The Myth about Terrorist: Historical Materialism as A Response to Realist Approach

By

Ogunrotifa Ayodeji Bayo
School of Social and Political Sciences,
University of Edinburg, UK

Abstract

Since 9/11 bombing of New York and Washington, the term 'terrorism' has feature more prominently in the headlines of media, and in the discourse of political and security forces in the western world to malign certain states, insurgency groups and organisations as 'terrorists'. This politics of naming and labelling is unconnected with the mainstream theoretical agenda of realism that tend to defend and justify the monopoly of the state in legitimate use of force and regard 'terrorists' as non-state actors only. Realist theorists have been critiqued for ignoring terrorism used by the state against its own citizens, and failure to provide a class analysis of terrorism. This paper therefore uses Karl Marx's Historical Materialism (HM) to fill the gap Realism left uncovered with a view to providing a balance view on terrorism and terrorist. Through HM, a class analysis of terrorism was espoused. The paper argues that government and the ruling class in the society use state terrorism to suppress dissent and induce fear on the population (citizens) while oppressive lumpen class vis-à-vis a membership of certain group(s) or organisation(s) use individual terrorism to achieve political objectives, express grievances and lash out at societal injustice. It further argues that 'terrorist' is not a fixed label and it peculiarities is not limited to the oppressed class rather institutions such as state is a 'terrorist' by using terrorism against its own citizen and opposition. The paper concludes that the labelling of real or imagine groups as 'terrorist' is inappropriate and should be discouraged, as this will harden the stance of the labelled/stigmatised group to reject truce and build arms. It is envisioned that unconditional diplomatic relations and implementation of policy actions such as equitable distribution of wealth is needed in integrating large layers of the lumpen class into working class with a view to stemming the tide of terrorism in the international system.

1. Introduction

Since the bombing of New York and Washington on September 2001, realist thinking about terrorism and who is a terrorist has dominated mainstream academic discourse especially in International Relations, Politics and Social Sciences. Similar realist view on who is a 'terrorist' has found an echo within the western media, politics and policy making—as the term 'terrorist' is frequently used to: denigrate certain forms of behaviour they perceive as awkward; to label certain groups oppose to western interest; and to echo the concern of respective government classification of certain individuals or groups as 'terrorist'. This kind of stereotypic profiling/ labelling was described by Duvall and Varadarajan (2003) as the discursive battles over the ability to deconstruct dissent by illegitimatizing certain world-views through the power of naming and names. Further exposition by Michael Bhatia (2005) posit that the politics of naming between insurgent groups and states at the outset of 'Global War on Terror' compelled many 'to verbally negotiate and assert who they are, who they are allied with, and who they are against'[1].

The power to name or establishing names by western states and its media as Narozhna Tanya and Andy Knight (2009) often remark, tend to command the monopoly on truth, determine which names were to be selected in the first place and to dictate who and who to include or exclude. A further review of the literature especially the works of Toros (2008), Schroeder (2005), Nadarajah and Sriskandarajah (2005), Peteet (2005) and Horsman (2005) in the 2005 special issue of *Third World Quarterly* on the politics of naming, and other works in mainstream terrorism studies (especially Realist theorists) depict that these

---

[1] See Michael Bhatia, op.cit. pp.7

studies were limited to specific cases and political contexts without providing or attempt at a general (universal) definition of who is a 'terrorist': one that applies to the many cases in Africa, Europe, the Americas, Asia, and everywhere else.

In general, a social science concept that is universal is stronger than one that is particular to only one case, time and place. It is author's contention that without a general definition of who is a 'terrorist', other views that seek to radically relativize the term by arguing that 'one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter' is going to be entirely unconvincing. This paper seeks to fill this gap using Historical Materialist perspective. Through this approach, class analysis of terrorism was espoused, thereby arguing that there is no fixed label like 'terrorist'. 'terrorist group(s)', 'terrorist organisation (s)' but what we have is that certain individual(s), group(s) or organisation(s) and institution (like the state) use two types of terrorism identified—state and individual terrorism to advance and protest interests. The government and the ruling class in the society use state terrorism to suppress dissent and induce fear on the population (citizens) while certain individual(s), group(s) or organisation(s) used individual terrorism to achieve political objectives, express grievances and lash out at societal injustice.

Who is a terrorist?
Terrorism and terrorist are sometimes interchangeably used even when there is a thin line between the two terms. In a free online dictionary, terrorism is described as the unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence to instil fear while terrorist refers to a person who terrorises or frightens others. Despite the fact that this dictionary definition did not tell us 'who actually terrorises who', it is useful to our understanding that who is a terrorist depends on how terrorism is defined. This definitional frame has crept not only into academic discourses, but also within the lens of public opinion. In the discourse of public opinion, the question of who is a 'terrorist' is frequently subject to misgiving, biases and value judgment depending on the subjective frame of reference of who is defining it.

Defining Terrorism conjures biases as one class, actor or parties in conflict stigmatizes one another. Terrorism is being defined in relation to one's class position, social background, and as emotional responses expressed by those affected 'Victims' or those who are being victimized from a particular act of terror at one time or the other. As Turk (2004) noted that the definition of terrorism stems from the context of political conflicts and ideological warfare where one class, party, and actor cast enemy as an evildoer in order to win support for his own cause. To be a terrorists means a different thing to different actors, as the term find its expression in relation to particular social condition to which actors find themselves.

However, in academic circle, describing who is a terrorist depends on the theoretical standpoint in which terrorism is conceptualised. However, Realist approach (a mainstream terrorism baggage) as a theoretical tool have dominated intellectual debates for more than forty years, and this inevitably shaped the perception of western government on terrorism and on who is a terrorist, informed mainstream media perception that had a great influence on public opinion.

Realist Approach
Realism as a western mainstream theory has dominated intellectual discourse on terrorism since September 2001. The theory argues that the state is the key actor or primary agents in international politics and there is no actor above the state[2]. Second, governments are engaged in a constant effort to ensure the survival of their respective states[2]. Third, states selfishly pursue their national interests, the most vital being national security (Klarevas, 2004: 19). Generally, the realist school assumes that 'the world politics is essentially and unchangeably a struggle among self interested states for power and

---

[2] See Ashley (1981), Mearsheimer (1990), Morgenthau (1951), Niebuhr (2001), Keohane (1984) for more on Realist perspective in International Relations and politics.

position under anarchy'[3]. States within this theory would always feel insecure about other countries thus, they always use military forces to deter other states and keep their interests which constitute their core aim in their foreign policy[4]. From a realist perspective, state has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and that terrorism is carried out by non-state actors only (Blakeley, 2009). This realist orthodoxy view rejects state terrorism and posits that state is legitimate and 'terrorists' are illegitimate social formation or as a non-state actor in international relations, and therefore opted for military force as a privileged means to an end, and necessary expedient for preserving power (Fiala, 2002).

The ontological position of realist approach is premised on Emile Durkheim's positivist philosophy that affirm that terrorists will exist 'out there' no matter what the historical context may be. This reflects in various definition of terrorism propounded by the realist scholars. The first is Bruce Hoffman's definition of terrorism as an 'acts perpetuated by a sub-national or non-state entity' (Hoffman 1998). Other realist scholar like Caleb Carr defines terrorism as 'warfare deliberately waged against civilians with the purpose of destroying their will to support either leaders or policies that the agents of such violence find objectionable' (Carr, 2002). These definitions have shown a common thread: who is a terrorist? And the realist answer lies in the fact that terrorist(s) are non-state actors who directed violence against state and civilians. Since the realist approach focus solely on the illegal non-state actors terrorising legitimate state, the approach helps to provide theoretical tool for the United States' statutory definition of terrorism as a 'premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by sub national groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience' (Pillar, 2001). Thus, provide policy tools and justifications for the so-called American and British war on terror in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan and Yemen, which uses dangerous counter terrorist tactics, military intervention, and regime change couple with tactic support and assistance to authoritarian regimes (allies) of Bahrain, Israel and Saudi Arabia. Furthermore, realist definition of terrorism has given Western states especially United States the needed impetus to categorise certain group as terrorists and incorporate them into their terrorist database.

A case of Nelson Mandela and other African National Congress (ANC) leaders during apartheid struggle was a reference point. ANC and other groups during the struggle against apartheid were accused of using guerrilla tactics to fight white separatist government, and were therefore labelled by the United States as terrorists. Despite being the President of the Republic of South Africa in post apartheid, Mandela and other ANC chieftains' name was still in US terrorist register. The implication of this is that Mandela was only allowed in US to attend United Nation meetings and was restricted to New York only, while other labelled ANC chieftains were refused visa to enter the United States. The use of realist label by the Western states to any group or organisation as 'terrorist' was ostensibly crafted to serve particular interests in today's global power relations—to sustain and maintain the existing institutional and power-relational status quo by confronting any destabilising pressures within the international system. The obvious reality in orthodox realist approach is to ensure that western state terrorism is off the agenda and subtly defines terrorism in a way that delegitimizes opposition to the interest and power of the West while legitimising the Western power's own political violence (Herring 2008: 22).

Realism has been critiqued by the critical theorists for ignoring violent activities used by the state (state terrorism) against its own citizens or other states (Gunning 2007; Silke 2009; Jackson, Smyth and Gunning 2009, Herring 2008). Further criticism of realist approach is that the theory failed to explain class analysis of terrorism: how social relations of production among different social class produce terrorism within and across states. The quest to address the criticisms levelled against realist perspective gave rise to the introduction of Historical Materialism to fill the knowledge gap.

---

[3] W. Charles and JR Kegley. *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. (U.S.A: Wordsworth Cengage Learning, 2008) 27

[4] James Dougherty, and Robert Pfaltzqraff. *Contending Theories of International Relations*. (Adison Welsley Publishing Company, 1996)

Historical Materialist Perspective

Historical Materialism (HM) as a theoretical tool was first articulated by Karl Marx, a German philosopher, to explain the scientific law that govern the evolution, development and historical succession of society per time. Marx argued that the history of all hitherto existing society has been the history of class struggle that emanated out of the existing social relations to production:

> Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes. In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations. The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones[5].

To Marx, the dialectics of historical development in all societies is the locomotive of class struggle between classes. Therefore, the objective reality of contemporary human society is the reality of a past human life, which can only, comes into being on the basis of the creation of man through human labour and class struggle that shape the supersession of an earlier form already in existence (Copleston 2003). To Marx, 'class conflict serves to facilitate major historical change while deeper causes of revolution lie in the autonomous tendency for the productive forces to develop throughout history' (Katz 1993:1). Marx's Historical Materialism however, shed more light into how a new society was developing within the old: such that contradictions implicit in the old society will inevitably give way to a new society. He therefore posited that human societies had underwent myriads of stages-starting from primitive communalist society of hunters and gatherers, and later transformed into Asiatic type of society, feudal society and to capitalist society.

However, Marx was interested in feudalism (feudal society) and how this mode of production ushered capitalism (capitalist society) to which he devoted most of his study on. Marx did not specifically analysed terrorism but his focus on how class struggle and peasants revolution in feudal era gave rise to the creation of 'state' and how the ruling class (King, Aristocrat/feudal lords) used state to terrorise peasants (serfs) under feudalism, and how state as instrument of class rule was sustained and utilised in capitalist era to suppress the revolt from the working class, underscores the significance of Marx's Historical Materialism to terrorism studies.

Late feudal era heralded the emergence of private property and the quest to protect it by the ruling class, came in conflict with the existing relations of production with peasants. As Marx noted:

> At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or - what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the

---

[5] See the preface of Karl Marx's (1848) book 'Communist Manifesto' available at
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/ch01.htm

legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production[6]

Marx regarded the material base of these societies as the productive forces and the corresponding social relations. The productive forces in this regard constitute the instruments of production wherewith material values are produced, the people who operate the instruments of production and carry on the production of material values and the labour-power (labour skill), while the productive forces are only one aspect of mode of production in these societies, another aspect of production in these societal mode of production, is the relation of men to each other in the process of production—men's relations of production, which Marx described as social relations of production[7]. Marx and Engel regarded participation in the social relations as important characteristics of human beings, and that the nature of these social relations in the mode of production of these societies is inherently in conflict with the further productive capacities. This generates internal inefficiencies, social contradiction and conflicts among classes which inevitably altered the balance of social relations, which eventually give way to higher form of society (as primitive communalist give way to Asiatic societies, and Asiatic societies give way to feudal societies).

In feudal mode of production, the primary form of property is the possession of land in reciprocal contract relations: the possession of human beings as peasants or serfs is dependent upon their being entailed upon the land. Social relation of production is between the ruling class (noble or aristocrat) and the serf (lumpen class). Mick Brooks (2002) argued that 'exploitation under feudalism is clear and unveiled. Freer peasants had land to till and had to pay a rent in kind. Others had an intermediate status, working small plots to gain their own subsistence and forced to pay labour services the rest of the time, on the lord's land. The peasants pay services in money, labour or produce to the lords. Everyone can see what is going on. If the lord is in a position to force the peasant to work four days instead of three on his land, then it is clear to both parties that the rate of exploitation has been increased'[8]. This forms of exploitation which occurs through reciprocated contract formed the basis of class struggle between the landlord (noble) and the serfs.

The resultant social explosion that borne out of these class struggles was the 1381 Peasants' Revolt in England. The effect of the social dislocation caused by the peasants' revolt compelled the ruling class (the King, nobles and Landlords) to establish state structure (bodies of armed men that were mainly drawn from the ruling class) who had a monopoly of armed might. It was at this time that political and economic powers were in the same hands (the ruling class). 'Justice in the village was largely in the hands of the lords' manorial courts. The feudal lord and his men-at-arms were police, judge, and executioners all rolled into one'[9].

---

[6] See Karl Marx's (1859) book: title: 'Preface to the critique of Political Economy' available at http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm

[7] Productive forces comprise human labour power, technical know-how used in the means of production such as tools, equipment, buildings and technologies, materials, and improved land). While Social relations of production comprises the property, power and control relations governing society's productive assets, cooperative work relations and forms of association, relations between people and the objects of their work, and the relations between social classes.
[8] See Mick Brooks' (2002) article on 'what is Historical Materialism? A study guide with questions, extracts and suggested reading' available at http://www.marxist.com/historical-materialism-study-guide.htm

[9] See Karl Marx's (1867) Capital: a critique of Political Economy. Pp 694-809

State was therefore established at this time as an instrument of class rule, needed to protect the ruling class against the rebellious serfs. In transition from feudalism to capitalism, Marx noted that the ruling class created state as an instrument to suppress the agitations of the peasants who are clamouring for change and revolution. In this regard, the ruling class used state instrument and apparatus such as police, military, prison and judiciary to intimidate, repress and suppress agitation and opposition to its rules coming from the peasants. According to Marx, 'the state arose from the need to hold class antagonisms in check, but because it arose, at the same time, in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class....' The ancient and feudal states were organs for the exploitation of the slaves and serfs; likewise, "the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage-labour by capital. By way of exception, however, periods occur in which the warring classes balance each other so nearly that the state power as ostensible mediator acquires, for the moment, a certain degree of independence of both...." Such were the absolute monarchies of the 17th and 18th centuries, the Bonapartism of the First and Second Empires in France, and the Bismarck regime in Germany [10].

Therefore, state terrorism started in feudal era, was used against peasants' dissent. Despite the defeat of peasant's revolt and the resultant dispossession of land, feudal era marked a decisive stage in establishment of rational agriculture, and ushered a process of primitive accumulation by the merchants. The merchants (the future capitalists) began to turn their attention to the peasants half-employed on tiny plots of land. They began to 'put out' weaving to these households. The peasantry became more and more dependent on their weaving income. The merchants were able to move from just supplying raw materials and supplying sales outlets, to possession of the peasants, looms and even their cottages. Through their control over outlets they held the whip hand. This was another important process whereby the feudal peasantry was reduced to proletarian status. The new economic clout possessed by the merchants is constantly at class struggle with landowner and absolute monarchy who wants to keep the peasants on the land.

The feudalism under the auspices of feudal ruling class is having perpetual conflict with merchant bourgeoisie who wanted to generate surpluses and profits through expansion of markets and maximisation of export-oriented agricultural peasantry. Marx argued that 'the productive forces represented by the bourgeoisie rebelled against the order of production represented by the feudal landlords and the guild-masters. The result is known, the feudal fetters were smashed, gradually in England, at one blow in France. In Germany, the process is not yet finished. But just as, at a definite stage of its development, manufacturing came into conflict with the feudal order of production, so now large-scale industry has already come into conflict with the bourgeois order or production established in its place'[11]. Since capitalism represents higher level of development than feudalism, the latter had no option than to give way for the former. Therefore, the capitalist (Merchant bourgeoisie) displaced the feudal landlords and became the new ruling class in the capitalist society.

The destruction of peasant proprietorship (in the form of ownership of land by individual farmers) was regarded by Marx as an essential ingredient in the expansion of capitalism — a process which neither should nor could be prevented. The capitalist society heralded a new social relations and new productive forces that is fundamentally more sophisticated and advanced than the previous societal mode of production (such as feudalism) because most of the profit or the surplus extracted from the labour of the working class is reinvested in industry, commerce, tourism, investments abroad, or other forms of capital expenditure (Calhoun 2002:22). In this regard, Marx considered the capitalist class to be one of the most revolutionary in history, because it constantly improved the means of production, more so than any other

---

[10] See Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1973, pp. 326-27)

[11] See Karl Marx's (1867) Capital: a critique of Political Economy. Pp 671-713

class in history. Capitalist mode of production fosters inequality among the classes, and further divides the society into have (rich and super-rich) and have-not (the poor).

Marx further argued that the social contradictions that is inherent in capitalism such as excessive exploitation and crude accumulation of labour produced surplus value, excessive expansion, over-production, under-consumption, overstretching of credit system and falling rate of profit would in the long run punctuate economic growth and deepened recurring and cyclical depressions leading to mass unemployment, financial crisis, and systemic crisis of immense proportion that will inevitably usher conflicts within the social classes in the capitalist mode of production that will inevitably produces class struggle that necessitates its end, by giving way to socialism or socialist mode of production (Calhoun 2002:22).

In the contemporary world capitalist system, class crystallization within the society revolves around the ruling class, working class and the lumpen class. The ruling class comprises the capitalist, business sector leaders, political/power elites and the rich. The working class are the workers in factory and manufacturing sector, and civil/public servants. The lumpen class are the majority of the population. They 'consist of the millions of teeming labourers, peasant farmers, jobless graduates, underemployed workers, criminals, beggars, prostitutes, the poor and the aged' (Amzat and Olutayo 2009: 242).

In the period of capitalist crisis and contradiction, 'the class antagonism among the classes becomes sharper given the extreme polarisation and inequality between the rich and the poor, while capitalism cannot continue to guarantee certain social welfare scheme and economic package for employees and the citizenry. The ruling class in response to the crisis of capitalism ekes the position of 'class war' by undertaken savage cuts in living standards and harsh economic reforms, purposely to save capitalism from imminent collapse and negation. The rich and other members of the ruling class are less likely to be affected by these cut in social spending than the working and the lumpen classes. Therefore, the gap between the ruling class and the working/lumpen class become wider, and this will inevitably affects the prevailing social relations within capitalism. Reformist measures such as less pay (wages) but longer working time, mass sacking of employees, poor working conditions, cut in social spending and harsh austerity measures will be implemented. Thus triggers social conflicts and class struggle among the classes. In this situation, there is potential that class struggle that will lead to strikes, protest and industrial disharmony between the working class and the ruling class'[12].

The intensity of class antagonism during capitalist crisis depends on the social concession in terms of welfare package the ruling class is willing to offer to the working and lumpen class. In the developed countries, tensions among the classes are not so tense because the state can afford, and ensure that social security benefits; unemployment stipends, single mother benefits, scholarship and student loans, pension among others are made available to the working class and the lumpen class. This is possible because there is so much capital (wealth of the state) nurtured by over-exploitation of third world countries vis-a-vis taxes and incomes from multinational firms. Therefore, there are enough resources to soften the antagonism among social classes, and ensure that sections of the lumpen class are discouraged from forming or joining sectarian groups that will engage in violence and terrorism against the state.

But in developing countries, these forms of benefit are non-existent. This therefore makes social antagonism and divides among classes to be sharper especially in the period of capitalist crisis. The sharper this antagonism between classes, the more the lumpen class becomes frustrated and aggrieved. The frustrated and de-classed members of the lumpen class who are angry with the state of affair become the willing tools in the hand of groups/organisations susceptible to the use of terrorism against the state. This form of terrorism against the state by individual or group is called Individual terrorism[13].

---

[12] See Ogunrotifa (2012). Pp.6

[13] Ogunrotifa (2008:24) did a thorough study on terrorism. Thus, he described individual terrorism as an act of terror unleashed by individual, group or organization, as a means of expressing their grievances

The contradictions caused by the capitalist mode of production and the inability of the state (domination of ruling class) to provide for lumpen class is recipe for anarchy. This is because unemployed and others who cannot understand the series of frustration caused by the capitalist crisis will be forced to response to the crisis one way or the other. Frustrated sections of the lumpen class are more likely form criminal gangs, radical Islamic groups, sects, fascist and terrorist organisations, who will find more solutions to their plight and social condition by engaging in anarchism, and other forms of individual terrorist method against the state. However, the use of individual terrorism to create or induce fear by any group or organisation in expressing grievances against the state is dangerous and counter-productive—as this will be countered and confronted by the state—who is better armed to engage in counter-terrorism/combatants operations against the perpetrators of Individual terrorism.

The use of individual terrorism method by the non-state actor will give state the necessary excuse and opportunity to clamp down on citizens' dissent on the pretence of counter-terrorism or war against terror (State terrorism). This was confirmed given the provocation, condemnation and global responses that characterised the unfortunate individual act of terror allegedly perpetrated by the Al-Qaeda on United States in 2001. That act of terror gave United State, Europeans states and states around the world, the excuse to tighten their respective local laws, formulate harsh anti-terrorism act and restrict human rights (Kielsgard 2006:249-261), and perpetrated state terrorism (counter-terrorism) against certain groups/organisations linked to individual terrorism, in their watch lists. The War on 'terror' that was spearheaded by the United States and western countries started by tightening and formulating enabling laws in their respective states, was extended abroad to Africa, Middle-Ease and Latin America.

Terrorism is therefore a reflection of social relations among social classes within modern capitalism (Jonathan, 2011) such that the use of terror can be perpetrated by any of the classes whenever their interests, rights and priviledges are at stake. The ruling class use state terrorism to suppress citizens' dissent and counter the revolt from below—from the working and lumpen class. While the lumpen class who are mostly member of certain group or organisation use individual terrorism to express their grievances and lash out at societal injustice. In this case, terrorist could be state and non-state actors depending on the context of the socio-political situation. The usefulness of Historical Materialism in understanding the nature of terrorism lies in the fact that terrorism is within the society not outside it, and that terrorist is not limited to non-state actor (individual or group) but also institution such as state itself. Therefore, terrorist is not a fixed label as realist theorists want us to believe.

Consequently, individuals and groups who are non-state actor are terrorists if they used individual terrorism method to achieve their objective and express grievances but also cease to be terrorists the moment they drop individual terrorism as method of struggle. Just like strikes, picketing and protest are method used by the working class to express grievances, individual terrorism is a method used by the lumpen class to express grievances and lash out at societal injustices. Therefore, the use of label 'terrorist' by the realist theorists and their western states and media is unjustified and unwarranted.
Through Historical Materialist perspective, terrorism can be defined as the method of violence used by the state and non-state actors to instil fear to their respective target with a view to protecting their interest and responding to the socio-economic and political situation in the society.

Historical Materialism in the Face of Contemporary Terrorist Attacks
The contemporary era has witnessed avalanche of terrorist attacks as state and non state actors balance each other out in the context of the existing social relations that characterised global capitalist system. Apart from the violence, war and terrorism that shaped the cold war, the post cold-war era has seen how

---

against the actions and policies of the state or another state with a view of achieving certain interest be it economic, political and social.

method of state and individual terrorism transcend beyond a national boundary. State terrorism in the 21st century comprises: state terrorism against her own citizen, state sponsored of terrorism in another state or country, and foreign intervention of state(s) in another state. All these are state terrorism because the ruling class in a particular state or society used state instrument and institution to coerce, intimidate and harass her citizens, non-state actors and other state. However, the use of individual terrorism method by Osama Bin Laden and his Al-queada group against New York and Washington in 2001, and London in 2005 was deemed successful by groups who oppose their own state institution, and were encouraged to use such method.

The approval of individual terrorism method by Al-queada has received much impetus from groups or organisations who are non-state actors in Africa, Middle east, Latin America and Europe, and many realist critics has regarded this as 'transnational terrorism'. What is clear is that member of the lumpen class who have been frustrated by the socio-economic condition in their respective society formed or joined non state actor group who used individual terrorism to achieve specific objective. Due to the sophistication of state apparatus and instrument of terror, these groups aligned increasingly with sophisticated and lethal group that has broad anti-Western Jihadist agenda like al-Qaida in order to challenge their own state instrument of power.

James Lutz (2010) in his documentation of numerous examples of state terrorism posited that 'In Burundi the periodic pogroms against Hutus by the Tutsi elite qualified as terrorism. The targets of the violence were not able to avoid death by individual lawful behaviour. P pogroms against Jews in Central and Eastern Europe that occurred after the 1970s with the tacit or active consent of governments would qualify as terrorism as well. More recently, the government of Sudan has unleashed Arab *janjaweed* militias against its domestic opponents, first in the southern, mainly Christian, part of the country and then in Darfur (which is mainly populated by African muslims) as part of efforts to terrify dissident groups into submission' Added to the spate of state terrorism is the action of the supporters of President Mugabe in Zimbabwe whose government's party para-militaries and veterans of the independence struggles when directed against members of the opposition in last presidential election (Lutz 2010: 39).

Other examples of state terrorism are the use of state repression against opposition and protesters in Libya, Syria, Bahrain, and Egypt during the Arab spring protest. Further examples of state terrorism is the state sponsored of terrorism in other states or countries: Libya state sponsorship and support for Irish Republican Army (IRA) against British occupation of Northern Ireland (Trebon 1988), US and CIA sponsorship of Mujahedeen against Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1981, American invasion of Grenada in 1983, American invasion of Afghanistan in 2001; US, Britain and France's invasion and occupation of Iraq in 2004, Israel bombing of Palestinians, and United States' use of conflicts and military might to engage and intimidate enemy states, and the assassination attempts on foreign leaders amounted state terrorism. State in this example is a terrorist because of the use of state instrument of repression to terrorise her citizen, citizen of other states and government of other states.

On the other side is the member of the lumpen class who have been used by group(s) or organisation(s) to carry out individual terrorism against state and other states. Frustrated member of the lumpen class either form or join groups or organisations whose objective is in sharp contrast to the state. The examples of these groups are Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) in Spain, Irish Republican Army (IRA) in UK, Ku Klux Klan (KKK) in US and others such as Al Qaeda, Hezbollah in Lebanon, Al- Shabaab in Somalia, Sunni Islamic extremist groups—such as Egyptian Islamic Jihad and Al-Gama'at Al-Islamiyya in Egypt, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, Salafi Group in Algeria, Hamas in Palestine, Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) in Turkey, Movement for the Emancipation of Niger-Delta (MEND) and Jama'atu Ahlis Sunna Lidda'awati Wal-Jihad (known as Boko Haram) in Nigeria. Some of these groups or organisations have been linked to bombing and terrorist attack in the recent times. For instance, Al Qaeda was alleged to have carried out suicide bombing of New York and Washington in 2001, and London in 2005;

Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) linked to 2004 Madrid train bombings in Spain, Movement for the Emancipation of Niger-Delta (MEND) have claimed responsibility for the bombing of oil installation in Niger-Delta as a protest against Nigerian state, while Boko Haram has claimed responsibility for the bombing of police and military formation in Northern Nigeria from 2010 to 2012. These groups are not terrorist organisation as realist theorists claimed but they are terrorists because they employ the use of individual terrorism method to express grievances and achieve set objectives. They also cease to be terrorists the moment they renounce this method of individual terrorism.

Conclusion

Today's terrorism is not fundamentally and remarkably different from that of the cold-war era given the ideological underpinning of state and non-state actors terrorism and how this reflect the dynamics of unending class struggle implicit in the hidden structures of oppression and structured contradictions in the material world which global system of capitalism represents. The discursive frame of terrorism cannot be analysed in isolation of its class nature and the socio-economic conditions that gave rise to it. This is the point that realist theorists ignored. It is therefore important that Karl Marx's Historical Materialism exposes the class nature of terrorism in the current mode of production (capitalism) and how terrorism (from both state and non-state actors—member of lumpen class who formed or joined (groups/organisation) emerged out of the existing social relation of production among classes in the society.

The argument of realist approach that there are terrorists, and they exist 'out there' regardless of the historical context is not true. Terrorism and terrorist act are produced out of the reflection of social relations among classes in a global capitalist mode of production. The ruling class in the society who the instrumentality of state power and apparatus of government at their disposal to protect their interest, and to suppress and intimidate working class, lumpen class and other groups in the society who oppose their primordial interest is a terrorists, while the lumpen class is terrorists because they used individual terrorism method to respond to state oppression and frustrated socio-economic condition. To be a terrorist is not a fixed label as any of the classes in the society can use terror whenever their interests, rights and priviledges are at stake, and restrain from it whenever their desires and objectives have been achieved.
Therefore, in an unending class struggle (which capitalism props up) among classes in the society, terrorism is a tactics of all side and not that of the lumpen (oppressed class) as realist theorists want us to believe.

Policy Implications

The application of realist theory has shaped policy direction in the mainstream western world as to what is terrorism and who is a terrorist? Realist theorists have made great strides in disseminating the false perceptions that permeate the international debate on terrorism. This has further gives the western states undue advantage in labelling and classifying terrorist as far as global power relations is concerned. Thus, triggers a new imbalance on mainstream media reportage of terrorist events around the world. However, the politics of naming which the dominant mainstream used on groups who they labelled as 'terrorists' or 'terrorist organisations' often undermine ongoing effort at achieving peaceful resolution of conflicts in the world as the labelled or stigmatised groups continue to harden their stance and tone, build up arms and become more combative at the slightest provocation. This was demonstrated by Martha Crenshaw's (2005:88) observation on the politics of naming. Crenshaw posits that 'the terrorist label may impede American understanding of Hezbollah,' she wrote, 'but it is unclear how much that understanding would improve if the term were not applied.'

Crenshaw argument is helpful in pointing out critical component of realist interpretation which United States and other states in the West applied in the 'war on terror'. With Historical materialist approach, western states and other states in the world must come to the grim reality that terrorism is a class struggle

between classes in the society—as all classes engaged in it to protect their interest or express grievances. Therefore, being a 'terrorist' is not a fixed label as all party to political conflicts used it to portray opponent, opposition and enemy as an evildoer in order to win support for their own cause. Adequate knowledge of Historical Materialism will be useful in shaping new policy direction towards dropping off terrorist label and classification that have been the policy trademark of western capitalist states and media, and to draw necessary conclusion that groups or organisations used individual terrorism to express grievances and lash out at societal injustices, rather than viewing them as 'terrorists' and 'terrorist groups' that needs to be forcefully disarmed or crushed. Therefore, foreign policy must orientate towards critical engagement in negotiation with groups linked with individual terrorism as far the need for global peace and co-existence is concerned.

Finally, it is important to state that the appropriate social and public policy formulation is needed to salvage the cyclical social dislocations orchestrated the global capitalist crisis, and to discourage the youth who are mostly member of the lumpen class from joining organised groups/organisations tainted with individual terrorism. This can be achieved through equitable distribution of wealth and by taken all grievances seriously rather than police and military measures to address this problem. For Western capitalist states it is much easier to fight individual terrorism with military force, than introducing complex economic measures, such as an equitable redistributive mechanism in the global market. To fight terrorism, efforts should be made to ensure that large members of the lumpen class are integrated into the working class through provision of job opportunities. The current global war on terror is unwinnable as long as poverty, inequality and economic oppression continue in the Third world societies.

References

Amzat, J. and Olutayo, O. A. (2009) 'Nigeria, Capitalism and the Question of Equity'. *Anthropologist,* 2009, 11(4):239-246

Ashley, R. K.(1981) 'Political Realism and Human Interest' *International Studies Quarterly*25(2): 204-236.

Bhatia, M. (2005) Fighting Words: Naming Terrorists, Bandits, Rebels and Other Violent Actors. *Third World Quarterly* 26(1):5-22.

Blakeley, R. (2009) *State Terrorism and Neoliberalism: The North in the South.* Abingdon: Routledge

Mick Brooks, M. (2002) 'what is Historical Materialism? A study guide with questions, extracts and suggested reading' available at http://www.marxist.com/historical-materialism-study-guide.htm. Date Visited 30th April, 2012

Carr, C. (2002). *The Lessons of Terror*. New York: Random House.

Copleston, F.C. (2003). *A History of Philosophy: Volume 7: 18th and 19th century German philosophy*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Craig J. Calhoun (2002). *Classical Sociological Theory*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Crenshaw, Martha (2005) The Name Game. *Foreign Policy. Available at* http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2005/07/01/the_name_game *Date visited 25th march, 2012.*

Duvall, R. and Varadarajan, L. (2003) 'On the Practical Significance of Critical International Relations Theory'. *Asian Journal of Political Science* 11(2):75–88.

Fiala, A. (2002). *Terrorism and the Philosophy of History: Liberalism, Realism, and the Supreme Emergency Exemption. Essays* in Philosophy, Vol. 3, April 2002. Available at http://www.humboldt.edu/~essays/fiala.html.

Gunning, J. (2007) 'A Case for Critical Terrorism Studies' *Government and Opposition*, 42(3): 363-393

Herring, E. (2008) 'Critical terrorism studies: an activist scholar perspective. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 1 (2): 197-211

Hoffman, B. (1998) *Inside Terrorism*. London: Victor Gollancz

Horsman, S. (2005) Themes in official discourses on Terrorism in Central Asia. *Third World Quarterly* 26(1):199-213

Jonathan J. (2011) Terrorism as a social relation within capitalism: theoretical and emancipatory implications. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 4(1): 23-37

Jackson, R. (2009) 'Critical Terrorism Studies: An Explanation, a Defence and a Way Forward' *BISA Annual Conference*, pp.1-25 available at http://www.bisa.ac.uk/index.php?option=com_bisa&task=download_paper&no_html=1&passed_paper_id=54 (accessed on 25 February 2012)

Katz, C.J (1993) 'Karl Marx on the transition from Feudalism to Capitalism'. *Theory and Society*, 22: 363-389

Keohane, R. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Kielsgard, M.D. (2006) 'A Human Rights Approach to Counter-Terrorism'. *California Western International Law Journal*, 36: 249-261.

Klarevas, L. (2004) 'Political Realism: A culprit for the 9/11 attacks'. *Harvard International Review*, 26: 19.

Lutz, J.M. A Critical review of Critical Terrorism Studies. Perspectives on Terrorism, 2010, Vol. 4(6):1-10

Mearsheimer, J. J. (1990), 'Back to the Future. Instability in Europe after the Cold War'. *International Security*, 15(1): 5-56.

Morgenthau, H.J.(1951) *In Defense of the National Interest*. New York: Knopf, 1951

Narozhna, T and Knight, W. (2009) 'Understanding Suicide Terrorism: Problem-Solving Approach to Suicide Terrorism'. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies,* 3(2): 8-28

Nadarajah, S. and Sriskandarajah, D. (2005) 'Liberation Struggle or Terrorism? The Politics of naming the Ltte', *Third World Quarterly,* 26(1):87-100

Niebuhr, R. (2001) *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. New York: Scribner's

Ogunrotifa A.B. (2012) Putting Historical Materialism into Terrorism studies. *International Journal of Current Research*, 4(4):6-7

Peteet, J. (2005) Words as Interventions: Naming in the Palestine-Israel Conflict. *Third World Quarterly,* 26(1):153-72

Pillar, P. (2001). *Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press.

Schroeder, M.J. (2005) 'Bandits and Blanket Thieves, communists and Terrorists: the politics of naming Sandinistas in Nicaragua, 1927-36 and 1979-90'. *Third World Quarterly,* 26(1):67-86

Silke, A. '*Contemporary terrorism studies: issues in research'*, in R. Jackson, M. B. Smyth and J. Gunning, eds. Critical Terrorism Studies: A new research agenda. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009, pp.34-48

Toros and Gunning '*Exploring a Critical theory approach in Terrorism studies'*, in R. Jackson, M. B. Smyth and J. Gunning, eds. Critical Terrorism Studies: A new research agenda. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009

Toros, H. 2008. Terrorists, Scholars and Ordinary People: Confronting Terrorism Studies with Field Experiences", Critical Studies on Terrorism, 1(2): 297-92

Turk, A.T. (2004) 'Sociology of Terrorism'. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30:271-286