.

hasty approach toward the violent attacks of 9/11 by going to war in Iraq and Afghanistan with heavy casualties and billions of dollars spent with little result, forced Americans to question their fate in the administration. The upshot of the presidential election showed Americans discontent toward the lingering nature of the wars, coupled with recession.

Political violence could alter the entire state structure or philosophy. The rebellion in Russia in 1917 changed the country from monarch formation into first communist state in the planet. The Second World War also forced the Germans and the Japanese to cuddle democratic values, thereby, rejecting the belligerent nature of the fascist and totalitarian regimes respectively.

In most cases political violence does not favor the people economically. Since wars can totally devastate economies of countries. For instance, in the Second World War western European countries were devastated by the war. They relied on aids from the United States for reconstruction and rebuilding of their economies. However, this had adverse effects on third world countries that relied on these aids. Political violence could as well lead to sanctions, embargo and blockade, thereby inflicting intolerable pain to the victims. The violent conflict between Hamas and the Israeli government has led to blockades and restrictions by Israel. This has crippled the economy of Gaza.

Political violence leads to assassinations, mass murder, ethnic cleansing and genocides. This will definitely lead to decline in population. There is also malnourishment and famine like we have seen in the case of Somalia. Schools are shot down, brain drain as a consequence of mass movement of intellectuals, like in the case of Argentina during the late 1960s. Poor medical facilities, forced labor, child labor and rape are also social effects of political violence. Political violence

could lead to infringement of human rights such as unfair trials and arbitrary detentions.

Chapter 3

VIOLENCE AS A USEFUL INSTRUMENT: FOR STATE AND NON-STATE ACTORS

3.1 Violence and its Various Forms

It is quite regrettable that vast majority of world population are only inclined to instant violence, or violence that affects our daily activities. This form of violence is used to cover several forms of violence. We can only hear people converse about arm robbery at one bank or the other, or shootings by gang-stars at a restaurant in the city. All these make headlines on weekly bases in our renowned magazines and news. The attention this kind of news draw can hardly be compared with the assassinations carried out by dictatorial regimes in Latin America, or lootings of public funds by head of states and administrators in African countries. This is our today's world and the way it has been programmed.

Nonetheless, the numerous tribulations confronting majority of world population is associated to different forms of violence. There are penury, child labor, starvation, forced labor, assassinations, murder and even rapes in different parts of the world. All these exist even in the so called civilized part of the universe. According to Jamil Salmi, the world richest economy (United States) has 20 percent of children living in poverty; 3.5 million people are homeless, one-third of low-income families go hungry on a regular bases; 37 million citizens live without health insurance, 23, 000

people are murdered and 50, 000 rapes are reported every year.[80] Whether this exist

or not, it is what we barely hear from most western Medias. In fact, this particular

information is shocking since most western countries have been portrayed as heaven

on earth. Even in heaven, the Bible stated it clearly that the kingdom of God (heaven)

suffered violence and violence taketh it by force.[81]

However, there is only one form of violence, others don't exist. Some group of

people have been categorize as violent inhabitants, whereas others are not. Lootings

of billions of dollars from state treasury which could possibly lead to

undernourishment and deaths of many people is not regarded as violence. But

hijacking of plane or hostage taking of people by groups is defined as violence. In

many developing countries youths are been paraded as armed robbers on daily bases.

Most of them are shot without trials. On the other hand, administrators in these

countries plunder billions of dollars every day, and this is hardly news, neither will

they be confronted by anyone. Most of the lootings are done by these administrators

and their collaborators in some western countries. In fact, in 1983 alone, one billion

in petroleum was secretly divert from state oil terminal to foreign tankers with

Nigeria businessmen and politicians taking the profits.[82] All these raises such

questions as, what constitutes violence, or what provokes violence? Whether there

are connections between some acts perpetuated by state actors and violence from

non-state actors.

Violence of various forms does exist, such as cultural or structural violence.

Cultural violence is any aspect of culture used to legitimize violence in its direct or

---

[80]Jamil Salmi. *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right*. Zed books. London. 1993. P. 2.
[81]The Holy Bible. *Book of Mathew Chapter 11*: verse 12.
[82] Ukachukwu Okerie. *Nigeria Weeps.* Snaps Press. Enugu. 2003. P. 74.

structural form.[83] Nevertheless, structural violence will be this paper's main concern in view of the fact that it has more roles to play in this chapter. It is physical and psychological harm that results from exploitive and unjust social, political and economic system.[84] Good examples of structural violence include poverty and hunger. One of the major causes of structural violence remains unequal distribution of wealth or resources. Some causes of structural violence in developing countries have been attributed to colonial forces[85] and oppressive regimes, such as military rule. The number of people that die as a result of starvation and malnutrition is between 10 and 20 million people per year.[86] This is never a problem and should not be discussed at all. That has been the attitude towards such information. Why should people die of malnourishment and malnutrition in a world overflowing with abundance wealth and resources? In short, that is not an issue what matters is that Red Brigades has kidnapped Aldo Moro (former Italian prime minister). It is what everyone wants to hear.

Nonetheless, our tribulations are still there waiting. One could as well ask, what is our problem? Our problem is the gap between the rich and the poor, is like the dead and the living chained together. Therefore, it cannot hold because it is not meant to be. The exploitative nature of some people has led to the poverty and hunger of others. This is violence, and structural one. After all, a hungry person is an angry person, then, how do we expect him to be passive?

From the definition provided in the first chapter of this study, corruption is regarded as violence, but indirect form of violence. Occupation is violence, in a structural form because those who dwell in people territory do not only keep an eye

---

[83]Johan Galtung. *Cultural Violence*: Journal of Peace Research. 1990. Vol. 27, no. 3. pp 291 – 305.
[84]Robert Gilman. *Structural Violence: Can We Find Genueine Peace in a World with Inequitable Distribution of Wealth among Nations*? 1997. http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC04/Gilman1.htm. p. 8.
[85]Ibid. p. 10.
[86]Ibid.

on their daily activities. But they also regulate and structure their lives to suit the occupier's interest. In this case the occupier dictates what you should have and in some cases how you use them. For instance, in the early days of the occupation of Gaza and West Bank Israel tried to monitor every aspect of Palestinian life.[87] Virtually all properties owned by Palestinians were counted, and even school textbooks, novels, movies, newspapers and political leaflets were inspected and frequently censored.[88] Unemployment has remains a tool to control the Palestinians as Israel dictates when the rate of unemployment goes high or down. To the extent the manner Palestinians were eating was examined. All these could possibly provoke anger, and result to the use of direct violence. Therefore, corruption and occupation undermine likelihood of good relationship between people. Carol Wojtyla (Pope John Paul II) in his message for 1997 world day of peace stated that: "Corruption too and political or ideological manipulations are essentially contrary to the truth: they attack the very foundation of social harmony and undermine the possibility of peaceful social relationship".[89]

The inequality, injustice, oppressions and exploitation in the world have provoked aggression from many non-state actors. This violence which could be described as direct violence is perceptible. However, the structural violence caused by most state actors which is the real violence itself has remained indiscernible or ignored due to propaganda. Exploitation creates tension and anxiety, therefore, both the state and non-state actors with the help of modern technology and weaponry,

---

[87]Neve Gordon. *Israel's Occupation: A Book Interview*. 2008.http://www.zcommunications.org/israel-s-occupation-a-new-book-by-neve-gordon-by-neve-gordon. p. 3.
[88]Ibid.
[89]Ukachukwu Okorie. *Nigeria Weeps*. Snaap Press. Enugu. 2003. P. 75.

have become each others' prisoners.[90] The irony of the whole matter is when some politicians, people who have access to power or people in power, must have acquired wealth by exploiting others. Then, they will persist on strong security system because they know that their actions must provoke direct violence.

On the other hand, the world is so unjust in such a way that justice hardly prevails. The exploited has resorted to direct violence as a means of registering their grievances. In fact, violence is such a burly and perilous weapon because it can obliterate power.[91] It was the violence from the Barbarians that put to an end the almighty Roman Empire. When violence destroys power there is the possibility that violence will escalate. For instance, after revolutions there is more shading of bloods in order to consolidate it. However, strong security system can check violence to an extent. This is the reason those who use indirect violence (structural violence) seek for safety to check direct violence they have aggravated. For instance, most dictators are corrupt, and in most cases they are only interested in strengthening the military. They do this by paying military personnel's heavy wages as well as buying weapons, thereby building the so call strong state. Their fall always come when the military turned against them or by foreign intervention. The ousted military regime of Saddam Hussein is a typical example. Saddam and his military chiefs had the best villas and mansions in Iraq, whereas many Iraqis were marginalized.

Hard policies are violence too, and sometimes it is only through direct violence they could be broken. Colonial policies such as to control, direct or rule are hard policies. It could provoke direct violence. Most colonial states sought to address the issue of colonialism and its hard policies through dialogue. It was when such

---

[90]Robert Gilman. *Structural Violence: Can We Find Genuine Peace in a World with Inequitable Distribution of Wealth among Nations*? 1997. http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC04/Gilman1.htm. p. 11.
[91]Mark Ayyash. *Hamas and the Israeli State: A 'Violent Dialogue'*. European Journal of International Relations. Sage Publications. 2010. http://ejt.sagepub.com. P. 110.

dialogues failed due to the interest of the colonialist that most Natives resorted to direct violence in order to end such policies. In Zambia and Zimbabwe, during the periods of structural adjustments programs government officials and big business men were enjoying because the restrictions on importations and the influx of foreign direct investments were favoring them. Whereas the vast majority of the population were starving and dying from all sort of diseases due to harsh nature of structural adjustment. It was only when the masses went on rampage that the regimes of President Kenneth Kaunda and Robert Mugabe ended the structural adjustment policies which led to the rise of oppositions under two strong dictators. Hard policies can quietly wipe out entire population if the masses hesitate to respond.

Both repression and oppression are violence as they deny the masses their basic human rights. They put in danger the lives of their victims because there is absence of justice. For instance, under repressive regimes there are no fair trails. This could certainly cause injury or lead to the death of innocent people. Hard policies which I mentioned earlier on are mainly born under repressive regimes. All the democratic values and benefits are thrown into the bins under repressive regimes. The military regimes in Nigeria were responsible for the nullifications and cancellations of free and fair elections in the country, thereby denying the people the opportunity of reaping democratic dividends. Repression and oppression does not allow human beings to attain their full human status. It takes away basic human rights like freedom of speech, freedom of movement, and freedom of press and so on. Therefore, they are big threats because they hurt.

Apartheid is violence, but an alienating violence.[92] It creates tension and reduces a human being to a thing. Slavery is violence as well as racism. These are

---

[92]Jamil Salmi. *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right*. Zed Books. London. 1993. P. 21.

ideas and concepts that force human beings to appear like lower animals (e.g. dogs and cats) in the eyes of another. This will certainly bring marginalization, discrimination and segregation. Immediately these things set in, then, a human being is treated like a lower being. This will definitely incite direct violence from the person who is being ill-treated because he/she is being tortured emotionally, mentally and psychologically. For instance, apartheid is a system that encouraged denationalization.[93] In this situation, independent territories were created in the poor areas in South Africa. As a result of this Africans (blacks) who worked in industries and mines were granted temporary stay in White South Africa. Those their labors were not needed – the old and the disabled were expelled to the new created territories. In other words, the new territories are their own native land. The apartheid regime was parading itself as one that encourages self- determination. The new independent territories included Transkei, Ciskei, Bophuthatswana and Venda. As a result of the creation of these new territories many Africans were forced to leave their native lands. Consequently, there was widespread violence in South Africa. The apartheid police opened fire on undefended civilians, including school children. This led to the death of many people.

Once again, class domination is violence, for every man has been given potential to become whatever he/she could envisage. Any force that intends to avert this, no matter where it's from is an impediment. Class domination prevents vast majority of world population from attaining their aspirations. In many societies in the world some groups have continued to govern others, whether they have leadership traits or not, it's not a decisive factor. It is just their birth right. Other groups have remained in a deplorable state or condition. This is their fate in life, and how it ought to be, and

---

[93]Boutros Boutros – Ghali . *The United Nations and Apartheid*. United Nations Department of Public Information. New York. 1996. P.37.

any other thing more than this is a threat to the dominant class. They are not permitted to have good education in order not to be conscious of their environment. They are not allowed to participate in the polis (political arena). In fact, man is a political animal, and whoever does not belong to the polis is either a beast or god. However, those who are being dominated are not god because gods don't only govern. They create and control as well. Therefore, those who are being dominated have been turned into beast by those that dominate them. It is natural that beast cannot live with human beings. Then, what do we expect from those that have been dominated, rage.

Some people have put others down as a result of class domination and this has lead to many brutal conflicts around the world. The dominant class use any means to make sure those they dominate remain in the same status. For those that are being dominated, direct violence has been seen as a perfect legitimate option, as they groups considers themselves to be at war against an oppressive class or system.[94] The groups picture themselves as righteous champion of the poor and downtrodden.[95]

3.2 Use of Violence by State and non-State Actors

Violence has become an instrument for state and non-state actors. But the manner violence is used and its consequences are another issue. The state actors, who assert that non-state actors are criminals (terrorists) because of their violent behavior, use violence on a greater scale than non-state actors. Nonetheless, names given to any violent conflict does not matter. Whether it is call war, low intensive conflict or interventions. The truth remains that all violent conflicts produce the same result which is destruction of infrastructures and death of people. Following this one could

---

[94]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 135.
[95]Ibid.

conclude that all wars are terrorism.[96] Most states commit more crimes when using violence against those they consider as enemies of states. Research has shown that the highest casualty from non-state violence is more than three thousand or thereabout which happened during September 11 2001. This cannot be compared to the casualties caused by the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, or millions that died in concentration camps in Europe during the Second World War. Most states go as far as killing undefended civilians which they call collateral death. There are lots of cases where states use violence against states and non-state actors. States also legitimize violence through institutions like the United Nations when necessary.

In the first place, the Israelis insist that Hamas is a terrorist group because of their conducts. This has been accepted by most western countries in view of the fact that Hamas is in the list of terrorist groups. However, Israel trained, sponsored and harbored the South Lebanon Army which they used to control the Israeli security zone in South of Lebanon as well as fighting Hezbollah.[97] The South Lebanon Army (SLA) was involved in brutal assaults in Lebanon in its pursuit for a pro-western Lebanon and devoid of Syrian presence.[98] But little or nothing was heard about this group notwithstanding the havoc it caused in Lebanon. What can we call such group, terrorist group or liberation movement? Nothing was heard about SLA because it was backed by strong state just like other groups supported by super powers. In addition, it should be recalled that the Zionist used extreme violence against Palestinians and other Arabs in their pursuit for the creation of the state of Israel. After the creation of Israel, the state has sustained itself through aggression. This has

---

[96]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 15.
[97]South Lebanon Army. 2006. http://www.soundofegypt.com/palestinian/adult/sla.htm. p. 1.
[98]Ibid.

manifested itself in Israel continuous conflict with Palestinian groups and its sporadic wars with other Arab states.

The Sri Lankan government in recent past announced its annihilations of the Tamil Tigers. One can as well ask, how? Before answering the question I would like to point out that the Sinhalese has dominated the politics of Sri Lankan for some time. Actually, they constitute 74% of the state population, whereas Tamil's are 18%, the remaining population is the major minorities from different ethnic background. The Tamil people strongly believe they must be given powers equal to that enjoyed by Sinhalese.[99] Nothing more or less, and also the north and east of the country should be made one province.[100] This has resulted in the death of more than 58, 000 people (military and civilians), including 10, 000 Tamil fighters.[101] On many occasions the Sinhalese's have used the highest degree of brutality to bring the Tamil under their control, until recently when they increased their aggression to exterminate the Tamil Tigers. The Tamil Tigers have been labeled terrorist group over the years, but little is heard about the Sinhalese brutality which surpasses that of the Tigers.

The South African case is a unique one because it has remained the most brutal, fatal and inconceivable event in the twentieth century. The apartheid government used all forms of violent, including direct, structural, repressive and alienating violence. The way the apartheid government was applying aggression even scared white South Africans. Alan Emery and Rupert Taylor argued that the increase in violence by the apartheid regime made white South Africans to expect guerrilla

---

[99]Purnaka de Silva. *Sri Lankan Futures: Conflicts, Alternatives and Twenty-first Century Possibilities*. Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 176.
[100]Purnaka de Silva. *Sri Lankan Futures: Conflicts, Alternatives and Twenty-first Century Possibilities*. Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 176.
[101]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 131.

warfare before it started. There were massacres in some cities and towns. Deportation, detention of children, random shootings and torture was the order of the day. As a matter of fact Steven Biko the founder and leader of the Black Consciousness Movement died in police custody as a result of torture by the apartheid police. Racial segregation and discrimination was at its peak. The irony of the whole matter is the African National Congress (ANC) did not see the struggle as one between whites and black. Rather they believed it was a fight against the system that is unjust,[102] and it was until the forbidding of the ANC in 1960 that the armed struggle started in 1961. Nonetheless, the apartheid regime used superior force and terror[103] to repress the ANC, its armed wing and other liberation movements. However, every violent act carried out by the liberation movements was perceived as terrorist acts, whereas the big terror (apartheid regime) was initially ignored by some western countries, including Britain and the United States that opposed actions against the apartheid government.[104]

The United States invasion of Panama in December 1989 has been described as horrible.[105] People were burning to death in the incinerated dwellings, leaping from windows, running in panic through the streets, cut down in cross fire, crushed by tanks, human body fragments everywhere.[106] Many sources have maintained that thousands of people died during the invasion, but the official number accepted by the United States is five hundred people. The death of these people is not an issue because it is collateral death. The vital part of the story is Manuel Antonio Noriega

---

[102]Alan Emery and Rupert Taylor. *South Africa: from 'Racial Conflict' to Democratic Settlement*. Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 62.
[103]Alan Emery and Rupert Taylor. *South Africa: from 'Racial Conflict' to Democratic Settlement*. Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. P. 61.
[104]Boutros Boutros - Ghali. *The United Nations and Apartheid*. United Nations Department of Public Information. New York. 1996. P. 42.
[105] William Blum. *Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions since World War ll*. Zed Books. London. 2003. P. 305.
[106]Ibid.

involvement in drug trafficking. Drug trafficking is awful as well as snatching people's lives out of them forcefully. The truth is Noriega was once informant of the United States, though he has been infamous over the years but when he got involved in drug trafficking he became a problem to the United States. As most drugs produced around the world is heading for the United States. Nevertheless, the only option for the United States was to use direct violence against their former agent in a conflict that took the lives of thousands of innocent civilians. This particular event was not given the attention it deserves because a super power was involved. This would have been a memorable event if super power's citizens were slaughtered by any group. This study is not in support of any violent act from any state or any group. But what is good for the goose is good for the grandees. The unjust nature of the system calls for a drastic change to be made. This is not charity but a right, not bounty but justice, which I am pleading for. The present state of civilization is as odious as it is unjust.[107] This is completely the reverse of what it ought to be. When violence emanates from some groups it becomes threat to the society, and when it comes from another group it is normal and should be accepted no matter the consequences.

3.3 The use of Force beyond the Limits of States (State Terrorism)

Many states have considered 'terror' essentially as an outlawed use of force.[108] Since the use of violence by states notwithstanding the consequences, and mode, is not terrorism. Following the definition above any group of people that uses violence to cause harm or death of people, or use of violence to create tension in any society, could be considered as an act of terror. On the other hand, violent activities

---

[107]Thomas Paine. *Right of Man*. Harcourt Brace and Company. Washington. 1927. P. 337.
[108]Mark Ayyash. *Hamas and the Israeli State: A 'Violent Dialogue'*. European Journal of International Relations. Sage Publications. 2010. http://ejt.sagepub.com. P. 111.

committed by a state against civilians are forbidden by international conventions and are clearly defined as 'war crime' (in the context of a war situation) and as 'crimes against humanity' (in other situations) (United Nations, 1949: 46).[109] In fact, the Geneva Conventions as regards to the protection of the civilian population clearly stated that civilian population as such, as well as individual civilians, shall not be the object of attack.[110] Acts of threats of violence the primary purpose of which is to spread terror among the civilian population are prohibited.[111] In addition, the Geneva Convention signed in Geneva on 12 August, 1949 is not protecting only civilians. But persons taking no active part in hostilities, including members of armed forces who have laid down their arms and those placed *hors de combat* by sickness, wounds, detention, or any other cause, shall in all circumstances be treated humanely, without any adverse distinction found on race, color, religion or faith, sex, birth or wealth, or any other similar criteria.[112]

Nevertheless, states engage in acts of aggression, unannounced, indirectly or direct against perceived enemies. The Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor against the United States during the Second World War is a typical example. We should recall that even when talks were going on between the states Japan launched an unexpected assault that led to the loss of more than three thousand Americans. But we must acknowledge the fact that states are permitted to use violence on certain occasions. For instance, against armed criminals or in self-defense (against an aggressive state or any aggressive actor). During these periods states are not permitted to harm or

---

[109]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: is One Man's Terrorists another Man's Freedom Fighter*? Police Practice and Research. 2002. Vol. 3, no. 4.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713647973. P. 299.
[110]United Nations. *International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism*. United Nations. New York. 2004. P. 323.
[111]Ibid.
[112]Ibid. p. 314.

cause the death of undefended civilians. Then, what could be classified as an act of terror by states?

States can slot in terrorist acts in many ways. But the problem among states is they have not been able to distinguish freedom fighters from criminals (terrorists). Some states sustain some groups other states have labeled terrorist. As a result of this those states have been labeled terrorists states as well. Some of these states have maintained that they are against terrorism. However, they have vowed to encourage those who fight against oppression and occupation. In November 1986, President Hafez el-Assad declared that: "We have always opposed terrorism. But terrorism is one thing and a national struggle against occupation is another. We are against terrorism. Nevertheless, we support the struggle against occupation waged by national liberation movements".[113]

How to reconcile this is a problem among states. The first major multilateral attempt to adopt an international instrument addressing the problem of international terrorism was the 1937 Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism drafted under the auspices of the League of Nations.[114] This step was taken as a result of the murders of King Alexander lll of Yugoslavia and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs in Marseille in 1934. Italy refusal to handover the alleged suspects to France compelled France to call for international measures on a universal level.[115] The League of Nations organized Conventions for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism and for the Creation of an International Criminal Court. However, all these

---

[113]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist another Man's Freedom Fighter*? Police Practice and Research. 2002. Vol. 3, no. 4.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713647973. P. 292.
[114]Bibi van Ginkel. *The United Nations: Towards a Comprehensive Convention on Combating Terrorism.* Kluwer Law International. Hague. 2003. P. 211.
[115]Ibid.

did not enter into force because as of 1941 it was only India that was able to ratify the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.

As a result of the demise of the League of Nations and its replacement with the United Nations, in 1972, the issue of fighting terrorism came up at the UN General Assembly. Prior to this time the Organization of American States had made an attempt to draft a Convention on Combating Terrorism in 1971, in which it tried to formulate a general definition of terrorism.[116] This move was proven abortive in its totality.

During the 1960s and beginning of 1970s there was a lot of kidnapping and hijacking events. This put more pressure on the United Nations to act on this issue. On 18 December 1972 the General Assembly decided by Resolution 3034(XXVII) to establish an *Ad Hoc* Committee on International Terrorism to examine the question in all its aspects.[117] The *Ad Hoc* Committee of thirty-five members was unable to come up with a definition of terrorism in its reports of 1973 and 1979. In short, the Committee refrained from defining terrorism. 'if the West was nervous that a definition of terrorism could be used to include "state terrorism", the Third World was nervous that any definition which emphasized non-State actors would fail to differentiate between terrorism properly so called, and the struggle for national liberation.[118]

From the *Ad Hoc* Committee's Report of 1973 it became clear that although all nations wanted to outlaw terrorism, many states interpreted international terrorism differently.[119] Every state was concerned or was trying to protect its interest as

---

[116]Ibid. p. 213.
[117] Bibi van Ginkel. *The United Nations: Towards a Comprehensive Convention on Combating Terrorism*. Kluwer Law International. Hague, 2003. P. 213.
[118]Bibi van Ginkel. *The United Nations: Towards a Comprehensive Convention on Combating Terrorism*. Kluwer Law International. Hague. 2003. P. 213.
[119]Ibid.

regards to what constitutes the acts of terrorism. In addition, the move to remove wars of national liberation from the scope of the definition hindered the renewal of friendly relations that was about to exist between states based on this issue.

Nonetheless, the United Nations had taken some measures to eradicate international terrorism. The world organization is also trying to ensure that this will enhance better relation among states and to ensure their security as well. The General Assembly resolution 49/60 of 9 December 1994 (Declaration on the Measures to Eliminate International Terrorism) is as a result of the organization concern by the world-wide persistence of acts of international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, including those in which states are directly or indirectly involved, which endanger or take innocent lives, have a deleterious effect on international relations and may jeopardize the security of states.[120] The organization strongly believed that there was increase, in many regions of the world, of acts of terrorism based on intolerance or extremism.[121] Therefore, the United Nations was determined to eradicate international terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.[122] The world body was convinced also that the suppression of acts of international terrorism, including those in which states are directly or indirectly involved, is an essential element for the maintenance of international peace and security.[123] In addition, the United Nation decided that those responsible for acts of international terrorism must be brought to justice.[124]

At the regional level, other regional organizations – just like the Organization of American States have taken measures to combat terrorism, and to deal with the issue

---

[120]United Nations. *International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism*. United Nations. New York. 2004. P. 252-253.
[121]Ibid. p. 253.
[122]Ibid.
[123]United Nations. *International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism*. United Nations. New York. 2004. P. 253.
[124]Ibid.

of state terrorism. However, states that engage in acts of terror and those that intervened in other states unannounced have justified their actions. In August 2008, Russia intervened in Georgia declaring that it has come to push back an aggressor[125]as well as defending Russians in South Ossetia. But some sources have revealed that Russia intention was 'regime change' in Georgia. As Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov had told United States Secretary of State's Condoleezza Rice in a conversation on the phone that the Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili should leave office. Georgia and Ukraine had already declared their desire to join NATO, and Russia has not been pleased with this. Some sources had stated that Russia had laid a trap to make the Georgians fire the first shot, thereby letting Russia claim to be pushing back an aggressor.[126] According to Stratfor, a private American intelligence company, Russian forces were pre-positioned near the border, therefore more able to respond quickly to attack the Georgians when they moved into South Ossetia on August 8.[127]Nevertheless, whether by means of supporting groups or through direct interventions, one thing is sure. First, killing of undefended civilians is not allowed in any conflict no matter the justifications. Secondly, going to war or intervening in another country unannounced is prohibited.

I believe some definitions will help to understand how states engage in terrorist acts. Therefore, some have been made available in this section. These definitions will also enable us to understand the limits states could use force. I would prefer the definitions given by Boaz Ganor which I considered as 'all-inclusive'. Since it did not stop at only those that sponsor and direct groups known as terrorist. Rather those that perpetuate the act of terror under the disguise of interventions are not left out.

---

[125]The History Guy. *The Georgian – Russian War*. 2008. http://www.historyguy.com/georgia-russia-war.htl. p. 5.

[126] The History Guy. *The Georgia – Russia War*. 2008. http://www.historyguy.com/georgia-russia-war.htm. p. 5.

[127]Ibid.

- *States supporting terrorism*: states that support terrorist organizations, providing financial aid, ideological support, military or operational assistance.[128]

- *States operating terrorism*: states that initiate, direct and perform terrorist activities through groups outside their own institutions.[129]

- *States perpetrating terrorism*: states perpetrating terrorist acts abroad through their own official bodies – members of its security forces or its intelligence services, or their direct agents. In other words, states intentionally attacking civilians in other countries in order to achieve political aims without declaring war.[130]

Notwithstanding the fact that virtually all manners in which states commit terrorist acts are included in these definitions. However, no states will admit that civilian casualties are carried out deliberately. Even when they admit names are given to those that died. For instance, minor or collateral death and on many occasions few numbers are accepted, and many are buried secretly in mass graves. During the United States intervention in Panama in 1989, William Blum narrated the story of three civilians who were running away from the fury of U.S army, and they were shot by the death squad, living widows behind. The United States accepted that five hundred civilians were killed in the invasion. But other sources disclosed that many were buried secretly in mass graves. In addition, in July, 1985, the French government through security agents carried out nuclear test in Waitemata harbor in New Zealand. During the test there were two consecutive explosions that shook, the

---

[128]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorists another Man's Freedom Fighter*? Police Practice and Research. 2002. Vol. 3, no. 4.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713647973. P. 299.
[129]Boaz Ganor. *Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorists another Man's Freedom Fighter*? Police Practice and Research. 2002. Vol. 3, no. 4.
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713647973. P. 299.
[130]Ibid.

Rainbow Warrior, Greenpeace's flagship vessel, sinking it and disabling it.[131] The explosions also killed thirty five year old Portuguese, who is also a photographer. Initially, the French government denied being part of this horrible act, and ordered the New Zealand authority to take decisive actions against the cuprites. When New Zealand intelligence got enough information showing France involvement, coupled with the arrest of two French collaborators who were later sentenced to ten years imprisonment, the French government imposed trade sanctions against New Zealand.[132] The bombing of the Rainbow Warrior was authorized by the socialist French Minister of Defense, Charles Hernu.[133] Then, what is going on? Are states covering their own crimes?

Domestically states actors have perpetuated acts of terror against their citizens in their bids to advance personal interests. Domestic state terrorism most times exists under repressive regimes and military rulers which is common in developing countries. In this situation, state actors accuse political opponents and oppositions of threatening state security, thereby either intimidating them or using death squads on them. Most media personnel's are also targeted as they intend to repress the media in order to cover their crimes. Sometimes state actors use the concept 'revolution' to carry out terrorist acts against fellow citizens. Revolution should be carried out, if necessary, for the betterment of the entire state not for the interest of selected few. After the Ethiopian revolutionary government led by Mengistu Haile Mariam came to power in September 1974. Many Ethiopians thought that things might improve. Since the regime has eliminated those they called enemy of the state (former officials

[131]Jamil Salmi. *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right*. Zed Books. London. 1993. P. 93.
[132] Jamil Salmi. *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right*. Zed Books. London. 1993. P. 94.
[133]Ibid. p. 93.

of the Haile Selassie regime).[134]However, the dictatorial regime continued its revolution by killing many Ethiopians in its bid to remain in power. In fact, the high court arranged by the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) for the trial of the revolutionary government argued that the Dergue (Ethiopian Revolutionary Government) carried out 'red terror'[135] against political organizations, including children bellow the age of thirteen, whom the regime considered as operatives of the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Party (EPRP).[136] Robert Kaplan has asserted that revolutionary Ethiopia is nothing but "the African Killing Field".[137]Furthermore, the khmer Rougue is another regime that hide under the umbrella of revolution to annihilate millions of Cambodians. The interesting thing about the khmer Rougue is that the regime did not only kill political opponents after the civil war. It went as far as killing women, men, boys, girls and babies considered as impure, therefore, not qualified to live in the new society it intended to create.

State terrorism does not comprise of states that sponsor, harbor, direct or initiate terrorist acts via agents or groups. It also include direct interventions insofar it is unannounced, as well as involving the death or injury of undefended civilians, whether home or abroad. The use of biological or nuclear weapons, either during wars/conflicts or by means of testing it, insofar it could lead to miscarriages, deformities or annihilation of people is also classified as terrorist acts. In all, the uses of violence or force by state actors beyond their limits produce one common result which is calamities or deaths of people which has become state terrorism.

---

[134]Edward Kissi. *Genocide in Cambodia and Ethiopia*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 315.
[135]Edward Kissi. *Genocide in Cambodia and Ethiopia*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 308.
[136]Ibid. p 310.
[137]Ibid.

Chapter 4

STATE AND NON-STATE ACTORS: JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE USE OF VIOLENCE, CIVILIANS' FATE AND THE POSITION OF SCHOLARS

4. 1 Justifications for the Use of Violence by State and non-State Actors

In 1887, a Russian student group plotted the assassination of Czar Alexander III.[138] The young Russians were caught, and tried by a law court. During their trial, a prominent member of the group, Alexander Ulyanov, declared that "terror (their violent acts) is that form of struggle that has been created by conditions of the nineteenth century".[139] Ulyanov went on to state that the use of violence acts (terrorist acts) is the only form of defense to which a minority, strong only in terms of its belief, can resort against the physical strength of the majority.[140] It took only a bit more than one decade and few years, after members of this group were either executed, or expelled from Russia, for the majority to realize how corrupt the Czar system was.

On the other hand, in 1986, the United States war planes struck many locations in Libya, including area with high population in Tripoli, thereby killing hundreds of

---

[138]Moorhead Kennedy. *The 21st Century Conditions Likely to Inspire Terrorism*. Sage Publications. London. 1998. P. 185.
[139]Ibid.
[140]Ibid. p. 186.

people and injuring many. In fact, at least 100 people died after USA planes bombed targets in Libya.[141] President Reagan had blamed Libya for her involvement in terrorist attacks against United States citizens in places like La Belle discoteque in West Berlin 10 days before the United State attacks. In a television address to United States citizens two hours after the attacks, he said: "when our citizens are attacked or abused anywhere in the world on direct orders of hostile regimes, we will respond so long as I' m in this office".[142] President Reagan maintained that the United States action was absolutely a self defense which is in conformity with Article 51 of the United Nations charter.

These are just two examples of justifications of non-state and state actors. Every group has something to say to defend its aggressive acts. Some justifications might be right. However, it still depends on where you sit. How close is one to the truth? In other words, what are the motives behind any violent act? Another thought comes to mind here, whether if the motives can justify the bombing of cities and killing of innocent civilians. Some people strongly believe that some causes are worth killing for and dying for. In fact, it is quite incomprehensible and amazing how a human being could detonate a bomb, killing him/her-self, and killing others as well. Are such things worth doing? Are these people insane? After all, life itself is a gift because no one can give life to him/her-self originally. Therefore, one's life ought to be precious to him/her.

Most actions of people that engage in aggressive acts to the extent of killing others and themselves are presumed to be well calculated. Notwithstanding the fact

---

[141]BBC. *"US Launches Air Strike on Libya"*.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/april/15/newsid3975000/3975455.stm.1986.
(Accessed June 4,2010). P. 1.
[142]BBC. *"US Launches Air Strike on Libya"*.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/april/15/newsid_3975000/3975455.stm. 1986.
(Accessed June 4, 2010). P. 2.

that these violent acts are initiated and direct from distant locations in most cases, the agents or those who carry out these acts are responsible to a certain extent. They cautiously accomplish their acts with little or no mistakes. For instance, if a suicide bomber shows any sign of having bombs on him/her self. Then, his/her victims will run away before he/she detonates the bomb. Rather the suicide bombers appear decent, thereby giving no room for alarm. This depicts the fact that the suicide bomber is a rational being. He does his own calculations independently outside the initiators directions because no matter how you direct or control a moron, he is always liable to flaws at the end. Then, the issues of motives and conditions that precipitate violent acts comes in here. What propels those that partake in brutal acts to kill others or themselves? From all indications most people that engage in brutal acts are normal and rational beings. Researchers have shown that some motives could be responsible for such acts. For instance:

- To *acquire* what is unfairly denied – land, freedom, basic rights, opportunities.[143]

- To *reassert* identity, status, legitimate possessions, where these are challenged or lost.[144]

- To *protect* where an entity is threatened or ill-treated.[145]

- To *restore* where former rights, privileges, advantages have been denuded or taken away.[146]

Motives are essential key for people standing up to fight, kill or die for something. After this, the initiating, directing and execution of aggressive act comes in, then, followed by justification. Justification could as well be based on these motives

---

[143]David Whittaker. *Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World*. Routledge. London. 2004. P. 51.
[144]Ibid.
[145]Ibid.
[146]Ibid.

because one can claim that: I bombed their city because they support repressive regimes that deny us our rights. In fact, this is one of the claims of Bin Laden. According to Bin Laden, and if you listen to what he says, it's worth it.[147] They are very angry at the United States because of its support of authoritarian and brutal regimes; its intervention to block any move towards democracy; its intervention to stop economic development; its policies of devastating the civilians society of Iraq while strengthening Saddam Hussein; and they remember, even if we prefer not to, that the United States and Britain supported Saddam Hussein right through his worst atrocities, including the gassing of the Kurds, Bin Laden bring that up constantly.[148] These are the reasons for the attacks carried out by Bin Laden and his group against the West and United States in particular.

With these reasons they feel their aggressive acts are justified, therefore, they have little or no regret of what they have been doing. We should acknowledge the fact that some justifications are accepted by some people in a particular region. For instance, most people in the west condemned the hideous acts of September 11, 2001. As a result of the incident the alleged suspect Osama Bin Laden is perceived as evil in most western countries. The reverse is the case in most Middle East and some Asian countries. Some people in these regions supported Bin Laden in many ways and even regard him as the conscience of Islam.[149] This goes a long way to show that some justifications get popular approval – maybe not in public, but a lot of people might approve it in secret.

People have justified their violent acts in many ways. During the Vietnam War an American soldier was asked about why they destroyed a particular town. He

[147]Noam Chomsky. *The New War Against Terror*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 250.
[148]Ibid. p. 251.
[149]Ibid.

replied by saying that it became necessary to raze the town to save it.[150] The Americans perceived the peril of allowing their antagonist to get hold of this town. Then, the finest thing that could happen is to erase the town completely. Their enemy was not allowed to occupy the town. But the town can be rebuilt afterwards. This has remained a yardstick for many groups that embark on violent revolutionary ventures. They believe that instead to allow an unjust or corrupt system to stay. It is better to even destroy the entire city insofar as the bad system is removed.

In the late 1960s, until the late 1990s virtually all the military regimes that came to power in Nigerian had justified their actions. They claimed that the civilian regimes were corrupt. Therefore, there was need for drastic change. One of the most aggressive and bloody coup d'état in the country was led by Chukwuma Kaduna Nzeogwu. Nzeogwu who was a young skillful military officer led other young officer in order to revolutionize the country. Some politicians were killed in what latter was termed an Ibo coup. That is coup said to be carried out by Ibo nation or Ibo speaking people in South East Nigeria. Nzeogwu and his men justified their violent acts claiming that: "Our enemies are the political profiteers, the swindlers, the men in high and low places that seek bribe and demand ten percent".[151]

Though Nzeogwu and his men were later arrested, and this particular incident was one of the reasons Nigeria found itself in a civil war. But the fact remains that most revolutionary groups that justified their violent acts with such excuses, had always won the supports or approval of majority of the masses, notwithstanding the bloodshed or damage their aggressive acts might have caused. Just like in the case of Bin Laden who got support of some people after the hideous acts of September 11, 2001. This raises question such as, whether some justifications (violent acts) are well

---

[150]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenged, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 11.
[151]Ukachukwu Okorie. *Nigeria Weeps*. Snap Press. Enugu. 2003. P. 74.

approved by the people, whereas others lack merit or support of the people. Actually, some violent acts lack merit no matter the justification. A good example could be the case of the Barbarians and the Civilized as narrated by Mark Salter, or the colonial rulers who capitalized on the story to deal with the Natives. The Civilized (colonial rulers) justified their brutal acts claiming that the Barbarians (Natives) were naturally dangerous, violent and irrational.[152] The Civilized also claimed that the Barbarians were opposite of their civilization,[153] therefore, a threat to it. As a result of this, they extended their rules to the Barbarians by forcing their norms, values and culture on the Barbarians. Even to the extent of using violence on the Barbarians (Natives) in order to achieve their aims.

History has shown that colonization is primarily aimed at exploiting the indigenous people. Therefore, any justification of such brutal and vicious act is stinking and lacks merit in all ramifications. In fact, the colonial rulers would have made it more open by justifying their violent acts; by putting it simply that might is right. We should recall that without the sophisticated weapons used by the colonial Masters. They wouldn't have been able to penetrate in many areas. It was due to the help of such weapons, they used in devastating the Natives in order to penetrate. In Zulu (South Africa), the colonial rulers encountered a stiff opposition from Chaka Zulu and his warriors. But due to the help of modern weapons, they were able to make a way into the country. The Civilized (colonial rulers) would have been more courageous to put it simply that might is right – just like the Athenians made it very clear to the Melians without giving any flimsy excuses. Even the more refined colonization known as neocolonialism is very harsh on the people. Therefore, cannot be justified in any way. In fact, what Bin Laden was pointing out (according to

---

[152] Mark Salter. *Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations*. Pluto Press. Virginia. 2002. P. 36.
[153] Ibid. p. 28.

Chomsky), if one should accept it, and put it the other way round, is pure neocolonialism.

Some groups have also used such word as "extremism in defense of liberty is no vice" to justify their violent acts.[154] Actually, this quotation originated from Senator Barry Goldwater. He used this in the 1964 presidential elections in order to present himself as better candidate than President Lyndon Johnson on the issue of anti-communism which dominated United States politics during this period. Nevertheless, this slogan has been adopted by many groups that engage in aggressive acts. The quotation represents an uncompromising belief in the absolute righteousness of a cause.[155] In short, most Islamic extremists have hold on to this. The reason is that this could as well mean good versus evil.[156] We should recall that the Americans perceived the Soviet Union and its communism as evil, whereas the United States and capitalism represents the good. Most groups and Islamic extremists who believe they are fighting a just cause have used this to justify their violent acts. As they perceive their enemies as evil, therefore, should be destroyed.

One person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter[157] is a common phrase used by many groups that engage in violent acts. Even criminals (terrorist) hide under this umbrella in order to achieve their aims. In addition, no group would like the society to see them as outlaws. But the truth remains that there are no general accepted definition concerning who is, or not a terrorist, because people have labeled freedom fighter terrorist due to their selfish interest. However, groups that engage in aggressive acts in most cases blame their opponents for compelling them to engage in such acts – just like the young Russians who bluntly admitted that the conditions

---

[154]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 10.
[155]Ibid.
[156]Ibid.
[157]Ibid. p. 9.

of their time compelled them to adopt violent means as the only alternative of defense.

4.2 Who is a 'Terrorist'?

The word 'terrorist' has a negative meaning which is added to its original meaning as pointed out earlier. There is no doubt that this issue has been widely discussed, and has generated a lot of controversy in 21st century. In fact, if Narodnaya Volya members should start operation again as a group that have it in mind to revolutionize the society through the means of violence, they will not accept or agree to bear this name (terrorist) again. Rather they will look for some other encouraging name that will suit their cause. Politicians have turned the word 'terrorist' into something else, maybe it should be another name for Satan. That is what it should be, and nothing more. It doesn't suit into the human system again. Even those that involve themselves in some other hideous or notorious acts preferred to be called any other name, rather than terrorist. To be an outlaw, murderer, criminal, assassin or any other thing one can imagine is acceptable and could be accommodated maybe with time.

Due to the manner politicians are portraying the word terrorist. It has become very difficult to know or understand who a terrorist is as freedom fighters have been labeled terrorist as well. The irony of the whole matter is even those the politician call terrorist, also perceived most politicians as such, due to their involvements in acts of terror through their agents or otherwise. And today or yesterday terrorist, can become tomorrow commander in chief or president. A typical example is Dr Nelson Mandela. President Mandela and the African National Congress were labeled terrorist (group) during the apartheid era. The United States under the administration of President Ronald Reagan supported this idea. They went very far, to the extent of

prohibiting Mandela from entering into the United States. Immediately after the apartheid era Mandela won the election, and became the first democratic elected President of South Africa.

In Ethiopia, the story is not different in any way. Immediately after the fall of Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam the Tigray People's Liberation Front (TPLF) took the lead in determining crucial political matters.[158] The TPLF was labeled a terrorist group by most western countries, including the United States at the peak of the cold war. That was under the brutal regime of Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam. It was quite ironic to observe the TPLF being supported by the United States and western European countries as it ascended to power.[159] The TPLF went on to form alliance with three other weak groups in order to get the support of Ethiopians which was later known as the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF). In August 1995, the group was proclaimed the elected government in Ethiopia.

This kind of situation cannot be perceived as events of the 1990s. Neither would one say that there is a transformation or a gradual change taking place. It also happened during the ancient time, after the Renaissance, and even almost after the second half of the twentieth century. In the antiquity, the Barbarian Teutonic insurgent[160] without any doubt overpowered and overthrew the almighty Roman Empire. The Barbarians were over the years perceived as outlaws and defiance. They were maltreated by Roman soldiers and officials. Finally, the Barbarians captured power and became the legitimate authority. The Jacobins did not hesitate to capture

---

[158]Aregawi Berhe. *Ethiopia: Success Story or State of Chaos*? Macmillan Press LTD. London. 2000. Pg. 96.
[159]Ibid. p. 97.
[160]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 9.

power during the early days of the French revolution.[161] What about the Irgun in Israel? The Jewish group in Irgun who were perceived as terrorist group was part of the groups that founded the state of Israel. The list goes on.

In fact, a particular question should come in at this point. The question is what happened/happens after the so called outlaws or terrorist ascends to power? The truth is that the outlaws, defiance and terrorist will change the history books by rewriting them. In this case, they will (re)label themselves as freedom fighters, patriots, and/or proponents of national liberation, and to denote their vanquished adversaries as 'terrorist', autocrats, and imperialists, and so on.[162] For instance, in South Africa, Truth and Reconciliation Committee was set up immediately after the ANC ascended to power. Many National Party (NP) members were brought in front of the Committee to face charges brought against them. Even Peter Botha who headed the apartheid regime was compelled to face the Committee notwithstanding his refusal, though he was later pardoned by the ANC government. In Ethiopia, the Ethiopia People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) had to set up a court that argued that the Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam regime committed genocide under Ethiopian law,[163] though Mengistu Haile Mariam and some of his official were later allowed to leave the country to any destination in order to avoid a civil war. As regards to the Barbarians, they must have wiped out their adversaries since there were no human rights or any external pressure to stop them. The Jacobins labeled their adversaries as enemies of the state. They arrested and killed many as they could.

---

[161]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 10.
[162]Ibid.
[163]Edward Kissi. *Genocide in Cambodia and Ethiopia*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 308.

Some scholars have wondered whether anything like terrorist exist at all. They have asserted that terrorist/terrorism is a *political construct,* a historically variable and ideologically useful way of branding those who oppose a particular policy or government as beyond the moral pale, and hence 'not worthy' of diplomacy and negotiations.[164] The ideological use/abuse of the word terrorist has gone beyond those that are worthy of diplomacy and negotiations. People who are inside the political arena or part of government have been abused, and accused, of being a terrorist or member of terrorist group. The recent scene at the Knesset (Israeli house of parliament) has shown that in no distant time politicians will be confronting themselves openly with any weapon they might chose to use, like gang-stars, just because of this particular issue (terrorist).

Haneen Zoabi of the Balad Party was ruthlessly abused and accused of being terrorist and a member of terrorist group by Miri Regev of the Likud Party. Zoabi said "Israeli commandos fired on the freedom flotilla before boarding the ship.[165] She accused Israeli government of treating the Israeli Navy's bloody raid as a 'pirate military operation'.[166] She asked why the soldiers had been ordered to confiscate reporters' cameras and why the government has refused to allow the media to publish pictures of the nine people who were killed.[167] In response, Miri Regev accused her of being responsible for double crime: joining terrorist, and a moral crime against the state of Israel.[168] Regev asserted that she is a betrayer of Israel, a terrorist he called her. He concluded that they don't need a Trojan horse in the Knesset.[169]

---

[164] Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 9.
[165] Ali Yenidunya. *Gaza Flotilla: Member of Israel Parliament Accused of Supporting "Terrorist"*. June 3, 2010, available at http://enduringamerica.com/2010/06/03/gaza-flotilla-member-of-israel-parliament-accused-of-supporting-terrorists/.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid.

This kind of scene lays bare the current scenario in the ideologically abuse of the word terrorist/terrorism. People are being abused, tortured, maltreated and killed all in the name of terrorism. A recent report have revealed how the Swiss born Tariq Ramadan who has his roots from Egypt was maltreated by the U.S. state department for his alleged connection to terrorist group. Dr Tariq Ramadan was forced to resign his position at the university of Notre Dame in south Bend Indiana as a result of his visa revocation by the state department. Between December 1998 and July 2002, Dr Ramadan had given donations totaling $940 to two organizations, the Comite de Bienfaisance et de Secource aux Palestiniens (CBSP) and the Association de Secours Palestinian (ASP).[170] The United States Treasury designated both the CBSP and ASP terrorist fundraising organizations for their alleged links to Hamas on August 22, 2003.[171]

Dr Ramadan had been previously dismissed by the Rotterdam city and Erasmus University from his position. They claimed that the program he chairs on Iran's press TV (Islam and life) was irreconcilable with his duties in Rotterdam. However, after a court ruling in the United States, on January 20, 2010, after more than five years of waiting, the U.S. state department has decided in a document signed by Secretary of State Hilary Clinton, to lift the ban that prohibited Ramadan from entering the United States.[172] Many scholars, writers and artist have suffered the same fate throughout the world. All these are happening as a result of the fight against terrorism.

In Guantanamo Bay, thousands of people have lost their consciousness and dignity as a result of torture and humiliation. The United States detention facility in

---

[170]Manya Brachear. *The Seeker: A Personal and Professional. Chicago Welcomes Once-Banned Muslim Scholar*. April 5, 2010.
http://newsblogs.chicagotribune.com/religion_theseeker/2010/04/chicago-welcome-oncebanned-muslim-scholar.html.
[171]Ibid.
[172]Ibid.

Cuba has turned human beings into pigs for laboratory experiments. Force feeding accusations by hunger striking detainees began in fall of 2005, detainees said "large feeding tubes were forcibly shoved up their noses and down into their stomachs, with guards using the same tubes from one patient to another".[173] The detainees have insisted that no efforts were made in order to ensure that sedatives were available during this period, and U.S. doctors were present at the scene, including the person in charge of the prison clinic.

Many people have wasted close to six years in Guantanamo with torture, and some deformed, without any trial, and no trace to the alleged crime, all in the name of terrorist/terrorism. Former Guantanamo detainee Mehdi Ghezali was freed without charge on July 9, 2004, after two and half years internment.[174] Ghezali has claimed that he was the victim of repeated torture.[175] Omar Deghaves alleges he was blinded by pepper spray during his detention.[176] Reports have revealed suicide and suicide attempts in Guantanamo as a result of frustration and despair on the part of the inmates. As of August 2003, at least 1000 inmates of Camp Delta had attempted suicide in protest.[177] After the incidents the Pentagon had claimed that the inmates were trying to get unnecessary attentions and sympathy, therefore did not wish to commit suicide in the real sense. However, on June 10, 2006, three detainees were found dead, who, according to the Pentagon killed themselves in apparent suicide act. What is this? It must be a kind of contradiction or frame up. Who is deceiving

---

[173]The New York Times. *Guantanamo Bay Naval Base (Cuba)*. June 27, 2010. Available at http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/national/usstatesterritoriesandpossessions/guantanamobaynavalbas ecuba/index.html.

[174] The new York times. *Guantanamo Bay Naval Base (Cuba)*. June 27, 2010. Available at http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/national/usstatesterritoriesandpossessions/guantanamobaynavalbas ecuba/index.html.

[175]The new York times. *Guantanamo Bay Naval Base (Cuba)*. June 27, 20010. Available at http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/national/usstatesterritoriesandpossessions/guantanamobaynavalbas ecuba/index.html.

[176]Ibid.

[177]Ibid.

who? The inmates who have been able to survive the harsh nature of Guantanamo Bay, are finding it very difficult to regain their consciousness, and to suit into the new world, they have found themselves after their release.

The situation in Guantanamo is deplorable and very inhumane. It is inconceivable that such things are happening to innocent people in 21st century, to the extent that sexual methods were used by female interrogators to break Muslim prisoners.[178] Critics of U.S. policy say the government has violated the Third Geneva Convention in attempting to create a distinction between prisoners of war and illegal combatants.[179] Amnesty international has called the situation "a human right scandal in series of reports".[180]

Elsewhere, U.S drones are carrying out terrorist acts against undefended civilians. Philip Alston has released some shocking reports showing how United States drones are killing undefended civilians indiscriminately. These drones used by the United States, controlled by the CIA in distant locations, have resulted to the death of many hundreds of civilians[181] in places, including Pakistan. All these ugly scenes have manifested in the name of searching for terrorists. In fact, the definition of terrorism and terrorist can never be complete unless things are harmonize in such a way that freedom fighter (political terrorist) and innocent civilians are well distinguished from, other forms of terrorist acts, especially criminal terrorism.[182]

---

[178]Ibid.
[179]Ibid.
[180]Ibid.
[181]Philip Alston. *UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Killings: Record Afpak Drone Attacks Under Obama may Violate International Law*. The War and Peace Report. http://www.democracynow.org/2009/10/28/un_special_rapporteur_on_extrajudicial_killings.
[182]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 9.

4. 3 The Position of a Group like Hamas in this Context

For anyone to call Hamas a terrorist organization is one thing, and to know the genesis of this group, and the reason behind its adoption of violence as the only means to settle the Palestinian question, which is the reason the group has been labeled a terrorist group by most western countries, is another issue. In addition, we should bear in mind that Hamas as a group has a different outlook in most Arab countries as well as some Muslim states. Nevertheless, Hamas came into existence only in the late 1980s, whereas the Palestinian-Israeli conflict started in the 1940s when Israel declared its state hood. One can imagine how long the occupation, oppression and ethnic cleansing have lasted before the emergence of Hamas. I believe that there will be no Hamas without the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Therefore, it will be good to have a look at the Israeli-Palestinian issue, before drawing any conclusion on Hamas, and its adoption of violence as a means to achieve its goals.

For decades Israel has been in brutal conflict with its Arab neighbors. The bone of contention is centered on its occupation of Palestinian territories. The Palestinians who sought to claim their territories and to have full independent state, have been able to achieve little due to Israel military might and its huge support from the West. Due to frustration some armed groups have emerged from Palestine. These groups include the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Islamic Jihad and Harakat al-Muqawama al-Islamiya, also known as Hamas, to mention but a few. Nevertheless, the emergence of Hamas has caused Israel more nightmare than any other Palestinian armed groups. Hamas has perceived the struggle with Israel not as that of territory,

rights, or dignity, but as a spiritual struggle, where life and death are at stake.[183] This idea has inspired thousands of suicide fighters to unleash hell on the Israelis. This type of act is one the Israelis have not been able to understand. It is a situation where a human being deliberately could lose his or her own life on the process of killing others – just for the sake of his/her own targeted goals. For the suicide fighters this kind of death is freedom itself. Therefore, it is worth more than any other thing the Israelis or anyone can imagine.

Hamas triumph in the 2006 elections has given it more impetus to confront the Israeli presence in Palestinian territories. Prior to the 2006 elections Hamas has refused to accept Israel in all sphere. In fact, they regard the conflict with Israel as a matter of an eye for eye. This implies that Hamas was not willing to negotiate with Israel insofar as the occupation, restrictions, blockages and sporadic air raids continued. Therefore, they were ready to return the aggression back to the Israelis regardless of its consequences. They are among the parties that perceive the Oslo Peace Accord as a weakness on the side of the PLO. As a result of this, as well as their sporadic firing of rockets into Israel territory, coupled with suicide attacks against Israel which have caused lots of harm to the Israelis. Israel has increased the level of its hostility against the Palestinians and Gaza in particular. Thereby inflicting unbearable pain to the Palestinians or as Stephen Lendman puts it, "Israel slow motion genocide in occupied Palestine".[184]

This violent conflict between Hamas and Israel has brought more pain to the Palestinians than the Israelis. In Israel per capita GDP is $27, 450; in Gaza it's two or

---

[183]Mark Ayyash. *Hamas and Israeli State: A 'Violent Dialogue'*. European Journal of International Relations. Sage Publications. 2010. http://ejt.sagepub.com. P. 107.
[184]Stephen Lendman. *Israel's Slow-Motion Genocide in Occupied Palestine*. November 26, 2008. Available at Countercurrents.org.

three dollars a day.[185] This is as a result of constant Israeli restrictions on all major sectors of Gaza's economy.[186] In addition, constant roadblocks, checkpoints, electric fences and sporadic air raid are what Gazans has become used to. There is also regular closure of the frontiers of Gaza, no good water, shortage of food; all have lead to the impoverishment of Gazans. There are detentions of minors or children by Israeli military. The death toII rose to 1, 387 after Israeli air raid in January 2009.[187]

Israel historical belief has also contributed to its brutal conflict with the Palestinians. The state of Israel strongly believes that Palestinians never existed in that region. From their biblical records Arabs used to reside in the cities of Judea and Samaria (i.e. West Bank). This goes a long way to show that this land does not belong to the Jews. But they have maintained that is the land God promised to them according to the Bible. This Israeli position has contributed to the show of force and violent clash between them and the Palestine's.

So far Hamas has been able to use violence to provoke their opponent in order to achieve certain goals. The provocation caused by their aggression compelled their antagonist to increase the level of its hostility; hence, you need violence, to subdue violence. Consequently, this drew the attention of the international community to denounce the actions of Israel. The increase in the level of violence by Israel, provoked by violent acts from Hamas, caused major disaster against their enemies as well as unprotected civilians. In January 2009, there was widespread disapproval of Israeli air raid in Gaza. In most European countries there were demonstrations in which they chanted 'we are all Palestinians', 'stop the hostility in Gaza'.

---

[185]Nicolas Pelham and Max Rodenbeck. *Which Way for Hamas*? The New York Review of Books. 2009. P. 4.
[186]Ibid.
[187]Ibid. p. 3.

On the part of Hamas, violence has become an arsenal of provocation that led to their actualization of certain goals. The case of Hamas depicts that violence has become a tool to attract sympathy, respect, as well as capturing power. Hamas after been robbed their victory at the 2006 elections forcefully took control of Gaza. In fact, a banker who lives in Gaza said "under the Palestinian authority (PA), police were afraid of thieves, now the thieves are afraid of them (Hamas)".[188] This shows there is better security system under Hamas government in Gaza. And there are recent calls by some western countries for the group to be more moderate in its activities. This signifies a kind of recognition of Hamas on the part of these countries.

Israel's occupation of Palestinian territories, its oppression and ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians have provoked uncompromising violent acts from Hamas. On the other hand, Hamas uncompromising violent acts had led to Israel's increase in its hostility against the Palestinians; this has brought condemnation of Israel by most Arab countries, some Muslim states, and some western countries in recent past. Hamas uncompromising violence has also brought criticism to Hamas by most western countries, and its admiration and self-esteem in most Arab countries, some Muslim countries, and little recognition from some western courtiers in recent past. Therefore, to say that Hamas is completely a terrorist group and ignoring all the factors that led to its adoption of the use of violence (might be completely unfair). Nevertheless, Hamas has gone through a lot of transformation. It has shifted from its initial position on its dealings with Israel notwithstanding the fact that it uses violence against Israel sporadically. The group has realized the need to reach accord with Israel on certain issues. Hamas also parade itself as the legitimate government

---

[188]Ibid.

in Gaza. This has raised the question, whether Hamas is a liberation movement, political group, terrorist group or government. However, the achievements of Hamas are to the expense of unprotected civilians who were either displaced, injured or killed. Finally, violence has become a tool for liberation and emancipation of the people to their own detriment.

4. 4 Reason behind the use of Violence against Civilians by non-State Actors

The use of violence by non-state actors against civilians is not conventional in any way, and it has received criticism from majority of world population notwithstanding any kind of justification by non-state actors. However, most non-state actors believe that they have no option for their political, economic, and/or religious grievances and oppression.[189] Consequently, they kill and maim random civilians at random places and at random times to give publicity to their causes.[190] Their expectation is that their aggressive acts could lead to rebellion against the oppressor. Actually, non-state actors who have such intentions feel that this rebellion will definitely benefit them through their economic, political or religious appeal.

The problem with such ideas of most non-state actors is that violence begets more violence.[191] In this situation, instead of the oppressor to surrender or to make drastic changes in order to calm the wrath of the oppressed, rather the oppressors in most cases had escalated their oppression, and even increased their own aggression. A typical example is the events that took place during the apartheid era in South Africa. Immediately the African National Congress started their armed struggle in 1961. The apartheid regime escalated its violence, and empowered its security

---

[189] Phil B. *The True Reason for Terrorism, Why Terrorism Fails, and How to Stop Terrorism*. 2010. http://www.philforhumanity.com/the_true_reason_for_terrorism.html. p. 1.
[190] Ibid.
[191] Ibid.

personnel's to assassinate ANC members which forced most of them to go on exile. Nevertheless, in most cases the oppressed (non-state actors) will not give up; they will escalate their own violence as well. The case of Hamas and Israel is a good example. All Hamas members would prefer to die rather than giving up; each time there was Israeli air raid in Gaza. There is always increase in suicide attacks and throwing of rockets in Israel.

Immediately there is increase in violence from non-state actors and state actors. Definitely the issue of security will come in since must state actors will intend to give themselves adequate security. This will prevent non-state actors from hitting their main targets. Therefore, they (state actors) have become untouchable. Then, any civilian from their constituency has become a high return in propaganda value[192] for the non-state actors. In other words, civilians that are close, related or from the same place with the hard targets (state actors) are bound to become victims of non-state actors. As far as these non-state actors are concerned the issue of innocent civilians does not exist here. The non-state actors regard these civilians as enemies because their husbands, brothers, sisters or fellow countrymen have remained untouchable as well as oppressive. They believe that hitting these civilians will directly or indirectly affect their main adversaries.

Most non-state actors also use violence on civilians in order to create fear among them. This will make civilians not to expose their whereabouts or to reveal their main base. For instance, in 1992, the Algeria's Armed Islamic group and Armed Islamic Movement first targeted security forces at the initial stage of their campaigns. They later targeted civilians to keep them from revealing where the rebels were staying.[193] Most non-state actors feel that this could be their main security because if their

---

[192]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 265.
[193]Ibid.

adversaries discover their main hideouts, then, they will not hesitate to destroy them completely.

Non-state actors also target civilians who have symbolic personality.[194] In this case, most non-state actors do not look at how innocent the civilian is or where he/she is from; rather their main aim is to use such opportunity to draw attention, or to undermine their enemy if the person is highly recognized by their enemy. Most times such people are murdered or executed by most non-state actors. A typical example is West German industrialist Hanns-Martin Schleyer who was kidnapped by the Red Army Faction in Germany. He was later executed by the group.[195]

4. 5 Scholars Approach to State and non-State Violence

Actually, most scholars believe that state terrorism is a ridiculous idea, due to the notion of states having monopoly of the use of force. This implies that states have the right to use force at will. Or some (scholars) might be supporting the idea of Cicero (the great Roman writer) who asked, "What can be done against force, without force?"[196] That is encouraging counter-terrorism which some states have capitalized on to carry out terrorist acts against political opponents and undefended civilians. These ideas have been challenged in the recent past by distinguished scholars, scientists, and religious leaders who believe that violence and war are rarely, if ever, justifiable, and that mega-war and mega-terrorism in the twenty-first century represent the greatest human-created threats to life on earth in history of our species.[197]

---

[194]Ibid.

[195] Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 152.

[196]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 106.

[197]Ibid. p. 99.

How scholars have broad or narrow ideas of state and non-state violence have different perspectives. This means that scholars could view this issue from different angles. There are also controversies surrounding the limits states can use force (state terrorism) because scholars are divided on the issue. For instance, while scholars like Chheang Vannarith and Chap Sotharith are interested in dealing with terrorism, and how to bring the perpetrators to justice.[198] Other scholars like Jurgen Habermas and Noam Chomsky believe that counter-terrorism should be rejected because it will escalate violence, and terrorism is a political construct use to target those that violently oppose some policies of governments.[199]

Nevertheless, through my research, I realized that some scholars have agreed that states use force/violence beyond their limits, and they were able to defend their stands beyond doubt. For example, Jamil Salmi declared that states engage in terrorist acts.[200] Edward Kissi supported him,[201] Nicolas Werth did not hesitate to join them,[202] and John Taylor firmly believes in state terrorism.[203] Even other scholars that believe that states uses force beyond their limits were unable to clear the air by being specific on the issue. That is to say that their position on the issue is a bit obscure. The definitions they used to define state terrorism weren't all-inclusive. This means that some acts of violence by states (that could be described as acts of terror) are omitted from their definitions. For instance, they might include

---

[198]Chheang Vannarith and Chap Sotharith. *The Fight against International Terrorism: A Cambodian Perspective*. Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace. CICP working paper No. 23. April 2008. Available at http://www.cicp.org.kh. P. 20.

[199]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism and The Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 9.

[200]Jamil Salmi. *Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right*. Zed Books. London. 1993. P. 92 – 93.

[201]Edward Kissi. *Genocide in Cambodia and Ethiopia*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. p. 307 – 323.

[202]Nicolas Werth. *The Mechanism of a Mass Crime: The Great Terror in the Soviet Union, 1937 – 1938*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 215 – 239.

[203]John Taylor. *"Encirclement and Annihilation": The Indonesian Occupation of East Timor*. Cambridge University Press. New York. 2003. P. 163 – 185.

states that sponsor and support terror acts as terrorist states, thereby ignoring states that intervene direct through their security forces.

However, some scholars like Dr Henry Kissinger, Javier Jordan and Luisa Boix are either interested in strategies to destroy terrorists/terrorism,[204] or interested in criticizing the use of violence by non-state actors. In fact, James Piazza went as far as describing non-state violence as illegal political violence,[205] thereby legalizing state violence. Though the use of violence by non-state actors is not permitted or allowed. But most of these scholars failed to state the motives or causes of use of violence by some non-state actors. This depicts a kind of flaw, ignorance or foul play on the side of these scholars. Nonetheless, a lot of things might be involved in such situation. Some scholars have declined from participating fully in such controversial issue due to the position they occupy, or threats from state actors who control the systems these scholars are part of. For instance, recent report has revealed how a supreme court in the United States ruled that human right advocate led by a USC Professor, Ralph Fertig, could be prosecuted if they offered advice to a foreign terrorist group, even if the advice was to settle disputes peacefully.[206]

Fertig who says he opposes violence, said he wanted to advocate for the Kurdish people before a United Nations tribunal, but he feared that in the process he might make contact with members of the Kurdistan Workers Party, known as the PKK, which has been designated as terrorist group by the U.S. state department.[207] Professor Fertig case is to an extent a mirror of how many scholars have either declined from associating themselves with state and non-state violence, or how most

---

[204]Henry Kissinger. *Foreign Policy in the Age of Terrorism*. Wadsworth. London. 2004. P. 116 – 121.
[205]James Piazza. *Is Islamist Terrorism More Dangerous*? An Empirical Study of Group Ideology, Organization, and Goal Structure. Terrorism and Political Violence, Vol. 21, January 2009. P. 62 – 88.
[206]David Savage. *Supreme Court Upholds Law Against Advising Terrorists*. June 22, 2010.http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-court-terror-2.
[207]Ibid.

scholars have been forced to become mainstream authors as a result of the position they hold. Nonetheless, some scholars also believe that terror acts are not morally equivalent.[208] For instance, one cannot compare the acts of terror committed by British soldiers against German civilians during the Second World War, with such act of terror from non-state actors, as the violent attacks of September 11, 2001, on the soil of the United States.[209] This issue is debatable as well; however, to justify any act of terror either by scholars or any group is unethical.[210]

---

[208]Charles Webel. *Terror, Terrorism, and the Human Condition*. Palgrave Macmillan. New York. 2004. P. 101.
[209]Ibid.
[210]Ibid.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION: THE LINK BETWEEN STATE AND NON-STATE VIOLENCE

Violence has always been part of humanity. It is as old as man himself. The truth remains that individuals, nations and states have not been able to avoid the use of violence right from the ancient times. From the ancient period until this our contemporary world violence is a means of achieving certain goals. Such aims or goals include political power, emancipation of the people, to revolutionize the society and for leverage.

Nevertheless, the level of violence has varied from one point to the other. In other words, there had been increase in violence at one point in history and decrease at another point. This also depicts that the level or scale of violence by state and non-state actors had caused more or less damage at different points in history. For example, the level of violence witnessed in the twentieth century caused more damage to our world, than any other point in the history of man. This has been attributed to the advancement in science and technology. As a result of advancement in science and technology more sophisticated weapons were at the disposal of state and non-state actors which had helped them to do more damage to our world than ever.

Though there are reasons, claims and counter-claims as regards to the use of violence by state and non-state actors. This kind of attitude has not improved the situation. Some non-state actors had insisted that they are being oppressed or

repressed by state actors. Therefore, they have resorted to violence as the only means to break the shackles of oppression and repression. On the other hand, state actors had justified their use of violence by claiming that non-state actors who they use violence against are criminals (terrorists). This position or stand has not helped matters either. Rather, it has escalated the level of violence. This kind of situation could be best described as, if you do me, I will do you back. It will definitely lead humanity into more disastrous situation.

Generally, the majority of world population perceives violence as only the use of physical (direct violence) force to hurt, damage or kill.[211] However, there are other forms of violence. They include structural or indirect violence, repressive and alienating violence. Nevertheless, physical or direct form of violence had been the victim of other forms of violence. It has remained the subject of discussion due to its visible nature, and it is used most times by non-state actors. In fact, it is used to cover other forms of violence. This is perceptible given that state actor's uses massive propaganda through the media to portray the acts of non-state actors as malicious and evil. Whereas in most cases violent acts of state actors are concealed, and when uncovered, it is portrayed by the media, the states control, as regrettable. Through this particular medium a lot of people are deceived. In fact, crimes are only crimes when other forms of violence commit them.[212] When state actors commit crime they are not crimes. Nevertheless, the whole history can be changed because non-state actors could control the media, if only they can capture power.

Nonetheless, there are links/connections between state and non-state violence. In the first place, most state and non-state actors who engage in violent acts are seekers of power. In fact, power has become indispensable in order to actualize certain

---

[211] MSDict Viewer. *E – Book*. Oxford University Press. 2003.
[212] Noam Chomsky. *Imperial Ambition*. Penguin Group. London. 2005. P. 68.

objectives. Through the means of violence or via elections, both forms of violence do capture power in order to accomplish their aims. Such aims or objectives could be economic, political, ideological or religious. In addition, state and non-state actors are capable of unleashing violence when necessary. State violence could be abuse of force through its forces (e.g. military) or through its corporations, or its supports for dictators. We should acknowledge the fact that violence (structural violence) through state institutions does not cause harm directly. Therefore, it is hardly perceived or visible. Whereas non-state violence is noticeable and direct, this emanates from these actors themselves. Their (state and non-state violence) violence when unleashed hurts, injures or kills unprotected civilians. In other words, state and non-state actors who engage in violent acts could be perceived as murderers. State and non-state actors are willing to dialogue or negotiate for peace if necessary. They all need the support of states or international community (to a certain extent) to be victorious in their causes.

State actors also try to legitimize their violent acts through institutions. For example, the United States was able to legitimize its use of force/violence against the Taliban's and al-Qaeda through the United Nations which made the war very easy. In addition, during the Gulf War the United States also legitimized the use of force/violence through the same United Nations which made the actualization of their goals in this war very easy. This does not mean that the use of violence by states is always legitimized. Rather legitimized use of violence draws more support of states and makes the war easier. As we can see, the 2003 Iraqi war lacked support and lingered for some time because the United Nations refused to support the United States. As a result of this, most United Nation members did not join the United States, including some traditional western European allies like Germany and Spain

who opposed the war. On the other hand, non-state violence is hardly legitimized; therefore, it lacks support or recognition of world institutions. This makes it very difficult for some non-state actors to successfully champion their cause. Rather institutions like the United Nations encourage non-state actors to champion their cause through non-violent means. For example, during the apartheid era in South Africa the United Nations sanctioned the apartheid regime. However, it did not encourage liberation movements in South Africa to use violence.

The extent of damage done by the violence that emanates from state actors (state violence) is greater in size than that of non-state actors (non-state violence). No one can compare the incineration of atomic bombs of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to any violent acts carried out by any group. In addition, the violent acts of state actors are well coordinated than that of non-state actors. The reason for all these is the enormous resources at the disposal of state actors.[213] Furthermore, state and non-state violence will definitely remain a big problem to humanity if proper steps or measures are not taken by policy makers, most non-state actors, cooperate organizations, religious bodies and other well meaning individuals to harmonize issues. Such issues as causes of non-state violence – like oppression, repression, marginalization, discrimination and poverty. Such measure will be a better counter terrorism action, and also ensure the discontinuation of violence by state actors in world politics.

---

[213]Gus Martin. *Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*. Sage Publications. London. 2003. P. 81.

REFERENCES

Ayyash, Mark Muhannad. (2010), Hamas and the Israeli State: A 'Violent Dialogue'. European Journal of International Relations. Sage Publications. http. 104 – 123. (Accessed May 14, 2010)

Alston, Philip. (2009), UN Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Killings: Record Afpak Drone Attacks Under Obama May Violate International Law. The War and Peace Report.- http://www.-democra-cynow.org/2009/10/28/un_special_rapporteur_on_extraljudicial_killings. (accessed June 18, 2010).

Beyer, Cornedia. (2004), "Structural Violence as one cause of International Terrorism". Counterterrorism in Perspective. Available at: . http://www.uni-kassel de/fb5/frieden/themen/terrprism/beyer.html (accessed May 2, 2010)

Blum, William. (2003), Killing Hope: US Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II. London: Zed Books.

Berhe, Aregawi. (2000), Ethiopia: Success Story or State of Chaos? London: Macmillan Press.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros. (1996), The United Nations and Apartheid. New York: United Nations Department of Public Information.

BBC. (1986), US Launches Air Strikes on Libya. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/april/15/newsid_3975000/3975455.stm. (accessed June 4, 2010).

Bard, Mitchell. (2009), Jewish Virtual Library: The Munich massacre.http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/terrorism/munich.html.

Brachear, Manya. (2010), THE SEEKER: Chicago Welcomes Once-banned Muslim Scholar. Available at http://newsblogs.chicag-otribune.com/religion_theseeker/2010/04/chicago-welcomes-oncebanned-muslim-scholar.html. 1-5 (accessed June 27, 2010)

Colli, Steve. (2004), Ghost Wars. New York: Penguin Books.

Colas, Alejandro and Saull, Richard. (2006), The War on Terrorism and the American 'Empire' after the Cold War. London: Routledge.

Casas, Bartoleme de las. Brief Account of Devastation of the Indies. http://www.swarthmore.edu/sci/bdorsey1/41docs/02-las.html. 1 - 5. (Accessed October 31, 2007).

Creshaw, Martha. (1981), "The Cause of Terrorism". Comparative Politics Journal, vol. 13, no. 4 : 379 - 399

Chomsky, Noam. (2005), Imperial Ambition. London: Penguin Group.

Chomsky, Noam. (2004), The New War Against Terror. London: Wadsworth.

Clarke, A. Richard. (2004), Against All Enemies. New York: Free Press.

Cook, Catherine, Hanieh, Adam and Kay, Adah. (2004), Stolen Youth: The Politics of Israel's Detention of Palestinian Children. London: Pluto Press.

De Silva, Purnaka. (2000), Sri Lankan Futures: Conflicts, Alternatives and Twenty – First Century Possibilities. London: Macmillan Press.

Emery, Alan and Taylor, Rupert. (2000), South Africa: From 'Racial Conflict' to Democratic Settlement? London: Macmillan Press.

Ely, Karmon. (2002), "The Role of Intelligence in Counter Terrorism". Korean Journal of Defense Analysis. Vol. 14, no. 1: 119 – 139.

Galtung, Johan. (1990), Cultural Violence: Journal of Peace Research, vol. 27, no. 3, 291 -305

Ganor, Boaz. (2002) Definig Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist another Man's Freedom Fighter? Police Practice and Research. Vol. 3, no. 4.http:/www.informaworld.com/smpp/title-t713647973. 287 – 304. (accessed May 7, 2010).

Gellately, Robert. (2003), The Third Reich, the Holocaust, and Visions of Serial Genocide. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Genest, A. Marc. (2004), Conflict and Cooperation: Evolving Theories of International Relations. London: Wadsworth.

Gilman, Robert. (1997), Structural Violence: Can We Find Genuine Peace in a World with Inequitable Distribution of Wealth among Nations? http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC04/Gilman 1.htm. (accessed May 7, 2010).

Goldstein, S. Joshua and Pevehouse, C. Jon. (2006), International Relations. New York: Pearson Longman.

Gurr, Ted. (1968), Psychological Factors in Civil Violence: World Politics. Stable: Johns Hopkins University Press. Vol. 20, no. 2. Pp 245-278.

Hamm, Mark. (1998), Terrorism, Hate Crime, and Antigovernment Violence: A Review of The Research. London: Sage Publications.

Hamas Website. (2007), CBS News. Captured Israeli Soldier. http://www.cbc.ca-/world/story/2007/06/25/hamas - soldier.html

Heuvel, Katrina Vanden. (2002), A Just Response. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/ Nations Books.

Jerkins, Brian. (1998), Will Terrorist go Nuclear? A Reappraisal. London: Sage Publications.

Jordan, Javier and Luisa, Boix. (2004), ''Al – Qaeda and Western Islam''. Terrorism and Political Violence, vol. 14, no. 1, 119 – 139.

Jones, Seth. (2008), The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad. International Security, vol. 32, no. 4: 7 – 40.

Kennedy, Moorhead. (1998), The 2ist – Century Conditions Likely to Inspire Terrorism. New York: Sage Publications.

Kierman, Ben and Gellately, Robert (2003), The Specter of Genocide: Mass Murder in Historical Perspective. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kissi, Edward. (2003), Genocide in Cambodia and Ethiopia. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kissinger, Henry. (2004), Foreign Policy in the Age of Terrorism. London: Wadsworth.

Krushner, Harvey. (1998), The New Terrorism. London: Sage Publications.

Keohane, O. Robert. (2004), The Globalization of Informal Violence: Theories of World Politics and The Liberation of Fear. London: Wadsworth.

Kelly, Robert. (1998), Armed Prophets and Extremists: Islamic Fundamentalism. London: Sage Publications.

Levin, Brian. (1998), The Patriot Movement: Past, Present, and Future. London: Sage Publications.

Lendman, Stephen. (2008), Israel Slow – Motion Genocide in Occupied Palestine. CounterCurrens.Org. 1 – 8. (accessed March 12, 2008).

Martin, Gus. (2003), Understanding Terrorism, Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues. London: Sage Publications.

Medhurst, Paul. (2002), Global Terrorism. A Course Produced by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research. New York: United Nations.

Munck, Ronaldo. (2000), Deconstructing Terror: Insurgency, Repression and Peace. London: Macmillan Press.

Munck, Gerardo and Boniface, Dexter. (2000), Political Precesses and Identity Formation in El Salvador: From Armed Left to Democratic Left. London: Macmillan Press.

Mohamoud, Abdullah. (2000), Somalia after the Cold War: Anarchic Factionalism, Intervention or Peacemaking? London: Macmillian Press.

Neve, Gordon. (2008), Israel Occupation: A ZNet Book Interview. http://www.zcommunications.org/israel-s-occupation-new-book-by-neve-gordon-by-neve-gordon. (accessed May 4, 2010).

Nosotro, Rita. (2003), From Czardom to Communist State: the 1905 and 1917 Russian Revolutions. http://www.hyperhistory.net/apwh/essays/comp/cw30-russia1905vs1917rev.htm. (accessed May 29, 2010).

Okorie, Ukachukwu. (2003), Nigeria weeps. Enugu: Snap Press.

Ollier, Matilde Maria. (2000), Private, Public and Political: Learning Processes of Revolutionary Left in Argentina. London: Macmillan Press.

Pappe, Ilan. (2006), The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine. Oxford: Oneworld.

Paine, Thomas. (1927), Right of Man. Washington: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Pelham, Nicholas and Rodenbeck, Max. (2009), Which Way for Hamas: The New York Review of Books.

Phil, B. (2010), The True Reason for Terrorism, Why Terrorism Fails, and How to Stop Terrorism. http://www.philforhumanity.com/thetruereasonforterrorism.html. (accessed June 18, 2010).

Piazza, James. (2009), Is Islamist Terrorism More Dangerous? : An Empirical Study of Group Ideology, Organization, and Goal Structure. Terrorism and Political Violence, vol. 21. No. 1. 62-88.

Rapoport, C. David. (2001), The Fourth Wave: September 11 in the History of Terrorism. Current History. 419 – 424.

Rokach, Livia. (1980), Israel Sacred Terrorism. New York: Association of Arab – American University Graduates, Inc.

Robinson, Mary. (2009), Report: Leading Jurists Call for Urgent Steps to Restore Human Rights in efforts to Counter Terrorism. http://ejp.org/hearing2.php3?idarticle=167. (accessed May 29, 2010). (accessed May 4, 2010).

Salmi, Jamil. (1993), Violence and Democratic Society: New Approaches to Human Right. London: Zed Books.

Salter, Mark. (2002), Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations. Virginia:Pluto Press.

Saull, Richard. (2006), Reactionary Blowback: The Uneven Ends of the Cold War and the Origins of Contemporary Conflicts in World Politics. New York: Routledge.

Savage, G. David. (2010), Los Angeles Times: Supreme Court Upholds Law Against Advising Terrorists. Accessed June 23, 2010. Available at http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-court-terror-2... (accessed June 23, 2010)

South Lebanon Army. (2006), http://www.soundofegypt.com/palestinian/adult/sla.htl (accessed May 4, 2010).

Scraton, Phil. (2002), Beyond September 11. London: Pluto Press.

Taylor, John. (2003), "Encirclement and Annihilation": The Indonesian Occupation of East Timor. New York: Cambridge University Press.

The History Guy. (2008), the Georgia – Russia War. http://www.historyguy.com/-georgia-russia-war.htm. (accessed June 11, 2010).

The New York Times. (2010), U.S. STATES, TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS: Guantanamo Bay Naval Base (Cuba). Accessed june 27, 2010. Available at http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/national/usstatesterrit-oriesandpossessions/guantanamobaynavalbasecuba/index.html. 1-4 (accessed June 27, 2010).

Thucydides. (2004), The History of the Peloponnesian War. London: Wadsworth.

United Nations. (2004), International Instruments related to the Prevention and Suppression of International Terrorism. New York: United Nations.

Van Ginkel, T. Bibi. (2003), The United Nations: Towards a Comprehensive Convention on Combating Terrorism. Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Vannarith, Chheang and Sotharith, Chap. (2008), The Fight Against International Terrorism: Cambodian Perspective. Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace Working Paper no.23. http://www.cicp.org.kh. 4 – 24. (accessed May 4, 2010).

Waltz, Kenneth. (2004), Man, the State and War. London: Wadsworth.

Webel, P. Charles. (2004), Terror, Terrorism, and The Human Condition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Werth, Nicolas. (2003), The Mechanism of Mass Crime: the Great Terror in the Soviet Union, 1937 – 1938. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whittaker, David. (2004), Terrorists and Terrorism in the Contemporary World. New York: Routledge.

Winter, Jay. (2003), Under Cover of War: the American Genocide in the Context of Total War. New York: Cambridge University Press.