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Abstract

Propaganda of the Deed is a conceptual tradition which uses calculated and media-oriented terrorist violence with symbolic and strategic intent. This research examined how Propaganda of the Deed has endured over the last one hundred and forty years to influence the continuity of terrorism as a form of political discourse. This thesis illuminates previously unidentified paradigms and paradigmatic shifts in the use of Propaganda of the Deed.

Propaganda of the Deed was investigated using a comparative historical analysis. David Rapoport’s Four Waves of Modern Terror theory provided the analytical framework. This delimited the research field, with one representative terrorist movement selected from each wave. The research methodology was based on analysis of terrorist propaganda, and situated using the historical context and empirical record. The use of Propaganda of the Deed by those focus movements was then cross analysed through six major themes found in terrorist propaganda. Those themes included advocating the theoretical purpose; justifying the transition to violence; celebrating the strategic methodology; advising on the tactics; its implementation as a systematic campaign; and glorifying the revolution and martyrdom.

This thesis aimed to address the gap in knowledge currently affecting Propaganda of the Deed in the history of terrorism. Established research in the field is lacking in historical analysis, being largely written by journalists, sociologists, and political scientists. An historical study using this methodology and framework has no precedent. Historical analyses provide an original comprehensive perspective, and yield new outcomes on how Propaganda of the Deed in terrorism has endured throughout history.

Research also involved an examination of whether later terrorist movements were familiar with the usage of Propaganda of the Deed by earlier movements. The study concluded that terrorist movements were often aware of the writings of earlier movements, though this was not referenced directly in the propaganda. Therefore it is plausible that terrorists were influenced by the actions of preceding groups. The historical context also suggests that there was an opportunity for the transmission of revolutionary knowledge, both directly and indirectly, through the movement of revolutionaries around the globe.
The thesis identified a series of previously unrecognised paradigms and paradigmatic shifts in the use of Propaganda of the Deed by the focus movements. These paradigmatic shifts were the result of changes in the historical context, technology, and ideology. The study thus establishes that Propaganda of the Deed is both traditional and innovative. It has changed incrementally in unique ways with each new wave, especially in regards to the manifestation of strategic and tactical methodologies. However, the overarching strategic intent, observed in the justification for violence and the theoretical purposes, demonstrated adherence to the traditional concept. Therefore, Propaganda of the Deed is innovative in transcending previous paradigms, while simultaneously conserving its traditional intent.
Introduction

…this irrepressible violence is neither storm in a teacup nor the reemergence of savage instincts nor even a consequence of resentment: it is man reconstructing himself. I believe we once knew, and have since forgotten, the truth that no indulgence can erase the marks of violence: violence alone can eliminate them.¹

Jean-Paul Sartre, 1961

Propaganda of the Deed is the conceptual tradition which underpins modern terrorism. For over one hundred and forty years, terrorists have used violence, as Sartre suggests, not to demonstrate the re-emergence of savage instincts, but to reconstruct society in pursuit of their idealised society: a revolutionary abstraction. Terrorists hoped that through the use of Propaganda of the Deed and coercive violence, they would bring about change. In doing so, the concept has influenced the rise of terrorism as a form of contemporary political discourse. It is intrinsic to contextualising the endurance of terrorism throughout modern history, and establishes an important historical precedent for the adaptive ability of terror. While terrorist groups rose and fell, the Propaganda of the Deed endured. It changed incrementally with each new adaptation, but the intent remained the same.

This thesis investigates the Propaganda of the Deed using David Rapoport’s analytical framework, the Four Waves of Modern Terrorism theory.² From each wave, or energy,³ representative terrorist groups were selected: the Russian anarchists/populists from the nineteenth century; Irish anti-colonialists of the early twentieth century; German New Leftists in the twentieth century; and salafi jihadists of the late twentieth and early twenty-first

³ The term used by Rapoport to divide the Four Waves. Ibid.
century. Propaganda of the Deed was examined through these four focus movements by analysing the major themes in their propaganda. There were six dominant, but not exclusive, themes: establishing a theoretical platform; legitimising violent action; exalting the strategic methodology; discussing the tactical methodology; employing these methods in a systematic campaign; and glorifying the revolution and martyrdom.

No previous research comparatively analyses these propaganda themes within the empirical and historical context, using Rapoport’s theory as the analytical framework. Research on Propaganda of the Deed rarely builds on a comparative analysis, and seldom investigates the differences in its usage and implications on an historical scale. Within a significant amount of research into contemporary terrorism, there is little in-depth analysis of Propaganda of the Deed, or how it may contribute to the endurance of terrorism. While its conception has been widely researched, its endurance and adaptation has not.

The term Propaganda of the Deed was born of the broader international anarchist community, with Pyotr Kropotkin, Errico Malatesta, and Carlo Cafiero all contributing. Propaganda of the Deed was first implemented in 1878, in Russia, when Vera Zasulich shot and injured General Dmitry Trepov. This act was initially based on her desire to avenge a fellow revolutionary abused in prison, however, it garnered political significance ex post facto. Her acquittal by the jury was interpreted by the terrorists as social approval of the use of terrorism, and its systematic use began. Attacks were redolent with symbolism, so early targets included the tsar, and senior government officials. Later, military, intelligence, security, political, and civil symbols became legitimate targets. With the rise of democratic nation-states and the idea of sovereignty of the people, the onus of responsibility was transferred to civilians who allegedly show their agreement with government polices by virtue of elections. Civilians are now

---

5 Ibid. p44
popular targets for mass casualty terrorism, as this guarantees greater media coverage and enhances the dissemination of propaganda.

Research Questions

1. How has Propaganda of the Deed endured over the last century and a half, and influenced terrorism as a form of political discourse?

Subsidiary Questions:

a. What similarities and differences can be seen in Propaganda of the Deed across time and space?

b. Did the use of Propaganda of the Deed by the focus movements influence subsequent movements?

The continuity of terrorism highlights its importance as a form of modern political discourse. As events such as the rise of Islamic State (and with it the current War on Terror) attests, international and domestic terrorism are increasing in global relevance. Martin Miller suggested in 2008 that:

...there is an increasing reliance on the use of violence as a means either to achieve a desired political goal seen as unattainable by nonviolent methods, or to neutralise the current perceived threat.

He saw terrorism as a “historically contextualized phenomena characterized by the violent combat between governments and societies.” Miller suggests that current research is lacking in historical analysis, being largely written by journalists, sociologists, and political scientists. This thesis addresses that gap by providing a historical comparative analysis of Propaganda of the Deed in the history of terrorism.

---

7 Garrison wrote, “Modern terrorism is two hundred years old, and she hasn’t aged a day.” Arthur H. Garrison, "Defining Terrorism: Philosophy of the Bomb, Propaganda by Deed and Change through Fear and Violence," Criminal Justice Studies 17, no. 3 (2004). p277


9 Ibid. p125

10 Ibid. p126
Propaganda of the Deed itself requires more investigation. As the fundamental justification for violence, it provides the *modus operandi* for extremist political minorities pursuing violent revolution. It is vital that the continuity of this strategy is understood, as Miller indicated that terrorism “never really ceases to exist as much as it falls off the media’s radar until a spectacular incident occurs.”¹¹ Propaganda of the Deed channels the strategic intent of terrorism, by proclaiming the purpose, justification, strategy, tactics, campaign, and glorification. Bruce Hoffman, who investigated the *modus operandi* of terrorism since the 1960s, found:

> An almost Darwinian principle of natural selection seems to affect terrorist organizations, whereby, (as noted above) every new terrorist generation learns from its predecessors, becoming smarter, tougher, and more difficult to capture or eliminate. In this respect, terrorists also analyze the “lessons” drawn from mistakes made by former comrades...¹²

One of those lessons was Propaganda of the Deed. An enhanced understanding of this strategy in the evolution of terrorism may assist in a better understanding of the terrorist capacity to endure, through capitalising on historical precedent. Consequently, this research has important contemporary and historical elements.

**Contribution**

This research contributes to the field of knowledge by inquiring into how Propaganda of the Deed influenced the endurance of terrorist violence since the nineteenth century. Though this conceptual tradition has been acknowledged as important to terrorist doctrine, it is very rarely the sole subject of analysis. As a conceptual tradition within terrorism, Propaganda of the Deed is subject to adaptation and innovation by its users, which augments the endurance of the tradition while retaining its original strategic intent.

In addition, this thesis comparatively analyses Propaganda of the Deed by investigating the possible influence of focus movements on subsequent movements, in an attempt to determine

---

¹¹ Ibid. p132
if tangible connections between the groups can be verified by historical evidence. While the terrorists did not refer directly to each other’s propaganda, it is likely there was some familiarity with earlier groups’ instructional manuals and propaganda. In some instances there may also have been indirect and abstract influence due to population movement. If not, it may be that the inspiration to use Propaganda of the Deed is an instinctive process, as Walter Laqueur suggested in his “Instinctive Terror” hypothesis.\(^\text{13}\)

A comparative analysis of the six propaganda themes, using the selected focus movements, has never been previously undertaken. This analysis contributes original findings regarding paradigms that exist primarily between the Russian anarchist and the West German New Left focus movements; and those that exist between the Irish anti-colonialist and Jihadist focus movements. Several common paradigms, and paradigm shifts, are identified through this methodology. This has enhanced the understanding of Propaganda of the Deed by demonstrating the common components, the unique adaptations, and the innovations pertinent to each.

The value of this thesis lies in positioning Propaganda of the Deed as an active series of themes in the propaganda which, when analysed, illuminate underlying features of the terrorist mindset, ideology, strategic intent, and methodological coherence; in addition to situating the terrorists within the broader historical context and existing paradigms. This makes “Under the Shadows of Swords” a significant and original contribution to the knowledge regarding Propaganda of the Deed in the history of terrorism.

**Chapter Outline**

This thesis comprises ten chapters. The first, *Pen and Bullet*, covers the mechanics of the research. The definitions which clarify the parameters of this research are explored, then the theoretical approach, research methodology, conceptual framework, selection criteria, and overarching themes are outlined and the literature reviewed. The main body of the thesis

allocates two chapters to each representative movement. The first chapter for each movement introduces the revolutionary context, ideology, select propagandists, and groups. The second analyses their propaganda and deeds through the six propaganda elements, namely: theoretical purpose, justification for violence, strategic method, tactical method, systematic campaign, and glorification of violence.

Chapter Two, Cloak and Dagger, begins in the cradle of modern terrorism. Nineteenth century Russia was caught in the grasp of tsarist feudalism, and became turbulent with the rise of the ideology of anarchism. The chapter introduces the propagandists who consolidated Propaganda of the Deed, such as Pyotr Kropotkin, Mikhail Bakunin, and Vera Figner; and their contributions to the creation of the Propaganda of the Deed. Chapter Three, Dynamite and Daring, analyses the way these propagandists and the focus movement, the Narodnaya Volya, comprehended and used Propaganda of the Deed. It draws attention to the bombing of the Winter Palace and the Odessa Rail, and the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. Russian anarchist terrorism dwindled with the revolution of 1905, and was absorbed in the chaos of the Great War and the 1917 Revolution.

Chapter Four, Blood and Soil, deals with Irish anti-colonialists seeking to remove the shackles of Imperial Britain. Their discontent had manifested earlier under Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, Padraig Pearse, and James Connolly. But it was in the early twentieth century that the new generation of leaders, such as Michael Collins and Florence O’Donoghue, used terrorism in a successful campaign, in addition to other insurrectionary measures. The terrorists’ ideology, groups, and leading figures are discussed. Chapter Five, Soldiers and Spies, examines how the Irish Volunteers and Republican Army understood and implemented Propaganda of the Deed. Main events include the Easter Rising, Bloody Sunday, and the martyrdom of Connolly.

The New Left terror of the 1970’s is introduced in Chapter Six, Guns and Drugs. New Leftist ideology inspired a new wave, fighting the capitalist establishment. At the forefront was the German Baader-Meinhof Gang, also known as the Red Army Faction (Rote Armee Fraktion).
Here, Ulrike Meinhof and her associates such as Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin are introduced, along with the group’s ideology. Chapter Seven, *New Colour and New Clothing*, investigates how the Red Army Faction exploited Propaganda of the Deed. Their use of Propaganda of the Deed matured after the capture and imprisonment of the core leaders, while new leaders sought to coerce the West German government into releasing their comrades. The main events include the shooting of Benno Ohnesorg, the assassination of Hanns Martin Schleyer, the May Offensive, and the German Autumn.

Chapter Eight, *Sword and Prayer*, brings the history to the modern day with the religious wave of terror, in the form of international *salafi jihadism*. These current revolutionaries, the *mujahedeen* or holy warriors, have shown their mastery of Propaganda of the Deed in such a way as to make its continuity highly relevant to modern terrorist operations. This chapter explores the revolutionary and religious context, then introduces terrorists such as Osama bin Laden and Ayman al Zawahiri, with special attention to *al’ Qaeda* and its closest affiliated groups. Chapter Nine, *Steel and Ideals*, explores how the Islamists interpreted and exploited Propaganda of the Deed. This terrorism is still occurring at the time of writing, therefore this section only covers 1979 to 2014. The main events include the attack on the World Trade Centre, the London bombings, the Madrid train bombing, and the Bali bombing.

Chapter Ten, *Flame and Ash*, discusses how the past one hundred and forty years of terrorist strategy has become streamlined under Propaganda of the Deed. It brings together the arguments of the preceding chapters to extrapolate on the continuity and tradition of Propaganda of the Deed in terrorism, especially in light of the paradigms and paradigmatic shifts identified in the propaganda themes. It situates the outcomes in accordance with the subsidiary research questions regarding whether use of Propaganda of the Deed by the focus movements influenced subsequent movements, and what differences and similarities demonstrate paradigms. This chapter also orientates this study within the wider field of terrorist research.

**Conclusions**
This research found that Propaganda of the Deed has endured for the last one hundred and forty years to influence the development of terrorism as a form of political discourse. It has done this through becoming a traditional method of political protest. This tradition is not static, but constantly augmented by circumstances and experience. The original strategy, as conceived by the anarchists, has been retained while it has also simultaneously been transcended by later groups. Propaganda of the Deed is characterised by both tradition and innovation, due to the influence of the contemporary context, technology, and ideology.

There are congruencies between the focus movements based on their ideology - whether forward-facing or based on historical past; their situational historical context - especially in regards to technology and ideology; and significant commonalities in their strategic and symbolic intent. However, in some cases, how this intent manifested was entirely different. These shifts represent anomalies which forced the terrorists to alter their way of knowing, and find new methods to achieve their goals. The comparative approach highlighted previously unappreciated paradigms concerning the operandi modus of political violence, while also finding terrorists were able to adapt or break from paradigms to suit their terrorspace.

Finally, it is likely that later terrorists were familiar with some of the propaganda and instructional manuals of preceding terrorists, although this is not directly referenced in their writing. The focus terrorists were predominantly well-educated, and studied previous revolutions. It is therefore possible that they were influenced by the actions of preceding groups. It is also possible the revolutionary memory was carried through the international movement and emigration of terrorists. The transmission of the ideas, it is suggested, can be traced through the movement of those who used Propaganda of the Deed. In more recent times, the tradition has been shared by groups directly through collaboration and training camps.

However, the findings of this thesis remain limited because of the methodology. Using the Four Waves Theory as an analytical framework, while valuable in streamlining the research
parameters, limits the outcomes to the specific focus movements. The conclusions, especially regarding the paradigms and paradigmatic shifts, are restricted to the representative focus movements, and may not apply to other terrorist groups. Propaganda of the Deed must therefore be further investigated, as it has become a traditional and innovative method of protest, demonstrated by the continuity and adaptations of the concept to suit the terrorpsace.
Chapter One: Pen and Bullet

Framing the Study

This thesis examines focus movements in the history of terrorism in order to analyse the endurance, evolution, influence, and innovation of the concept of Propaganda of the Deed. It is accepted that “Terrorism is a historically contextualized phenomena characterized by violent combat between governments and societies over unresolved political issues.”¹ David Rapoport’s Four Waves of Terror theory provides the analytical framework for the study, which selects a terrorist group and affiliates as a focus movement, representative of each historical wave. This sets the parameters for the research. This chapter discusses the main definitions and terms used in the thesis. It identifies and outlines the primary propagandists and terrorist writings of the selected groups. Finally, literature on Propaganda of the Deed is reviewed to orientate the thesis within the field of previous research.

Definitions and Terms

Academic literature variously describes terrorism as a tool, a theatre, a psychological weapon, and a tactic. To date, there is no single agreed definition of ‘terrorism’, perhaps because the evocative nature of terrorism undermines etymological objectivity. The term itself comes from the French Revolution (1789-1792), in which la Grande Terreur violence is estimated to have killed 500,000 people.² Terrorism was initially subject to descriptive etymological analysis in the 1970’s, but as this brief review demonstrates, new definitions emerged after the attack on the World Trade Centre in 2001. However, earlier descriptive definitions for terrorism may prove the most useful for historical analysis.

¹ Miller, "Ordinary Terrorism in Historical Perspective." p125
In 1975, noting that in popular discourse, ‘terrorists’ included revolutionaries, political extremists, criminals using politics as an excuse, and the mentally ill, Jenkins defined terrorism:

The threat of violence, individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear – to terrorize – may be called terrorism. Terrorism is violence for effect; not only, and sometimes not at all, for the effect on the actual victims of the terrorists’. In fact, the victim may be totally unrelated to the terrorists cause. Terrorism is violence aimed at the people watching.³

Jenkins thus situated terrorism by its intent more than its method. He also highlighted the importance of the attention that terrorism garnered. Terrorists were able to attract a disproportionate amount of attention worldwide, which allowed them to coerce governments. Therefore Jenkins established a definition of terrorism as a public event with intent to cause fear, with both actors and audience.

In 1988, Haig Khatchadourian discussed terrorism as a conceptual problem and as morally wrong, in light of Just War Theory.⁴ He decided that, while terrorism is difficult to define, it may be described:

An adequate description of any type, species or form of terrorism must minimally include a description of the following five aspects or elements of terrorism in general: (1) the socioeconomic or historical and cultural root causes of its incidence (e.g., homelessness); (2) its immediate, intermediate, and long-range or ultimate goals (e.g., retaliation, publicity, and the regaining of a lost homeland, respectively); and (3) the forms and methods of coercion and force generally used to terrorize the immediate victims and those the terrorists coerce or hope to coerce as a result...; (4) the nature or kinds of organizations and institutions, or the political systems, supporting or sponsoring the terrorism...[and] (5) the social, political, economic, or military circumstances in which the terrorism occurs; e.g., whether it occurs in time of peace or in wartime.⁵

This description provides a framework for analysis, and has the merit of proposing a broad context for analytical studies into terrorism. Terrorism as a descriptive act can attempt to bypass the condemnatory prejudice identified by Norman Swazo when he investigated jihadi

³ Brian Jenkins, "International Terrorism," in California Seminar on Arms Control and Foreign Policy (California: Crescent Publications, 1975).p1
⁵ Ibid. p132
morality. Swazo found that moral sensitivity about terrorism makes its conceptualisation problematic.\(^6\)

The Australian legal definition of terrorism in the Commonwealth Criminal Code is largely descriptive. A terrorist act is defined as:

\[
\text{... an action or threat of action where:}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a) } & \text{the action falls within subsection (2) and does not fall within subsection (3); and} \\
\text{(b) } & \text{the action is done or the threat is made with the intention of advancing a political, religious or} \\
\text{ideological cause; and} \\
\text{(c) } & \text{the action is done or the threat is made with the intention of:} \\
\text{\quad (i) coercing, or influencing by intimidation, the government of the Commonwealth or a State,} \\
\text{Territory or foreign country, or of part of a State, Territory or foreign country; or} \\
\text{\quad (ii) intimidating the public or a section of the public.}\(^7\)
\end{align*}
\]

Subsection two includes acts, or threat of acts, causing serious harm or disruption to people, property, information and telecommunication systems, transport systems, utilities, essential government services, or financial services. Meanwhile, subsection three excludes industrial action, advocacy, protest, and unintended violence from the definition of terrorism. This definition is similar to those used in legislation and criminal codes throughout the Western world. As a legal definition of criminal behaviour, it does not countenance the circumstances of terrorism emphasised in Khatchadourian’s early review.

In 2001 (but before the 9/11 attacks), Paul Wilkinson distinguished terrorism from other modes of conflict by the following criteria:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{It is premeditated and designed to create a climate of fear;} \\
\text{It is directed at a wider target than the immediate victims;} \\
\text{It inherently involves attacks on random or symbolic targets, including civilians;} \\
\text{It is considered in society as ‘extra-normal’, that is in the literal sense that it violates the norms} \\
\text{regarding disputes, protest and dissent; and} \\
\text{It is used primarily, though not exclusively, to influence the political behaviour of governments,} \\
\text{communities or specific social groups.}\(^8\)
\end{align*}
\]

---


\(^7\) Australia, Criminal Code Amendment (Terrorism) Act of 2003, no 40, part 5.3, div 100.1. np

Consequently, terrorism can be defined by descriptive and contextualised criteria which depend on the intent, target, purpose, and societal norms. It is therefore relevant to the present study. The United Nations Security Council, as Wilkinson discussed, also came close to providing an international definition in Resolution 1566, but hedged on ‘criminal acts’ and cautiously avoided the term ‘definition’ itself. Wilkinson concluded that terrorism is not a label but a concept.

Research on terrorism increased following the World Trade Centre attacks of 2001. In 2004, Arthur Garrison contended that terrorism was a tool, serving to distinguish the terrorist from the freedom fighter:

Terrorism, both as a tool and justified by the terrorists themselves, is a tool used to achieve a specific outcome by using force or violence on one segment of society, with the primary goal of causing fear in the larger society to make a change in that society.

This definition implies that terrorism is utilised by terrorists to construct change. However, this is too vague for practical historical research, and underemphasises the strategic purpose to the propagandist intent.

Bruce Hoffman posited yet another definition in 2006. He described terrorism as a show business, even a “perverted show business”. While this demonstrates the importance of the media and theatrical showmanship in terrorism, it does not acknowledge the purpose, justification, the spectacular strategy, and daily tactical methodologies within terrorism’s far-reaching intent. Gabriel Weimann also focused on the media aspect and thereby reconceptualised terrorism within symbolic communication theory. The “Theatre of Terror” metaphor draws attention to the objectification of the victim: although victim is part of the

---

10 Garrison, "Defining Terrorism." p259
message, it is the audience which is the true target. Weimann quoted Paul Wilkinson to highlight the connection:

When one says “terrorism” in a democratic society, one also says “media.” For terrorism by its very nature is a psychological weapon which depends upon communicating a threat to a wider society. This, in essence, is why terrorism and the media share a symbiotic relationship.13

As a psychological weapon, then, terrorism surpasses tool and tactic definitions, and becomes a far more abstract, yet influential, process.

In *Terrorism: A History* (2009), Randall Law discussed terrorism as a tactic:

Terrorism is not an ideology, and does not exist within any specific world view. Terrorism is a tactic, a means to an end – although often one that eventually overshadows the putative goals to which its users ostensibly strive.14

This observation is unique in its assessment that the tactics and attacks are more frequently discussed and more significant than the ideology or purpose behind them. Terrorism can be understood as a tactic - one that comprises both media manipulation and violent methodology. Yet these somewhat orthodox definitions of terrorism have been criticised by Poowin Bunyavejchewin in his overview of “The Orthodox and the Critical Approach to Terrorism.”15 Orthodox studies, thus framed by some of the aforementioned definitions, focus on the how of terrorism, rather than the why. This frames terrorism as independent of the socio-political actors and contexts. Bunyavejchewin posits instead that critical approaches situate terrorism as a dynamic dialectic, in which terrorism does not exist autonomously. The constructivist approach has been adopted by the *Critical Studies on Terrorism Journal*.

Incorporating orthodox and constructivist definitions as a tentative consensus was discussed by Alex Schmid in *The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism* in 2011, and republished by *Perspectives*

13 Ibid. p69
14 Randall Law, *Terrorism: A History*, p3
in Terrorism in 2012. His definition established the functional intent, tactics, targets, and media orientation of terrorism:

Terrorism refers, on the one hand, to a doctrine about the presumed effectiveness of a special form or tactic of fear-generating, coercive political violence and, on the other hand, to a conspiratorial practice of calculated, demonstrative, direct violent action without legal or moral restraints, targeting mainly civilians and non-combatants, performed for its propagandistic and psychological effects on various audiences and conflict parties.

Schmid deconstructed this statement into twelve salient processes and points, establishing the three main contexts for violence: how it was initiated and publicised; the intent of the violence; the real and intended victims and their orientation to the terrorist message. This definition is thorough and has multidisciplinary appeal.

In seeking criteria or parameters for contextualising terrorist acts, this thesis is influenced by the descriptive definitions offered by Khatchadourian and Wilkinson, while simultaneously acknowledging the value of Schmid’s. However, it must be noted that the term ‘terrorist’ in itself can become reductive when applied on a historical scale. Nevertheless, terrorist has largely been used to describe all of the focus movements in order to enable impartial analysis, and not confer any greater or lesser legitimacy upon the groups examined.

Despite the lack of consensus in defining terrorism, there is agreement on defining propaganda. Jowett and O’Donnell’s research made a clear distinction between propaganda and persuasion based on the intent of the communication, despite the interchangeable use of the terms. Persuasion, they argued, was where the information was designed to satisfy the needs of both the persuader and the target. Propaganda, on the other hand, attempts to shape the response in accordance with its own goals. They defined it as:

The deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior to achieve a response which furthers the desire of the propagandist.


18 Ibid. p7
Propaganda thus has a controlling purpose to change or consolidate a power balance. Christian Christiansen, who examined the interplay of terrorist and government propaganda on Youtube in the War on Terror, also adopted this definition. This indicates its suitability for terrorism studies.\textsuperscript{19} Therefore, it is also the operational definition of propaganda in this thesis.

Jowett and O’Donnell’s definition ties in with definitions of Propaganda of the Deed. James Billington cautiously described Propaganda of the Deed as a rationalising concept in \textit{Fire in the Minds of Men}, while also suggesting it was a doctrine.\textsuperscript{20} Walter Laqueur agreed, as he decisively labelled Propaganda of the Deed a concept.\textsuperscript{21} This label has been little contested, with Neville Bolt expanding on it in 2008. He wrote that Propaganda of the Deed:

\begin{quote}
[D]raws on a conceptual tradition but eludes an empirical test...One way of approaching this dilemma may be to situate it within a tension between: 1) an operational act of political violence; 2) a performance ritual...3) an act of communicating a message to a local or wider population.\textsuperscript{22}
\end{quote}

While it is debatable as to whether Propaganda of the Deed truly can elude empirical testing, this thesis demonstrates that Propaganda of the Deed does represent a conceptual tradition. Significantly, although as a ‘concept’ Propaganda of the Deed is an abstract idea or plan, its force comes in pursuing the transition of the abstract into the physical.

As a conceptual tradition, Propaganda of the Deed is both abstract and physical with elements of tradition and innovation. Its historical manifestation contains consistent components. The process usually begins with a small group of radicals who have witnessed the failure of peaceful agitation to effect meaningful political change. Frustrated with this failure, they turn to violence to communicate their propaganda. It is then that Propaganda of the Deed emerges. Violent deeds ensure maximum media attention, which amplifies the message to a larger audience. The

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
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violence is designed to undermine the authority of the state, and provoke it into an overreaction against the general population. The terrorists intend the state to discredit itself before the community. The terrorist action ideally inspires hope for change in the masses, and they join the revolt, thereby creating revolutionary heroes. This catalyses into a popular revolution with the terrorists supposedly riding at the vanguard. For that reason, Propaganda of the Deed is a conceptual tradition which uses calculated media-oriented violence with symbolic and far-reaching intent.

Much has already been made of the role of the media in both terrorism and Propaganda of the Deed. The most significant researcher on this topic is Bruce Hoffman in *Inside Terrorism.* There, he explores the dynamic in both old and new media. Owing to his extensive and lauded work on the topic, and due to the scope limits of this thesis, the role of the media is not explored in depth. This thesis is influenced by Hoffman’s findings that terrorism and the media share a symbiotic relationship. The media is intrinsic and obvious to the terrorism discourse and to Propaganda of the Deed.

We cannot be certain that modern terrorists are aware of the historical terminology of Propaganda of the Deed, but they are most certainly aware of it strategically. Carlo Pisacane came close to coining the phrase in his writings in 1857. Later, Paul Brousse, a French Socialist, coined the term in 1877 in his publication “Propaganda by the Deed.” However, the concept existed before the term. It was adopted by the anarchist Pyotr Kropotkin, in 1880. The true ideological genesis of Propaganda of the Deed, however, belonged to the anarchist community as a whole. Letters between Errico Malatesta, Carlo Cafiero, and Emilio Covelli around 1894 established the basic principles legitimising violence. Luigi Gallaeni and Gustav Lauder also discussed these ideas. The transmission of this concept through history is a significant theme of this thesis.
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The first definite historical application of Propaganda of the Deed came in 1878 in Russia. Propaganda of the Deed is aimed at maximising the dissemination of the terrorist message, broadening the radical support base, innovating with strategic and tactical methods, and popularising the actions through glorification. Achieving an atmosphere of widespread fear and terror would render the target audience more susceptible, while limiting and influencing the responsive action of the target state. This understanding will be put to the test in the ensuing chapters, assessing the endurance of Propaganda of the Deed as a conceptual tradition and identifying paradigms and shifts.

The use of the term paradigm, and paradigmatic shift, in this thesis stems from the work of Thomas Kuhn. In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* in 1962, Kuhn described the changing process in the way scientific knowledge is explored as undergoing rapid revolutionary shifts, as opposed to continuous linear progress. The presence of a paradigms does not imply that a complete set of governing rules exist: it is limited and overlapping, while still influencing traditions in science.\(^\text{26}\) The more precise the paradigm, the more exposed it is to scientific anomalies – the presence of which drives further investigation, and ultimately, shifts in knowledge.\(^\text{27}\) Departing from Kuhn’s theory of scientific and universally recognised paradigms, this thesis adopts Ibrahim Halloun’s contrasting interpretation that paradigms are also inherently personal, as they are perceived within the person and therefore no two paradigms are the same.\(^\text{28}\) Transposing this to history, a paradigm represents a traditional way of knowing and understanding. A shift occurs when an issue is encountered by the terrorist or group that cannot be addressed or overcome by the traditional means, which drives innovation and adaptation. The use of paradigms in the study of terrorism is not new. In 2007, based on the

\(^{27}\) Ibid. pp133-134  
\(^{28}\) Ibid. p134
same understanding, Christian Hirst identified a paradigmatic shift in Australia’s defence policy due to the spectacular terrorism on 9/11.\textsuperscript{29}

Spectacular terrorism is a term which will be used frequently in this thesis. The term ‘maximisation’ is commonly used to describe terrorists aiming to exploit the impact of attacks, through maximising casualties. This term is limited, as spectacular terrorism comprises more sophisticated strategies than mass casualty. For nineteenth century terrorists, maximising propaganda was not achieved through mass casualties, but through the targeted assassination of high-ranking individuals. This caused the desired spectacular effect, and enhanced the dissemination of propaganda.\textsuperscript{30} ‘Spectacular’ and its derivatives are used for that reason, in addition to the terms being commonly used by the early terrorists.

This thesis uses the term ‘martyr’ over the term ‘suicide bomber.’ There is considerable debate over the use of the term. Martyr’s usage has been discouraged in the contemporary press, as it glorifies suicide terrorism. Suicide terrorism also implies a selective moral disengagement from the act of self-destruction which is divorced from historical evidence. It also bears with it a moral debate, seeming to justify and lend legitimacy to terrorist acts.

This thesis is based on document analyses spanning around one hundred and forty years, and throughout this time, martyrdom is the term which the terrorists used to describe their activities. For the purpose of this research, the term martyrdom will be used in place of suicide terrorism for ease of communication. Martyrs, as they are presented in the propaganda, are portrayed as committed and passionate about the revolution. Their actions, therefore, are not
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disengaged as implied by suicide terrorism, which may serve to obfuscate the significance of this theme in the propaganda.

This thesis introduces the term ‘terrorspace,’ an adaptation of the concept of battlespace. Battlespace is used in military literature to describe the complex and changing dimensions in which military activity is undertaken, including combatting terrorism. It is defined in United Kingdom military doctrine as comprising maritime, air, land, space, information, electromagnetic, and time dimensions. These components are highly interrelated. The battlespace for conventional militaries therefore encompasses all conditions, circumstances, and elements in physical and non-physical domains relating to military operations.

The concept of terrorspace describes terrorists’ operational environment without limiting the discussion to geographic locations or specific audiences. This contributes by assisting in how the tendentious terrorist domain is perceived – an issue which is ‘syntactical and conceptual,’ according to Boaz Ganor. This research limitation disassociates the terrorist act from the critical context, and positions it as independent of the socio-political actors and contexts. Terrorspace aims to redress this by conceptualising the modern terrorist domain as a fluid, dynamic space which has direct and indirect audiences, locations, and dimensions, for an enhanced holistic approach.

Terrorspace comprises all aspects of terrorism which directly or indirectly forms the strategic intent. These dimensions are: maritime, air, land, information, psychological, human, and time. Similar to the concept of battlespace, none of these dimensions can be considered in isolation.

31 The Australian military use the term “Operational Environment”, however, battlespace is used in UK and US doctrine.
34 This ties in with what Bunyavejchewin wrote above, in how orthodox approaches to terrorism limit research and understandings into it.
To further explore the physical domain, terrorism can incorporate maritime elements, such as with the bombing of the *USS Cole* in 2000. Terrorism has traditionally incorporated land elements, and incorporates an air dimension as displayed in the World Trade Centre attack in 2001. The information domain, which includes the communication dimension, is becoming increasing relevant in the terrorspace. In the information domain, terrorists wage the battle of the narrative to win the support of certain target groups. This is undertaken by exploiting mainstream, private, and social media. Inherent to this is the psychological dimension, in which symbolism is communicated through terrorist acts, targeting the attitudes and morale of both direct and indirect target audiences.\(^3^5\)

This is interrelated with the human dimension, concerning the cultural, ethical, moral, historical, and social factors that may determine the receptivity of terrorism. The human dimension incorporates the local community where the event occurs, the international community which spectates, the target community which can be a combination of both, and the event can serve to radicalise moderate communities. The final dimension is time. Unlike the military battlespace, terrorists do not need to define how long they will operate in a certain terrorspace. It is the lack of a defined operations period which enhances their advantage of time and initiative over their targets. The term terrorspace is used to describe the dimensions of the interrelated physical and nonphysical operating environment in terrorism.

Terrorspace contributes to the thesis by providing a new conceptual lens which holistically encompasses the multifaceted operational environment. For example, when discussing the terrorist environment, this normally indicates the immediate geographic locale in which operations take place and have immediate impact. Terrorspace facilitates the holistic and diverse contexts of the terrorism environment, including the direct impact zone, the propaganda zones and targets, the international backer/funder, and the ripple effect it has on the indirect or symbolic targets in other countries. Terrorspace does not direct the analytical outcome of the thesis, but influences how terrorism in each context is conceptualised.

\(^3^5\) This is unsurprising as terrorism is a method of psychological warfare.
Further consideration must be made for two final terms used frequently in this study: tradition, and with it, innovation. Tradition is used to communicate the somewhat tenuous transmission of terrorism and its strategies throughout history and across an expanse of cultural groups. The term is not used in a rigid or conventional sense, referring more to historically reoccurring behavioural patterns. Innovation is used to describe the changes, disruptions, or adoptions to those admittedly inconsistent patterns, which is often directed by the technology and ideology of the specific historical context.

Analytical Framework

The analytical framework of this research is shaped by David Rapoport’s 2001 Four Waves Theory which categorises the past one hundred and forty years of modern terrorism into four waves. These are the anarchist wave of the late nineteenth century; early twentieth century anti-colonialist/separatist terrorism; New Left terrorism in the second half of the twentieth century; and religious terrorism in the late twentieth to early twenty-first century. The waves reflect the dominant ideologies and are inclusive of earlier wave characteristics, which appear to a limited extent. They are international, have a cycle of activity with expansion and contraction periods, are driven by a common predominant energy, and last roughly forty-five years, or until a generational shift. The titles of the waves reflect their dominant, but not unique, feature.

The first wave of anarchist terror was precipitated by the failure of the Paris Commune, and sparked by the 1878 shooting of General Dmitry Trepov, and with it the realisation of Propaganda of the Deed. This wave receded in the turmoil of the First World War. The second wave...
wave of anti-colonialist terror had deep historical roots in colonialism, but claimed further validation with the treaty of Versailles, whereupon terrorists exploited the principle of self-determination as a legitimisation for terror. Terrorist campaigns had several limited successes in the twenty-five years which followed. This wave ebbed around 1960, as radicals focused less on the colonial idea and more on general political themes, as decolonisation was almost complete. The third wave of the New Left became prominent at this time, and fed largely off the anti-war sentiment related to the Vietnam War. It endured for two decades, and receded in the late 1980’s due to a generational shift, with children not holding to the same ideologies as their parents, according to Rapoport. The final and fourth wave of religious terror was precipitated by the Iranian Revolution in 1979, as a successful theocratic revolution, although many groups had additional ethnic and historical contexts for unrest (such as American far-right terrorism). This wave, predominantly Islamist, remains current at the time of writing.

Four Waves is a dominant theory in the history of terrorism, while Rapoport himself is cofounder and editor of *Terrorism and Political Violence*. One high-profile supporter is Audrey Kurth Cronin, a leading US researcher and strategist on terrorism and counterterrorism. Another is Jean Rosenfeld, who believes the theory best explains recent terrorism data. One of the few to challenge the theory is Ann Larabee who believes it obfuscates the greater wave of military violence, though she admits the theory is useful. Contending theories are proposed by Ehud Sprinzak, Weinberg and Richardson, and the Gurrist group. Sprinzak argued that right-wing groups showed a cyclical pattern, but this is inapplicable on the broader historical scale. Weinberg and Richardson used conflict theory to analyse terrorist groups, but found that this was only applicable to twentieth century Western European terror models. The Gurrist group, inspired by Ted Robert Gurr, studied terrorism through the paradigm of their relevant social

42 Cronin, *How Terrorism Ends*. pp95-96
movement. However, it was found that the general social movement was rarely orientated towards violent action. Rapoport’s is therefore “the broadest, historically based hypothesis.”

There are further attempts to critique the Four Waves Theory. Research by Karen Rasler and William Thompson (2009) sought to test Rapaport’s model against known data to ascertain if the waves were reflected in terrorism databases. Rasler and Thompson admitted that their data set was incomplete due to the length of the timeframe. Their results are based on examining on the events between 1968 and 2004, thereby excluding two full waves and around ninety years of terrorist activity. Moreover, their deconstruction of the characteristic attacks for each wave of terror was simplistic and overly exclusive. The results they could garner despite the limitations of the study nevertheless supported Rapoport’s theory.

A more thorough investigation was conducted by Jeffery Kaplan. Kaplan found that Rapoport’s global vantage point was an inherent weakness, although he claimed that his evidence in no way contradicted the central theses. The internationalism of the theory, according to Kaplan, did not account for the Fifth Wave, which incorporates groups which began at an international level. These groups were funded by foreign governments and bodies and, in rejection of their international benefactors, regress to a local level and essentially break away from the established terrorist wave. As a result, Kaplan argues that the Four Waves theory is, to an extent, exclusive of contemporary small-scale ethnic, linguistic, sub-state nationalism, and millennial utopian terror occurring in the non-Western world. The theory is not inclusive of contemporary environmentalist, far-Right and tribal terrorism.

The implications of these findings suggest that the Four Waves theory is not inclusive of local-level or special-interest terrorism, but nor does the theory claim to be. It is broadly
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representative of the dominant energies of each historical context. It therefore excludes the categories listed above, and indeed, arguments continue over the legitimacy in labelling some of those manifestations, such as environmental activism, as terrorism. This thesis acknowledges that the Four Waves Theory only represents dominant energies in the history of terrorism to the exclusion of local-level extremism, and focuses on those four energies. By applying the Four Waves Theory as an analytical framework, it is possible to use representative terrorism movements to identify key times, movements, and acts.

Methodology

The methodology of this thesis is based on the analysis of primary source documents, using the empirical record, and comparative analysis. This method situates each terrorism movement within its historical context. The main component of research is analysis of terrorist propaganda – the primary texts written by the terrorists themselves. These texts are approached from the understanding that they represent extremist points of view, and were written as propaganda. They are strategically targeted, and cannot be analysed in isolation from the contemporary historical circumstances. The writings represent an abstract, or desired, reality.

This propaganda is analysed in light of the historical context provided by both primary and secondary sources. Examination of the time period, the variety of competing views, and reported happenstance of terrorist deeds, will show the implementation and innovation of Propaganda of the Deed. These two approaches complement each other to show the historical continuity of this terrorist strategy. This methodology underpins the comparative analysis of the four focus movements using Propaganda of the Deed.

Six major themes emerged from the evidence and propaganda as common themes within the functioning of Propaganda of the Deed. These were the theoretical purpose; the justification for terrorist violence; the strategic method which encompassed overall plan and large scale attacks that drove the entire terrorist effort; the tactical method which addressed low-level

\[47\] *Ibid. np*
activities, materials, and techniques; the combination of these methods as a systematic campaign; followed by the glorification of both the revolution and martyrdom.

Deconstructed, these six topics form the strategic intent underlying use of Propaganda of the Deed. For example, the theoretical purpose is coached within the propaganda to inform the audience of the activist’s intent. The justification for violence explains to the audience why the transition to violence was necessary. The strategic and tactical methods, and their implementation as a systematic campaign educates the audience about how the violence will/or did occur. Lastly, the glorification of martyrdom and revolution accessed the symbolic, emotional, and ritualistic side of Propaganda of the Deed: to inspire hope and popular revolution. In sum, the first five functional aspects cater to the technical requirements of Propaganda of the Deed to facilitate change, while the latter two cater to the symbolic requirements. In-depth analysis of these six topics illuminates how each focus movement understood, implemented, and transformed Propaganda of the Deed in each historical context.

Four Waves, Four Movements

One focus movement was selected for analysis from each Wave of Terror. The criteria for selection included the availability of the propaganda in English; a strong and correlating empirical record; representativeness of the ideology attached to the wave; and the impact of the movement. In some cases, key groups represented the energy of multiple waves, and although important to the field of terrorism, they were problematic for the research parameters because of their mixed ideology. Therefore, focus movements were selected based on their embodiment of a single wave to form a representative research area.

The Russian populist group, Narodnaya Volya, and its affiliates were chosen to represent the energy of the first anarchist wave of terror. Narodnaya Volya embodied the combined populist, nihilist, and anarchist ideologies, with its propagandists authoring key texts. They were

48 Groups who exhibit this are the Palestinian Liberation Organisation and its affiliate the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Provisional Irish Republican Army.

49 Such as Pyotr Kropotkin who wrote Conquest of Bread, Mutual Aid, and Anarchism; and Mikhail Bakunin, who wrote God and State and other essays.
organised, with a record of high profile attacks. Their propaganda is readily available in English from reputable sources.\textsuperscript{50} Rapoport used the \textit{Narodnaya Volya} as an anarchist example for his first wave despite their frequent ideological factionalism.\textsuperscript{51} Though they were technically populists, many of the groups of this time have been referred to under the umbrella of anarchism. Many of the activists under the title of anarchism actually combined nihilist, communist, syndicalist, agrarian socialist, and populist ideologies. For convenience, if not always precision, these groups are referred to as anarchist, which in any case is not atypical in historical writing.\textsuperscript{52}

The Irish Republican Army, its predecessors and affiliates, were chosen to represent the early anti-colonialist energy of the second wave of terror. Although the IRA was situated early in the anti-colonialist wave, the success it achieved was internationally significant for other anti-colonialists around the world. Propaganda demonstrated a concerted effort to keep the cause nationalist, thus embodying the anti-colonial typology.\textsuperscript{53} Their texts are available in English, and access was granted by the Irish National Library to view IRA files from 1880-1920. Rapoport also used the Irish to demonstrate the essence of the second wave.\textsuperscript{54}

The Baader-Meinhof Gang/Red Army Faction (RAF) and their affiliates were chosen to represent the energy of the third New Left wave of terror. Unlike the Palestinian Liberation Organisation which had national-level goals, the RAF typified the excessive internationalism and outrage at broad political themes that was a dominating factor of the New Left wave. They protested the Vietnam War, championed the Third World masses, and rejected the perceived hegemony of the United States. Propaganda was found from English-speaking sources, including

\textsuperscript{50} Such as in Walter Laqueur, ed. \textit{Voices of Terror: Manifestos, Writings, and Manuals of Al Qaeda, Hamas, and Other Terrorists from around the World and Throughout the Ages} (Illinois: Sourcebooks, Inc, 2004).

\textsuperscript{51} Rapoport, "The Four Waves of Modern Terrorism." pp50-52

\textsuperscript{52} Sources which explore how interlinked marginal political groups like anarchists, populists, and nihilists were include Burleigh, \textit{Blood and Rage}, p68; and Chaliand and Blin, The History of Terrorism, p96-97.

\textsuperscript{53} The early IRA avoided the religiosity which affected later manifestations of Irish terrorism, such as PIRA, CIRA, and RIRA.

\textsuperscript{54} Rapoport, "The Four Waves of Modern Terrorism." p55
international newspapers, which also demonstrated the historical impact of the RAF. Rapoport used the RAF as an example demonstrating a strategic shift in the third wave.\textsuperscript{55} 

\textit{Al ‘Qaeda} and its affiliates such as Egyptian Islamic Jihad were found to be representative of the energy of the fourth wave, religious terror. According to Rapoport, “Islam is at the heart of the wave.”\textsuperscript{56} The most representative of Salafi jihadi organisations was \textit{al ‘Qaeda}.\textsuperscript{57} Many Salafi theorists were affiliated with \textit{al ‘Qaeda}, and helped create the current operating doctrine. Their propaganda is readily accessible through translated anthologies, and through modern media sources. \textit{Al ‘Qaeda}’s role in provoking the War on Terror clearly demonstrates its historical impact.

**Terrorist Propaganda**

The most influential anarchist propagandists were Prince Pyotr Kropotkin, Vera Figner, and Nikolai Morozov. Known as the father of modern anarchism, Kropotkin’s writings set the foundations for anarchist ideology.\textsuperscript{58} Figner was an influential leader and propagandist of the \textit{Narodnaya Volya}. Her purpose in \textit{Memoirs of a Revolutionist} was to justify the violence she helped nurture in her revolutionary years, and to explain the terrorist process behind the acts.\textsuperscript{59} Morozov contributed to this literary effort by making a hero out of a terrorist and a martyr out of a murderer in his pamphlet, “The Terrorist Struggle.”\textsuperscript{60}

Laqueur’s \textit{Voices of Terror} also included propaganda by Karl Heinzen, Mikhail Bakunin and Johann Most. The Prussian Heinzen’s 1849 work “Murder” had a significant impact on anarchist terrorism, challenging the state’s right to execution by arguing that the act of murder should be

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid. p58 In particular, they allegedly revived the strategy of assassination, but instead of targeting military or political figures as had occurred previously, they targeted prominent industrial, legal, and financial leaders. 

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid. p61 

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid. p63 

\textsuperscript{58} In addition to his scholarly works, his personal memoirs were also used: Peter Kropotkin, \textit{Memoirs of a Revolutionist} (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, 1908); \textit{The Conquest of Bread and Other Writings}; \textit{Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings}, ed. Roger N. Baldwin (New York: Dover Publications Inc, 2002); with some pamphlets in Laqueur, \textit{Voices of Terror}. 

\textsuperscript{59} Vera Figner, \textit{Memoirs of a Revolutionist} (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1991 [1927]). 

\textsuperscript{60} Nikolai Morozov, [1880] “The Terrorist Struggle.” Laqueur, \textit{Voices of Terror}. p76-82
equally prohibited or permissible for all. Bakunin was another pillar of anarchist thought: his pamphlet, “Revolution, Terror and Banditry,” was important for explaining the transition from word to deed. Most had three significant publications that doubled as instructional manuals. The first, “The Case for Dynamite,” exhorted the benefits of explosives in terrorism. The second, “Advice for Terrorists,” advocated the professionalism of terrorism by weapons training. The last and most important was the *Science of Revolutionary Warfare* which detailed the science of poisons, explosives, arson, and other terrorist tactics still used today.

Other significant anarchist propagandists included Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinski, Gerasim Tarnovski, and Sergey Nechaev. Stepniak-Kravchinski’s publication, “Underground Russia,” waxed eloquent on the duties of terrorists. Tarnovski’s “Terrorism and Routine” was an attack on social conditions in Russia, and a passionate defence of terrorism. Sergey Nechaev glamourised terrorist identity in *The Catechism of the Revolutionist*, glorifying the ruthless commitment of the terrorist.

While not in the same class as these propagandists, two additional primary sources are valuable here. *Russia in Revolution*, by G.H Perris, appeared in 1905, shortly after the peak of the *Narodnaya*’s revolutionary activity. It is sympathetic towards the terrorists’ cause, and is valuable for its contemporary time frame and its information on specific events. Victor Robinson’s *Comrade Kropotkin* (1908) eulogised a man who was not yet dead. There were
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factual errors in his writings, however, it is a useful source for indicating the effectiveness of anarchist propaganda.

Irish anti-colonialist propaganda in the early twentieth century came from several writers, principally, Jeremiah Donovan Rossa, Padraig Pearse, and James Connolly. Rossa’s books *Recollections* and *Six Years in Six English Prisons* appeared to embody the Irish struggle at the time.\footnote{Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, *Prison Life: Six Years in Six English Prisons* (New York: P.J Kenedy, 1874; repr., Internet Archive); Diarmuid O’Donovan Rossa, *Rossa’s Recollections 1838-1898* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972).} He served as an inspiration to the prolific writer Padraig Pearse. The latter’s most important works were the *Graveside Oration* for Rossa and “The Murder Machine,” which accused the British education system in Ireland of crushing Irish spirit and creating an oppressed colonial identity.\footnote{Padraic H Pearse, *Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse: Political Writings and Speeches* (Dublin: The Phoenix Publishing Co., Ltd, 2013 [1916]).} James Connolly was far more pragmatic: *The Workers Republic* sought to incite revolution while encouraging a new (socialist) form of Irish government.\footnote{James Connolly, *The Workers’ Republic*, ed. Desmond Ryan (Dublin: At the Sign of Three Candles, 1951[1899-1914]).}

The nationalist leader, Michael Collins, and his affiliates Piaras Beaslai and Florence O’Donoghue were also significant. Given the covert nature of Collins’s war, it is hardly surprising that his most significant tract, *Path to Freedom*, came after his initial struggle was complete.\footnote{Michael Collins, *The Path to Freedom* (Cork: Corpus of Electronic Texts, repr., 2012 [1922]).} This tract is several things: modest in IRA victory, chilling about its methods, and particularly telling in its justification of terrorism. Collins’ director of publicity, Beaslai, also wrote a post-terror victory book.\footnote{Piaras Beaslai, *Michael Collins and the Making of a New Ireland*, vol. II (Dublin: The Phoenix Publishing Co., Ltd., 1926).} It glorified the terrorists and their leaders, simultaneously demonizing the British government and the Black and Tans.\footnote{The Black and Tans was the name given to the British Auxiliaries who were sent to Ireland to deal with the terrorist threat and the general insurrection. The name comes from their mismatched uniforms.} Florence and Josephine O’Donoghue’s *War of Independence*, contains valuable primary sources on pre-Civil War...
Ireland. Little mention is made of Florence’s involvement in many assassinations and bombings. It is not known if this was self-censorship, but the book was clearly situated to place the terrorism in the best possible light.

A special note must be made of the IRA’s *Handbook for Volunteers (The Green Book)*. This was originally released to new IRA recruits in 1956 – after the period of revolutionary activity with which this thesis is concerned. However, the *Handbook* restates tactics, theories, and philosophies developed from 1916 to 1922. The 1956 version was used, as the later 1977 edition was altered according to the experiences of the PIRA.

We cannot discuss all the important international anti-colonialist propagandists. Writings by the Jewish radicals in particular, such as Dr Israel Eldad, Abraham Stern, Uri Greenberg, and David Raziel, resonate with the Irish propaganda. Frantz Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth* is also very important in the history of terrorism, providing further justification for colonized peoples to rise up and seize their independence through the cleansing act of violence. However, this research is streamlined into a single focus movement within each analytical wave, so such works cannot be explored in depth.

The most prolific propagandist of the German New Left was Ulrike Meinhof. An anthology of Ulrike Meinhof’s columns, *Everybody Talks About the Weather... We Don’t*, provided the main source for New Leftist propaganda. At the time, they were published by her husband in one of the few left-wing political magazines, *konkrete*. This source is one of the rare comprehensive resources on Ulrike Meinhof, and is particularly relevant to this study. She, along with Andreas
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Baader and Gudrun Ensslin, was a contributing author to the Red Army Faction’s most significant manifesto: *The Urban Guerrilla Concept*. This outlined their ideology and terroristic purpose.

For instructional manuals, the German New Left adopted the writings of South American revolutions. Carlos Marighella’s *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla* provided a platform for urban terrorism, whereas Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara’s *Guerrilla Warfare* instructed the terrorist on rural terrain. These manuals had international recognition as both authors were regarded as cult heroes of the New Left. Due to their comprehensive nature, and the profile of their authors, the RAF used them instead of writing its own instructional manuals.

Other New Leftist propaganda came from anthologies, manuals, and newspaper archives. Trove, maintained by the National Library of Australia, proved to be a valuable online data resource for this wave of terror. The most prolific source for international news which has undergone digitization in Australia was *The Canberra Times*, which reported on Germany throughout the years of 1966-1983, typically incorporating Reuters and AFP reports. In many cases, this newspaper quoted the terrorists. These served to fill a gap in the literature by providing empirical backup to the propaganda.

The last significant New Left source was Stephen Aust, author of *The Baader-Meinhof Complex*, and an acquaintance of the Baader-Meinhof Gang. He regularly quoted the Gang members, but it is not known if these are verbatim, or from memory. The work is obviously subjective; however, Aust is at times quite critical of the RAF. The work is told as a narrative, but includes
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events Aust could not possibly have witnessed (such as Gudrun Ensslin’s childhood). There is substantial unreferenced detail, only some of which can be corroborated by other sources.

Finally, Islamist primary sources were predominantly obtained from anthologies, including Walter Laqueur’s *Voices of Terror*, and Raymond Ibrahim’s *The Al ‘Qaeda Reader*. These together provide the propaganda of Taqi-ud-Deed ibn Taymiyya, Osama bin Laden, and Ayman al-Zawahiri. Taymiyya’s “The Religious and Moral Doctrine of Jihad” legitimised attacks on Muslim leaders who he deemed as apostates. Osama bin Laden’s speeches and messages, such as his “Oath to America,” “Why we are fighting you,” and “Truce Offer” are reliable translations. In addition, these books contain al-Zawahiri’s theological tracts, including “Jihad, Martyrdom, and the Killing of Innocents,” “Sharia and Democracy,” and “Loyalty and Enmity.”

Other primary propagandists include Muhammad Abd al-Salam Faraj, Sayyid Qutb, and ‘Abdullah Azzam. *The Neglected Duty* by Muhammad Abd al-Salam Faraj was important as he argued that *jihad* was the sixth forgotten pillar of Islam. Probably the most significant propaganda encouraging *jihadism* was Sayyid Qutb’s *Milestones*. Qutb introduced Islamist ideology and re-defined old concepts in new ways, such as *takfir* and *jahiliyya*, which justified attacks on Muslims. ‘Abdullah Azzam’s *Join the Caravan* and *Defense of Muslim Lands* are also highly propagandistic, encouraging the pursuit of martyrdom as an end in itself. Online
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reports by BBC News and Al Jazeera provided transcripts for other terrorist media releases. Where possible, these have been compared to other translations for accuracy.

This wealth of propaganda, representative of each of the Four Waves of Terror, was comparatively analysed through a series of recurring themes: the theoretical purpose; the justification for violence; the strategic method; the tactical method; the systematised campaign; and the glorification of the revolution and martyrdom. This has allowed paradigms and paradigmatic shifts to be identified. The combined analytical framework, research methodology, selection criteria, and comparative analysis of deconstructed terrorist propaganda has no precedent in established literature on Propaganda of the Deed.

Literature review

Propaganda of the Deed is often mentioned in the field of terrorist research, but is seldom the entire focus of the publication. The most significant research which focuses on Propaganda of the Deed is Neville Bolt’s 2008 work. However, some investigation into Propaganda of the Deed has occurred since terrorism studies became an academic sub-discipline in the 1970’s.

Brian Jenkins penned one of the earliest and seminal works on terrorism, as mentioned earlier. Although Jenkins did not use the precise term, Propaganda of the Deed, he was integral in establishing the potent media aspect of terrorism. He wrote that terrorism had the goal of obtaining publicity and,

Through terrorism, the terrorists hope to attract attention to their cause and project themselves as a force that merits recognition and that must be reckoned with. The publicity gained by frightening acts of violence and the atmosphere and alarm created cause people to exaggerate the importance and strength of the terrorists and their movement. Since most terrorist groups are actually small and weak, the violence they carry out must be all the more dramatic and deliberating shocking.95

Jenkins described the concept of the terrorist audience, and with it the idea that terrorism was aimed more at the people who were watching than the victims. He also argued that terrorists

95 Jenkins, "International Terrorism." p4
wanted people listening, not dead, and tried to debunk the idea that terrorism was inherently irrational and senseless.

In 1980, James Billington offered another analysis of Propaganda of the Deed.\textsuperscript{96} He indicated that the concept first came into being at the behest of Mikhail Bakunin in 1870.\textsuperscript{97} According to Billington, Propaganda of the Deed was a Bakuninist concept which rationalised the use of violence amongst revolutionary groups in Russia. Evidence would come to light later that Bakunin was not the sole authority on the concept. Propaganda of the Deed continued, according to Billington, because the contemporary radicals in nineteenth century Russia scorned the \textit{malye dela}, the small deeds. Only great deeds held significant appeal to the growing intellectual class.\textsuperscript{98}

The next major publication discussing Propaganda of the Deed came in 1987. Walter Laqueur’s \textit{The Age of Terrorism} attributed Propaganda of the Deed to Carlo Pisacane, an activist in the Risorgimento in 1857.\textsuperscript{99} Laqueur suggested that similar theories pre-existed Piscane, but it was the statements of Errico Malatesta and Carlo Cafiero in 1876 which heralded the era of modern terrorism. Paul Brousse then popularised the term. It spread through the writings of Russian anarchists such as Pyotr Kropotkin and Sergei Stepiak-Kravchinski, and figured prominently in the International Anarchist Congress of 1881.\textsuperscript{100} Laqueur’s research on the beginnings of Propaganda of the Deed is still highly regarded today. He argued that terrorism was instinctive for radicals. They knew, without books, that publicity would help their protest: that ideological rationalisation sometimes followed the act instead of pre-empting it, for “in the beginning there was the deed.”\textsuperscript{101}
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In 1993, Ariel Merari examined terrorism as a strategy for insurgency within the broader scale of modern warfare.\textsuperscript{102} His examination, albeit cursory, of Propaganda of the Deed found that it was only the first stage of the insurgency struggle.\textsuperscript{103} He agreed with earlier researchers that it was defined and explained by the anarchists, but argued that Propaganda of the Deed does not constitute the complete terrorist strategy, but rather precedes the advancement of other modes of struggle. Merari also established that Propaganda of the Deed changed from symbolic terrorism to mass casualty terrorism. This, he believed, was designed to capitalise on the shock value to capture more media attention, instead of tying the justification for violence into the act itself.\textsuperscript{104}

Paul Wilkinson is often cited for his 2001 work, \textit{Terrorism and Democracy}, which discusses the mutually beneficial relationship between terrorism and the media.\textsuperscript{105} His research has a broad scope, as it references word-of-mouth propaganda in the Middle Ages, through to the pamphlets of the anarchists, to the modern mass media and internet used by the \textit{al \textasciitilde Qaeda} network. He argued that terrorism and the media had a symbiotic relationship which was essentially used as a psychological weapon against democratic society.\textsuperscript{106} Propaganda of the Deed was used to generate broad support, spruik the terrorist cause, frustrate and twist the state’s response to support their agenda, and to intensify recruitment.\textsuperscript{107} The present study confirms Wilkinson’s explanation of Propaganda of the Deed.

In 2003, P. Eric Louw approached the concept of Propaganda of the Deed obliquely, through examining how propaganda factored into terrorist and Pentagon planning.\textsuperscript{108} Confining the study to terrorism after 2001, he considered \textit{al \textasciitilde Qaeda’s} ability to comprehend and implement
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Propaganda of the Deed. Accordingly, the 9/11 attacks were Propaganda of the Deed in action, targeting economic, military, and cultural symbols.\(^{109}\) He claimed that the villain/victim paradigm which the Pentagon used to counter *al ‘Qaeda’s* Propaganda of the Deed was problematic, but ultimately successful.\(^{110}\)

Arthur Garrison provided a substantial investigation of Propaganda of the Deed in 2004.\(^{111}\) He used texts from the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries to make the argument that terrorists can be defined through their writings. Garrison added a new name to the founders of the concept, by showing that it was not only Malatesta and Cafiero who exchanged letters, but Emilio Covelli as well. He believed terrorism could be used as a systematic tool in tandem with Propaganda of the Deed, insomuch as terrorism is propaganda. Garrison makes the claim that:

> The use of terrorism as a tool to effect change has remained the same throughout history. Although the causes asserted to justify terrorism have changed, the tool of terrorism (and the value of its utility in the minds of those who use terror) has not.\(^{112}\)

His conclusion is that the rationalisation has remained the same, while the tools for terror have changed. This research largely supports Garrison’s findings, though it identifies areas where the rationalisation for terror has been incrementally adapted.

A contending view of Propaganda of the Deed, focusing on Spanish anarchism, was published in 2005 by Julian Casanova. Casanova defined Propaganda of the Deed as an “insurrection against the army and capitalism, as opposed to political assassination.”\(^{113}\) This thesis will demonstrate that political assassination was one of the early major tenets of propaganda of the deed, and has continued that way. He also stated that “‘Propaganda of the deed’ was a desperate
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attempt by the international anarchist movement to escape isolation.” Propaganda of the Deed may well manifest as both a ‘desperate attempt’ and a form of political protest. However, in order to explore political agency this thesis is justified in exploring Propaganda of the Deed as a deliberate strategy.

Bruce Hoffman’s, Inside Terrorism (2006), supported Billington’s theory that Propaganda of the Deed can be mainly attributed to Piscane, but agrees with other researchers that the Narodnaya Volya were the first to put the concept into practice. He describes their attitude towards it as “quixotic” and discussed their selective targeting and symbolism. The anarchists had already consolidated the symbiotic relationship between terrorism and the media during the first communication revolution centred on the printing press. The launching of the first United States television satellite in 1968, marked the beginning of the second communication revolution exploited by the contemporary terrorists. Hoffman linked the launch of this new method of communication by the USA to the increased level of attacks targeting the United States around the globe. That same year, Melik Kaylan, author of Losing the Propaganda Wars, discussed the apparent inability of the United States administration to combat the propaganda of Osama bin Laden, given their historical experience in controlling the media in war zones.

In 2007, Matt Carr considered the similarities between the anarchists’ and al’ Qaeda’s use of Propaganda of the Deed. He made the point which is incorporated in this research that “the real connection between the two movements can be found in their strategic conception of violence” – being, of course, Propaganda of the Deed. He noted some discrepancies between
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the two, including technology, targets, ideology and religion; however, he drew other similarities based on their statements, their depiction in the media, and a similar philosophy.

Chaliand and Blin opened *The History of Terrorism* with: “The essentials of the psychological basis of the terrorist struggle have changed little since the nineteenth century.” They do, however, argue that on its own, Propaganda of the Deed is an incomplete strategy, as it is only the first step in the grander scheme of the revolution. Significantly, they highlight that Propaganda of the Deed is not a strategy to overthrow the government, but a prelude to spreading the word for the overthrow itself. They also make the fundamental point that, whether the anarchist terrorists knew it or not, “the very essence of terrorism is to instil an irrational sense of insecurity.” Also in 2007, Ethan Bueno De Mesquito and Eric Dickson studied the effectiveness of Propaganda of the Deed in mobilising support for extremists, using a probability model. They found that an attack did not need to be successful in order to generate support, and that the effectiveness of terrorism in mobilizing popular support depended in part on government retaliation.

In 2008, the Insurgency Research Group held a conference on Propaganda of the Deed, during which it was decided that there was an “unacceptable knowledge gap.” The conference report, which had a counter-insurgency focus, found that Propaganda of the Deed transcended an operational technique, to instead resemble a multi-event narrative with symbolic and rhetorical significance which trigger deep-seated grievances. Propaganda of the Deed was aided by technological advances, and ought to be studied in the political domain as opposed to the
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Neville Bolt contributed to the RUSI report, and published a pointed analysis of Propaganda of the Deed and the IRA. He defined it as a conceptual tradition and an operational act, with performance ritual elements, attempting to communicate a message. He drew explicit links between Irish and Islamist terrorism, stating “Like Pearse, Bin Laden understands the language of PoD, that today’s war is a war of words and ideas.”

In 2008, James Gelvin’s research provided a comparative analysis of al ‘Qaeda and anarchists. He found that they were reactionary, defensive, semi-autonomous, and aimed at the existing system itself. While he did not explicitly address Propaganda of the Deed, the article itself shows the value of comparative studies of historical terrorist events and modern experience. Gabriel Weimann in turn took a media based perspective, examining “The Psychology of Mass-Mediated Terrorism”. Although he did not directly cite “Propaganda of the Deed” — it was nonetheless the implicit topic of study as it focused on the importance of the modern media for terrorism, and analysed it according to symbolic communication theory. However, the research lacks historical depth as it situates terrorism using the mass media as something relatively recent and affiliated with megaterrorism. Weimann detailed the psychology of terror through the “terror as theatre metaphor”, quoting Jenkins that terrorism was not so much directed at its victims, but at those watching, and fulfils the tenets of Propaganda of the Deed indirectly.

*Blood and Rage* by Michael Burleigh is another source which indirectly discusses Propaganda of the Deed, through contextualizing terrorism as simultaneously combining career, culture, and lifestyle. He demystifies operational acts of terror through the depth of detail, which is why this source is used so frequently throughout the thesis. Importantly, it highlights the historical
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continuity of the terrorist double-tap in explosive attacks, from *Narodnaya Volya* assassinations through to the double-taps of *al ‘Qaeda* affiliates, *Jemaah Islamiya*, in the Bali Bombings.\(^{132}\)

Randall Law’s 2009 *Terrorism: A History* described Propaganda of the Deed as a “cornerstone of the modern terrorist’s strategy” in which the well-chosen attack would be both symbolic and provocative.\(^{133}\) The historical scope was broad, discussing the strategy from its inception to contemporary times. Law identified three initial factors which led to the endorsement of Propaganda of the Deed in the nineteenth century: the collapse of international anarchist organisations, the failed insurrections, and the social reforms sweeping Europe. These, in essence, led to the use of Propaganda of the Deed as “an act of desperation by a minority that feared it was losing its audience and its relevance.”\(^{134}\) He directly attributed its spread to the United States through the emigration of Johann Most, an argument supported by this research.\(^{135}\) The anarchist understanding of Propaganda of the Deed, Law found, was a “direct predecessor” to the concept of therapeutic violence advocated by Frantz Fanon in the anti-colonialist wave.\(^{136}\)

Surette, Hanson, and Nobel attempted to measure what they refer to as “media-orientated terrorism”, Propaganda of the Deed.\(^{137}\) They discussed contemporary terrorists (as of 2009), without reference to the long history of terrorism. They also claimed “The desire for media attention is not a constant feature of terrorism.”\(^{138}\) In addition, they wrote that pre-mass media terrorists had to rely on word of mouth. It is not clear what they meant by “pre-mass media” or if any research was undertaken on the history of media or communications. Their statements
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appear unsupported, especially in light of previous research. The present study rejects this argument and will demonstrate this throughout the thesis.

Nicholas J O’Shaunessy and Paul R Baines (2009) argued that Propaganda of the Deed is “a genre of symbolic communication,” and formed an imprecisely calibrated language.\(^{139}\) They indicated this began with the anarchists, passed through the Fenian brotherhood and anti-colonialist movements, and is currently used by al ‘Qaeda.\(^{140}\) They concluded that the resonation and symbolism in al ‘Qaeda’s discourse requires further research in order to be neutralised. These authors also analysed Bangladeshi and Pakistani Muslim responses to Islamist propaganda.\(^{141}\) There, they drew parallels between political marketing, and terrorist marketing to find that its use by terrorists would be incendiary were it not for the difficulty and ambiguity of the communication process itself.\(^{142}\) O’Shaughnessy later argued in “The Death and Life of Propaganda,” that propaganda was the “guiding hand of history.”\(^{143}\) Surveying a broad historical scope, he examined the influence of propaganda throughout history to demonstrate its continuity, which includes its “essential Manichean dualism.”\(^{144}\)

In 2013, David Lyons examined al ‘Qaeda through propaganda theory. He described Propaganda of the Deed as used by al ‘Qaeda as “new”, a suggestion which this thesis rejects.\(^{145}\) However, he does make the argument that, within al ‘Qaeda’s Propaganda of the Deed, the attack itself does not have to be successful in order to generate recruitment, which was posited in earlier research by Mesquito and Dickson.
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At the time of writing, research on Propaganda of the Deed obviously continues. While the concept itself is understood and incorporated into many studies, it is rarely the focus of the study, and has never before been examined by the methodology, framework, and criteria used in this thesis. This research investigates Propaganda of the Deed in its own language: that of the propaganda documents and of the empirical record, and analyses that across the waves of terror to generate a greater understanding of how this conceptual tradition has endured and innovated, influencing terrorist paradigms and indicating paradigmatic shifts.

This thesis differs from the literature by challenging the tacit acceptance of Propaganda of the Deed, and positioning it instead as an active series of themes in the propaganda which illuminate underlying features of the terrorist mindset, ideology, strategic intent, and methodological coherence; in addition to situating the terrorists within the broader historical context and existing paradigms. Previous literature focusing on Propaganda of the Deed was confined to examining one or two terrorist movements. This thesis uses a broader historical context to focus on this specific concept, thereby yielding a more comprehensive analysis.

**Conclusion**

This thesis uses the understandings of Khatchadourian and Wilkinson to explore terrorism as a descriptive and historically contextualised act with multiple elements. It prefers ‘spectacular terrorism’ to ‘maximisation’ and ‘martyrdom’ to ‘suicide terrorism’. The concept of terrorspace, prompted by the military term, battlespace, contributes to our understanding of terrorist acts. This thesis investigates how Propaganda of the Deed has endured and evolved, and whether its use by earlier movements influenced subsequent movements. It illuminates the paradigms manifest in its use; and identifies paradigmatic shifts where innovation has overcome tradition.

This fills a gap in the established research with the illumination of these paradigms through which Propaganda of the Deed can be understood. Propaganda of the Deed can be described as a conceptual tradition which uses calculated media-oriented violence with symbolic and far-reaching intent, which has the ability to innovate, while conserving the original strategic intent. This thesis therefore offers an historical understanding regarding the continuity of terrorism by
offering new insights into Propaganda of the Deed. The empirical analysis begins in the following chapter, examining the nineteenth century Russian anarchists.


Chapter Two: Cloak and Dagger

The rise of Russian anarchist terror

It was this superabundance of joy in my attitude to life as I first entered it, that formed the real source of my altruistic aspirations... Gratitude to whom?...To the sun, which bathed the field in its golden light. To the stars which shone over the garden at night...It was gratitude for everything in general; not gratitude to some one for some particular thing, but to every one and every thing. I wanted to give thanks to some one for the blessings of the world, the blessings of life. I wanted to do something good...

Vera Figner, 1927

Vera Figner was a prominent nineteenth century Russian anarchist propagandist, and one of the early terrorist leaders to implement Propaganda of the Deed. This chapter explores the rise of Russian anarchist terror, and the many contending factors which influenced the escalation to violence through Propaganda of the Deed. It examines the historical context of revolutionary unrest, and the conditions that contributed to acts of extreme political violence. Anarchist ideology is then explored to establish the turbulent political context. This is followed by a discussion of the intelligentsia’s role, which was integral to radical politics in nineteenth century Russia; and an introduction to the terrorist groups, such as the Narodnaya Volya; and their propagandists, including Pyotr Kropotkin and Vera Figner.

Historical accounts typically acknowledge that the Russian anarchists were responsible for the systematic implementation of Propaganda of the Deed. This research takes that assumption further to claim that the anarchists unified the random outbursts of violence into a ruthless and systematic strategy which outlasted their ideological wave, thus establishing the tradition of terrorism. This was demonstrated through the implementation of propaganda with deeds in a manner which emphasised the symbolic political significance and strategic intent of terrorism.
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The period of early terrorist activity in Russia spanned the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The reasons for the revolutionary discontent were political, social, and ideological. The establishment of political and civil freedoms of the Western Enlightenment did not reach full realisation in Russia between the years of 1740-1801. The following century saw repeated attempts at reform and counter-reform which failed to quell the unrest.

The Enlightenment in Russia was something of a contradiction, with a vast divide between the rich and poor. There was a surge in growth of culture and refined arts among the elites, and an expansion of Russia’s borders and military strength. The nobility were excluded from the onerous poll tax which impoverished the commoners. Peasants and serfs in feudal Russia had no part in this golden age. Around 90 percent of the population were peasants and most of Russian Orthodox faith. This serfdom more resembled New World slavery than Old World serfdom. Landlords exercised private law over the peasants on their property; had the final authority on serf marriages; and in the event of uprisings, were able to bid government forces to punish the offenders.

Reform Russia, from 1855-1881, was initially a time of progressive politics. Tsar Alexander II [1855-1881] was considered a reformist leader. Censorship relaxed under his reign, allowing literary circles, private presses, and independent journals to thrive. Many of these were sponsored by universities in St. Petersburg or Moscow, and were written for an intellectual and secular audience. Yet there was significant peasant unrest in the provinces until, against the will of the nobility, the tsar emancipated the serfs in 1861, though they were still not citizens until the Fundamental Law in 1906. Peasant unrest had largely declined by 1864. Alexander II
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also created the *zemstva*, elected local government bodies which was in part responsible for the rise of the bureaucracy and the employment of the *intelligentsia*.\(^6\)

The product of these reforms was a more politically aware middle class. But, by 1870, this awareness had turned into discontent. After Alexander II’s death in 1881, the accession of his son Alexander III heralded the beginnings of counter-reform. The liberal reforms had failed to achieve what was expected, and the rising crime rate and violence of the revolutionary movement saw reaction replace reform.\(^7\) Western judicial reforms were abandoned, censorship increased once more, and military tribunals were arranged to hear civilian offenses (specifically the dissemination of illegal propaganda). The *zemstva*, instead of exercising their authority in administrative reform, began to petition for more political representation, such as a constitution and a national assembly.\(^8\) The officialdom decided that the *zemstva* was an unsuccessful venture in liberal reform. Their authority was scaled back, and repression was renewed.

With the rise of the middle class came the formation of the *intelligentsia*. This was a growing professional class of well-born and well-educated people. From 1860 to 1900, the number of graduates from university, colleges, and elite schools rose from 20,000 to 85,000.\(^9\) Their rapid growth in size, organisation, and importance was unnerving for the Russian government, which was not known for encouraging independent civic societies. Societies formed regardless, and study groups converged in bookshops and salons all over Russia, becoming increasingly radical.\(^10\)

The *intelligentsia*, being well-travelled as well as educated, witnessed the freedoms enjoyed by their Western counterparts while studying abroad in places such as Sweden and Germany, and
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wanted such freedoms for Russia. They were also frustrated with social stagnation, as many were caught within the crux of social mobility, unable to rise any higher than their station. Political stagnation was also apparent; for example when members of the zemstva petitioned the tsar, as was their right by law, for changes within the province (such as a school for the peasant’s children), they faced persecution, prohibition, suspension, and in some cases, exiled to Siberia. The majority of the terrorist leaders and propagandists were drawn from this educated social group.

However, according to Martin Miller, Russian social conditions did not inspire anarchist terrorism so much as the failure of the Paris Commune in France. In 1871, revolutionaries seized parts of Paris and attempted to establish a new form of government – a commune based largely on Marxist principles. The manner in which the dissenters were treated by government forces was significant to the Russia agitators, as:

> ...the French army laid waste to the entire neighbourhood around the Commune headquarters with limitless brutality. Police files had evidence for over 4,000 insurgents. Around 10,000 were sentenced to deportation, prison, or execution, in addition to another 10,000 who were cut down by gunfire or died in the fighting.  

According to Miller, in light of this event, governments had criminalised radical activity long before its outbreak in the 1890s. The threat of anarchist activity was then so high that the Western world, from St Petersburg to Washington, mounted a “war on anarchism” resulting in two international governmental conferences in 1898 and 1904.

The legacy of the Enlightenment, reforms, reactions, and rise of an educated middle class was the rise of new ideologies. These came as Marxism, socialism, nihilism, and anarchism. Using these philosophies, the intelligentsia sought to enhance the human experience by theorising political methods to alleviate general social woes. Ideas included the separation of Church and
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state, embracing science and scepticism, and scrutinizing the natural laws and rights of mankind. The Russian anarchists were preceded by William Godwin and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon in the early nineteenth century. They speculated about governance and freedom at a time when these topics were both inherently limiting and limited. Russian anarchists were inspired by them to create a uniquely Russian understanding of anarchism.

Anarchism

The first important tract on anarchism was published in 1840, by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *What is Property? An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government*. This pamphlet sought to address the fundamental imbalances of nineteenth century French society.

Proudhon’s goal was stipulated in the preface:

I boldly avowed my intentions to bend my efforts to the discovery of some means of AMELIORATING THE PHYSICAL, MORAL, AND INTELLECTUAL CONDITIONS OF THE MERE AND NUMEROUS POorer CLASSES.”

The king was merely a man, he wrote; and the rule of man over man was upheld by law – the same law, he argued, which was distinct from justice and truth. Therefore the rule of man over man was unjust. The church, he also decided, was morally stagnant and in order “To restore religion, it is necessary to condemn the Church.” Proudhon wrote: “[All] men believe and repeat that equality of conditions is identical with equality of rights; that PROPERTY and ROBBERY are synonymous terms...” “Property is theft” became Proudhon’s slogan, taken up by many anarchists. Saul Newman summarised the classical anarchist perception of the state as “a violent institution of domination – as a structure which sustains and intensifies other hierarchies and relations of power and exploitation, including economic relations.”
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Kropotkin is considered a classic anarchist for his definition of Russian anarchism.\(^{21}\) To him, the very nature of anarchism defied any attempt to set its subtle teachings within a rigid set of structures. However, Kropotkin wrote later in 1903:

> No ruling authorities, then. No government of man by man; no crystallization and immobility, but a continual evolution – such as what we see in nature...In other words, no actions imposed upon the individual by fear of punishment; none is required from him by society, but those which receive his full acceptance. In a society of equals this would be quite sufficient for preventing unsociable actions...\(^{22}\)

His goal was to emancipate society from oppression by God and state, in order to allow each person to realise their full potential. The only source of governance would be in communes of equals. These would maintain and develop social customs, and facilitate economic growth.\(^{23}\) Essentially, Kropotkin defied any institute or tool of coercion by a governing body: from prisons to chapels. Geifman argued that this concept stemmed from the anarchist belief that “man is naturally good and human and therefore does not need to comply with norms established by compulsory institutions.”\(^{24}\) However, this concept was also hard-line as Geifman suggested, focusing on action, a refusal to compromise, and without concrete aims.\(^{25}\)

There was no united anarchist front, according to Abe Greenwald.\(^{26}\) The anarchists were fractured into individual camps, which he called “hair-splitting abstractions.”\(^{27}\) Proudhon was an anarcho-syndicalist, Kropotkin was an anarcho-communist, and Bakunin was anarcho-collectivist. Despite the ideological hair-splitting, Kropotkin’s definition is similar to academic definitions of anarchism, such as *Demanding the Impossible* by Peter Marshall:

> [Anarchists] reject the legitimacy of external government and of the state, and condemn imposed political authority, hierarchy and domination. They seek to establish the condition of

\(^{21}\) Ibid.
\(^{22}\) Kropotkin, *Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings*. p157
\(^{23}\) Ibid. p137
\(^{25}\) *Thou Shalt Kill*. p123
\(^{27}\) Ibid. p33
anarchy, that is to say, a decentralized and self-regulating society consisting of a federation of voluntary associations of free and equal individuals.\textsuperscript{28}

Anarchism has been criticised for its extreme idealism, yet, perhaps because of this idealism, anarchist terrorism can still be found in politics today.\textsuperscript{29}

**Revolutionaries**

This idealism led the Russian anarchists to believe that violence would facilitate political change, while it would inadvertently consolidate Propaganda of the Deed. This section will discuss the main theorists, influences, terrorists, and groups involved in the conception of Propaganda of the Deed. Mikhail Bakunin will be introduced, followed by the Circle of Tchaikovsky. The Circle was founded in part by Sophia Perovskaya, which recruited the anarchist philosopher, Prince Pyotr Kropotkin and Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky. Some members of the Circle went on to form part of the Zemla i Volya, which engaged Vera Figner. Figner would, along with Perovskaya, become instrumental to the formation of the far more violent Narodnaya Volya leadership, the most prolific terrorist group of this period, and their adoption of Johann Most’s ideas. The *Narodnaya Volya* was the first populist group to implement Propaganda of the Deed as a systematic strategy.

Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) was known as the godfather of Russian anarchism. Born into one of the more liberal households in Russia, Bakunin’s father encouraged him to debate, moderated his observance of Russian Orthodoxy, and provided an alternative learning environment to the average Russian aristocrat.\textsuperscript{30} Bakunin went to the artillery officer school in St Petersburg but tired of military life, and deserted in 1835. He then went to Moscow, where he studied German idealism, and deserted in 1835. He then went to Moscow, where he studied German idealism, and established himself as “the most important Russian Hegelian of the period.”\textsuperscript{31} He travelled to Berlin to converse with other radical thinkers and promote the

\textsuperscript{29} See for example, Tom Kington, ”Italian Anarchists Kneecap Nuclear Executive and Threaten More Shootings,” *The Guardian*, 12 May 2012.
\textsuperscript{31} Ibid. p92
anarchist revolution. It is here one can see the influence of Hegelian idealism on Russian anarchism.

Bakunin inspired Russian anarchists with his revolutionary activity.32 In 1848, he participated in the Witsuntide insurrection, and was expelled from France to Prague. A year later, he joined the Dresden Revolt. He was incarcerated and transferred to Konigstein Fortress in Germany, where he was sentenced to death in 1850, which was commuted to life imprisonment. He was extradited to Austria and then imprisoned in Prague. Bakunin was transferred to Olmutz Fortress in Austria again, where he was again condemned to death in 1851. Instead, he was extradited to Russia and imprisoned in the St Peter and Paul Fortress. From there, he was transferred to the Schusselberg - the most isolated prison in Russia - where his life sentence was commuted to life in exile in Siberia. In 1861, Bakunin escaped Siberia via Amur, San Francisco, the Panama Canal, and New York, and arrived back in Poland in 1863 to participate in an insurrection. He then travelled through Florence, Stockholm, Naples, and Geneva, founding anarchist associations, such as the International Brotherhood, as he went. This was all achieved while he wrote anarchist pamphlets attempting to rouse people in revolt.33

Bakuninism influenced the formation of a radical study group, the Circle of Tchaikovsky. By modern standards, it was not a terrorist group, and did not engage in violent terrorist acts (although the tsarist government tended to be suspicious of these groups). The Circle was a peaceful propagandist group that espoused anarchist social revolution. It was named after founder Nicholai Tchaikovsky. He was inspired by Mignet’s retelling of the French Revolution, in addition to his established sympathies for the peasantry.34 While at university, Tchaikovsky and his fellows began organising schools for artisans’ children. It was there he met Sophia Perovskaya, who became a co-founder of the Circle in 1869.35

32 This is possibly due to Bakunin’s notoriety at having the most varied incarcerations and expulsions of any anarchist at the time.
34 Perris, Russia in Revolution. p197
35 Ibid. p199
Tchaikovsky and Perovskaya wanted to spread educational propaganda amongst the working class. Their goal, as related by Tchaikovsky, was to “proceed to make connections amongst the workers and the peasants and gradually prepare for revolutionary upheaval.”

They referred to their revolutionary cadres, a series of small propaganda circles across Russia (with a presence in each of the thirty-eight provinces) as the *Narodnya Intelligenzia*: the Peoples Intelligentsia. The Central Circle recruited some of the finest thinkers of the Russian revolutionary movement: Pyotr Kropotkin, Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky, and later, Nikolai Morozov. It was Perovskaya, however, who would link the important people of this time together.

Sophia Lvovna Petrovskaya (1853-1881) was referred to as the “white queen of the red revolution.” She was born into a noble family, the daughter of the former Governor-General of St. Petersburg, Lev Nikolayevich Perovsky. He was described as a “despot amongst despots” and had profited greatly from serfdom. After her obligatory time at the Alarchinsky Institute for Women, she left the family home and helped Tchaikovsky found the Circle. The house in which the meetings were held was rented by her under an assumed name. She used her nursing skills in the provinces as goodwill propaganda for the Circle. When it disbanded, she became part of the *Zemla i Volya* in 1876. After the conference at Voronezh in 1879 which led to its disbanding, she chose the path of violence with the *Narodnaya Volya*.

From then, Perovskaya was “first in all terroristic projects.” She was involved in the bombing of the Odessa Rail in 1880, the mining of Italyanskaya Street in 1881, and the assassination of

---
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38 Perris, *Russia in Revolution*. p202
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40 Perris, *Russia in Revolution*. p208
41 Figner, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. pp105-106
43 The conference in Voronezh was where the *Zemla i Volya* chose to split into two groups: the *Black Partition* which favoured peaceful agitation, and the *Narodnaya Volya*, which favoured violence.
Alexander II in 1881. For that, Perovskaya was venerated by her fellows. Figner admired her “radiant love of humanity,” her commitment to the revolution, and her womanly goodness. Stepniak-Kravchinsky, perhaps in memory of her martyrdom, glorified her:

She had the ready laugh of a girl, and laughed with so much heartiness, and so unaffectedly, that she really seemed a young lass of sixteen.... At dinner time, when all met, there was chatting and joking as though nothing was at stake, and it was then that Sophia Perovskaya—at the very moment when she had in her pocket a loaded revolver intended to blow up everything and everybody into the air—most frequently delighted the company with her silver laugh.

This opinion was by corroborated by many of the Russian anarchists. Even Kropotkin marveled at her intelligence and generosity and called her “a fighter of the truest steel.”

Pyotr Kropotkin (1842-1921) was a high-born Russian noble who, like many in this period, was raised by the servants. At fifteen, he entered the Corps of Pages, and distinguished himself as the *page de chambre* to the tsar himself. Despite this privilege, upon his graduation, Kropotkin joined the little-known mounted Cossacks of Amur Regiment in Siberia. To Kropotkin, Siberia represented the chance for reform. He had been disillusioned by the plight of the serfs, as contrasted to court life and Winter Palace balls. In *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, he wrote: “I soon realized the absolute impossibility of doing anything really useful for the masses of the people by means of the administrative machinery. With this illusion I parted forever.” He left the Russian army after witnessing brutality against Poles by his fellow officers during the insurrection of 1866. Involvement in the International Workingmen’s Association led him to Bakunin’s writings.

45 Ibid. pp106-107. She undertook this task aided by Vera Figner, and her peasant lover, Andrey Zelyabov.
46 Ibid. p104-105
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He was recruited to the Circle of Tchaikovsky in 1872.\textsuperscript{54} Caroline Cahm argued that despite his approval of the concept, he never liked to use the term Propaganda of the Deed to describe the revolutionary action he advocated.\textsuperscript{55} After two years, he was arrested and held without trial; the charges being his involvement in a “secret society which has for its object the overthrow of the existing form of government.”\textsuperscript{56} He was imprisoned in the St. Peter and Paul Fortress. In 1874, his health failed and he was transferred to a military hospital. The Circle jail-broke Kropotkin and smuggled him out of Russia, and he lived in exile in Western Europe until nearly the end of his life. Kropotkin provided intellectual legitimacy to the anarchist movement. He clarified both the practical and theoretical aspects of anarchism. Important pamphlets include the “Spirit of Revolt,” “Appeal to the Young,” and “Revolutionary Government.”\textsuperscript{57}

Another Circle graduate, Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinsky (1851-1895) was the “technician of the revolution.”\textsuperscript{58} He was extremely well-educated, having studied at Orlov-Bahktin Military Academy; the Third Aleksandrovsky Military Institute; and graduating from the Mikhailovsky Artillery Institute as a lieutenant in 1870, aged nineteen.\textsuperscript{59} He soon assumed the pseudonym of Stepniak, meaning “of the steppes” to associate himself with the common people. His disillusionment with peaceful agitation may have come when he and a friend, Dmitry Rogachev, failed to rouse the peasants of Tver province with their revolutionary pamphlets in 1874.\textsuperscript{60} Kravchinksy joined the Tchaikovsky Circle and was one of their great propagandists.

Stepniak-Kravchinsky left Russia in 1877 to help the Italian anarchist, Errico Malatesta. He took part in the uprisings in Benevento (north-east of Naples) and later in Herzegovina.\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid. p285
\textsuperscript{56} Kropotkin, Memoirs of a Revolutionist. p314
\textsuperscript{57} All of which can be found in Anarchism: A Collection of Revolutionary Writings.
\textsuperscript{58} James Joll, The Anarchists (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964). p147n
\textsuperscript{59} Anthony Anemone, Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia, (Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2010). pp101-102
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid. p102
\textsuperscript{61} The Anarchists. p120
returned to Russia and, in 1878, murdered General Nikolai Mezentsev, head of Russia’s secretive Third Section police.62 Fleeing Russia, he spent most of his life in exile in London, where he became well-known as an authority on revolutionary Russia with his publication *Underground Russia*.63 Stepniak-Kravchinski remained a favourite among the revolutionaries.64 Kropotkin wrote: “I felt real love for his honest, frank nature, for his youthful energy and good sense, for his superior intelligence, simplicity and truthfulness, and for his courage and tenacity. He was ten years younger than I was, and perhaps did not quite realise what a hard contest the coming revolution would be.”65 This statement could have been applied more to the entire Circle.

The premise of the Circle was to ‘go to the people’. Its members utilised familial aristocratic bonds to spread their ideas. They published propagandist pamphlets, and arrests ensued. When a member, Dmitry Karakozoff announced his plan to shoot Alexander II in 1866, the Tchaikovsky Circle did their best to dissuade him. When that failed, they kept watch to prevent the attempt. Kropotkin claimed this saved the life of the tsar.66 Tchaikovsky himself was eventually so disillusioned by the lack of any apparent social progress that he moved to Western Europe in early 1878. By then most of the core members of the Circle had turned to violent propaganda. The Circle of Tchaikovsky had nevertheless performed a particular task. Perris wrote:

> The first of these two periods may again be divided into a time of preparation and missionary effort lasting four or five years, and a time of open and increasingly violent struggle culminating in the adoption of terrorism as a policy and ending in the practical extinction of the revolutionary organization by the wholesale measures of government revenge.67

The Tchaikovsky Circle hoped to prepare Russia for revolution. In doing so, the participants inadvertently prepared for the violence to come.

---
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Many of the Tchaikovsky graduates moved on to the Zemla i Volya. Translating as ‘Land and Freedom,’ this group had two periods of activity. The first was a short-lived student movement, active from 1861-1864. This group essentially reacted to the government’s reversal of university reforms, but adopted the plight of the serfs as well, perhaps in an attempt to make their mission more popular. The serfs, after all, were only granted conditional freedom, without land or property. It could be from that which the Zemla i Volya drew its name. The goals of organisation were threefold. It sought to demonstrate the weakness of the government, to educate the peasants to revolution, and to encourage the insurrection. This movement quickly dwindled.

A new band of revolutionaries, comprising Perovskaya, Kropotkin, and Stepniak, took on the name, Zemla i Volya in the 1870s. Their campaign relied heavily on rural propaganda and goodwill missions. One member, Lev Tikhomirov fractured the group by criticising peaceful agitation. He believed that a willingness to commit acts of terror was “the sole mark of revolutionary legitimacy.” Like its predecessor, the success of this group was marginal. In 1876, they organised a protest in front of Kazan Cathedral which, as will be mentioned later in this chapter, ended horrendously. In 1876, the Kievan branch of the group attempted the murder of Nikolai Gorinovich, who they suspected of being a police informer. Gorinovich survived the attack and assisted the police in apprehending the assailants.

Zemla i Volya’s importance in the scheme of Russian revolutionary terrorism would be small if it were not for one event. In 1877, General Fyodor Trepov visited the St. Petersburg jail. Therein imprisoned was a Zemla i Volya founding member, Arkhip Bogoliubov. After arguing with Trepov, Bogoliubov was flogged. He was of the intelligentsia, a well-born gentleman, and it was illegal and also untoward for a man of his birth to be flogged like a common criminal,

---
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irrespective of the circumstances which landed him in jail. This act outraged Vera Zasulich. She had recently returned to St Petersburg from Siberia, where her association with the anarchist Sergei Nechaev had seen her exiled. In January, 1878, she shot and wounded Trepov, and in doing so, executed Propaganda of the Deed.

The issue of violence divided the Zemla i Volya. They had two conferences to address this. The first in Voronzeh in 1879, left the program of the Zemla i Volya unchanged, to the dissatisfaction of many. The various groups from the cities and provinces distrusted one another, according to Figner, although she claimed that the spirit of unity prevailed. It was at Voronzeh that Figner first suspected that a secret circle headed by Nikolai Morozov existed within this secret society. Meetings continued in St. Petersburg, where efforts to assassinate the tsar were thwarted by internal division. Before the year was out, it was decided that the group should split: those who favoured peaceful propaganda and economic warfare became Chornyi Peredel (The Black Partition) and those who stood for violent insurrection became part of the Narodnaya Volya (The People’s Will). The latter took the group’s resources; dynamite and 23,000 rubles. It is within the Narodnaya Volya, that the beginnings of professional, organised, and strategically-coherent terrorist groups can be seen, in part, due to the actions of Figner.

Vera Figner (1852-1942) is possibly one of the most unappreciated figures of terrorist history. When she is mentioned in academic literature, she receives only a passing comment. Yet, she had a significant role in the Russian revolutionary movement as a propagandist, a terrorist, and a popular social personality. She was born to prosperous noble parents, and her sisters were

______________________________
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also involved in the revolutionary movement. Her ambitions were high, even if her family’s opinion of her was low. In *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, she quotes her aunt: “Vera’s a beautiful doll. She is like that pretty, crimson lantern that hangs in the corner of her room. On the near side it is good to look at, but the side that is turned to the wall is empty.”

This statement clearly resonated with Figner, as she became one of the most feared women of her time. She originally trained as a physician, and completed most of her studies in Zurich, before her revolutionary aspirations saw her leave her husband and degree in 1876. Figner became a member of the Zemla i Volya and contributed to spreading goodwill propaganda in the provinces through providing free healthcare. When the Zemlya i Volya split a few years later, she joined the Narodnaya Volya. As a Narodnaya leader, she was central to the propaganda movement. She soon escalated her involvement to the planning and coordinating of terrorist attacks, such as the assassination of Alexander II in 1881. She would spend nearly 20 years in prison for her involvement in this crime.

The Narodnaya Volya formed a coherent strategy to overthrow the tsar and attempt to catalyse the revolution. The guiding principle of the Narodnaya Volya was the populist belief that “the people existed for the government, and not the government for the people.” To the Narodnaya Volya, the government was responsible for the stultified emancipation of the serfs; the gap between rich and poor; the lack of political rights which encouraged social stagnation; and the extreme censorship which neutered the literary minds from exerting social influence. The Narodnaya were frustrated at the inertia of the peasants and the indomitable nature of the state.

---
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The group was organised as secret societies which operated in locales, all subject to the leadership of the central Executive Committee, and were obliged to offer up whatever resources the Committee required at any given time. These groups were specialized: some would spread propaganda amongst the *intelligentsia* in the salons and ballrooms of high-society Russia, while others would move amongst the working class. And, of course, there were ones which specialized in violent agitation. Figner wrote:

> Terror for its own sake was never the aim of the party. It was a weapon of protection, of self-defense, regarded as a powerful instrument for agitation, and employed only for the purpose of attaining the ends for which the organization was working.\(^8^2\)

Here can be seen the beginnings of the first political collective using terrorism as a strategy to exhibit and promote its revolutionary goals in a violent manner, such as that advocated by Johann Most a few decades earlier.

Johann Most (1846-1906) was German-born but influential on the Russian movement. Unlike his revolutionary comrades, Most was not well-born. His parents were working class, and by reports, abusive and physically violent. He suffered severe facial disfigurement from a night when his parents forced him to sleep on the floor of a freezing storeroom. An abscess was the result, and its treatment was at first neglected, and then mistreated, requiring significant facial surgery later to remove, leaving him horrifically scarred.\(^8^3\) Most was a contemporary of the Prussian revolutionary, Karl Heinzen, and supported Marxism as a Social Democrat. During the 1860’s, he participated in many demonstrations, rousing the crowds with his speeches about class struggle and revolution. For this, he was charged with treason in Vienna and sentenced to five years imprisonment in 1870.\(^8^4\)

Deported to Germany, Most took part in local politics and edited revolutionary newspapers. He was elected as member of the Reichstag in 1874, and was frequently ejected from the chamber
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because of his spirited interjections. That same year, he was imprisoned in Plotzensee Prison for inciting violence, and eventually had to flee following two attempts on the life of the Kaiser (authorities believed he had some influence over the second would-be assassin, Nobiling). Living as an exile in London, Most was caricatured as “General Boom Boom,” with dynamite in one hand and a revolver in the other. There, he worked on his anarchist propaganda focusing on Propaganda of the Deed, until he was, again, arrested for sedition and libel in 1878. Most emigrated to the United States of America in 1882, where he received training in munitions factories to write his famous terrorist manual, “Military Science for Revolutionaries.” His activities in America linked him to the assassination of President McKinley, the murder of the industrialist Henry Clay Frick, and the Haymarket affair, where his manual was used as evidence in the ensuing trial.

Most’s activities, principles, and publications may have influenced the violent actions of the Narodnaya Volya, though there appears to be no direct link. In pursuit of Propaganda of the Deed, the Executive Committee worked predominantly on the assassination of Tsar Alexander II. They were responsible for the 1880 bombing of the tsar train on the Odessa Rail. They also organised the 1880 bombing of the Winter Palace, where their operative Stephan Halturin embedded dynamite two floors under the tsar’s dining room. The blast did not reach the Imperial family, instead killing or wounding fifty members of the Finland Regiment. In response to the Winter Palace bombing, Prince Michael Loris-Melikov headed a Supreme Commission which abolished the Third Section and moved the secret police into the Interior Ministry, which appealed to the liberals.
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Figner arranged the shooting-assassination of Loris-Melikov before he could succeed in settling the unrest. He was shot by an operative known as Molodetsky, who was hanged “four days later with the smile of a hero.”\(^9\) Figner’s next plot was the stabbing of Panyutin, a chancellor for a governor-general, but this was interrupted by a message from the Executive Committee.\(^9\) Panyutin was forgotten, for the tsar was once again the priority target. It had taken the *Narodnaya Volya* six attempts, but on 1 March 1881, Alexander II was killed (as will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three).

Upon confirmation of Alexander II’s death, The Executive Committee sent a carefully worded letter to his successor, Alexander III. It stated, *inter alia*:

> The conditions under which we are living, the general dissatisfaction of the people, Russians aspiration towards a new order of life, all of these create revolutionists. You cannot exterminate the whole Russian people, you cannot therefore destroy its discontent by means of reprisal; on the contrary, discontent growths thereby...\(^9\)

> There are two possible escapes from this situation: either a revolution, quite inevitable, which cannot be averted by any number of executions, or the voluntary turning to the people on the part of the Supreme Authority...\(^4\)

They also called for the freedom of the press, assembly, speech, elections, and general amnesty for the crimes committed in pursuit of revolution. These conditions were not met. The group failed in its ends, but as will be seen, its method of pursuing those ends was far more significant.

In conclusion, the historical context for revolutionary Russia was a combination of grievances. Russia’s late acceptance of Enlightenment thought, and the socio-economic disparities made the golden age exclusive to the upper class. Reforms were scaled back when more political freedom was demanded. The rising educated middle class soon became frustrated with their lack of social movement, and formed the *intelligentsia*. Some of the *intelligentsia* embraced
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anarchist ideology, which led to the formation of groups such as the Circle of Tchaikovsky. Members of the Circle, in turn, became disheartened with the lack of progress, and many including Figner, Perovskaya, and Morozov became activists within the *Narodnaya Volya*. The *Narodnaya Volya*, as will be seen in the next chapter, was the first populist group to apply Propaganda of the Deed as part of a systematic terrorist campaign to achieve revolution.
Chapter Three: Dynamite and Daring

The Russian anarchists and Propaganda of the Deed

An international congress of anarchists, including Kropotkin and Malatesta, met in London and officially adopted ‘propaganda of the deed,’ a policy of illegal acts. These acts aimed at institutions and towards revolts and revolutions were necessary since verbal and written propaganda had proved ineffectual.¹

According to Richard Bach Jensen, the transition towards the violent use of Propaganda of the Deed was a deliberate decision taken by the anarchist community. The Russian anarchist terrorists were both effective and destructive in their exploitation of this concept. Whitney Kassel contests this assessment. Apparently ignoring the organisational order of the Narodnaya Volya, she claims that the anarchists were “profundly disorganized, unsystematic, and lacking in the objective coherence of the sort found in many other terrorist and revolutionary movements.”² This analysis of their propaganda disagrees with Kassel’s interpretation through examination of six propaganda themes: the theoretical purpose of terror, justification for the use of violence, the strategy, the tactics, implementation as a systematic campaign, and the glorification of the revolution and of martyrdom. As Rapoport found, the Narodnaya Volya gave the world a strategy to ponder and improve.³ The Russian anarchists represent the first clear application of Propaganda of the Deed as a consistent strategy in modern history. They are the blueprint for comparison with all the waves of terror which followed.

Theoretical Purpose

² Whitney Kassel, "Terrorism and the International Anarchist Movement of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," Studies in Conflict & Terrorism 32, no. 3 (2009). p237
The purpose of anarchist terrorist violence was to undermine the state and to provoke an overwhelming and brutal response against general society, which in turn would incite the mass revolution. The Russian anarchists acknowledged that this scheme was not sufficiently compelling to inspire the people to revolt. Therefore, the terrorists declared the purpose of their violence in other terms; terms deliberately constructed to win new recruits to their cause. Propagandists such as Kropotkin, Figner, and Nikolai Morozov best epitomise the anarchist understanding of the purpose of violence, and, consequently, Propaganda of the Deed.

Kropotkin was initially highly supportive of terrorism. Its purpose was to enhance the propaganda by capturing the media’s attention. His well-known explanation comes from “The Spirit of Revolt:”

> By actions which compel general attention, the new idea seeps into people’s minds and wins converts. One such act may, in a few days, make more propaganda than a thousand pamphlets.⁴

Action as propaganda equated to violence as propaganda. This violence had a two-fold purpose in Kropotkin’s understanding of Propaganda of the Deed. It would engender hope among the masses, and encourage greater repression by the state. He wanted the tsardom to be more brutal, more violent.

One courageous act has sufficed to upset in a few days the entire governmental machinery, to make the colossus tremble...Hope is born in their hearts, and let us remember that if exasperation often drives men to revolt, it is hope, the hope of victory, which makes revolutions.

The government resists; it is savage in its repressions. But, though formerly persecution killed the energy of the oppressed, now, in periods of excitement, it produces the opposite result. It provokes new acts of revolt, individual and collective; it drives the rebels to heroism; and in rapid succession these acts spread, become general, develop...⁵

He envisioned a few acts of violence causing the revolution, by the violence becoming generalised. The greater the terrorist violence, the greater the state reaction. This would educate the masses as to the ‘true’ evil of the state. They would join the radical support base

---
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and overthrow the state. Therefore, according to Kropotkin, the true purpose of terrorist violence was to incite increased governmental violence and general violence. The resulting collateral damage was not discussed.

On the other hand, Figner understood the purpose of the violence as an essentially urban communication activity. Upon the failure of peaceful propaganda, she too began to encourage terrorist violence as propaganda. Figner was initially opposed to the use of violence, but came to see its purpose within the revolution as a necessity. Once committed to this, she became intrinsically involved in many of the following terrorist attempts, begging to be permitted a part in the action. In *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, she wrote:

> Terroristic acts went almost unnoticed in the village: there was no one on whom to observe the effect they produced; unheralded and unmourned, they did not stir even the revolutionists themselves, who, dwelling in the country, had not lived through the anxieties, dangers, and joys of the conflict...they did not lament the loss of their comrades who had gone to their death.  

The purpose, to Figner, was to be noticed, to draw attention to the cause of the revolution, and to draw on the emotional reserves of the people. The only way to achieve this was through terrorism with an audience.

Nikolai Morozov understood the purpose of violence in terms of both word and direct action, action which was systematic and consistent. According to “The Terrorist Struggle:”

Russian terrorists have two highly important tasks:

1. They should theoretically clarify the idea of the terroristic struggle, which up to now is understood differently by different people...preaching on future struggle is essential...
2. The terroristic party should show in practice the usefulness of the means its employs. The party should bring about the final disorganization, demoralization, and weakening of the government for its actions of violence against freedom. This should be achieved through a consistent, punishing system used by terrorists.

---

6 Figner, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. p73 Figner wrote: “Sophia Petrovskaya and I, who had not taken a definite stand at Voronezh in our efforts to preserve the unity of the organization, no longer objected when the time came for action.”
7 Ibid. p64
To Morozov, the purpose was to use both propaganda and deeds to bring about the end of the tsardom through the consistent application of violence as clarified in the propaganda. His vision of violence is self-perpetuating – violence would beget more violence, until its tradition was institutionalised within Russian society, thereby “destroy[ing] the very possibility of despotism’s recurrence in the future.” Morozov hoped that every act of violence would inspire new terrorists, for every tyrant would become a target for terrorist-assassins, like Solovjev and Nobiling. Thus, he hoped, the possibility of despotism would become impossible. By the relentless application of violence, the tsardom’s position would become untenable, and political change would follow.

The anarchists believed that propaganda and deeds were complementary, and a combination was required for revolution. Kropotkin saw violence as necessary in increasing tensions and spurring society to revolution, through encouraging repression from the state. Figner regarded it as activities in urban settings where there was an audience, marking a shift from her previous agrarian focus. Violence was necessary as it would inculcate an emotional response from the population, and further the revolutionary propaganda. Morozov emphasised the importance of the violence being applied systematically – an important formula to come. He saw the purpose of terrorism as a self-sustaining tradition which would undermine the control of the state, and become an institution in society. The combined influence of these understandings was the general acceptance that violence was necessary and justified in order to implement the vogue anarchist ideology. It was not without purpose, but designed to incite the revolution.

Justification for Violence

9 Ibid. p82
10 Solovjev and Nobiling were responsible for attempted regicide. Alexander Solovjev made an attempt on the life of Tsar Nicholas II in 1879. Dr. Carl Nobiling tried to shoot the German Emperor Wilhelm in 1878 (See Philip Pomper in Terrorism in Context, ed Marsha Crenshaw (Pen State Press, 2010, p40)).
12 “[T]he anarchist movement would both destroy the state and come into being as an actual entity competent to create a new form of society in its own image.” Kassel, “Terrorism and the International Anarchist Movement of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries.” p241
Kassel argued that Propaganda of the Deed allowed the anarchists to “embody the meaning of the movement and motivate others to take up arms” which was seen as the justification for violence.\(^{13}\) Andrew Koch thought the justification for violence stemmed from the importance of rationalism in anarchism.\(^{14}\) The present study demonstrates that the terrorist propaganda shows that the anarchists did not believe the state had rightful authority over them, as they believed in individual autonomy. Ergo, they did not believe states had the right to force. If the state used force against them, it was in the natural rights of the anarchists to use force against the state. Much of the violence was therefore justified with a combination of moral relativism, and claims of self-defence. The state was depicted as the enemy of Russian life: the terrorists were the defenders. Heinzen, Bakunin, Tarnovski, and Figner were significant propagandists of this philosophy.

Heinzen was a German propagandist whose 1849 work “Murder” had significant impact on the Russian anarchist justification for violence. He wrote:

> We do not desire any killing, any murder, but if our enemies are not of the same mind, if they can justify murder, even going so far as to claim a special privilege in the matter; then necessity compels us to challenge this privilege.\(^ {15}\)

Heinzen positioned violence as democratic and retaliatory, using the self-defence argument. He also relativized murder, citing historical assassinations to make the argument that murder was necessary for progress to occur.\(^ {16}\) Violence was not optional; to Heinzen, it was compulsory and retributive. He triumphantly wrote:

> Murder is their motto, so let murder be their answer. Murder is their need, so let murder be their payment. Murder is their argument, so let murder be their refutation. The European barbarian party has left us no choice than to devote ourselves to the study of murder and refine the art of killing to the highest possible degree.\(^ {17}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Ibid. p238


\(^{15}\) Karl Heinzen. “Murder.” Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p58

\(^{16}\) Ibid. p59 He cites acts of historical precedent such as the attempted assassination of Porsenna by Mucius Scaevola, the death of Julius Caesar by his favourite, Junius Brutus, and, the most recent example, the German nationalist Karl Ludwig Sand stabbing the dramatist, Kotzebue, in 1819.

\(^{17}\) Ibid. p67
This encapsulated the moral relativism of anarchist terrorism. The act of political violence was not viewed as unlawful. Heinzen captured the sense of righteousness that accompanied the so-called art of killing. He argued that the state murdered by way of sanctioned executions, therefore the terrorists could sanction murders also. He elevated the revolutionary party to the same authority as the government. His second argument echoed in terrorist propaganda for years to come: violence was justified to create change, therefore the morality was relativised. Susan Morrissey described the moral economy as having two stages: “lines were drawn between combatants and non-combatants, the guilty and the innocent: the second blurs, perhaps even erases such distinctions, accepting, perhaps even desiring, large numbers of casualties.”

In his 1869 pamphlet, “Revolution, Terrorism, and Banditry,” Bakunin also justified violence using the self-defence position. His justification was that the state was to blame for the inception of violence, and that the violence of the bandit (the terrorist) was the response designed to liberate the people.

The nature of Russian banditry is cruel and ruthless; yet no less cruel and ruthless is that governmental might which has brought this kind of bandit into being by wanton acts. Governmental cruelty has engendered the cruelty of the people into something necessary and natural. But between these cruelties there still remains a vast difference. The first strives for the complete annihilation of the people, the other endeavors to set them free.

By Bakunin’s reasoning, the transition from word into violent deed was a reaction to the violence of the state. The terrorist was therefore the tsar’s own creation. This justification blamed the state, while also claiming societal altruism. Tarnovski took a similar approach to justifying violence. To Tarnovski, the tsar had no moral legitimacy. The people had no choice but to respond:

Before us is a gang of worthless louts exploiting poor, hungry Russia, writhing in a wild frenzy on ground spattered with the blood of its finest people. At its head is the czar, without heart or

19 Mikhail Bakunin. “Revolution, Terror, and Banditry.” Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p68
20 Ibid. p68
reason, who has made it his aim to stifle all those who show signs of life. The defense of public life has passed into the hands of the people who have decided to rid Russia of the tyrant, whatever the cost.\(^{21}\)

His justification excused the violence by proclaiming the terrorist as a champion of the people. He assumed the role of the defender of the people, and positioned the tsar as the aggressor.

Figner saw the dialectic between the revolutionaries and the tsardom as a defensive measure as well. She wrote: “the party committed its deeds of violence under the banner of the people’s welfare, in defence of the oppressed and insulted.”\(^{22}\) To Figner, the terrorists were responding to the violence of the state – due in most part to the persecution propagandists faced.

When the youth turned to the people with peaceful propaganda, the government met them with wholesale arrests, exile, penal servitude, and central prisons. When, outraged by violence, these young Russians punished a few servants of the government, the central power replied with military rule and executions.\(^{23}\)

She excused the terrorist violence, and shifted responsibility to the government. While at the time justifying the violence with arguments of humanity, altruism, and the desire to better Russian society, Figner went on to critique it with signs of remorse, gloomily describing the cult of violence for its own sake which had begun to grip Russia.\(^{24}\) She nevertheless saw the terrorists as revolutionaries and champions of the people. Her justification for the violence echoed with regret, perhaps owing to her writing the *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* in 1927, three decades after her revolutionary peak.

Terrorism was therefore justified by several sentiments: self-defence, retaliation, necessity, and altruism as a mark of revolutionary legitimacy. Violence was justified as equally prohibited or permissible; as the state gave violence, so too would it receive violence. The terrorist violence was therefore positioned as self-defensive and retaliatory. It was excused using moral relativism. Violence was also justified as a necessity in order to create change. Altruism was a

\(^{21}\) Gerasim Tarnovski, “Terrorism and Routine.” Ibid. p84
\(^{22}\) Figner, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*. p117
\(^{23}\) Ibid. p73
\(^{24}\) Ibid. p116
common theme in anarchist propaganda. The terrorists positioned themselves as heroes and liberators to confer legitimacy on their justification of violence.

**Strategic Method**

One of the most significant aspects of Propaganda of the Deed is the way it legitimised and encouraged spectacular violence. Propaganda of the Deed legitimised uninhibited violence if it furthered the cause of the revolution; ergo terrorists were at their liberty to orchestrate the most violent acts. Spectacular acts of violence could not be ignored. Strategic strikes, such as singular and dramatic acts, were designed to upset tsardom and to cause such upheaval as to irreversibly affect Russia. Political assassination was one major manifestation.\(^{25}\) The symbolism of the attack maximised propaganda by harnessing the resources of the media, and demonstrating the power of the terrorist. Propagandists for this argument were Most, Kropotkin, Stepniak-Kravchinsky, and Figner.

In Most’s eyes, no violence was too great. He encouraged spectacular acts of Propaganda of the Deed. The significance of the person killed maximised the propaganda generated. He wrote in 1884 that “Everyone now knows, from experience, that the more highly placed the one shot or blown up, and the more perfectly executed the attempt, the greater the propagandistic effect.”\(^{26}\) Political assassination, so long a standalone mechanism for political change, became integral to the systematic strategy. Most applauded spectacular political assassinations:

> The great thing about anarchist violence is that it proclaims loud and clear for everyone to hear that this or that man must die for this and this reason: then at the first opportunity which presents itself for the realization of this threat, the rascal in question is really and truly dispatched to the other world. This is indeed what happened with Alexander Romanov, with Mezentsov\(^{27}\) ....Once such an action has been carried out, the important thing is that the world learns of it from the revolutionaries, so that everyone knows what the position is.\(^{28}\) [Emphasis added]

---

\(^{25}\) The other major manifestation remains mass casualty – a more frequent occurrence and requiring less planning to than the assassination plots for the Tsar and his governors. This will be discussed in the next section.

\(^{26}\) Johann Most, “Advice for Terrorists.” Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p104

\(^{27}\) Also spelt ‘Mezentsov’, he was chief of the Third Department between 1878-1879. Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p45

\(^{28}\) Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p109
High-profile and systematic assassinations became inherent to Propaganda of the Deed, as they allowed the terrorist to control the content of the message, tying it intrinsically to the target. Most shared his technical knowledge in *Science of Revolutionary Warfare* to encourage this by providing explosive formulas, and suggesting bombing high society banquets.\(^{29}\)

Kropotkin agreed.\(^{30}\) He also believed that speculator acts of Propaganda of the Deed had a greater impact and maximised the propaganda opportunity. After the assassination of Alexander II, he wrote:

> One courageous act has sufficed to upset in a few days the entire governmental machine, to make the colossus tremble... The people observe that the monster is not so terrible as they thought; they dimly begin to perceive that a few energetic efforts will be sufficient throw it down.\(^{31}\)

An act of courageous violence was significant for several reasons. First, it maximised propaganda. Second, it broke down the aura of government authority. Third, it engendered hope within the masses that violence could create change. Lastly, the more spectacular the terrorist violence, the more savage the governments anticipated reaction would be. “The ruling classes may also try and find safety in savage reaction. But it is now too late; the battle only becomes more bitter, more terrible, and the revolution which is looming will only be more bloody.”\(^{32}\) This overreaction would expose the illegitimacy of the state, and the people would overthrow it, hence Kropotkin believed spectacular acts served a high strategic purpose for the revolution.

The terrorists were obsessed with the specular symbolic components of regicide. Stepniak-Kravchinsky referred to Alexander II as the “omnipotent emperor” who the terrorists struck to the ground.\(^{33}\) This language, while dramatic, did capture how the tsar was regarded among the Russian lower classes. The tsar and God dominated their known power structure, and while

---

\(^{29}\) Most, *The Science of Revolutionary Warfare*. p14  
\(^{30}\) Later in life, he went on to regret this support and stopped encouraging anarchist violence.  
\(^{32}\) Ibid. p98-99  
\(^{33}\) Serge Stepniak-Kravchinski. “Underground Russia.” Ibid. p89
they may not have thought the tsar omnipotent, his authority was well-established. The death of a tsar affirmed of the power of the terrorist. Morozov wrote, “Do not be afraid of the tsar, do not be afraid of despotic rulers because all of them are weak and helpless against secret, sudden assassinations…” The killing of the tsar was spectacular propaganda, and offered maximum effect for the terrorists.

Propaganda manifested as action. One of the Narodnaya Volya’s assassination attempts on Alexander II in 1880 was to plant explosives under the railway near Odessa, Alexandovsk, and Moscow, to be detonated as the procession passed over on return from annual vacation in Odessa. Three separate explosives were laid along the rail, targeting the Imperial train. One team was arrested with 50 pounds of dynamite, a failed electrical circuit let down the second team, and the third team missed the tsar but derailed his baggage train. The second event was the 1880 bombing of the Winter Palace, mentioned earlier. Discouraged, possibly, but not daunted, the terrorists made yet another attempt, this time spearheaded by Figner and Petrovskaya’s cell. The tsar held a special fascination to Figner. “I wanted to see, if only once in my life, the man whose existence was of such fatal significance to our party,” she wrote in her Memoirs.

The secret society for assassinating the tsar involved Figner, Perovskaya and her lover Andrei Zhelyabov, Yuri Bogdanovich, Anna Korba, and the bomb makers Kibalchich, Sukanov, and Grachevsky. Every Sunday, the tsar travelled in his carriage from the Winter Palace through the streets of St Petersburg to the Hippodrome, where he inspected the military guards. He commonly went via Sadovaya road. The Narodnaya Volya’s Executive Committee purchased a cheese shop fronting the road, and burrowed under it from the basement to plant mines.

---

34 Nikolai Morozov. “The Terrorist Struggle.” Ibid. p77
35 Burleigh, Blood and Rage. p48-50
36 Ibid. pp48-49
37 Figner, Memoirs of a Revolutionist. p86
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Additionally, there were two back-up teams of bomb throwers. The bomb throwers, Rysakov, Grinevitsky, Emelyanov, and Mikhaylov were commanded by Zhelyabov and Perovskaya.

However, on 1 March, 1881, the tsar did not go via Sadovaya, instead turning along the Ekaterininskaya Quay. Perovskaya redeployed the bombers accordingly. At 2:00 p.m., Rysakov threw his bomb under the tsar’s carriage. It detonated, overturning the carriage. Unharmed, the tsar approached the assailant, as he had done in the past with attempted assassinations. Grinevitsky then stepped forward and threw his bomb between the tsar and himself, mortally wounding them both. It had taken the Narodnaya Volya six rehearsals, but Alexander II was finally assassinated. Figner later wrote:

I rushed home. The streets hummed with talk, and there was evident excitement. People were speaking of the Tsar, of his wounds, of blood and death. When I entered my own dwelling and saw my friends who as yet suspected nothing, I was so agitated I could hardly utter the words announcing the death of the Tsar. I wept, many of us wept; that heavy nightmare, which for ten years had strangled Young Russia before our very eyes, had been brought to an end...

The death of the tsar did not catalyse society into popular revolution. The high-profile, spectacular assassination failed to bring about political change, but it did provoke an overpowering reaction from the state. Russia was altered by this event, as violence between terrorists and the government became more urgent and systematic. More was to come.

The Russian anarchist strategic method heavily emphasised spectacular attacks, by assassinating high-profile targets. Their main targets were political and military. This allowed the terrorists to control the symbolism of the message, so that the masses would learn the position of the terrorists from the source. It also magnified the propaganda output, and achieved maximum impact. This allowed them to undermine the government’s appearance of authority. This strategic method was a deliberate construct within early use in Propaganda of the Deed.

39 Ibid. p98-99
40 Ibid. p99
41 Burleigh suggests that around 1905 there were new methods adopted by the terrorists: indiscriminate targeting and increased use of suicide attacks. Burleigh, Blood and Rage. p60
Tactical Method

Propaganda of the Deed was not purely a strategy of killing high-profile targets. It had two sides to its violence. One was the strategic and spectacular – the other was the tactical and sustained. Singular assassinations created a sense of urgency, while sustained tactical violence prolonged an atmosphere of tension. Tactical violence took the form of small arms attacks, explosives, and handheld bombs. The targets had less importance than the tsar, but were still symbolic. Bakunin wrote: “Poison, dagger, noose, and the like!... Everything in this fight is equally sanctified by the revolution.”42 This statement would encourage innovation and become grimly prophetic.

Most wanted to infuse anarchist violence with a sense of professionalism. He wrote that anarchist organisations “should then learn military techniques, so they can mobilize effectively...”43 An avid champion of violence, he frequently wrote about the many ways in which terrorist violence could be achieved. Small arms would be integral. He wrote in The Science of Revolutionary Warfare:

> When the people’s revolt breaks out, it is very much a question of whether enough guns are in the hands of revolutionaries at the very beginning of the insurrection to surprise the enemy with a few bold strokes, to eliminate key enemy personnel by covert means [emphasis added]...44

Most wanted workers organisations to stockpile arms, to commit acts of terrorism, but to mobilize in general insurrection once terrorists had catalysed the revolution. His handbook had two purposes: to inspire violence, and to show how it could be achieved. His optimism echoed through the propaganda, and his diatribe against disarmament also may have been designed to impress his readers with a sense of immediacy. “Don’t waste any more time; get the best weapons you can afford!”45 Small arms became popular weapons for terrorist attacks because of the ability to obtain, conceal, and use them with a relative lack of skill.

---

42 Mikhail Bakunin. “Revolution, Terror, and Banditry.” Laqueur, Voices of Terror. p69
43 Most, The Science of Revolutionary Warfare. p52
44 Ibid. p57
45 Ibid. p54
The first successful instance of Propaganda of the Deed in Russian terrorism involved a conventional firearm, when Zasulich shot Trepov in 1878.\(^{46}\) Early tactics relied on conventional firearms, spontaneity, and luck – a strategy coupled with discriminating application, but flawed through poor planning. Two unsuccessful attempts on Alexander II involved revolvers, the first by Dmitry Karakozov in 1866.\(^{47}\) The member of Hell, an offshoot of the Organisation,\(^ {48}\) shot at the tsar during his morning walk, but missed.\(^ {49}\) In 1879, the *Narodnaya Volya* gave Alexander Soloviev a Bear Hunter pistol to shoot the tsar. Spotting the terrorist’s high cockaded hat during a walk, the tsar fled, avoiding five bullets.\(^ {50}\) Early attempts were often flawed by amateur opportunism and lack of technical skill. Nonetheless, Gregory Goldenberg of *Zemla i Volya* successfully shot Prince Dmitri Kropotkin in 1878, and in the following decades various presidents, ministers, governors and generals met the same fate at the hands of anarchists world-wide. Selective targeting and amateurism characterised early use of Propaganda of the Deed.

Explosives were another integral component. Dynamite is perhaps the most democratic of terrorist weapons, as its initial purpose was for mining and was not initially part of the war-fighting equipment of states. Heinzen saw dynamite as an equaliser between the terrorists and the overwhelming number of government personnel.

> We need instruments of destruction which are of little use to the great masses of the barbarians when they are fighting a few lone individuals but which give a few lone individuals the terrifying power to threaten the safety of whole masses of barbarians.\(^ {51}\)

Dynamite, conceived in this fashion, was a weapon of maximisation. Most declared of a half-pound bomb: “Just imagine this bomb had been planted under the table at a high society banquet or thrown through a window onto their table – it would have achieved wonderful

\(^{46}\) Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p44  
\(^{47}\) Claudia Verhoeven thinks historians have overlooked the importance of this attack in the greater scheme of terrorism. Claudia Verhoeven, *The Odd Man Karakozov*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009). eBook.  
\(^{48}\) A nihilist group which may have had links to the *Zemla i Volya*  
\(^{49}\) Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p35  
\(^ {50}\) Ibid. p46  
\(^ {51}\) Karl Heinzen. “Murder.” Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p65
The symbolic victims in this fantasy were the bourgeoisie. Most instructed other terrorists on the properties and handling of nitro-glycerine, dynamite, and gun cotton in his handbook.\(^{52}\) Dynamite offered the terrorists the equaliser they desired, and became a tactical weapon which fitted the overarching strategy of Propaganda of the Deed.

While roadside bombing dominates current insurgencies, the tactic had roots in nineteenth century Russia. Three significant operations using dynamite on transportation targets were undertaken by *Narodnaya Volya* in 1880. First was the Kammeny Bridge bombing. The terrorists encased a 113kg bomb in rubber and submersed it under the bridge to detonate as the tsar’s procession passed overhead.\(^{53}\) The bomber overslept. The bombing of the Odessa railway failed, among other reasons, because of the electrical faults.\(^{54}\) Finally, the assassination of Alexander II occurred while in a carriage. The use of explosives on transport systems was to become significant in later waves of terrorism.

With this came innovation in the use of handheld explosives, such as grenades. The anarchists found handheld bombs useful in implementing Propaganda of the Deed. They were visually arresting, made the news, killed multiple people with ease, and required only a bomb master and a bomb thrower. Heinzen had dreamed of the power of explosives two decades earlier in “Murder:”

The aim of our study must be to eliminate the superiority of the barbarian party through the invention of new methods of killing, so as to nullify the numerical advantage of the organized masses by means of instruments of destruction....Would it not be possible, then, to devise some sort of missile which one man can throw into a group of a few hundred, killing them all?\(^{55}\)

This concept was picked up by anarchist terrorists. As their militant skills grew, so too did their fascination with dynamite – most of it, according to Johann Most, stolen from governmental supplies.\(^{56}\) He claimed “there is in all cases a necessity to appropriate weapons from the

---
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enemy. Most admired dynamite’s versatility: it was easy to conceal, effective, and ensured victory. He wrote to his fellow revolutionaries:

The importance of modern explosives for social revolution need hardly be stressed nowadays. They are going to be the decisive factor in the next period of world history.

In this, history would prove Most absolutely correct.

His manual for the construction of handheld explosives is technical and succinct. Handheld incendiaries and explosives required a shorter fuse than fixed-location explosives. Terrorists also found percussion detonators used in spherical or tubular bombs, whereby inserting a glass tube of sulphuric acid into a casing of sugar and potassium chlorate that shattered upon impact, causing a small fire which would detonate the basting cap and the dynamite. The shift to handheld explosives was a logical innovation, and was used in killing Alexander II. While this attack was the first regicide using dynamite, it was also the prototype of suicide bombing. Noteworthy amongst the later victims was the Russian Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich in 1905. When Ivan Kalayev of the Narodnaya Volya threw a hand-held bomb into his carriage, it again proved the efficacy of the tactic.

Small arms and explosives formed the core tactical component to the concept of Propaganda of the Deed. It was legitimised, and in some cases celebrated, within their propaganda. Supplies were sometimes stolen from the government, according to Most, as small arms were not difficult to obtain, train with, and use. The Narodnaya Volya frequently exhibited en route opportunism, attacking mobile targets at a time and place of their choosing. This same advantage was afforded by the use of handheld explosives. Fixed-location explosives required greater planning and resources, and in those early attacks, there were frequent failures due to amateurism. This was corrected by terrorist manuals to develop technical proficiency. The

---
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bomb became the hallmark of terrorists, and separated them from common criminals.\textsuperscript{61} The tactical component to the strategy of Propaganda of the Deed was established early and applied systematically.

**Systematic Campaign**

Anarchist terrorist use of Propaganda of the Deed saw terrorism used in a systematic campaign. This did not evolve naturally: it was deliberately constructed. The systematic application of the tactics and strategy as discussed above had several purposes: to exploit their natural advantages, to create an atmosphere of enervating tension, and to provoke the state to respond. This was outlined by Morozov, Stepniak-Kravchinsky, Most, and Tarnovski.

The Russian terrorists had two natural advantages which they exploited. The first was small numbers. The terrorists knew they were few, and it was precisely because of this that they had the capacity to endure. Anarchist terrorism, while not absent from the rural areas, was predominantly an urban phenomenon. There, they hid amongst the masses, camouflaged in the general population. The illusive terrorist was highly glamorised, as indicated by Morozov:

\begin{quote}
...at the head of the country was the all-powerful government with its spies, prisons, and guns, with its millions of soldiers and voluntary government servants who either knew or were ignorant of what they represented...Against this large organization, the depressed, intelligent Russia youth brought forth a handful of people insignificant as to numbers, but strong and terrible in their energy and illusiveness.\textsuperscript{62}
\end{quote}

Their small numbers made the terrorists difficult for the secret police to infiltrate, although the Degaev affair shows that it was not impossible.\textsuperscript{63} Morozov wrote: “Using insignificant forces it had the opportunity to restrain all efforts of tyranny which seemed to be undefeated up to this time.”\textsuperscript{64} After the attack, the terrorists, “disappear without a trace and thus they are able to

\textsuperscript{61} Hence why the terrorist preferred to use dynamite for spectacular attacks instead of small arms.

\textsuperscript{62} Nikolai Morozov, “The Terrorist Struggle.” Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. p76

\textsuperscript{63} Figner, as the sole surviving leader of the Executive Committee appointed Serge Degaev to run a military component of the *Narodnaya Volya*, not knowing his brother Vladimir was an informer. Serge himself also became an informer through a government agent, Georgy Sudeykin, who hoped to thus control the terrorists. Serge later murdered Sudeykin, but not until the *Narodnaya Volya* had been publicly discredited. Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. pp53-54
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fight again against the enemy, to live and to work for the cause.”\footnote{Ibid. p79} This showed a sense of economy. Fighters were rare and could not be easily replaced. Keeping numbers small (though this was probably not a choice in practice) minimised the likelihood of exposure, infiltration, and capture.

All the terrorists needed was time. This was the second natural advantage celebrated by the anarchists. They had the initiative: waiting for weeks, and months before the next attack. Morozov believed that a sustained campaign of terrorism, not occasional assassinations, would be more effective.

\begin{quote}
The terrorists cannot overthrow the government, cannot drive it from St. Petersburg and Russia. But having compelled it, for so many years running, to neglect everything and do nothing but struggle with them, by forcing it to do so still for years and years, they will render its position untenable. Already the prestige of the imperial government has received a wound which will be very difficult to heal...the revolutionists, it must be confessed, have on their side an immense advantage, that of time.\footnote{Ibid. p93}
\end{quote}

Time was the advantage of the terrorist, and their small numbers enhanced the likelihood of endurance. A sustained campaign meant a war to exhaustion. Stepniak-Kravchinsky believed their numbers could be replenished by an “immense and inexhaustible source of new recruits” inspired by the actions of previous terrorists.\footnote{\cite{Stepniak-Kravchinsky. “Underground Russia.” Ibid. p92}} He was candid about the weakness of the terrorists’ position, writing that there would be no “victory, immediate, splendid, and decisive” for them.\footnote{Ibid. p92} With their small, well-hidden, renewable force, the terrorists could fight the state until it was exhausted.

Propaganda of the Deed also spread fear amongst its targets and constituency to heighten the appearance of the threat. The fear of not knowing when the terrorists would strike next – until they did - was a psychological tactic used against the masses and the power-holding elites. None presented the intransigence of the conflict so well as Karl Heinzen, in “Murder.”
The revolutionaries must try to bring about a situation where the barbarians are afraid for their lives every hour of the day or night. They must think that every drink of water, every mouthful of food, every bed, every bush, every paving stone, every path and footpath, every hole in the wall, every slate, every bundle of straw, every pip bowl, every stick, every pin may be a killer...may fear be the herald...69

This evoked a sense of inevitable destruction. It implied that the terrorist had the balance of power and the violent initiative. The recipient of the violence was more often than not Alexander II. Tarnovski illustrated it as:

The life of a tyrant changes from one of luxurious, sensuous ease to that of a tormented life full of tragedy of the kind paraded in front of the eyes by the czar, trembling every moment for his criminal existence. And nowhere will he find a word of compassion; everyone, gazing at these Macbeth-like agonies will say maliciously, “Thieves never prosper.”70

The enduring tension was deliberate. The longer that the government struggled with the terrorists, the more it was made to look inept. It was incapable of ensuring the safety of its own people, and of Head of State. This sent a powerful message to the Russian audience. If terrorists could kill the tsar, what was beyond their grasp? The terrorists believed that the longer the struggle lasted, the stronger they would become. Stepniak-Kravchinsky wrote:

Every month, every week, of this hesitation, this irresolution, of this enervating tension, renders the position of their adversary worse, and consequently strengthens their own.71

Propaganda of the Deed exploited the weapons best suited for terrorism, and coupled that with the advantages of small numbers and time, ultimately to endure beyond the state’s ability to maintain the legitimacy of its position.

Propaganda of the Deed was channelled towards two important objectives: to coerce the target state into a disproportionate reaction and to inspire action by the masses. This would educate the masses as to the authoritarian nature of the state, and they would move to join the radical support base. The revolution would become general, and the government would fall. This was terrorism applied as a systematic campaign aimed at rendering the position of the government

69 Karl Heinzen, “Murder.” Ibid. p67
70 Serge Stepniak-Kravchinsky, “Underground Russia.” Ibid. p86
71 Ibid. p93
unteunable. It turned the small terrorist manpower into strength by anonymity; it exploited the advantage of time; and contributed to the atmosphere of terror which weakened and demoralised the state, whereby the state would overreact and become the real harbinger of revolution.

Glorification

The exaltation of the revolution, and with it the glorification of martyrdom, was significant to the continuity of Propaganda of the Deed. According to Michael Carr, anarchists “willingness to die imbued the assassination with moral grandeur.”72 This thesis supports this conclusion.

The first element, the exaltation of the revolution, is assessable by its continuity within the propaganda and its veneration of the revolutionary abstraction. The second, the glorification of martyrdom, has been more influential, and has left its scar on the pages of history.

Exaltation

The exaltation of the revolution was an imperative component of Propaganda of the Deed. The propagandists sought to give their revolution a transcendent purpose. This exaltation was referred to as the ‘revolutionary spirit’ or the ‘spirit of revolt,’ glorified to confer legitimacy to the terrorist revolution. This created a revolutionary abstraction: a concept based in the ideals of the revolution rather than the physical. It elevated the terrorist cause from its mundane struggles, to high-minded notions. The exaltation of the revolution and glorification of the revolutionary abstraction is most apparent in the propaganda of Kropotkin, Morozov, and the Executive Committee of the Narodnaya Volya.

Kropotkin attempted to use the ‘revolutionary spirit’ to exalt the revolution itself. He described an atmosphere charged with high-running emotions like a carnival or festival, whereupon “the situation itself is revolutionary.”73 Violence, he believed, would heighten this revolutionary fervour and “awaken the spirit of revolt: it breeds daring.”74 In Spirit of Revolt, he praised the revolution:
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Those who long for the triumph of justice, those who would put new ideas into practice, are soon forced to recognize that the realization of their generous, humanitarian, and regenerating ideas cannot take place in a society thus constituted; they perceive the necessity of the revolution whirlwind which will sweep away all this rottenness, revive sluggish hearts with its breath, and bring to mankind that spirit of devotion, self-denial, and heroism, without which society sinks through degradation and vileness into complete disintegration.\textsuperscript{75}

The revolution was positioned as the event to purge the system of its flaws. It would cleanse the corruption from Russian society. Kropotkin attempted to create an abstraction of the revolution. The only salvation lay with the terrorists, as portrayed in his pamphlets.

Human society is seen to be splitting more and more into two hostile camps, and at the same time to be subdividing into thousands of small groups waging merciless war against each other. Weary of these wars, weary of the miseries which they cause, society rushes to seek a new organization...\textsuperscript{76}

Through this exaltation of the revolution, and through his repeated emphasis on the necessity of terrorism in Russia, he attempted to make terrorism socially acceptable by exalting it as a revolutionary abstraction.

Morozov took a different approach, and glorified the revolution by virtue of the terrorist themselves. These groups embodied the fearlessness of the revolutionary spirit, and their zeal lent credibility to the revolution. He exalted the manner in which they waged their struggle, and glorified the few against the many.

The active, spontaneous revolutionary struggle was concentrated in this small group. To the pressure of the all-powerful enemy it opposed impenetrable secrecy. This small group was not afraid of the enemies numerous spies since it protected itself by the way it carried on the struggle...The revolutionary group is immortal because of the way its struggle becomes a tradition and part of people’s lives.\textsuperscript{77}

Unlike Kropotkin, Morozov did not base his exaltation on the ideals of the revolution. He had too much practical experience in terrorism for that. Rather, he based glorification of the revolution in the people themselves, for it was the people who would make the revolution. The
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revolution, and its legitimacy, lay in the way of struggle and those who carried it. This, Morozov hoped, would become a traditional method for political protest.

A jointly-written statement by the *Narodnaya Volya* captured the essence of the revolution in the letter sent to Alexander III immediately after the assassination of his father. The Executive Committee of the *Narodnaya Volya* exalted their organisation as expanding and renewable, and as such, indomitable:

> A more perfect, stronger revolutionary organization will take the place of the groups wiped out. In the meantime, the number of malcontents in the land will increase, popular faith in the government will lapse, and the idea of the revolution, of its possibility and inevitably, will take root and grow more and more rapidly in Russia.  

This open letter was sent far and wide across Russia. It exalted the terrorists and their purpose, and positioned the *Narodnaya Volya* as both transformative and an abstraction in itself. This is because it also gloried in the terrorists’ anticipated destruction, for they were cognizant of their roles as an inspiration rather than an institution.

To summarise, the anarchist terrorists felt that society was fundamentally flawed and required the violence of terrorists, who were presented as heroes, to fix it. They turned their violent purpose into a revolutionary abstraction, and at times, even the groups themselves became abstractions. Propaganda of the Deed was thus accomplished: the violent action had been taken, its justification had been announced, and its existence and mission had been exalted: now they could but only await the scaffold.

**Martyrdom**

The glorification of the martyr has been a theme in modern terrorist propaganda since its advent. In current day, Islamist terror occurs in the pursuit of death, where death is the primary objective and terror is merely the method. In nineteenth century Russia, terror was the primary objective, and death was merely a consequence. This was a dynamic of death in the pursuit of terror. The anarchists saw death as an acceptable consequence that came only after survival

---

was beyond their grasp. This could be obtained at the hands of the police, in a cell, or on the scaffold before an audience. Death was the consequence of the means – it was not the end in itself. Russian anarchist martyrdom may have laid the foundations for the martyrs to come, as they were glorified, but not mourned. Their purpose was held as supreme, and it was above all other revolutionary virtues. Propagandists for this included Serge Nechaev, Stepniak-Kravchinsky, and Figner.

Serge Nechaev is represented in history as an imposter with a flair for terrorist boldness – something which won him many admirers (such as Zasulich), but which in practice was entirely absent. The extent of his terroristic contribution was to kill a member of his cell for disagreeing with him. However, in his much-quoted *Catechism of the Revolutionist* in 1869, he wrote:

[1]The revolutionary is a doomed man. He has no interests of his own, no affairs, no feelings, no attachments, no belongings, not even a name. Everything in him is absorbed by a single exclusive interest, a single thought, a single passion – the revolution...[5]The revolutionary is a dedicated man, merciless toward the state and toward the whole of educated and privileged society in general and he must expect no mercy from them either. Between him and them there exists, declared or undeclared, an unceasing and irreconcilable war for life and death...[6] Night and day he must have but one thought, one aim – merciless destruction. In cold-blooded and tireless pursuit of this aim, he must be prepared both to die himself and to destroy with his own hands everything that stands in the way of that achievement... 

These statements, though farcical coming from the least-successful terrorist of his time, had a huge influence on the terrorists decades later. He had inadvertently designed the martyr that terrorists aspired to become. The term “But this is pure Nechaev!” became a way of describing his set of principles. The idea caught hold – the image of the terrorist was painted as a sacrifice of the people, and a life dedicated to the single cause of revolution.

Unlike Nechaev, Stepniak-Kravchinsky performed terrorist acts with some modicum of success. Martyrdom manifested as heroism in his writings. Given his terrorism and long involvement as a party propagandist, his glorification of the martyr is exuberant. In *Underground Russia*, he wrote:
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With a whole nation prostrate he alone held high his head, which throughout so many tempests he had never bent. He is noble, terrible, irresistibly fascinating, for he combines in himself the two sublimities of human grandeur: the martyr and the hero. He is a martyr. From the day when he swears in the depths of his heart to free the people and the country, he knows he is consecrated to death. He faces it at every step of his stormy life. He goes forth to meet it fearlessly, when necessary, and can die without flinching…

The martyr, to Stepniak-Kravchinsky, had great social grandeur. His existence was sacred by virtue of its violent purpose, and occupied the highest honour in the anarchist memory. The martyr was revered for encompassing the desirable terrorist qualities: determination, ruthlessness, total commitment to the revolution. Their deaths were celebrated in the propaganda rather than mourned.

His limbs may fail him, but as if by magic, they regain their vigor and he stands erect, ready for battle after battle until he has laid low his enemy and liberated the country…

Stepniak-Kravchinsky spoke of the individual power of the martyr – but he did not name the individuals like his comrades did. He glorified – not the person – but the idea. The anarchist martyr was immortal and eternal because the martyr was no mortal: the martyr was a concept. The martyr became part of the revolutionary abstraction itself, and conferred grandeur and immortality. Lynn Ellen Patyk’s research found that Stepniak-Kravchinsky turned the martyrs into celebrities, for terrorism’s political and social influence was only significant if the event was remembered.

For the anarchists, martyrdom was the sacrifice of a life; not in an instant, but for the duration of years. A living martyrdom such as this required a deep commitment to the revolution. Figner summed up the terrorist principles of the Narodnaya Volya:

These requirements of the constitution consisted: first, in the promise to devote all one’s mental and spiritual strength for the revolutionary work, to forget for its sake all ties of kinship, and all personal sympathies, love and friendship; second, to give one’s life also, if necessary, taking no thought of anything else, and sparing no one and nothing…
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This unrestricted service to the revolution, to the point of martyrdom, became a hallmark of terrorist propaganda. Figner was a premier propagandist, and was prepared to die as a martyr. However, she was capable of seeing the effects of the violence, for with the benefit of hindsight, she wrote:

On the one hand, the party declared that all methods were fair in the war with its antagonist, that here the ends justified the means. At the same time, it created a cult of dynamite and the revolver, and crowned the terrorist with a halo; murder and the scaffold acquired a magnetic charm and attraction...\(^85\)

When she wrote of the terrorist mood as “drunk with the spirit of strife and animated with success” she claimed political violence was driven by rational political necessity, but undermined by moral restraints. This uneasy ‘mood’ as she referred to it, was driven by “personal saintliness.”\(^86\) The purpose was sacred: therefore the martyr was glorified, despite inner moral misgivings. Martyrdom became integrated within the strategy of Propaganda of the Deed, and was used with deadly efficiency.

None embodied this concept so much as Sophia Perovskaya. She is mentioned in Stepniak-Kravchinksy’s *Underground Russia* as being one of the few Russian anarchists capable of keeping a secret, which contributed to her terroristic success.\(^87\) She was described by Figner as a rigid ascetic, with feminine gentleness offset by a masculine severity in her character.\(^88\) Her life was devoted entirely to the revolution.

Tender, tender as a mother with the working people, she was exacting and severe towards her comrades and fellow-workers, while towards her political enemies, the government, she could be merciless, a trait which made Sukhanov almost shudder...\(^89\)

During her missions, Petrovskaya endured in extreme conditions to achieve her goals. She lived in a hovel while coordinating the bombing of the Odessa Rail. Her final act of terrorism was to
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oversee the street bombers who killed Alexander II. She evaded capture for ten days, but was eventually caught on 10 March 1881, and sentenced to death. A placard with the words “The Regicide” was hung around her neck as she was led to the scaffold. Figner eulogised her last moments thus:

On the scaffold Petrovskaya was firm, with all her steel-like firmness. She embraced Zhelyabov farewell, she embraced Kibalchich and Mikhaylov; but she did not embrace Rysakov, who in an effort to save himself, had betrayed the apartment on Telezhnaya Street, and had brought to their ruin Sabin, who shot himself, Gesya Helfman, who died in the House of Preliminary Detention, and Timofey Mikhaylov, who died on the scaffold. So died Perovskaya true to herself in both life and in death.90

Perovskaya, by Russian anarchist standards, both lived and died a martyr for the revolution. She was the first woman executed in Russia for this political crime.

Therefore, Russian anarchist terrorism as represented by the Narodnaya Volya exhibited a paradigm of death in the pursuit of terror. Death was merely a consequence of the terroristic action, and was not the goal in itself. As such, the martyrs became part of the revolutionary abstraction, and were celebrated in personality cults due to the individualised nature of their remembrance.

The Aftermath

It is difficult to assess the impact of Propaganda of the Deed on the events which overtook Russia. Alexis Zimberg contended that Russian life “remained fairly unchanged” after the death of the tsar.91 The revolution did come, but it was not the revolution of which the anarchists dreamed. With the ultimate destruction of the Narodnaya Volya by covert government operatives such as Degaev and Azev towards the turn of the century, came the rise of a new party: the Party of the Socialist Revolutionaries.92 According to Susan Morrissey, there were some 1,782 terrorist attacks committed by this group in 1906 alone.93 They engaged in what
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became known as “bezmotivnyi terror,” motiveless terror which required no justification.\textsuperscript{94} However, Geifman made the distinction that the anarchist ideology itself was largely responsible for stemming the growth and organisation of terrorist groups into a legitimate political movement.\textsuperscript{95}

The purpose of the anarchist terrorists was to project a new future based on the somewhat vogue ideology of anarchism. A combination of both words and deeds was mandatory for the terrorists to achieve the political revolution in pursuit of this. Propaganda of the Deed had the purpose of provoking repressive state response, thus inciting revolution. This was done using systematic violence as an urban communication activity, designed to maximise media coverage and enhance the dissemination of propaganda. The result of this, the terrorists hoped, would be the use of terrorism as a traditional method of political protest. It would become an institution, and in doing so, undermine the ability of the state to be despotic.

This was justified using a combination of positioning the violence as retaliatory and self-defensive, born of necessity, and carrying with it a mark of revolutionary legitimacy. The terrorist proclaimed that the violence was merely the birth pangs of the new world, and the revolution could not come without it. The terrorists cast themselves as heroes, guiding Russia towards a better future.

Propaganda of the Deed legitimised the use of any strategy and tactic and the adoption of nearly any weapon so long as it furthered the cause of the revolution. The \textit{Narodnaya Volya} engaged in spectacular attacks and assassinations against high-profile targets in order to maximise the generation of propaganda. Spectacular and symbolic attacks allowed terrorists to control the message in line with their strategic intent, and demonstrated their power. They utilised the weaponry of the day, and foresaw the great value that explosives would have as a weapon of the weak. They used concealable weapons and devices in order to control the time,
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place and targets of the attack. Propaganda of the Deed legitimised the wide scale use of violence, against all types of targets, using all types of weapons.

Terrorism had the greatest effect when applied systematically. The anarchists applied totalitarian, systematic, and asymmetric violence against states as a campaign. This campaign was not designed to topple the regime; it was designed to make the regimes position untenable. The terrorists exploited their natural advantages of time and anonymity to create an atmosphere of pressure. The state, enraged at its inability to capture those responsible for the attacks, would strike out at the masses and thus help recruit for the terrorist cause. This would render the position of the state untenable, and its repressive counter-actions would precipitate the revolution.

The terrorists believed society was fundamentally flawed. Exalting the revolution was done through glorifying the revolutionary abstraction: the ideals rather than the actuality. By venerating the revolution, the terrorists immortalised the revolutionary abstraction. The martyrdom of the terrorists, be it the sudden martyrdom of a bomb thrower or the entire life dedicated to terror, were both glorified. Personality cults rose up around individual martyrs. To that end, they exhibited a death in the pursuit of terror paradigm.

The response of tsardom to this terrorism was repression. P.A Shuvalov, head of the Secret Police, wrote:

> Freedom of the press is incompatible with our system of government; it is feasible only in a constitutional state where it is supplementary to freedom of speech....where there is no freedom of speech, freedom of the press poses too great a danger as an anti-government weapon, since the government cannot enter into daily polemics but stands as a silent opponent, forced to concede in an unequal struggle....they must be taught respect and a degree of fear of the government by making their leaders responsible for their policy. A situation in which the government is assailed from all sides with complete impunity and in which demands which are contrary to its foundations can no longer be tolerated...\(^{96}\)

---
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And nor were they tolerated. Dr David Solskice, described as a “brilliant young barrister,” took part in the anarchist movement in the last days of the *Narodnaya Volya*.\(^97\) He was one of the many arrested without charge and spirited away to the Petropavlovsk Fortress, despite his self-denomination as a peaceful propagandist. He wrote “I myself did not believe in terrorism at all, but the tradition of terrorism was very strong...”\(^98\) Marie Vetrova and Angela Karpouzi were among those political offenders classed as terrorists and treated accordingly. Schlusselburg Prison received many of these dissidents. Perris described the outcome of over fifty internments: two men were shot in prison, seven committed suicide, six were either insane when they arrived or driven mad soon after, ten banished into exile in the Siberian reaches, twenty died “otherwise” in the fortress, five were killed by the gaolers – one through deliberate starvation, and a final twelve were still confined at the time of his writing.\(^99\)

The Russian state did in fact respond to the terror with greater repression. As the optimistic G.H Perris showed in his contemporary history of the time, numbers of those persecuted for such crimes rose. His table shows that the number of cases increased – in 1894, around nine hundred were prosecuted. This rose drastically to five and a half thousand in a mere nine years.\(^100\)

This indicated the levels of unrest in Russia during this period. The peasantry starved in one of the worst famines of Russian history in 1891. Propaganda of the Deed was quite successful in
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agitating an already unstable community. According to Perris, over 30,000 students went on
strike in 1899, and the peaceful demonstrations were broken up with force.\textsuperscript{101} Around 1901,
200 university students were forcibly drafted into the military for venting their frustrations at
political meetings. When the Writers Union and the \textit{Zemla i Volya} staged a peaceful
demonstration on March 5, 1901, in front of Kazan Cathedral, the unarmed civilians were
driven into the building by armed Cossacks and therein “slaughtered.”\textsuperscript{102} The students were not
alone: there were also wholesale arrests of workmen and intellectuals. Political dissenters were
taken to Petropavlovsk Fortress and some were held without charge.\textsuperscript{103} As a systematic
strategy, Propaganda of the Deed was successful in two things: agitating the people and
provoking state repression in the context of the Russian anarchist terrorspace.

General and unaffiliated unrest manifested as peasants uprising in the Baltic Provinces; general
strikes in Poland were followed by massacres; and there was mutiny in the naval ships in the
Black Sea.\textsuperscript{104} In Moscow in 1905, a simple bakers strike spread to St. Petersburg, and left the
railways, factories, and post offices idle. Alexander III’s successor, Nicholas II, made a small
concession; the election of a Duma in 1905. The Duma struggled to exercise any real influence
in Russia politics; it was dissolved after 70 days. Despotism continued into 1906, as Kropotkin
wrote in his \textit{Memoirs}:

\begin{quote}
And now, the condition in Russia is simply beyond description. The items which we have for the
first year of ‘Constitutional Rule,’ since October 30, 1905, til the same date in 1906 are as
follows: Killed in massacres, shot in riots, etc., 22,271; condemned to penal servitude, 851 (to an
aggregate of 7,138 years); executed, mostly without any semblance of judgment, men, women,
and youths, 1,518; deported without judgment, mostly to Siberia, 30,000.\textsuperscript{105}
\end{quote}

The time of the \textit{Narodnya Volya} was over before the turn of the century. The new century saw
the rise of Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, the White Terror, and leaders such as Lenin.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{101} Ibid. p258-259
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid. p260. It is difficult to know how many died, as many were merely beaten, but it was estimated some 700
people were involved.
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. p266-273
\textsuperscript{104} Kropotkin, \textit{Memoirs of a Revolutionist}. pxxx
\textsuperscript{105} Ibid. pxxx
\end{footnotesize}
The Russian anarchists spread across the world, emigrating to America and England. Jewish people, whether anarchist or not, were expelled predominantly to the south towards Jerusalem by government sanctioned pogroms. Mikhail Bakunin spent most of his life chasing revolutions across Europe being expelled from one country after another, eventually dying in a hospital in Berne in 1876. Johann Most emigrated to the United States, spreading anarchist principles throughout America, and transmitting the revolutionary memory. Pyotr Kropotkin spent a large amount of his life in exile in France, Switzerland, Savoy, and London. He returned to Russia after the Revolution of 1917, and died shortly after. Nikolai Morozov died in the prison where Vera Figner was held. Figner spent twenty years in Schlusselburg Prison, and found upon her conditional release in 1904, that the world had moved on and she was now viewed as an old icon. With the change of regime, she returned to Russia and was living there when the Germans invaded in 1941. She refused to evacuate when requested by the authorities, declaring “concern yourselves with the living.”

The *Narodnaya Volya* had created a legacy that was to leave its scar upon the world for centuries to come. In their quest for revolution they had created Propaganda of the Deed. It was coherent, systematic, ruthless, and strategically designed to undercut the strengths of states. This is not to say that the terrorism which followed was an exact methodological blueprint. Richard Bach Jensen, in comparing anarchist and Islamist terrorism in 2008, noted: “If history rhymes, as Mark Twain famously said, then these two terrorist twins are a little out of rhythm with each other.” But it was not the organisational model or programme which endured; it was the underlying conceptual tradition.

In conclusion, the Russian populists and anarchists of the nineteenth century, although influenced by continental anarchists, were the first to properly implement Propaganda of the Deed. Their failure to achieve social change would also become something of a terrorist
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tradition, although more recent literature suggests that the success of an attack is by no means linked to the success of Propaganda of the Deed. Sometimes, merely the attempt was enough, and that may have contributed to the continuity of Propaganda of the Deed as a conceptual tradition. With the first wave’s understanding of Propaganda of the Deed explored, attention will now turn to the second of Rapoport’s waves: the anti-colonialist wave, of which the Irish nationalists are the focus movement.
Chapter Four: Blood and Soil

The rise of Irish anti-colonialism

“...in all wars life must be lost...”¹
Jeremiah ‘Dynamiter’ O’Donovan Rossa, *Irish World*, 1880

Irish anti-colonialist terror in the early twentieth century, marked “a watershed” in the development of Propaganda of the Deed.² This chapter outlines the historical context for terrorism and the important events, people, and groups that contributed to Irish terrorism in the anti-colonialist wave.³ It surveys the development of anti-colonialist sentiment in Ireland through the Wolfe Tone Rebellion; the Great Famine; and the poor living conditions associated with the Industrial Revolution - all contributing to an atmosphere of unrest. It then considers the defining characteristics of Irish nationalism and anti-colonialism, and introduces the influential terrorist groups: the *Clan na Gael*, Irish Volunteers, and the Irish Republican Brotherhood and Army. The propaganda of the Irish terrorists introduced here is analysed in chapter five.

First, we return to the question regarding whether Propaganda of the Deed as used by earlier groups influenced subsequent groups. The transmission from nineteenth century Russia to twentieth century Ireland, it is speculated, was both direct and indirect. Russian anarchists, such as Sergei Stepniak-Kravchinski, endured exile in London. Stepniak-Kravchinski established himself as a public authority on Russian terrorism, publishing a *Society* column called Free Russia from 1885, holding meetings, and giving speeches.⁴ He translated many Russian
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revolutionary works into English, including his own *Underground Russia*, *The Career of a Nihilist*, and *Spartak*. He created the Friends of Russian Freedom organisation, and his house became a centre for writers, artists, musicians, and political emigrants. It is possible that Irish revolutionaries were directly influenced this way.

Population movement may have provided the opportunity for the exchange of revolutionary memory. Many anarchists, such as Johann Most and Emma Goldman, emigrated to the United States after 1891, where they hoped that the New World would be more sympathetic to their aims. There, in American migrant communities, an interesting historical possibility emerges. America housed a large Irish population – many of whom supported Irish independence. In 1867, the Fenian Brotherhood was formed, and later renamed the *Clan na Gael*. Irish anti-colonialist terrorism thus had clear connections in America. Irish-American expatriates funded the Irish Republican Brotherhood, later the Irish Republican Army. American donations of money and weapons, most gathered through the Dynamite Press, financed the early Irish anti-colonialist movement. It is possible that some inspiration for the Irish terrorist struggle came from interactions with migrant communities of Russian anarchists in Great Britain and the United States of America.

Given the longevity of Irish terrorism (persisting in a variety of forms to current day), the present analysis focuses on the period from 1880 to 1922. It was during these years that anti-colonialist Irish terrorism was a consistent strategy. After the 1922 Anglo-Irish Treaty, a Civil War ensued between pro-treaty and anti-treaty forces. The focus of Irish nationalism then turned to Northern Ireland, which remained part of Great Britain. These later developments lie beyond the scope of this thesis.
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The Irish nationalist-separatists, like the Russian anarchists, had legitimate grievances. Ireland had been under English rule for seven hundred years, since the twelfth century, and resistance to that rule was a constant theme, often taking a sectarian tone. This brief historical context, however, cannot encompass the entirety of nationalist movements. It examines some key events leading to the apex of Irish terrorism in the early twentieth century and provides a brief description of the social conditions fuelling anti-colonialism.

The Rebellion of 1798 is commonly associated with the nationalist, Theobald Wolfe Tone. He was an inspiration to Irish anti-colonialists, notwithstanding the historian Robert Kee’s assertion that Tone is little known today. Tone, and the United Irishmen organisation, tried to win foreign support for an Irish revolution. He secured the help of France, then at war with Britain, to take opportunity from Tone’s distracting and diversionary popular uprisings. The revolts around Dublin were uncoordinated and poorly led, and quickly suppressed by the authorities. Only the county of Wexford truly engaged in a people’s revolt, and initially routed local British forces, though Wexford itself was soon crushed by British artillery. Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa would later lament that if every county had the strength of Wexford, Ireland would be already free. Although the rebellion was also a by-product of international conflict between France and Britain, it had great symbolic relevance as a moment of Irish nationalist realisation.

The Great Famine of 1846-51 was highly significant for Irish nationalism. It occurred in the context of rapid demographic growth in Ireland, where the population had swelled to close to
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eight million. Of those, one half depended directly on potatoes as their daily food staple.\textsuperscript{16} Although the harvest had struggled to meet its seasonal average for several years prior, the yield of 1846 was down seventy-five percent due to the potato blight (\textit{phytophthora infestans}). The next five years saw an estimated 800,000 people die of starvation – close to ten percent of the population.\textsuperscript{17} Another 900,000 emigrated to the United States and Australia to escape the famine. The British government continued exporting potatoes from Ireland as they could be sold in England for a higher price, and did not arrange an affordable food staple to replace it.\textsuperscript{18} As recalled by Jeremiah O’Donovan Rossa, “There is no famine in any land that produces as much food as will support the people of that land – if the food is left with them. But the English took the food away to England and left the people to starve.”\textsuperscript{19}

The starving were particularly vulnerable to diseases, which the overflowing poorhouses did not have the skills or resources to heal. The British response was too little and too late. Unsurprisingly, the Potato Famine of 1879 thirty years later caused general alarm in Irish society. It did not have the same destructive extent as its predecessors, with few deaths recorded, but reawakened memories and resentment from 1846. The power of the Potato Famine in 1879 was dominated by social memory, as the Irish anticipated the same \textit{laisser-faire} non-interference approach by the British government as in 1846. The relationship between Ireland and Britain became increasingly strained.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, the Industrial Revolution posed new challenges for the Irish. Industrialisation meant that fewer people were required for the same labour unit output, which displaced unskilled labourers.\textsuperscript{20} Cheaper imports also undermined the strength of agriculture and undercut local jobs. Ireland lacked the developed infrastructure and facilities of
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secondary industries to employ locals. The dearth of mineral resources also saw Ireland importing four million tons of coal per annum, with a local production of only 90-145 thousand tons.\textsuperscript{21}

The country haemorrhaged from emigration, as the steady departure of people established an Irish diaspora around the world. Problems were exacerbated by the British administration and civil service, described as an expensive and “chaotic jumble.”\textsuperscript{22} Interventions such as works for distress relief, creating jobs in railway construction, clearing rent arrears, and drainage and land improvement were too little and too late.\textsuperscript{23}

Initiatives were also made to help the Irish tenants buy out their holdings. Holdings were rarely more than a single room. Poverty was extreme, and the slums were considered the worst in the United Kingdom. In September 1913, two dilapidated houses collapsed into the street, killing seven, including four children. This event, in conjunction with an Irish Transport and General Workers Union lockout, sparked an unruly protest a month later, in which two protestors were killed in a Dublin police baton charge.\textsuperscript{24}

Irish discontent manifested in other ways; in militant unionism, such as the Irish Transport and General Workers Union; in political agitation, including the Home Rule movement; economic unrest such as the Land Leagues campaign for the abolition of landlordism; the Gaelic League which resented the cultural imperialism of the British in the Irish education system; and the conscription agitation of 1918. The revolutionaries began to see the British as a pervasive threat to Ireland. Their language, culture, sports, society, politics, and essential distinctness as a separate people were at risk of being lost within the churning machine of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{25}
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The idea of ‘Ireland the nation,’ as separate and distinct from the British Empire despite seven hundred years of intermingling, was the cornerstone of Irish anti-colonialism.

**Irish Anti-Colonialism**

Irish anti-colonialism was epitomised by O’Donovan Rossa in his 1874 book, *Prison Life*. This anti-colonialist sentiment differed from the later nationalism championed by groups such as the Provisional IRA. Rossa saw the anti-colonialist cause as quite distinct from the existing Catholic Irish/Protestant English dispute. Irish priests, in his view, were not persecuted as one with the Irish people, thus separating them from the cause.

> The priests were free and comparatively happy, while the people were enslaved, and decidedly miserable...I don’t put my country before my god, but I put it before religious ascendancy of any denomination. The Church has many defenders, and needs my aid as little as she need fear my hostility; Ireland has few, and I am beginning to fear that they will not be able, unless aided more earnestly then they have been, to work out her immediate salvation.27

Rossa made a distinction between the Church as represented in Ireland, God, and country. The revolutionary abstraction of ‘Ireland the nation’ made early Irish terrorism essentially an anti-colonialist and ethno-nationalist struggle. *Prison Life* had a substantial impact on the following generation of radicals.

It is not possible to entirely separate Irish nationalism from Catholicism. Richard English discusses the fluctuating nature of Irish nationalism, from the Catholic and cultural nationalism of the early nineteenth century, to the Fenian and parliamentary nationalism from 1850-1900, thence to the revolutionary nationalism after the turn of the century.28 He argues that for some, “Irish nationality remained tightly interwoven with the cultural language of Catholicism.”29 English surmised the Irish nationalist movement during the period as a mixture of “culture, religion, politics – and (of course) economics.”30

---
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point, noting that the experience of Irish nationalism was essentially “atypical” among belligerent ethnicities.\textsuperscript{31}

With the death of Rossa in 1915 came the next important document for the anti-colonialist ideology. This was Padraig Pearse’s the “Graveside Oration” which, while praising Rossa and Tone’s nationalism, proclaimed:

...to hate evil, to hate untruth, to hate oppression, and hating them, to strive to overthrow them [Britain]...They think they have pacified Ireland. They think they have purchased half of us and intimidated the other half. They think they have foreseen everything, think they have provided against everything; but the fools, the fools, the fools! – they have left us our Fenian dead, and while Ireland holds these graves, Ireland unfree shall never be at peace.\textsuperscript{32}

This tract, and particularly the final sentence, had particular significance for the nationalist community. Rossa’s death was by no means the fault of the British, but with his death, the idea of Ireland as an abstraction distinct from Britain was re-emphasised. The trials endured by revolutionaries through Ireland’s troubled history became a uniting strength. Irish awareness of the nation as culturally, linguistically, historically, and socially distinct from Britain was paramount. Ireland for the Irish was the anti-colonialist goal.

\textbf{Revolutionaries}

Several groups and individuals implemented this anti-colonial ideology. They included the American-based 	extit{Clan na Gael} and the Irish nationalist Rossa (who was also linked to the Skirmishers); the Irish Citizens Army under James Connolly; the Irish Volunteers, led briefly by Pearse, with Michael Collins as a low ranking member; Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) and Army (IRA), in which Collins rose to prominence; along with the intelligence chief, Florence O’Donoghue. There were considerable links and crossover among the groups.

The 	extit{Clan na Gael} (Clan of the Irish) was established in the United States of America in 1867, the manifestation of decades of migrant-Irish unrest.\textsuperscript{33} Nominally led by John Devoy, the Clan’s

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{31} Townshend, "Religion, War, and Identity in Ireland." p893
  \item \textsuperscript{32} Pearse, \textit{Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse: Political Writings and Speeches}. pp136-137
  \item \textsuperscript{33} This was originally separate to the Fenian Brotherhood run by John O’Mahony.
\end{itemize}
purpose was to encourage Irish nationalist sentiment in America, and use the protection of American citizenship to agitate for Irish freedom. The expatriate community conjectured new ways to bring about Irish home rule. The Wolfe Tonian dream of a “people’s revolt” was slowly recognised as an inadequate means. A terror campaign, designed explicitly to undermine the strength and endurance of Imperial Britain, became a practical option.

A significant event for propaganda purposes was the Clan’s Fremantle jailbreak. This event was symbolic of the Clan’s commitment to direct action and enhanced its public exposure.\(^{34}\) In 1875, the Irish-American community raised $12,000 which the Clan used to purchase a whaling ship. The ship sailed to Western Australia, where six Fenian nationalists were freed from Fremantle jail. The fugitives returned to the United States, pausing for commercial whaling to cover part of the rescue expenditure. Donations the following year increased substantially. According to Michael Burleigh, “This propaganda coup fuelled the notion of a skirmishing fund to finance attacks against Britain and its global interests...”\(^{35}\) To that end, a great deal of Clan funds were wasted in trying to invent a submarine which would prey upon British shipping. When this came to nothing, the Clan focused its efforts on sending teams of bombers, notably, the Gallagher team and the Cunningham Team, to London, targeting places symbolic of Imperial power.\(^{36}\)

Rossa (1835-1915) was a symbol of radical nationalism, as he was “of the Gael”, being that he spoke Gaelic, thought Gaelic, and was of a line of Gaelic Irish.\(^{37}\) He was involved with the nationalist movement from a young age, and in 1856 established the pro-Gaelic Phoenix Literary and Debating Society. Because of this, he was charged with suspicion of conspiracy, involvement in a protest, and jailed for four years. Upon release, Rossa went to America, where
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he joined the Irish Republican Brotherhood. While in the USA, it is believed he swore in more men than “any other ten men in the land.”

Rossa returned to Ireland and was again arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment in 1865, but was released early. His most important book, *Prison Life*, publicised the mistreatment of Irish nationalists at the hands of the British. It clarified the Irish purpose as a nation desiring its own sovereignty, and its complex relationship with Catholicism. National commonality overrode religious diversity. Rossa symbolised the suffering of the Irish people, having endured judicial mistreatment by the British, and called Ireland to self-realisation. After a public disagreement with John Devoy of the Clan, he established his own terrorist cell in 1876, the Skirmishers, who carried out a series of attacks in London.

The Irish cause requires Skirmishers. It requires a little band of heroes who will initiate and keep up without intermission a guerrilla warfare...

*Irish World*, 4 December 1875

Rossa and Patrick Ford called for donations to the new Skirmishing Fund in the *Irish World*, which had a readership of approximately 35,000. The Dynamite Press openly solicited funds to engage in a military campaign against Britain. Their initial plan, similar to the Clan, was to attack the British on the high seas. This absorbed significant Skirmisher Funds, but came to nothing. Another impediment was the Fund’s trustees, who were committed to “honourable warfare,” that is, the conventional warfare which had failed in the past. In the wake of British armed interventions in Zululand and Egypt, the Skirmishers believed that conventional conflict was doomed to failure, as they would not stand a chance against British artillery and the “resources of civilization.”

According to Niall Whelehan, the new terror tactics were “a dramatic
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departure from traditional forms of resistance, and it required a sophisticated explanatory rhetoric."\(^{44}\)

Radicals hoped a dynamite campaign would serve to “scare and shatter” the empire, more so than the misuse of common blasting powder.\(^{45}\) The first attack by Rossa’s men came in 1881: the bombing of the London Regent Road barracks. In 1883, the Skirmishers struck a gasworks in Glasgow, completely destroying the gasometer and damaging the neighbouring industries. Eleven people were injured.\(^{46}\) This was followed by more attacks, notably, the bombing of Metropolitan Police Station on Parliament Street in London. The Skirmishers were the first Irish-American terrorist group to take nationalist terrorism to British soil as a consistent strategy for revolution. The Clan followed suit shortly after, with a Chicago lawyer Alexander Sullivan running a parallel but separate campaign to Rossa.\(^{47}\) They had huge influence on some later radicals such as Connolly.

James Connolly (1868-1916) was an avid trade unionist and an ex-serviceman of the Kings Liverpool Regiment.\(^{48}\) He had left the army and became involved as a propagandist with the Scottish Socialist Federation, which led to him to joining the Dublin Socialist Club. His writings indicated he was already a devoted nationalist. Peaceful protests and marches he arranged were broken up by force, such as the Wexford Lockout in 1911-1912.\(^{49}\) Dispirited with the progress of Home Rule, Connolly proposed a genuine nationalist party to contest elections. When this met opposition, he began to espouse violent revolution. He lived in America from 1903 to 1910, initially receiving a cool reception with the Irish Volunteers there before returning to Ireland. His most significant works are in *The Workers Republic*, and his essay, “On Street Fighting”.\(^{50}\) He left the Volunteers and joined the rivalry Irish Citizens Army in 1913.
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The ICA was a prop used by Connolly to promote his socialist views. It was not a terrorist group: it was a working class movement which initially used strikes and peaceful demonstrations to agitate for political change. It was run by James Larkin and Jack White, who were involved in the workers Lockout of 1913-1914. During the lockout, the men received minor military training in order to defend against police brutality. In 1914, the ICA put its ideological differences with the Irish Volunteers aside. They joined forces for the 1916 Easter Rising, with Connolly the Commander-in-Chief. It must be noted that the ICA were almost the only men in the Rising with military training: the Irish Volunteers had none.

The Irish Volunteers were founded in Dublin on 25 November 1913, by a Professor of Gaelic, Eoin MacNeill. Its original purpose, in light of the Home Rule bill stagnating in parliament, was to defend Home Rule should force come against it. This might have been a response to the Ulster Volunteers, who planned to militantly oppose Home Rule. It was always intended to be a defensive military organisation. The initial funding came from the Clan and John Devoy. The Volunteers were, without MacNeill’s knowledge, infiltrated by the IRB (who will be discussed later in this chapter) at its founding, and is now believed to have been largely under its control.

By 1916, the Volunteers had slipped even further from MacNeill’s leadership, and into the hands of Padraig Pearse. Pearse was born to a lower-middle class, Catholic family in 1879. He was well-educated in Irish literature, language, and mythology. Thomas Flannery’s nationalistic For the Tongue of the Gael engaged him in the Gaelic Revivalist movement, and he joined the Gaelic League at the age of sixteen. Through this, he later became an editor of An Claidheamh, a pro-Gaelic nationalist newspaper which claimed to be the “organ of militant
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Gaeldom.” Pearse was credited with explaining “Ireland’s past in terms more spiritualized, more ethereal and less determined by the changing nation of economic relations.”

Frustrated with the slow progress of the Home Rule Bill, Pearse turned to violent revolution, and was sworn into the Irish Republican Brotherhood in 1913. Through its influence, he was soon also a leader of the Irish Volunteers. He rose swiftly through the ranks to be a commander in the Easter Rising, largely due to his oratory skills. Yet he was not a charismatic leader, and his propaganda came from intense work rather than natural talent. His most famous work was the “Graveside Oration” for Rossa, and “Murder Machine,” of many of his revolutionary pamphlets.

When MacNeill protested against the Easter Rising plot, Pearse informed him: “We have used your name and influence for what they are worth...but we are done with you now. It is no use trying to stop us: our plans are all made and will be carried out.” MacNeill countermanded Pearse’s orders for a general uprising on Easter Sunday. Pearse rearranged his plans for the Monday, and did not inform MacNeill. The Rising occurred on Easter Monday, 1916. The Volunteers seized key locations around Dublin, with Pearse and Connolly at the forefront, and forces concentrated in the General Post Office, Dublin. This building had symbolic and political significance. There, on the steps, Pearse read aloud the proclamation of Irish independence.

The British brought in artillery, and even a fishery patrol boat, rigged with cannon, to simply blast the barricades and buildings apart. Collins, a subordinate in this event, would learn the flaws in this fixed-position strategy. According to Tim Pat Coogan, the Rising killed or wounded
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1350 people, leaving 51,003sq meters of Dublin gutted, to the cost of two and a half million pounds.61 Britain’s commanding officer, General Maxwell, wrote that he,

found it imperative to inflict the most severe sentences on the organisers of this detestable rising and on the commanders who took actual part in the actual fighting which occurred. It is hoped that these examples will be sufficient to act as a deterrent to intriguers... 62

The Rising’s leaders were tried in secret martial courts, and executed in groups of three and four over ten days.63 Instead of being a deterrent, this proved to be a public relations disaster.64 The executions were extraordinarily punitive; for example Willie Pearse was executed for being Padraig’s brother, despite having no major role in the revolt.

The Dublin public was initially unsupportive of the uprising, and showed little interest in the Proclamation. However, in the aftermath, sympathy for the Rising martyrs swelled to a crescendo, as Charles Townshend found that resentment of the British reaction radicalised the previously uncommitted.65 The Volunteer leadership engaged in the Rising anticipating its failure, but hoping for propagandistic success.66 The Easter Rising was celebrated as a blood tithe to the Irish nation, paid for the realisation of Irish freedom. According to Townshend: “the significant thing about the rising was not that it had failed, but how it envisaged succeeding.”67 This was the most significant act of Propaganda of the Deed in Irish nationalism, exemplifying its utility as part of wider insurrection, and was a watershed for the professional terrorism campaign to follow. The term Volunteers fell into disuse around August 1919, as they were incorporated into the Irish Republican Brotherhood/Army (IRA) apparatus.68
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The Irish Republican Brotherhood (later, Army) was an oath-bound secret society which viewed itself as the watchdog of the Irish nation. It was formed, loosely, in 1858 under James Stephens, with the intention of cooperating internationally with O’Mahoney and the Fenian Brotherhood in America. It was responsible for forming, funding, and ultimately dissolving a number of Irish nationalist groups, and had a controlling influence in the legitimate Sinn Fein political party.\(^{69}\) Dublin Castle authorities were aware that the Fenian Brotherhood provided the means for war, and the IRB provided the warriors. They were committed to obtaining arms and engaging with Britain in conventional revolt. At one stage, it was estimated that ninety percent of the Volunteers were also secret IRB.\(^{70}\)

In its early days, the IRB was riddled with British spies and informers. The Convention of 1873 provoked an overhaul in membership and established an intelligence hierarchy to thwart further attempts at penetration.\(^{71}\) There was a single officer in each town known as a Centre. Each Centre was directed by a County Centre, District Centre and so on until the Provincial Centre level. The IRB Supreme Council contained seven provincial directors who represented Ireland, Scotland, and North and South England. There were an additional four honorary members of the Supreme Council of whom the other members alone knew the identity.\(^{72}\) It was well organised, and similar to modern terror cells. Peter Hart found that it was comprised predominantly of un-propertied, unmarried, urban, and skilled middle-class men.\(^{73}\)

The IRB had infiltrated the Volunteers from its inception. The Volunteers, it was claimed, were the open military group of the IRB.\(^{74}\) The IRB itself was quite clandestine: it was often simply referred to as ‘the Organisation.’ It was not until the Easter Rising, in which many IRB units took part, that the group was known to the general public. Many of its members were imprisoned in
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Frongoch Prison following the uprising. When most of the prisoners were released in an amnesty in December 1918, the IRB had an opportunity for renewal. It redefined its purpose as one to establish and maintain a free Irish republic, and to train and equip its men for securing that independence via force.\(^{75}\)

When President Ashe of the IRB died in a hunger strike (during which he was forcibly fed), his position was taken by Sean McGarry, who nominated Michael Collins as his secretary. Michael Collins (1890-1922) was a low-born Catholic from West Cork. His earliest nationalism was stirred by his father, school tutors and reading nationalist stories.\(^{76}\) A workmate was his possible introduction to the IRB, which he joined in 1909.\(^{77}\) His early work with them was as a financial advisor due to his faculty with numbers.

In 1914, Collins enrolled in the No. 1 Company of the London Group of Irish Volunteers.\(^{78}\) He was lucky enough to be only imprisoned for his role in the Easter Rising. During this time, he earned the nickname “the Big Fellow”: supposedly describing both his height and his ego.\(^{79}\) Upon his release from Frongoch Prison, he ran for election for the Sinn Fein party. Following Sinn Fein victories across Ireland, the British conveniently unearthed the ‘German Plot,’ which implicated Sinn Fein with German forces, and justified the mass arrests of the Volunteer leadership. Collins avoided capture, and as Director of Organisation in the Volunteers, had the responsibility of rebuilding and regrouping officers within the IRB.\(^{80}\) It is hard to gauge what radicalised Collins, or the exact nature of his character. Tom Barry, leader of one of the celebrated Flying Columns, described Collins as ‘a tireless, ruthless, dominating man of great

\(^{75}\) Ibid. p177

\(^{76}\) John F. Murphy, "Michael Collins and the Craft of Intelligence," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 17, no. 2 (2004). p334

\(^{77}\) Coogan, *Michael Collins: A Biography*. p16 Another possible introduction was through his Gaelic football club.

\(^{78}\) Ibid. p29

\(^{79}\) Murphy, "Michael Collins and the Craft of Intelligence." p337

capacity...”\textsuperscript{81} Whereas others describe him as wild and unruly, and yet devoted to detail and minutiae. His most important propaganda piece was \textit{Path to Freedom}.\textsuperscript{82}

By 1920, Collins was President of the IRB. He restructured the military aspects, introduced the concept of the Flying Column, and organised the dispersal of bomb making and small arms equipment. Hidden within the IRB network, was the Irish Republican Army.\textsuperscript{83} The IRB were integral to recruiting, training, and controlling IRA men; but the IRA soon began to operate above and beyond the IRB.\textsuperscript{84} Peter Hart suggests that the two terms were used interchangeably in London,\textsuperscript{85} whereas O’Brien claims that IRB activity dwindled as the IRA rose to prominence.\textsuperscript{86} Collins was aided by people such as the O’Donoghues.

Florence O’Donoghue (1895-1967) was the eldest son of Kerry farmers. He considered himself far from brilliant at school. He was politically awakened by the Easter Rising, describing it as “an illumination, a lifting of the mental horizon giving glimpses of an undiscovered country.”\textsuperscript{87} He joined the Irish Volunteers and quickly rose through the ranks, becoming first lieutenant of the Cork Cyclist Company within a year. He was sworn into the Irish Republican Brotherhood in 1917, and became central to Collins’ intelligence activities; targeting mail, telephones, and telegrams, and recruiting spies and placing them in key positions. He was also involved in a series of police assassinations, informer murders, and a jailbreak. O’Donoghue reached the rank of Adjutant General of the 1\textsuperscript{st} South Division of the IRA, when he resigned in 1923.\textsuperscript{88}

His future wife, Josephine Marchment (1891-1966) was a middle-class Catholic, and married Coleridge Marchment, of the British Army. When he died on the front in WW1, she lost custody
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of their son to his Protestant grandparents, and was unable to win him back. In 1919, an IRA Chaplain put her in contact with the IRA for help in regaining her child. Florence O’Donoghue was her handler. Josephine was the head clerk and typist in the Victoria Barracks, British Army headquarters, and had access to classified military information. She became one of the most valuable (and yet little-known) intelligence operatives of the Irish Republican Army. All the 6th Division’s routine correspondence passed through her hands. She was never detected. In payment for her service, the IRA abducted her son and smuggled him back to Ireland. She married Florence O’Donoghue secretly in 1921 after the truce.

In 1921, the British offered a truce, and Collins went to London as the deputy of President de Valera to negotiate the Anglo-Irish Treaty, and the establishment of the Irish Free State. However, some nationalists, including members of the IRA and the Sinn Fein did not agree with the terms of the Treaty, and the Civil War ensued. Within a year, Collins had subdued the Anti-Treaty forces. It is there that the scope of this research ends.

The chapter has demonstrated the revolutionary context for unrest in Ireland, and introduced the major voices and their terrorist groups which will be discussed in the next chapter. There was significant IRA activity abroad in London, namely arson and property damage costing 671,169 pounds and the deaths of ten people, but the focus in the next chapter will be on the more intense Ireland-based campaign. The long build-up for unrest orientated the terrorist struggle in popular and historical sentiment, but diverged through their adaptation of Propaganda of the Deed and innovation in violent tactics.
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This chapter explores the six major themes of Propaganda of the Deed in early twentieth-century Irish terrorism. Propaganda of the Deed here manifested in both similar and distinct ways to the Russian anarchists, representing both tradition and innovation. The Irish anti-colonialist terrorists discussed the purpose of their actions and justified their violence in the propaganda. This included discussion about the strategy which targeted the British intelligence threat, and for which a secret death squad was created. Their tactics exploited the intelligence edge provided by female spies to manoeuvre fast moving Flying Columns. The systematic campaign broadly had three main stages: endurance, escalation, and exhaustion. The glorification of the revolution, and of the martyrdom of the fighters, was also heavily mythologised in the propaganda, drawing comparisons with mythological heroes.

**Theoretical Purpose**

The Irish terrorists established the theoretical purpose of terrorism more cogently than the Russian anarchists. They depicted the British government as the aggressor, and the terrorists and Irish nation were positioned as the cultural, religious, and social defenders. The purpose was based in a long historical build-up, which may have rendered the argument more comprehensible. However, by drawing on the historical and mythical past, the purpose was projected onto a reimagined future which utilised the revolutionary abstraction. Padraig Pearse, Michael Collins, and James Connolly were prominent propagandists.

Pearse believed the terrorist purpose was to reclaim Ireland from the British, in its geographic totality. He quoted the nationalist, James Fintan Lalor:

Ireland her own – Ireland her own, and all therein from sod to sky. The soil of Ireland for the people of Ireland, to have and hold from God alone who gave it – to have and hold to them and
to their heirs for ever, without suit or service, faith or fealty, rent or render, to any power under
heaven.¹

The terrorist purpose was to regain the entirety of Ireland: certainly geographically but also in
its historical, ideological, and religious entirety. The nation was the purpose: surpassing a mere
propaganda device, the nation became a revolutionary abstraction. After so many years of
British rule, the propagandists waxed eloquent about a free Ireland to shake the masses from
what they perceived as their stupor of obedience. That purpose would require violence,
according to Pearse quoting fellow nationalist, Thomas Davis:

…Will she [England] allow us, for good or for ill, to govern ourselves, and see if we cannot
redress our own griefs. ‘No, never, never,’ she says ‘though all Ireland cried for it – never!’ The
fields shall be manured with the shattered limbs of her sons, and her hearths quenched in their
blood; but never, while England has ship or soldier, shall Ireland be free.²

The goal of the revolution was to reclaim Ireland from the antagonists, the British, who were
depicted as occupying a diametric position as equally unremitting as the nationalists own.
Evocative language was used to add emphasis and urgency to the cause, and inspire the spirit
of revolt.

The idea of a free Ireland was consuming. It was a pursuit that overrode the day-to-day
complaints of the Irish people. Connolly was well-versed in the varied sources of Irish
discontent, but Ireland itself superseded ancillary claims. In The Workers Republic (1899), he
wrote:

Let us free Ireland! Never mind such base, carnal thoughts as concern work and wages, healthy
homes, or lives unclouded by poverty. Let us free Ireland!

…let us organize a class to meet our masters and destroy their mastership; organize to drive
them from their hold upon public life through their political power; organize to wrench from
their rubber clutch the land and the workshops on and in which they enslave us; organize to
cleanse our social life from the stain of social cannibalism, from the preying of man upon his
fellow man. Organize for a full, free and happy life FOR ALL OR FOR NONE.³

¹ Pearse, Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse. p252
² Ibid. p249
³ Connolly, The Workers' Republic. pp33-34
Freeing Ireland was less about the legitimate causes for discontent, and more about freeing the Irish national spirit from the corruption of British domination. The quantifiable complaints regarding famine, poverty, and unemployment were subsidiary to the greater purpose. National identity was at stake, and upon it being reclaimed, Connolly believed that all other issues would be resolved. To Connolly, the revolution was more than claiming a geographical space on a map. The reclamation would absolve the Irish of their perceived subservience to the British, and restore their national character.

Collins expressed similar sentiments, and took it further. The purpose of the propaganda was to encourage social acceptance and support for his violent method of revolution. The moral justness of his position was as incontrovertible to him as the enduring Irish nationality, “existing from legendary ages, and through centuries of foreign oppression.” He glorified the terrorist efforts, and sought to discredit the British reaction:

> During the war we had gathered strength by the justice of our cause, and by the way in which we had carried on the struggle. We had organized our own government, and had made the most of our military resources. The united nation showed not only endurance and courage but a humanity which was in marked contrast to the conduct of the enemy. All this gave us moral strength... [emphasis added]

Collins represented the Irish purpose as having unquestionable moral superiority over the British position. He used the past conduct of British troops to garner more support. In this, Collins understood Propaganda of the Deed in a similar way to Kropotkin. He may not have desired the brutal overreaction of the state, but he was clearly capable of using the conduct of that reaction for his own ends.

The theoretical purpose for the terrorist violence was to reclaim Ireland from the British. Accordingly, the propagandists exploited the collective memory of the shared historical and mythical past, and projected that as the re-imagined future that they were hoping to restore. The active veneration of the Irish abstraction surpassed the legitimate reasons for discontent in
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Irish society. Chronic poverty, unemployment, and famine provided recruitment pools, but the purpose was focused on Ireland as an idea, a concept. It embodied everything from sod to sky, home and hearth, culture and religion, society and politics, language and sports. Ireland was the revolutionary abstraction, and it was so marked that MacNeill even spoke out against it being a “poetical abstraction”. The terrorists used the fear of losing that mythologised identity within the British machine to justify their actions.

Justification for Violence

While the anarchists attempted to justify violence through their natural rights, the Irish anti-colonialists justified their violence on the grounds of moral obligation and duty, a defensive reaction to British presence. This transition to violence was declared in terms of law and natural rights as a mark of revolutionary legitimacy, and a reawakened awareness. The justification for killing and the terrorist defence against the accusation of wrongful violence were themes pursued by propagandists including Padraig Pearse, Florence O’Donoghue, and Michael Collins.

Pearse warned his followers that blood would come with freedom, and freedom would only come with blood. He justified the transition to violence through a combination of glorification, purification, and shame.

I do not think it is going to be achieved without stress and trial, without suffering and bloodshed; at any rate it’s not going to be achieved without work...Whatever comes to Ireland, she needs men. And we of this generation are not in any real sense men...

We may make mistakes in the beginning and shoot the wrong people; but bloodshed is a cleansing and sanctifying thing, and the nation which regards it as the final horror has lost its manhood. There are many things more horrible than bloodshed; and slavery is one of them.

The first step would be destruction. The destruction of the old “worm-eaten” boards of the English education system was important because Pearse believed it trained the Irish into submission. Then the violence was justified as a ritual of purification: it would not only win
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6 Kee, The Green Flag. p554. “That which we call our country is not a poetical abstraction, as some of us, perhaps all of us, in the exercise of our highly developed capacity for figurative thought, are sometimes apt to imagine – with the help of our patriotic literature.”

7 Pearse, Collected Works of Padraic H. Pearse. p96-97, 99

8 Ibid. p43
their freedom, but would re-establish their self worth. This created a blood and freedom symbiosis, where blood was the cost of the revolution.

O’Donoghue believed, similarly to Pearse, that killing was unavoidable. He discussed the transmission from peaceful agitation to violent action in his diary:

The year 1918 marked the development into a deep and untroubled conviction of my faith in the justice and logic of our claim to national freedom.⁹

However, O’Donoghue had to overcome two impediments before engaging in violence. The first was “the moral responsibility undertaken in killing...second, my personal reaction to death.”¹⁰ It was in Catholicism that O’Donoghue found his solace, and justified to himself the deaths which, at his orders, occurred. But to the general population, he justified violence as a right:

...a nation which is unjustly invaded has the right to resist the invader and the right to use every lawful means to try and eject him. That right is not extinguished by reason of the fact that in the invader, superior by force, has annihilated the lawful government...
There is even more than a right to resist. There is a duty. It is the moral duty of the people of the nation to resist and endeavour to reject the invader...¹¹

Violence was therefore justified by O’Donoghue as part of the natural order, and an act of self-defence in resisting British rule. His use of the terms ‘lawful means’ gave the impression of a legal application of force. This was nothing more than a deliberate deception. O’Donoghue granted himself and the Irish people the “right to kill the invader.”¹² In doing so, he sought to legitimise the many assassinations by the IRA.

Collins’ justification for violence was less burdened with moral or religious concerns. To him, it was the end result that mattered most. He recounted: “We fought for the one thing for which alone fighting is really justified – for national freedom, for the right of the whole people to live
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⁹ Borgonovo, Florence and Josephine O’Donoghue’s War of Independence. p49
¹⁰ Ibid. p49
¹¹ Ibid. p49
¹² Ibid. p49
as a nation.”\textsuperscript{13} This in itself required little justification – the position was held as undeniable, especially in light of the Treaty of Versailles and the sovereign principles of national self-determination. He later wrote:

Armed resistance was the indispensable factor in our struggle for freedom. It was never possible for us to be militarily strong enough to make England uncomfortable (and strong enough to make England too uncomfortable). While she explains the futility of force (by others) it is the only argument she listens to. For ourselves it had that practical advantage, but it was above all things the expression of our separate nationhood.\textsuperscript{14}

The violence was justified in the quest for revolution, but, moreover, leant legitimacy to the struggle itself. Collins positioned the violence as a legitimate expression of that nationhood. Therefore, to use violence to win back Ireland for the Irish was an expression of the Irish/Gaelic identity. Dissent against this could be easily construed as hostile.

In sum, the propaganda justified the use of violence using a combination of approaches. O’Donoghue believed the violence was in self-defence against the aggression of British colonialism, and established terrorism as a moral duty and a natural right of the Irish to employ in that situation. Pearse believed that violence was integral to the purpose of the terrorists; freedom would only come with blood, and blood with freedom. Collins saw violence as the mark of revolutionary legitimacy, and a validation of the struggle itself. This propaganda was carefully directed. According to these propagandists, Ireland had lost its identity, and lived in a state of shame. The only way to regain their honour and their freedom was through violent action – a blood tithe to the nation. The idea of the nation was enough to justify the violence. Historian Richard English likewise concluded that:

Violence was considered to be a value in itself, in terms of what it reflected about a nation which deserved its freedom; in terms of the careers and roles which it gave to many young men; and in terms of the attitudinal defiance it inculcated. Dignity, pride, and self-respect were all embodied in IRA resistance and defiance.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Collins, \textit{The Path to Freedom}. p12
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. p53
\textsuperscript{15} English, \textit{Irish Freedom}. p291
Strategic Method

The IRA had a strategy for spectacular violence, most notably comprising assassination, with a subtle twist being a death squad known as the Twelve Apostles. Violence was not openly glorified. This could be because the terrorist struggle was centred on intelligence and information, which endorsed a more covert approach. The IRA’s strategic attacks were not aimed at the political leadership of Britain, but at the British intelligence service in Ireland. This challenged and diminished British reputation and authority. Many of the strategic strikes were on military intelligence, the constabulary, politicians, and native informers. This contained a symbolic message: no one was safe. Because of their covert operations, there is insufficient documentation to show that the Irish terrorists understood the propaganda for spectacular assassination in the same overt fashion as the anarchists. However, empirical evidence suggests that they adopted a comparable, but distinct, methodology for spectacular attacks. This violence was selective, although Bolt pointed out that civilian casualties were acceptable “collateral.”

Spectacular assassination was first trialled on 6 May 1882. The English Secretary of State for Ireland, Lord Cavendish and his Permanent Undersecretary, Thomas Henry Burke were assassinated in Phoenix Park by the short-lived terror group, the Irish Invincibles. It targeted the symbol of British power in Ireland, but Cavendish, newly arrived to Ireland, was not held accountable for the depredations of his predecessors. Patrick Tynan, alleged leader of the Invincibles, tried to use the assassination for propaganda purposes:

The slaying of the British Secretary, Lord Cavendish, was not an act of personal revenge. He had never identified with any action that could create this feeling. In his person the office of Britain’s chief officer was struck down. It was British rule in any manner which these men protested.

Cavendish was killed for his symbolic role in Irish politics, rather than for his actions. There was no tangible political goal which accompanied this act, although Tynan nonetheless tried to capitalise on the spectacular attention that it generated:
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16 Bolt, “Propaganda of the Deed and the Irish Republican Brotherhood.” p50
It was a brave and daring action in the presence of so many guards; the slightest hitch would have surrounded the actors with numerous foes. The suddenness of the attack, and the unusual weapons, must have paralyzed the British guardians, and the men were gone when they came to their reason...Had one shot been fired, how quickly these scattered guardians of British rule would have clustered around, and in a twinkling the constabulary would be on the scene with shotted rifles and fixed bayonets...18

The assassination’s potential for Propaganda of the Deed was never to be realised in this situation. The assassination was widely condemned, and prominent nationalists, notably the leader of the Irish Parliamentarian Party, Charles Parnell, distanced themselves from it.19 It may be that the bad press impacted on the way the later terrorists chose their targets. Collins read Tynan’s writings in prison and shaped his terror campaign accordingly. His spectacular assassinations would be carried out by a secret squad.

The Squad, or the Twelve Apostles as they became known, was a covert unit that Collins formed in 1919. Their purpose was to directly counteract the British G Division, a police intelligence organisation in Dublin. According to Tom Bowden, the Cairo Gang, as the sect in G Division was known, comprised M15 and SIS secret service specialists.20 Collins selected the initial unit of five men from throughout the IRA. This increased to twelve, hence the nickname the Twelve Apostles, although numbers fluctuated based on necessity. The Squad was supported financially by IRA funds, and operated on a 24 hour basis, with secret identities and safe-houses.21 William J. Stapleton, one of the initial Squad members, wrote:

Our chief function was the extermination of British spies and informers. Two squad men in turn would carry out this work with an intelligence officer whose part it was to point out clearly and distinctly by a pre-arranged signal the spy concerned. The remainder of the squad would fan out to cover the retreat of the two. These exterminations were carried out mainly on Dublin streets in broad daylight, our subsequent escape was effected by mingling with any people standing or gaping about; a swift foot ensured a safe retreat. Rarely were cars used.22

18 Ibid. p265
19 English, Irish Freedom. p213
22 Ibid. p370
Shootings were the most popular method for assassination, and it took very little to be executed as an informer for the British. The papers of Piaras Beaslai, the Director of Publicity, contained execution orders for Irishmen Thomas Cunningham and Michael Reilly.\textsuperscript{23} Their crime was talking to the RIC and allegedly pointing out the houses where Volunteers lived. They were sentenced to death and killed in June 1921.\textsuperscript{24} It was hoped, according to O/C Offaly, who ordered the killings, that “these executions will have a salutary effect.”\textsuperscript{25} An atmosphere of existential fear was created: all those who did not support the Irish terrorists, and aided the British, could be targets.

However, the main targets were the RIC and the Auxiliaries. According to Bowden, the RIC and even the plain clothes detectives were “systematically shot.”\textsuperscript{26} In 1920, over 450 Royal Irish Constables were killed or wounded in attacks which occurred either in the streets or in their own homes during daylight hours.\textsuperscript{27} Manuscripts from 1921 also show that the IRA possessed the home addresses in Scotland, England, and Wales of over 300 Black and Tans serving in Ireland. This was for the purpose of threat, intimidation, and assassination.\textsuperscript{28} There was another sinister benefit to this strategy. By the time the IRA were finished, the “old” RIC had been virtually destroyed. This meant that the RIC were no longer able to positively identify IRA operatives, because all who had known them by sight were dead.\textsuperscript{29} A large reason for the elusiveness of Collins was because few British knew what he looked like – despite his internment in Frongoch Prison.

\textsuperscript{24} “Course of Inquiry and execution of Thomas Cunningham, ex-Soldier and Carpenter, Ballysheil, Cloghan.” and “Course of Inquiry and execution of Michael Reilly, ex-Soldier, Cloghan.” Ibid. np
\textsuperscript{25} “Remarks of Execution of Spies.” Ibid. np
\textsuperscript{26} Bowden, “The Irish Underground and the War of Independence 1919-21.” p18
\textsuperscript{27} Law, \textit{Terrorism: A History}. p146
\textsuperscript{29} "Letters from F. O’D. To ‘a Chara Dhilis’," in \textit{Florence O'Donoghue’s Papers} (Manuscript Collection A18: National Library of Ireland, c.1921).
Collins read Tynan’s experience with assassination while in prison.\textsuperscript{30} Assassination was to become an effective weapon for his war. In \textit{Path to Freedom}, he outlined the precise use of assassination against the British Intelligence community in Ireland:

\begin{quote}
England could always reinforce her army. She could replace every soldier she lost... But there were others indispensable for her purposes, which were not so easily replaced. To paralyse the British machine it was necessary to strike at individuals. Without her spies England was helpless. It was only by means of their accumulated and accumulating knowledge that the British machine could operate...
Spies are not so ready to step into the shoes of their departed confederates as are soldiers to fill up the front line in honourable battle. And even when the new spy is stepped into the shoes of the old one he could not step into the old ones knowledge.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

Here Collins expressed the deadly efficacy of assassinations. England had overwhelming force, and the killing of soldiers would accomplish little, as rank and file were easily reinforced. Intelligence officers, however, with experience, contacts, and established networks were not so easily replaced. The previous dynamic meant that spies were captured for information, but rarely killed out of hand. Collins acted in direct contradiction to British expectations. This was essentially a psychological intelligence battle between Collins and the British administration, and one spectacular event would devastate British intelligence: Bloody Sunday.

Bloody Sunday was conducted by the Twelve Apostles and supported by general IRA members, and is the most spectacular attack in Irish terrorism.\textsuperscript{32} On 21 November 1920, thirteen men were shot around Dublin.\textsuperscript{33} The first was Captain McLean, shot eight times. T.H Smith, of the same residence, was allowed to dress before he was shot. Next Captain Bennett and Lieutenant Ames were killed, Bennett being shot seven times. Lieutenant Peel survived the attack, barricading himself in his room while his fellow, Lieutenant Angliss, was killed. Lieutenant Wilde and Captain McCormack were killed in the Gresham Hotel. RIC officer Captain Fitzgerald was

\begin{flushleft}
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\textsuperscript{32} Described by Bowden as “systematic”. Bowden, "The Irish Underground and the War of Independence 1919-21." p3
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shot in his house. Another four officers died on Pembroke Street. Meanwhile, several Auxiliaries stumbled across an IRA covering party: two Auxiliaries were shot and killed.34

Collins described Bloody Sunday infamously as paying the British in their own coin.35 Most of the targets were, or were suspected of being, intelligence officers of the Cairo Gang, the “hush hush men”36 of G Division. The architects of the attack were Collins, Dick McKee (the principal organiser of the Twelve Apostles) and Paedar Clancy, with help from Conor Clune. The target list was originally thirty-five names. Collins whittled it down to fifteen, satisfying himself saying, “I have proof enough to assure myself of the atrocities this gang of spies and informers have committed.”37 It had required seven assassination squads, and around 120 IRA men. Tom Bowden wrote: “Given the goals of the attack, it was a superb success. The British Intelligence system was shattered. It had taken some nine months to build, train, and infiltrate the group in Dublin...Now all lay in ruins.”38

The immediate reaction was panic at Dublin Castle: “Intelligence officers – or their remnants - were crowding the gates with their families and possessions, their value as ‘plants’ among the ordinary citizens gone.”39 The slaughter of the Cairo Gang was a resounding success of spectacular Propaganda of the Deed, and created maximum publicity. It was a provocative blow at the centre of Dublin Castle, daring the British government to overreact. The implications went beyond terrorism, though, as it was also a strategic military strike designed to protect IRA interests and undermine the British effort. This justified Propaganda of the Deed as a military as well as a terrorist concept. The consequence of Bloody Sunday was the indiscriminate massacre of civilians at Croke Park by British forces.40

37 Dolan, "Killing and Bloody Sunday, November 1920." p794
38 Bowden, Elliott-Bateman, and Ellis, Revolt to Revolution, II. p264-265
39 Ibid. p264
40 Dolan, "Killing and Bloody Sunday, November 1920." p789
The Irish strategic method relied heavily on assassination. It was even thought that Collins had four detectives and a dozen of the uniformed constabulary reporting to him.\(^{41}\) Spectacular acts of terrorism were rather rare though. It may be that the backlash for the Phoenix Park murders led Collins to adjust his strategy. Instead of symbolically cutting off the head of the King, he took his eyes and ears. The victims had symbolic significance as Britain’s officialdom. The sweeping attack of Bloody Sunday was designed to achieve maximum propaganda effect, to terrify the British intelligence community in Ireland, and to damage Britain’s appearance of authority. This intent was supported by innovative tactics.

**Tactical Method**

Peirse wrote, “before this generation has passed, the Volunteers will draw the sword of Ireland.”\(^{42}\) In place of swords, the Irish had firearms and explosives. The Irish revolutionary movement did not use exclusively terrorist tactics – it utilised guerrilla and conventional tactics as well. Chaliand and Blin draw distinctions between these terms.\(^{43}\) Guerrillas are organised in battalions and platoons, whereas terrorists operate in small groups. The IRA had both battalions and special murder squads. Guerrilla tactics involve commando, ambushes and raids, while terrorists exploit assassinations, kidnapping, and bombings. Again, the Irish did both. Guerrillas primarily target military, police, and administration targets, unlike terrorists who target civilians as well. Guerrillas have uniforms and administrate territory. The Irish conventionals had parade uniforms, but wore plainclothes when engaging in terrorist activities, and mobility was the foundation of their strategy. Terrorism was not used exclusively by the IRA. That being said, the focus here is specifically on the terrorist tactics. Therefore, the use of women, the Flying Columns, firearms, explosives will be discussed below, leaving aside ambushes and raids on military targets, which are frequently undertaken by conventional militaries and as such don’t officially constitute terrorism as it was originally conceived.
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Women played a significant part in the Irish terrorists’ intelligence war. Lily Mernin, cousin to Piaras Beaslai, was an important spy. A typist in Dublin Castle, she frequently worked in the British Intelligence Branch, and was largely responsible for identifying the Cairo Gang. Nancy O’Brien was Collins’ cousin, which Dublin Castle knew. She took the Oath of Allegiance, which satisfied the British to the point where she was able to continue spying for the IRA. Josephine O’Donoghue operated within army headquarters and passed all information about the 6th Division’s officers, arms, and movements to the IRA. Murphy claimed that Josephine was intrinsic to the success of the south-west Volunteer struggle. But they were not limited to spying. Around twenty-four women were found to be ‘implicated’ in the Sinn Fein movement, according to a report in Beaslai’s papers. Charges included fundraising for the IRA, possessing a signals book, hiding and trafficking arms, operating safe houses and ammunition dumps for IRA fighters, membership to the Cumann-Na-MBan, and in the case of Mrs Sheehy Skeffington, being “A Bad woman [sic].” These women provided the IRA with an edge in intelligence, which was to serve the Flying Columns well.

The Flying Columns were small, highly mobile, organised units with detailed knowledge of their countryside and the British movements within it. The fixed-position tactic of the 1916 Easter Rising was viewed as a failure. That method had been based on Connolly’s socialist ideology. He believed that the British would never use destructive force against their own property. When the Rising prisoners were released from Frongoch, they were determined not to make the same
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mistake. They found the British were most vulnerable when they travelled around in troop lorries *en route* to raid Volunteer houses for weapons. O’Donoghue wrote:

> If the IRA was to maintain and extend the fight for freedom a way had to be found of successfully attacking these convoys with the available weapons. The Flying Column and the ambush were the answers. The IRA, immeasurably weaker than its opponent in arms and all the sinews of war, had at the outset taken the initiative and by the flexible adaptation of its basic organization had created formations and tactics which allowed it to retain that valuable advantage during the whole struggle.53

This characterised the innovative nature of Irish terrorism. The Flying Columns and leaders were mobile and camouflaged amongst ordinary Sinn Feiners. It was thought Collins and O’Donoghue rarely slept in the same bed two nights in a row.54 This strategy would prove integral to their endurance.

Consequently, the terrorists favoured small arms. The majority of weapons used by the IRA and the Volunteers during this period were stolen from British forces. Collins wrote in *Path to Freedom*: “On the Irish side, it took the form of disarming the attackers. We took their arms and attacked their strongholds.”55 However:

> Almost any small arms weapon can be a guerrilla weapon...sub-machine-guns, light machine-guns, shotguns, explosives, grenades, pistols, automatic rifles, flame throwers...56

Being part of an ‘almost’ conventional military organisation (the Volunteers), the IRA were well-trained and proficient with their weapons. Bloody Sunday stood testimony to this, when IRA teams used side-arms for assassination.57 The application of force was selective. Terrorists avoided shooting women and children. For example, when RIC Inspector O’Sullivan was shot
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while walking with his fiancé, the woman was unharmed. With the arrival of the Black and Tans, attacks became reprisals. When the RIC killed Lord Mayor Thomas Mac Curtin of Cork, the IRA retaliated by shooting the RIC District Inspector.

The IRA’s innovation in explosives gave them an edge. An unknown Irish terrorist declared that a pound of dynamite “contained more force than ‘a million speeches.’” O’Donovan’s Skirmishers and Clan na Gael were the first to use explosives against the British. In 1881, the Skirmishers attempted to bomb Mansion House in London – a symbol of the Lord Mayor’s power. The bomb had nearly seven kilograms of blasting power and a slow-burning fuse. The attack failed. This caused indignation amongst the terrorists – not the bombing itself, but its failure. Clansman William Lomasney scorned it, claiming the Skirmishers appeared as:

Lots of fools and ignoramuses, men who did not understand the first principles of the art of war, the elements of chemistry, or even the amount of explosive material necessary to remove or destroy an ordinary brick or stone wall.

Ironically, Lomasney would die three years later in a failed bridge bombing on behalf of the Clan na Gael. Lomasney rowed under London Bridge and detonated explosives in an attack that was likely the first instance of maritime suicide bombing. The Clan also attempted to bomb four British railway terminals using “infernal machines.” These failures represent early amateurism, but also the desire to gain technical proficiency.

True explosive proficiency came decades later with the seizure of better British equipment. The IRA Handbook was written in 1955 after the original IRA activity, but was based on the knowledge and tactics of early years. It claimed “Breaking down enemy resistance is also easier
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once explosives are employed.”

The Handbook for Volunteers gave explicit instructions on bomb-making, the use and handling of gelignite, 808, TNT, ammonal, gun cotton, burn rates for different fuses, and included formulas for the amount of explosive required to blast through buildings and roadways. The IRA also made significant innovations in detonation, including photo-flash slave unit triggers. The most reliable materials were stolen from the British, such as the ‘Mills Bomb’ grenade.

The IRA made effective use of hand-held explosives and grenades in daily tactics. There were few physical impediments to their use: being light, easy to make, conceal, and allowed terrorists to control the time, place, and victims. Casualties were higher: grenade shrapnel injured fourteen men when thrown into a government lorry in 1921. Troops travelling in lorries were extremely susceptible to this type of attack:

The wire cage lorry was the British response to grenades; they never found a satisfactory answer to the other devices. The wise crack popular at the time “The Boers put them in Khaki, the Germans put them in tin hats, the Irish put them in cages,” was quite true. The gathering impetus of the struggle had forced the British Forces into vehicles and onto roads...

And there, on the roads, the dynamic of the terror shifted. British forces had to travel in armoured vehicles and cages for their own safety because the IRA had seized the initiative. It must be noted though that while the Irish patented this cult of explosives, it was celebrated in terrorist propaganda in 1930 by the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army in its manifesto, “Philosophy of the Bomb.”
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In summary, IRA tactics made effective use of firearms and explosives. Though the equipment was similar to that used by the anarchists, thus adhering to tradition, they made significant technical innovations using stolen supplies. Early attacks, such as the Mansion bombing, were flawed by amateurism, and this led to the desire to gain technical proficiency. Other innovation included the optimisation of women in undercover roles, the Flying Columns, and en route opportunism in targeting of British troop lorries, which had a substantial psychological impact.

**Systematic Campaign**

These strategies and tactics coalesced into a systematic campaign. The Irish knew they had to create an unendurable situation, but they were also aware that they could not themselves endure indefinitely. The campaign had three main elements: endurance, escalation, and exhaustion. Enduring the campaign meant outstaying the British will to fight, while using their natural advantages for survival. The conflict was escalated by increasing the frequency of terror attacks. This put mounting pressure on the British government to either crush the terrorists, or negotiate with them. Ultimately, however, the British had to be pushed to a state of exhaustion, where the war was no longer supported by the British public. These three elements, applied consistently, created the desired state of fear.

Enduring the struggle required terrorists to accept their numerical inferiority and vulnerabilities. They also had to use the strength of Britain against itself. O’Donoghue was more aware of this delicate dynamic than most:

> Broadly, IRA operations were directed at wasting and wearing down the enemy, at outstaying his endurance, at breaking his will to win, at discrediting his apparent superiority, at making it a fight not worth the cost to him, at compelling him, as Fintan Lawler suggested, to undertake operations for which his army was never intended. With their modest resources, the IRA could never have achieved the physical destruction or compelled the surrender of occupying forces. Neither could they fight pitched battles...

---


This self-awareness indicated that the terrorists’ strategy was deliberate. They knew they could not win by force of arms. They challenged and ridiculed British forces, and, by taking the initiative, forced conventional troops to engage in irregular warfare for which they were not trained. The strategic and tactical methods, coupled with propaganda which targeted British support of home-rule in other countries, was designed to publicly humiliate. This targeted Britain’s international prestige, while the continued existence of the terrorists made a mockery of British authority. Richard English described it as a rational strategy, designed to “raise the costs of British engagement above the level which Britain judged them worth paying.”

Two main factors supported the endurance of the terrorists, and were deliberately cultivated. The first was their small numbers; second was the continuous pool of fresh recruits radicalised by British atrocities. In 1875, Patrick Ford of the Skirmishers wanted small groups of fighters because:

The Irish cause...requires a little band of heroes who will initiate and keep up without intermission a guerrilla war – men who will fly over land and sea like invisible beings – now striking the enemy in Ireland, now in India, now in England, as occasion may present.

Small groups of men were integral to a successful terrorist campaign. As early as 1917, O’Donoghue noted the importance of keeping operational numbers small. On 15 October 1917, he wrote:

(1) Quality over quantity of troops that count
(2) The larger the force the greater the difficulties. Every additional detachment increases the possibility of failure.

O’Donoghue calculated that if he kept numbers small in the Flying Columns, and operated at night in familiar terrain, the chances of a successful operation would increase. This proved correct. He also emphasised that during night marches, columns must have rear guards, and in
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night advances, they must have scouts. The methods to avoid detection conserved the numbers of fighters. This was integral to their endurance as a mobile force.

The harassment of peaceful Sinn Fein by the RIC created social discontent which radicalized nationalists. The 1920 murder of Thomas Mac Curtan, the Lord Mayor of Cork, by RIC policemen was one such event. His successor, Terrence MacSwiney, knew the likely consequences. After the funeral of Mac Curtan, O'Donoghue talked with MacSwiney:

> When I saw him, [MacSwiney] he said “Well, Florrie, what do we do now?” There were lines of weariness and sorrow on his pale face, but his blue eyes were bright and steadfast. I said, “You will take Tomas’ place?” It was not really a question. I have never forgotten how he looked away for a moment through the window over the city rooftops on that bright Spring morning, and then looked directly back at me and said simply, “I will.” He knew, and I knew, what that meant.  

Within seven months, MacSwiney was dead. The media storm over the inquest of Mac Curtan’s murder meant that, according to O'Donoghue, “Other means were found.” MacSwiney was arrested with a (allegedly planted) cypher and confined in Brixton Prison. He began a public hunger strike which lasted seventy-four days, dying after forced feeding. This willingness of radicals to take the office of those who had died serving, in anticipation that they too would die, was excellent propaganda. O'Donoghue knew that, as indicated by the florid manner of his writing. The public ritual of overtaking the office of murdered comrades was very successful in generating recruits, which enabled terrorist endurance.

The IRA escalated its activities in late 1919. Ramping up attacks served to burden the war-weary British public and create the impression of IRA dominance. British Government reports on “Outrages” in Ireland during this period recorded the sudden increase in IRA activities. Between January 1919 and April 1920, there were around 700 outrages, which involved 194 threatening letters to RIC members, 185 counts of property damage, and over 250 deliberate arsons. In addition, there were some sixteen murders of government officials and a similar
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number of assaults. These figures rose dramatically in the months of May and April, with over 1500 outrages recorded. This included over a dozen dead policemen, nine civilians killed, and seventeen soldiers robbed of their arms. Over 300 people reported IRA ‘intimidations’. There were 145 counts of arson, and the IRA systematically destroyed numbers of occupied RIC barracks, and over a hundred unoccupied RIC barracks.

Complete totals from January 1919 to October 1920 recorded about 7,300 outrages, including cutting telegraph wires over 300 times. From June to October, the systematic campaign remained constant. The Dublin Metropolitan Police added kidnapping to the list of outrages, with over 120 kidnappings. Terror was applied as a systematic campaign, and its escalation exhausted British authorities. The consistent escalation of attacks was more effectively implemented than that by the Russian anarchists. The IRA used its small numbers to advantage in staying mobile and effective, holding the initiative for action. They used the British reaction to recruit and therefore endure.

Glorification

The glorification of the revolution and martyrs also helped to broaden the terrorist support base. Irish propaganda was redolent with exaltations of ‘Ireland the abstraction,’ and the glorification of the dead. It is important point to note that the revolution was seldom glorified in Catholic terms, marking an adherence to Rossa’s separation between nationalism and Catholicity. The Irish used history to reinforce their propaganda. The exaltation of the revolution and the glorification of martyrdom drew on the past, present, and future, but in different terms. It exploited a shared mythological past, a contemporary foe, a hope for the future, and an all-consuming veneration for the spiritual Irish nation. Propagandists on exaltation were Pearse, Connolly, Collins, and Rossa.

Exaltation

---
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Pearse exalted the revolutionary abstraction of Ireland by holding it as the single most important part of the movement. This was channelled towards a cultivation of a national spirit. As already established, Pearse believed that the contemporary circumstances were fundamentally flawed. To address this, he wrote: “What Ireland wants beyond all other modern countries, is a new birth of a heroic spirit.”\textsuperscript{81} Pearse drew heavily on the Gaelic mythology of ancient Ireland, and encouraged its teachings in school. He took a shared historically based mythology and projected it as the reimagined future of Ireland. His propaganda on this topic was so proliferate that it appears to have seeped into the propaganda of his contemporaries, Connolly and Collins.

Connolly’s exaltation of the revolution focused on the ancient grandeur of Ireland as an abstraction. In \textit{Forward} in 1913, he acclaimed the fight;

\begin{quote}
Meanwhile, come weal or woe, in good repute or evil, we are prepared to fight, because we feel that this fight is a fight for the future, a brighter future...\textsuperscript{82}
\end{quote}

Here, Connolly is publishing the rewards of the revolution in order to exalt. However, in \textit{Disturbed Dublin}, Connolly created a narrative of the revolution, featuring the Irish as the underdogs. He praises the sacrifices of the collective, of the ordinary people in the community:

\begin{quote}
the old woman and young girls long crushed and enslaved, dared to risk all, even life itself, in the struggle to make life more tolerable, more free of the grinding tyranny of the soulless Dublin employers...\textsuperscript{83}
\end{quote}

Again, Connolly used the nationalist bandwagon to push his socialist ideology; however, his underlying aim was to applaud the actions of the ordinary people. He took common stories, and wove them into a grander narrative of self-sacrifice and courage in the face of the Imperial machines. He used evocative language, describing the “slave of the underworld” selflessly revolting against the master, in the spirit of unity, braving any danger including starvation and death. These little stories appear to be specifically designed to create a new paradigm within
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the Irish-British experience. It exalted the collective as part of the revolutionary abstraction, while obscuring the terrorist reality.

The terrorist sought to reclaim the grandeur of legendary times, and project this as the reimagined future for Ireland. Collins viewed Ireland as something both ancient and modern:

\begin{quote}
Let us advance and use these liberties to make Ireland a shining light in a dark world, to reconstruct our ancient civilization on modern lines, to avoid errors, the miseries, the dangers, into which other nations, with their false civilizations, have fallen.\textsuperscript{84}
\end{quote}

To Collins, Ireland was a revolutionary abstraction which was destined to be great once more. It was a magnificent dream that hailed back to older times. Ireland would be rebuilt greater and stronger than ever before. It alone would escape the troubles of modern governance, because Ireland was exalted as being greater than all other false civilizations. It became a revolutionary abstraction to be glorified, and was not to be questioned or critiqued.

\textbf{Martyrdom}

The dead of the Easter Rising gave the nationalist cause its martyrs.\textsuperscript{85} General Maxwell, the British commander who combatted the Rising, ordered the bodies of the leaders buried in quicklime without coffins, as he believed “Irish sentimentality will turn these graves into martyrs’ shrines.”\textsuperscript{86} This foresight did not pay off. Pearse was particularly fixated on death in myths, as well as the nationalist dead. It was unsurprising that he should glorify martyrdom and become a martyr himself. Yet it was not Pearse’s death that evoked the greatest outrage, but that of Connolly. Before Connolly’s death is examined, the martyrdom propaganda of Rossa, Pearse, and Collins’ must be reviewed.

The glorification of martyrdom manifested early in Irish propaganda. As early as 1874, the \textit{Irish World}, influenced by Patrick Ford and Rossa, was using the emotional reaction to martyrdom to
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raise funds. The role of the martyr was not just to fight, but to fight knowing that they would die. For the Skirmishers, it was declared:

We want some band of men to pioneer the way – sometimes to skirmish, sometimes to act as a forlorn hope, sometimes to give martyrs and confessors; always acting, always showing that we have still amongst us brave men ready to do or dare all that brave men every did and dared for the salvation of a fallen land.  

The link between martyrdom and freedom was therefore established early on: and the idea of death as publicity came before Propaganda of the Deed, and even modern terrorism itself. The terrorists were pioneers of the method, and there was little negative connotation. People read of the sacrifice of these forerunners of the Irish nation, and happily donated to the cause. This was social approval for systematic self-destruction – bearing in mind that the self-destruction was not suicide terror, but the commitment of a life to an enduring struggle. This resembled the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm of the Russian terrorists examined earlier.

Pearse devoted himself to the romanticisation and glorification of martyrdom. The blood sacrifice of martyrdom was the highest honour in his mind, the ultimate act of revolutionary legitimacy and heroism:

...our patriotism is measured not by the formula with which we declare it, but by the services which we render. We owe our country all fealty and she asks always for our service; and there are times when she asks of us not ordinary but some supreme service. There are in every generation those who shrink from ultimate sacrifice, but there are those in every generation who make it with joy and laughter, and these are the salt of the generations, the heroes...

These modern heroes, willing to give the ultimate sacrifice, were compared to the heroes of myth and legend. In “Murder Machine” he spoke of knightly traditions which resonated with the glorification of martyrdom that he wanted to teach the Gaelic youth:

I said to my boys: “we must recreate and perpetuate in Ireland the knightly tradition of the Cuchulainn, ‘better is a short life with honour than a long life with dishonour’; ‘I care not though I were to live but one day and one night so long as my fame and my deeds live after me...”
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Pearse wanted to indoctrinate the Irish youth with the belief that a life short-lived in pursuit of revolution was both acceptable and desirable. The use of the phrase ‘fame and deeds’ treaded close to Propaganda of the Deed. He hoped martyrdom would usher in the birth of a new heroic national spirit. It would build a new Irish nationalism on the graves of nationalists past: Emmet, Tone, Devlin, Rossa. The eulogy of Rossa showed veneration for martyrs, but also foreshadowed the blood sacrifice to come.

To Pearse, martyrdom and baptism were irrevocably intertwined, exhibiting selective religiosity. Martyrdom would cause national and personal regeneration. It would purify the colonised soul of dishonour. And, it would admit them to the high echelons of nationhood. In the “Graveside Oration,” he proclaimed:

We stand at Rossa’s grave not in sadness but rather in exaltation of spirit that it has been given to us to come thus into so close a communion with that brave and splendid Gael. Splendid and holy causes are served by men who are themselves holy and splendid.90

The Irish martyr was glorified for his heroic grace, and deemed holy in his actions. That holiness was within the martyr himself, and he shared that with the cause of the revolution. This type of martyrdom is similar to that of the anarchists: death in pursuit of terror. Rossa’s life was one sacrificed to the revolution, and therefore Pearse made him holy by virtue of his living martyrdom. And Rossa was not the only martyr that Pearse fixated on. In “How Does She Stand,” Pearse devoted pages to glorifying the martyrdom of Wolfe Tone. Imagining himself standing by the graveside of Tone, he wrote:

…with what joyousness and strength would we set our faces towards the path that lies before us, bringing with us fresh life from this place of death, a new resurrection of patriotic grace in our souls!91

Death would summon a new Irish life force: stronger, better, and braver than before. Life from death, martyrdom was an act of beginning, not end. It was an act of a nation and not of a person. The deaths of nationalists birthed the nation, and Pearse, as a propagandist, was more
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than happy to use any death to serve of his revolution. This resulted in an emphasis on both collective and individual martyrdom.

In *Path to Freedom* in 1922, Collins used this national sacrifice to glorify terrorism. Martyrdom was a national sacrifice; he even suggested that the individual fame mattered less than the act itself:

> Our strength lay in a common ideal of how people should live, bound together by mutual ties, and by a devotion to Ireland that shrank from no individual sacrifice…In that spirit we fought and won...Every county sent its boys whose unrecorded deeds were done in the spirit of Cuchulain at the Ford.\(^92\)

This emphasis on unrecorded deeds reinforces the value of collective, unknown sacrifice. Again the ancient myths of Irish sacrifice were invoked to justify the blood tithe. This is Collins’ second explicit reference to Cuchulain. Cuchulain was a mythic Irish hero who lived a short but extremely brutal and bloody life around the ninth century, and was fabled for the manner of his death. After receiving a mortal wound, the hero allegedly tied himself to a stone so he could die on his feet. The stone still stands in County Louth, Ireland, symbolising fanatic devotion to political ideals.\(^93\) The glorification of violent mythology may have been designed to make terrorism acceptable, and popularise the terrorist’s actions.

Connolly’s death was regarded as a significant martyrdom. While accompanying an expedition into a Prince Street alley during the Rising, he was shot in the ankle with an expanding dum-dum bullet. The bone was shattered, and Connolly crawled back into the safety of the General Post Office.\(^94\) British artillery set the GPO ablaze, and, from his stretcher, Connolly organised the withdrawal to the Moore Street Headquarters. There, he and Pearse surrendered unconditionally. Connolly was arrested and moved to Dublin Castle where doctors were unable to prevent the onset of gangrene.\(^95\) On 12 May 1916, the doctors assessed he was capable of
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rational thought, so Connolly was carried into Kilmainhaim Gaol, tied to a chair, and shot to death by a firing squad. His last statement read thus:

Believing that the British Government has no right in Ireland, never had any right in Ireland, and never can have any right in Ireland, the presence, in any one generation of Irishmen, of even a respectable minority, ready to die to affirm that truth, makes that Government forever a usurpation and a crime against human progress.
I personally thank god that I have lived to see the day when thousands of Irish men and boys, and hundreds of Irish women and girls, were ready to affirm that truth, and to attest it with their lives if need be.  

Martyrdom, to Connolly, became an act of truth, and revolutionary legitimacy. He did not frequently encourage martyrdom, but due as this tract was written while waiting for the firing squad, it marks a shift in his ideology. Connolly’s execution shocked the Irish public, and their outrage provided public sanction for the martyrdom principles he propagated.

Self-sacrifice for the nation became the ultimate act of revolutionary legitimacy – for both the cause, and its believers. The Irish terrorists demonstrated a Death in Pursuit of Terror dynamic, similar to the anarchists, and put value in both individual and collective sacrifice, with the latter being more highly regarded. Martyrdom was held as an affirming act which demonstrated the validity of the revolution, tied to the blood and freedom dynamic discussed earlier.

The Aftermath

In the words of Randall Law; “the British should have known better.” They had two centuries of experience in subduing nationalist uprisings in the colonies. However, their reaction to Irish anti-colonialist terrorism only served to escalate the conflict, rather than suppress it. At first they treated the nationalists as a criminal threat, and then a conventional military threat – neither of which the Irish represented. Their policy soon changed: enhanced (predominantly Protestant) police powers, abandoning Home Rule plans, and threatening mass conscription. However, Propaganda of the Deed had been instituted, and any response came too late. The terrorspace, ever dynamic, had been won by the IRA.
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The terrorists’ purpose was to achieve a free and united Ireland under Irish rule. The propaganda of Pearse, Connolly, and Collins verged on repetitive on this point, but used different processes to legitimise their claims. Pearse struck out savagely at British as the conqueror and the oppressor, which would never let Ireland slip from its grasp. Connolly saw Ireland, not as a geographical purpose, but a spiritual and cultural entity – a revolutionary abstraction. Winning back Ireland would also win back the Irish strength of spirit. Collins, who built on this, also declared that the purpose of the Irish in recovering Ireland had greater moral claim than the British keeping it.

Violence was justified as self-defensive and morally obligatory. O’Donoghue claimed that it was a natural right and duty to expel the invader. The revolution, according to Pearse, would only come with blood, creating a blood and freedom dynamic. He believed that the old order had to be violently brought down before a free Ireland could be achieved. However, the violence became retaliatory and retributive between the state and the terrorists. Collins was more prosaic. He was fighting for the one thing for which violence was justified: national freedom. He made no apologies, and wrote that violence was indispensable in achieving his goals, and in fact validated his cause.

The first stumbling steps of spectacular strategy caused anti-colonialists to recoil from high-profile assassination. Collins took note, and his strategic attacks were carried out by a secret assassination team, the Squad, aimed at exterminating British Intelligence, most notably of the G Division. Bloody Sunday was the most spectacular strategic strike, and it was aimed at the heart of British Intelligence. This had a significant propaganda impact, as it damaged the reputation of Britain in Ireland and internationally. In addition to that symbolism, foreign and local spies, informers, RIC policemen, auxiliaries, and ex-soldiers were also targeted. The virtual annihilation of the original RIC also had the chilling benefit of killing the only officers who could positively identify IRA operatives.
This was successful when coupled with the tactical methodology of mobile, well trained, and well-armed Flying Columns. The weapons of choice were revolvers and side arms, which were largely stolen from the British. Despite failing early attacks, the IRA was swift to innovate with tactics. Its operations became highly effective, in part because of the innovation in using women as spies, fundraisers, and smugglers. The detailed knowledge that the spies gathered gave the Flying Columns the advantage. This made tactics such as throwing bombs into troop lorries highly effective, employing *en route* opportunism.

The systematic campaign of Irish terror was shown best by the IRA. There were three factors involved: endurance, escalation, and exhaustion. Terrorist leaders had an accurate understanding of their own vulnerabilities, as well as an accurate estimation of enemy superiority. They adjusted accordingly. They endured by keeping their members organised in small, fast, mobile units who were highly proficient with their weapons, and very knowledgeable about their terrain. They used the deaths of fallen public officials as recruitment propaganda. They escalated the conflict dramatically between 1919-1921, engaging in a high number of murders, kidnappings, assaults, bombings, arson, sabotage, and intimidation.

The exaltation of the revolution and the glorification of martyrdom were heavily exploited themes in terrorist propaganda. This drew heavily on historical and mythological Ireland, projected as a reimagined future. This combined with the veneration of the revolutionary abstraction of the nation to produce death propaganda. Indeed, martyrdom was not just a revolutionary blood tithe or act of truth, but served as a personal and spiritual validation. Although individual martyrs were glorified, so too were the unknown collectives of martyrs. Through their intent, the Irish demonstrated a Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm.

The British reaction to this terror was to swamp Ireland with close to 7,000 new English RIC recruits, who became known as the Black and Tans. These men were intended to match terror for terror. When the Black and Tans arrived in Ireland, there were not enough RIC uniforms, 
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forcing them to wear khaki uniforms with black RIC belts and caps, hence the name.\textsuperscript{99} The Black and Tans’ purpose in Ireland was published by Dublin Castle authorities on 27 August 1920.

\textbf{THE BLACK AND TANS.}
They did not wait for the usual uniform.
They came at once.
They were wanted badly, and the R.I.C welcome them.
They know what danger is.
They have looked Death in the eyes before and did not flinch.
They will not flinch now.
They will go on with the job – the job of making Ireland once again safe for the law-abiding, AND AN APPROPRIATE HELL FOR THOSE WHOSE TRADE IS AGITATION, AND WHOSE METHOD IS MURDER.\textsuperscript{100}

The Black and Tan policy was to match the IRA terror for terror. They were, essentially, “dirty tools for a dirty job.”\textsuperscript{101} Making Ireland an appropriate hell, however, only served to radicalise the previously uncommitted. This was aided by the arrest or execution of non-militant Sinn Fein. The Black and Tans’ purpose was to draw the terrorist leaders out into the open, but served instead to broaden the terrorist’s recruitment pool and consolidate their hold on the terrorspace.

The brutality of the Auxiliaries has been well established. Beaslai described deeds of “drunken savagery” which includes two brothers being roasted alive in a fire in a bog; Volunteers tortured by having their tongue, nose, or heart removed while they yet lived; and a man who was tied behind a lorry and dragged down a road, with “portions of his body being afterwards found...”\textsuperscript{102} In addition, he described the Black and Tans sacking towns such as Bantry, Kilcommon, Limerick, Swords, and Lismore. An American delegate, Arthur Griffiths, corroborated this, claiming: “While America rebuilds in France, England destroys in Ireland.”\textsuperscript{103} However, Kee considers that some reports of British brutality are unsubstantiated.\textsuperscript{104}
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Black and Tan reputation for drunkenness and indiscriminate brutality was described by F.S.L Lyons as the result of being “constantly under threat of attack by rifle or bomb, subject to frequent and damaging ambushes, often unable to identify their enemies, their nerves at full stretch day and night...”\textsuperscript{105} Both sides embarked on campaigns of assassinations and counter-assassination. High profile targets included the killing of Tomas MacCurtain; and the killing of the elderly magistrate Alan Bell by the IRA.\textsuperscript{106} The violence escalated to fever pitch. The Twelve Apostles were unleashed upon the Cairo Gang, which resulted in Black and Tan reprisal, of the Croke Park massacre and thirty-one fatalities.

Violent conflict came to a stalemate in 1921, according to English.\textsuperscript{107} War-weariness was a factor in bringing both sides to the negotiating table. However, it must also be noted that the Irish political wing, the Sinn Fein (meaning “Ourselves”) was also partly responsible for the turn of events, according to Michael von Tangen Page.\textsuperscript{108} He demonstrated that terrorism with a political front can be complex, but also effective in achieving realistic goals. In addition, a British report indicated that it would require 150,000 extra men to bring Ireland back under control, in addition to implementing Boer War style concentration camps.\textsuperscript{109} Meanwhile, the terrorists were running out of ammunition.

A ceasefire was put into place at noon, 11 July 1921. The negotiations were quickly strained: IRB president Eamon De Valera ostensibly abstained from attending because King George did not attend. The negotiations were left to Prime Minister Lloyd George and his team, and Michael Collins and Arthur Griffiths’ team. Discussion stretched out to December, with primary disagreements revolving around Ireland’s constitutional status, partition or unity (especially
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around Ulster), and the British demand for naval and military facilities.\footnote{Lyons, “The War of Independence, 1919-1921.” Vaughan, Ireland under the Union II 1870-1921. p255} Lloyd George eventually gave an ultimatum that they come to an agreement or the British would launch total war within three days. Collins and his team signed off on the agreement on 6 December 1921, without consulting De Valera. This led to the establishment of the Irish Free State as a self-governing dominion within a year. It provided Ulster with the ability to opt out of the Free State, which it quickly did.\footnote{Ibid. p256}

All the Treaty required was ratification by both British and Irish parliaments. De Valera was unsatisfied, and he and fifty-seven others in the Dail voted against it. Collins moved through with a slim majority of sixty-four. Within six months, the Irish Free State descended into civil war. Collins now had the military machinery of government at his command, while De Valera had Liam Lynch commanding from Cork, using old IRA tactics. By 1923, there were 12,000 Anti-Treatyites in prison and 5000 dead, and 800 Free State soldiers dead.\footnote{Mike Cronin, Irish History for Dummies, Second ed. (Sussex: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd, 2011). p327} In the chaos of Pro-Treaty victory, Arthur Griffith died of a heart attack. Several days later, Michael Collins was killed in an ambush set by Anti-Treatyites, although they denied targeting him specifically.\footnote{Ibid. pp326-327} According to Daniel Murray, however, the anti-Treaty forces were well aware who they were ambushing.\footnote{Daniel Murray, "Evasive Manoeuvres: An Examination of Florence O'donoghue's Account of the Death of Michael Collins," Irish History (2013). np}

Max Boot wrote in 2013 that “the script followed by groups as diverse as the Vietcong and the Taliban was written in Ireland during its 1919-1920 War of Independence.”\footnote{Boot, "Kick the Bully." p49} Terrorism in Ireland was never to completely end. Decades later, IRA, the Provisional IRA, the Real IRA, and the Continuity IRA took up the fight again, in addition to Protestant terrorists who acquired a sectarian ideology. In the later manifestations, suicide attacks took the form of proxy bomb
campaigns, where hostages were forced to bomb targets on the terrorists’ behalf, according to Mia Bloom.\textsuperscript{116}

It may be said that those of the revolution seldom live long enough to enjoy it. O’Donovan Rossa died in bitter old age in America. Padraig Pearse and James Connolly paid the blood tithe, and served as an inspiration for terrorists to come. Michael Collins was killed at the peak of his accomplishments, allegedly by the men he used to lead, leaving Ireland without one of its political heavyweights. Of this study, only Florence and Josephine O’Donoghue remained. Florence was so disillusioned by the Civil War that he resigned and refused to have any part in it, campaigning instead for a truce. Later, he became a guerrilla tactics instructor in the Irish Army, before he retired as a historian of the revolution. He and Josephine died of old age in 1966-1967, barely a year apart from each other.

The early twentieth century marked the beginning of the anti-colonial wave of terror. The Irish success, however limited, was an inspiration for revolutionaries all around the world. Activity would last throughout the fifties and sixties, with uprisings taking place in colonies all around the world: South America, Africa, Asia Minor, Asia, and beyond the scope of this study. The Irish manifestation of Propaganda of the Deed shows both tradition and innovation. The theoretical purpose was to reclaim Ireland, and the terrorists were willing to justify the use of death squads to achieve it. Their strategic method was a combination of spectacular assassinations, and smaller tactical strikes, which, when used in a systematic campaign, brought Britain to the bargaining table. Unlike the anarchists, their glorification was highly mythologised and historically based, but also relied on the veneration of martyrdom. From the example of Irish anti-colonial terror, it may be suggested that they retained traditional aspects of the strategic intent of Propaganda of the Deed as theorised by the Russian anarchists, and they also innovated. The Irish experience had global consequences, as colonies around the world were emboldened by their success. One such anti-colonialist influenced was an Algerian, Frantz

Fanon, whose separatist work *Wretched of the Earth* received international recognition.\(^{117}\) It will now be seen if any of the anarchist or Irish adaptations of Propaganda of the Deed were adopted in the third wave of terror, which manifested as New Left terrorism in West Germany in the twentieth century.

\(^{117}\) Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*. 
Chapter Six: Guns and Drugs

The rise of New Left Terror

It is not necessary to wait for all the conditions for making revolution exist; the insurrection can create them.¹

Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara, 1961

This sense of revolutionary impatience expressed by Che, coupled with a desire to act precipitously, was a dominating characteristic of New Left terrorism. Many anti-colonialist groups extended into this third wave, and appropriated left-wing ambitions. Most notorious among these were the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Provisional IRA (PIRA). To ensure the most representative study, the focus here is on international New Leftism exemplified by the German New Left.² This chapter explores the West German historical context in the second half of the twentieth century, looking at the effects of the Cold War, international social movements, and the reactions of the Sixty-Eighters. It discusses the dominant characteristics of the New Left political ideology; and introduces the important propagandists, such as Ulrike Meinhof, and groups like the Red Army Faction (RAF). The main research window is the years between 1968 and 1983, which was the peak of their terrorist activity.

It should be noted that the ‘New Left’ is a broad term encompassing scholars, often in universities and contributing to a reputable journal, New Left Review; student and other activists engaging in usually lawful protest and propaganda, with a fringe of these occasionally involved in minor violence, usually property damage; and extremists like the Red Army Faction who mounted international terrorist campaigns.
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How the West German New Left came to adopt Propaganda of the Deed, if the Irish accrued the strategy from anarchist immigration, is the immediate question. Rapoport implied that the Irish success, however limited, was an inspiration around the world. He found “terrorist activity was crucial in establishing new states in Ireland, Israel, Cyprus, and Algeria, among others. As empires dissolved, the wave receded.”\(^3\) The Algerian struggle was significant: from it came Frantz Fanon’s important tract, *Wretched of the Earth*, which was published in 1961 and had international relevance to rising terrorist groups. In it, Fanon legitimised anti-colonial violence and demonstrated its necessity from a Third World perspective – the same Third World that the New Left terrorists claimed to champion. Fanon was linked to Jean-Paul Sartre, the New Left philosopher and humanist, who also met and publicly supported the RAF.\(^4\) He was also widely read by the Provisional IRA, who trained and coordinated with the RAF in the PFLP’s Jordanian camps.\(^5\)

It is also possible the RAF learned Propaganda of the Deed from the PFLP directly. The most contentious separatist situation involved the British-administered Palestinian Mandate area. In the 1940’s, Menachem Begin’s *Irgun* was engaging in terror to achieve the establishment of Israel, which proved successful. Two decades later, Palestinians struck back. George Habash of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation and the PFLP fought for the recovery of Palestine from Israel, in a region with an entrenched social memory of terrorist violence. Here, there is the possibility that the successful Irish use of Propaganda of the Deed influenced both *Irgun* and the PFLP, which operated closely with the RAF (and PIRA).

There is yet another alternative. The Red Army Faction manifesto, *The Urban Guerrilla Concept*, discusses Leninist terrorism in Russia.\(^6\) Notably, it refers to Lenin’s *What is to Be Done*, the anarchists and Social Revolutionaries, and draws parallels between revolutionary Russia and
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There was familiarity with revolutionary Russia literature; however, it is unsurprising that they read Lenin, as Leninist thought was highly influential in New Left ideology. Therefore, it is possible that Propaganda of the Deed came to be understood by the RAF through familiarity with the Irish success; through Fanon’s anti-colonial propaganda which was read by contemporary terrorists such as PIRA; through the entrenched social memory of terror as understood by the PFLP; or through familiarity with anarchist terrorism via the propaganda of Lenin and the actions of the Social Revolutionaries. All these represent potentiality for the direct or indirect transmission for the concept of Propaganda of the Deed.

**Revolutionary Germany**

The ideological division Germany hails back to WWII, although the Berlin Wall was only constructed in 1961. That division orchestrated a microcosm for international forces and movements, reflecting the politics between the West and East, capitalism and communism. The rise of the New Left in Germany came on the crest of several revolutionary movements during the Cold War. The arms, communication, civil rights, and sexual revolutions were among these. Many young people were discontented with the governing ‘generation of Auschwitz,’ who they believed were attempting to create a forward-looking future without the guilt of the Nazi death camps. The Sixty-Eighters horror at the past and rejection of the present led to extreme political alienation. The consequence of these movements was a dearth of right wing intellectuals, which gave greater prominence to New Left ideologies.\(^8\)

The Cold War (1950-1989) polarised the world between two economic (and ideological) approaches for a functioning society: capitalism and communism. Western youth, mainly white and middle-class, were raised with expectations of the glories and benefits of the capitalist system. And they, like youth all around the world, found the reality far different from their textbook teachings. Dominick Cavalla wrote of the American youth:

> Without question, the young people who joined civil-rights and peace organizations in the early years of the sixties were motivated by moral outrage over the gulf that separated American
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\(^7\) Ibid. p19

ideals and the American realities...They were disturbed as well by the pervasive, irrational anti-communism that dominated American politics, that stifled dissent at home, and inspired a nuclear arms race that threatened human survival.9

The American Marshall Plan carried these sentiments into West Germany. Like young Americans, radical German students became alienated from their political order, and disillusioned by the Western role in Third World repression.10 One manifestation of this political discontent in West Germany was the formation of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), though its roots went back to 1860. A more radical student wing emerged shortly after: the Socialist Student Union (SDS), led by Rudi Dutschke. An aggressive student group was also formed, called the Extra-Parliamentary Opposition (APO).

The Cold War also fuelled technological innovation, with expenditure on the Space Race and the arms revolution, including weapons advancements. The prospective terrorists joined with the popular anti-nuclear movement and campaigned against nuclear armament. Within a decade of the first atomic bomb, nuclear weapons had diversified, with nuclear missiles, rockets, depth chargers, torpedoes, artillery, and mines.11 By the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, it was hoped that nuclear weapons were too destructive to be used, and actually had minimal impact on Cold War theatres such as Korea and Vietnam.12 The Vietnam War, which terrorists also opposed, became mired in guerrilla tactics, and Americans used mass defoliants to expose Viet Cong bases and to destroy their food sources.13 By the late 1960’s, studies had found that these chemicals caused birth defects in mice.14 Usage in Vietnam was continued by the South Vietnamese until the war ended in 1975.15 Opposition to the Vietnam War was perceived in
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America as ideological - even communist - radicalism, and Leftist movements were harassed and intimidated by the government.\textsuperscript{16}

The advent of black and white television brought the reality of war home. In West Germany, material affluence brought televisions into many middle-class households. The horrors of the Vietnam War were broadcast into living rooms, to find an audience in an already disaffected youth, ostracized from what they perceived to be a fascist government.\textsuperscript{17} The media enjoyed unlimited access throughout this conflict. Images of Western-backed South Vietnamese forces engaging in human rights violations provoked a massive backlash which was connected to the civil rights revolution.

The international civil rights revolution had two main branches: race and women’s rights. It was internationally publicised from the United States, mainly regarding African-Americans. The Black Power movement operated on an inclusive socialist platform, and fought against segregation and assimilation, although some, like the Black Panthers, lobbied for black separatism.\textsuperscript{18} The American New Left sympathised with these goals. One predominately white Leftist terror cell, the Weather Underground, having appropriated the cause, engaged in acts of terrorism and also inspired the German New Left.\textsuperscript{19} The feminist revolt in West Germany drew support from many fields, but did not unify with the New Left. Indeed, German feminists targeted the men of the New Left with considerably more ferocity than elsewhere. The slogan “Liberate the socialist pricks from their bourgeois dicks” was popular.\textsuperscript{20} They rebelled against the misogynies of Christianity, professional inequality, contraception, abortion, unremunerated
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household and childcare labour, intellectual condescension based on gender, and sexual inequality.\textsuperscript{21}

The backdrop for the sexual revolution was in part due to the sexually repressive policies of the Nazi Party, which prohibited homosexuality, and practiced eugenics. In part, the ‘murderous orgies’ of the Holocaust were blamed on that sexual repression. Arno Plack wrote that Auschwitz was not the product of the German society, but rather, the product of sexual repression.\textsuperscript{22} The New Left targeted the Church and Christian morality as institutions of sexual control, and rejected the moral conservatism and old controlling institutions of state, ideology, religion, and history (regarding these as fascist), and sought a utopian state of sexual gratification.\textsuperscript{23} This resulted in social experiments such as the liberated camp of \textit{Kommune 1}, some of whose members would later join terrorist movements.

The sexual revolution was central to the German student rebellions of 1968. The Sixty-Eighters believed sexual repression was a harmful influence.\textsuperscript{24} The student movements in West Germany was not organised on the same scale as the Parisian student protests in May, 1968. In fact, Dagmar Herzog estimated that the German movement never numbered more than a thousand.\textsuperscript{25} Despite that, they had far-reaching international influence, and inspired students around the world. The student cause was political, sexual, civil, and appropriated the suffering and persecution of Jews for their own ends, according to Herzog:

\begin{center}
This can be read for what it is; a disturbing and simplistic, even offensive, appropriation of the suffering of others. But it can also be read for what it also is: an important, urgent, even desperate flailing to free oneself from the cloying and everywhere inadequately acknowledged toxicities of the supposedly so clean post-1945 period.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{center}
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The German Sixty-Eighters targeted many issues. They believed democracy had been inadequately established, especially regarding the new Emergency Laws (*Notstandsgesetze*).\(^{27}\) Hitler’s exploitation of the emergency laws in 1933 made them distrustful of the contemporary emergency laws. They were suspicious of the Axel Springer Verlag press, which controlled seventy-eight percent of news distribution in Berlin and one third of all West Germany.\(^{28}\) And, significantly, they believed the concentration camps, symbolised by Auschwitz, had been inadequately addressed.

In the early days after the end of the war, Auschwitz posters were put up around Germany by occupying military authorities, reading *Dies Schandtaten: Eure Shuld!* (These Atrocities: Your Fault!).\(^{29}\) A sense of collective guilt, *Kollektivschuld*, was imparted on the German people.\(^{30}\) All Germans were held responsible for the Holocaust, and this undermined their ability to mourn their dead: the 20,000 killed in the Dresden firebombing, or the rape of Berlin by Soviet shock troops.\(^{31}\) Then came the Auschwitz trials. Here there was a fundamental illogic: all Germans were held as guilty, and yet the guiltiest of the Nazi leaders often escaped punishment, with minor participants punished harshly. The *Einsatzgruppen* Case shows the inconsistency. Twenty-four people were accused of the same crime, and yet the sentences varied: fifteen death sentences, two life sentences, three twenty-year sentences, two ten-year sentences, one suspension on the grounds of illness, and one release.\(^{32}\) Some former Nazis were reinstated to powerful positions, with what the terrorists perceived as the blessings of America.\(^{33}\) The New Left feared the apparatus for a new totalitarian state was being engineered.
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\(^{30}\) This was supported by the Swiss psychoanalyst, Carl Jung. Jung meant this guilt metaphorically, for with guilt would come the ability to mourn. However, this distinction was not broadly recognised and was understood as the legal manifestation of guilt.
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A watershed moment came with a shooting. Inspired by demonstrations at University of California in the United States, the SDS began a strategy of ‘Subversive Action’. At first, they held an anti-Vietnam walk in Berlin involving 2000 protesters (the *Spaziergangdemonstration*). When a Kommune 1 member left the designated walk zone to walk in the city, the police crackdown resulted in seventy-four arrests. Six months later, in June 1967, the SDS organised a protest against the state visit of the Shah of Iran. During the protest, a student called Benno Ohnesorg was shot by a policeman. This was not seen as a single act by an undisciplined officer, but a demonstration of the authoritarian nature of German executive power. The protests against police brutality became widespread, and the police chief eventually resigned under the pressure. Berlin became an epicentre for international socialist thought, with the SDS International Vietnam Conference attracting over 6000 writers, thinkers, and intellectuals.

This period of tumult was ideological prey to the New Left intellectuals. The Right, so recently brought into disrepute by fascism, did not have the non-Nazi intellectual strength to balance the Left. The New Left called themselves thus to mark a distinction from what they saw as the emasculated Old Left. This division was the product of years of tautological Marxist debates. The New Left rejected these, along with most of Marx’s class dialectics, and favoured direct action and Maoist voluntarism. The New Left’s goals were to enhance participatory democracy, equality, liberty, and community. They sought to radically transform society through revolution, by creating decentralised communes, operating on economic and social relationships of mutual trust, modifying the nuclear family, and embracing sexuality. So their adoption of Leftist thought was selective, and therefore difficult to categorise.

**The New Left**

Defining New Left ideology is somewhat problematic. Intellectually, the New Left was based selectively on the foundations of the Old Left, by writers such as Karl Marx and Herbert
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Marcuse. Early socialists believed the power of production, property, and exchange was being exploited by the bourgeoisie in order to maintain the status quo, while the proletariat was becoming subsumed within the machines of industry. The dictatorship of the proletariat would equalise the means of production by communal ownership of property to alleviate social injustices. The issue with narrowly defining the New Left is that there was no universally agreed consensus, and groups often dissolved or split because of differing reinterpretations of Marxist ideas.

The RAF’s ideology could be described at Marxist–Maoist because of its adoption of voluntarism. The political ideology of the RAF was, according to Julian Preece, “a semi-blank screen on which they project ideas, scenarios, and fantasies.” Their pseudo-theory essentially rejected, not only West German authority, but the entire world order. They rejected capitalism, consumerism, imperialism, fascism, sexism, classism, repression, military domination, and transnational organisations such as NATO. As the primary representative, their target was the United States of America, and by extension, Israel. It operated, as argued by Preece, on a platform of ‘zero politics:’

The abstract identification of so many who had “radical feelings” with the RAF could only function as well as it did there because there was, especially on the RAFs side, zero politics...[It] did not articulate a single demand, only abstract phrases such as “fight with weapons,” “unconditional struggle,” “never give up, persevere at all costs.”

It must be said that West Germany, during this period, was not fascist. As Preece noted, New Left ideology was based in German history and was a German reaction to that history. That being said, the terrorist stance verged on anti-Semitism.
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Rapoport noted that this wave was characterised by its internationalism, and the RAF typified this. They modelled their group on the Japanese Red Army, and their core group were trained by the PFLP. The core leaders were Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, and Ulrike Meinhof. After their initial terrorism spree, they were defended by Horst Mahler in their trial. Beyond the prison walls, the campaign was carried on by Brigitte Mohnhaupt and the RAF, which was publicly allied to the Second of June Movement. Some of its influences at this time were transnational. The RAF was heavily influenced by Mao Zedong’s doctrine; and held the terrorist manuals of Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara and Carlos Marighella as policy.

Mao Zedong (1893-1976) heavily influenced the RAF. Peasant-born Mao Zedong became acquainted with Marxism in the University Library of Beijing, and founded the Communist Party in 1921. Tenets of his philosophy became generally accepted within the New Left, some even replacing Marxist tenets (although neither called for terrorism). Significantly, the RAF adopted the Maoist idea of voluntarism. Voluntarism was an emphasis on the people as the primary causative agent for revolutionary change. This was a rejection of the Marxist philosophy which held that economic forces were the primary agent for change. In addition, many had faith in his three stage model of revolution. Stage one was rural guerrilla insurgency against the state, while building a support base within the population; stage two concerned accumulating territory and liberated zones; while stage three morphed into a conventional army, and engaged in regular warfare.

Contemporary to Mao was Ernesto ‘Che’ Guevara (1928-1967), the Argentinean-born “darling of the New Left.” With Fidel Castro, he led a revolution in Cuba in 1959, toppling the American-backed Batista regime. This jettisoned Guevara into the international spotlight, and
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he was known as one of the most prominent guerrilla fighters of the twentieth century. In 1961, he wrote the highly influential *Guerrilla Warfare*, which was held as a bible of rural insurrection all around the world. Guevara became disillusioned with Cuba, and journeyed to Bolivia to fight the military dictatorship there. He was captured and executed. Shortly afterwards, historian Jose Moreno wrote that there were few aside from Guevara who were qualified to write about the principles, organisation, and ideas of guerrilla warfare. *Guerrilla Warfare* was a significant terrorist text for the RAF, in addition to the *Minimanual* by Marighella.

Carlos Marighella (1911-1969) was a Brazilian-born communist-terrorist. Marighella broke with the Communist party and created the National Liberation Action (ALN) in 1968; an urban terrorist group which targeted military, economic, political, and diplomatic institutions. After two years of fighting, he wrote the *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*. It laid out systematic urban terror tactics being used by the ALN. Its greatest significance was its emphasis on urban action, as opposed to the rural action championed by Guevara, and was vital to the RAF. Marighella died in a shoot-out with San Paulo police in 1969, around the same time as the Japanese Red Army was forming.

*Sekigunha*, the Japanese Red Army (JRA) was a precursor to RAF terrorism. This is because the very name of the RAF was inspired by the JRA. The JRA was a major student movement in 1968. This movement was peopled by the educated children of regional Japanese elites. It split from the popular movement, and made an important demarcation in its organisational structure: they were not members, they were soldiers. The JRA was forced out of Japan, finding
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safe-haven in North Korea and Lebanon, where they were trained by the PFLP. In 1971, they established a base in Lebanon, and became known as the *Nihon Sekigun*, simply the Red Army. In 1972, the newly-trained terrorists carried out the Lod Airport Massacre in Israel on behalf of the PFLP, where they killed twenty-six and wounded seventy-two.\(^55\) This act consolidated their position in Lebanon with the Palestinian terrorists, and demonstrated the internationalism of New Leftist terrorism. The JRA and the PFLP had a significant impact on the RAF.

The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine was the official ally of the RAF. Led by George Habash, it surfaced in 1968 following the Six-Day War, when Israel’s defeat of Arab forces caused an anti-Israeli surge in pan-Arabic communities.\(^56\) The PFLP was a constituent member of the Palestinian Liberation Organisation, despite factionalism. The PFLP claimed that the PLO represented the bourgeoisie of Palestinian society, while the PFLP saw itself as hard left, representing the proletariat.\(^57\) They were driven out of their original sanctuary in Jordan, and resettled in Lebanon. There, PFLP camps flourished as a centripetal revolutionary hub, training the RAF.

At one time or another, the Red Brigades, the Red Army Faction, ETA, the Provisional IRA, the Turkish Dev-Yol, ASALA, the Japanese Red Army, and many others had all spent time in al-Fatah or PFLP camps.\(^58\)

After training in PFLP camps, the PFLP and the RAF mounted a joint operation in 1975, storming OPEC Headquarters in Vienna.\(^59\)

The term “Baader-Meinhof Gang” was used to describe what could also be called the First Generation of the RAF. This group of terrorists never referred to themselves as the Baader-Meinhof Gang. The name was given to them by the West German press to deny them any...
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possible legitimacy for their political goals. The terrorist leaders were technically Andreas Baader and Gudrun Ensslin. However, Ulrike Meinhof had a greater public profile than Ensslin, hence her name being incorporated. Baader was the head of operations, while Meinhof was the public propagandist. Other core members included Holger Meins and Jan Carl Raspe. It was said there were sixteen ‘chiefs’ of the Red Army Faction, but the leadership roles of all sixteen cannot be verified.

Andreas Baader (1943-1977) was said to have the enfant terrible mannerisms of the German New Left, but without any of the genius, known mainly for his vulgarity. As a child, he was described as defiant, stubborn, and rebellious. As an adult and a common criminal, drug-user, and ardent graduate of the sexually liberated camps of Kommune 1, Baader only became interested in the New Left movement with the shooting of Ohnesorg. The APO revelled in his disregard for the establishment:

Late at night, Baader would sometimes follow a drunk to the toilets and relieve him of his wallet. His other specialty was car-theft. Students of the APO persuasion did not on the whole think ill of this; it showed that here at last was a man of action.

Jillian Becker wrote: “He hadn’t read Marx or Marcuse or Mao. He hadn’t read anything at all.” His crimes were construed as a political rejection of the West German order – despite his criminal record beginning before his political involvement. He became the Director of Operations within the RAF. Baader’s first political action, in coordination with Ensslin, was political arson.

Gudrun Ensslin (1940-1977) was viewed as the femme fatale of the Gang. She was raised a Protestant, in a pacifist household opposed to rearmament, pro-reunification, and sympathetic
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to the plight of developing countries.\textsuperscript{66} She was educated at Tubingen University where she studied nineteenth-century Russian literature, and may well have read the writings of the Russian anarchists. In the 1960s, she was romantically involved with Bernward Vesper, the son of the Nazi poet, Will Vesper.\textsuperscript{67} Together, they began working with the Social Democrats, but when they joined a coalition with the Christian Democrats, she saw this as a betrayal.\textsuperscript{68} Her frustration with the moderate Left peaked with the shooting of Ohnesorg, and she decided to work outside the system. After her first child with Vesper, she struck up with Baader.\textsuperscript{69} This could be seen as a symbolic act: in leaving the educated but pacifist Vesper for the unlettered, violent Baader, she also left her peaceful past behind and embraced propaganda by violence.

The main propagandist was Ulrike Meinhof (1934-1976), the Voice of the RAF. Meinhof was raised by Renate Riemeck who was the youngest female professor in Germany.\textsuperscript{70} The household was extremely Leftist and pacifist. In 1955, Meinhof began studying psychology at the University of Marburg.\textsuperscript{71} She was a politically active student, campaigning against nuclear technologies. When she transferred to the University of Munster to study journalism, she joined the SDS. In 1958, she began publishing leaflets called “argument.” By 1959, she had garnered greater publicity, and began writing for \textit{konkret}.\textsuperscript{72} \textit{Konkret} was a highly influential publication for its time: it was independent, analytical, opinionated, alternative, and artistic.\textsuperscript{73} With a weekly and bi-weekly circulation of 230,000, it represented the growing voice of the New Left.

\textit{Konkret} jettisoned Meinhof into the limelight. Meinhof became a brand name of the New Left, a highly respected star columnist. As observed by Karin Bauer:
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Radicalism was chic and could be taken in the homes of the wealthy. Meinhof had what it took to be one of the stars: she was attractive and intelligent, a talented, intense writer who projected integrity and authenticity.\(^74\)

She featured at parties, on television, radio, and protests. This failed to satisfy Meinhof, who was unable to reconcile her bourgeois lifestyle with her increasingly radical leftism. Although affected by the deaths of Ohnesorg and Dutschke, she radicalised when she met Ensslin. Meinhof’s premier importance within the group was as its voice and ideologue, lending her reputation to the perceived legitimacy of the RAF’s mission.

The RAF was officially founded on 14 May 1970, but its core members had been engaging in terrorism previous to this, making a start date closer to 1968. That year, Baader and Ensslin planted homemade incendiary devices in a Frankfurt department store, timed to detonate at midnight.\(^75\) The explosion and fire resulted in property damage and was in protest at the Vietnam War and capitalist monopoly. They were convicted for this crime in a high-profile trial, in which Horst Mahler was their defending attorney. Baader and Ensslin were sentenced to three years in prison. In 1969, the group were paroled early in a political amnesty, but then ordered to return to jail by the Federal High Court. Instead, they fled Germany.

Horst Mahler (b.1936) came from a Nazi family and his parents remained openly right-wing even after the end of the Third Reich. Like many young Germans, his reaction was to join the Left. He won a scholarship to the Free University of Berlin, where he studied law and became involved with the SDP and the more radical SDS.\(^76\) In 1964, having graduated, Mahler began his own legal firm which ran into disarray because of his propensity to defend left-wing clients. Mahler marched in protests, enjoyed the bohemian lifestyle, and engineered the Socialists Lawyers Collective.\(^77\) When the RAF went underground in Italy, Mahler sought them out and
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convinced them to return to Germany to fight. Mahler was, as Meinhof, an ideologue of the RAF.

Baader was recaptured by authorities upon return in 1970, which brought Ensslin and Meinhof into contact. Meinhof used her reputation to secure a prison-visit with Baader, and was integral to his escape which resulted in the shooting of the prison librarian. What followed was a two-year campaign of robberies, car-theft, travel, training in Jordan, and setting up secret safe-houses. They had contact with some of the leading intellectuals of the time: Jean-Paul Sartre visited Baader in prison, and Regis Debray provided direct assistance when they were underground in France. The May Offensive of 1972 was a peak period in activity: with bombings against American military, police, and media targets. Their actions culminated in a gunfire-siege which was broadcast live on television, and the arrest of the first generation leadership one by one.

The second generation of the Red Army Faction rose as a direct response to the arrest of the previous core leadership, and their primary goal was securing the release of their comrades. As the trial dragged out for five years, the RAF engaged in a number of activities to win their freedom. These included a siege in the German embassy in Sweden, the assassination of a federal prosecutor and a head of Dresden Bank, a rocket attack against a government building, and the kidnapping of Hanns-Martin Schleyer. When these efforts were futile, they turned to plane hijacking, no doubt on the advice of their Palestinian counterparts. When the RAF leaders died suspiciously in prison, Schleyer was murdered. This wave of violence was known as the German Autumn of 1977.
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Brigitte Mohnhaupt (b. 1949) commanded the second generation RAF. Not many sources are available in English regarding the early life of Mohnhaupt. She was originally a communist, and became involved with the RAF in 1971 after the Communist Party was dissolved. Like many, she went underground and was arrested shortly after Ensslin on terrorism charges, and imprisoned. Mohnhaupt met the core leaders when she was in Stammheim Prison in 1976. It is there that Baader groomed her for post-prison leadership. After her release in 1977, she assumed leadership of the second generation of the group and bombed a RAF lawyer’s office, (Klaus Croissant) and tried to frame neo-Nazis for the crime. That same year, while abroad in Baghdad, she also organised the assassination of federal prosecutor-general, Siegfried Bubak. Mohnhaupt remained a leader of the RAF until her capture in 1982.

A third generation of RAF terrorists were active from 1985 to 1998. In the words of Randall Law: “[b]y this point, the group bore little similarity to its original version, except for its thirst for chaos and vengeance.” For this reason he actions and evidence from the third generation of the RAF will be excluded, as it is not representative of terrorism, devolving into mere criminality. The RAF were publicly allied to the PFLP and the Second of June Movement (2MJ).

On 2 June 1967, as mentioned previously there was a peaceful protest against the state visit of the Shah of Iran to Germany, during which Benno Ohnesorg was killed by police. The Springer Press at first falsely reported that Ohnesorg was shot in self-defence, as he was allegedly part of a knife-wielding mob. It was later found he was unarmed, and shot at point-blank range. It is from this event that the Second of June Movement takes its name. The members, who mostly
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came from *Kommune 1*, were the second-most prominent terrorist cell in West Germany. They were:

> Against the family, the school, the company, the office, the factory, the university, the nick, the multinationals, the very ordinary demeanour of capitalist daily life which led the young of the entire world onto the barricades which pushed them into trying new forms of collective life and new forms of struggle.\(^{91}\)

Between 1971 and 1978, they were linked to twelve counts of terrorism, notably in the form of armed assaults and bombings, with one assassination and two cases of kidnapping.\(^ {92}\) In 1974 they were tied to the killing of a West German judge, and in 1975, the kidnapping of the leader of the Christian Democrat Party.\(^ {93}\) They were responsible for four deaths and three injuries.

In conclusion, the New Leftist terrorists of West Germany were inspired by Mao Zedong, and influenced by Che Guevara and Carlos Marighella. They modelled their terrorist groups on the JRA, and in turn, were trained by the PFLP. The core RAF leadership comprised Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, Ulrike Meinhof, and Horst Mahler, and after their incarceration, control of the second generation RAF passed to Brigitte Mohnhaupt. Mohnhaupt helped internationalise the RAF and allied it to the 2JM, and continued fighting with the PFLP. These terrorists were highly representative of the energy of the New Left wave, and embodied the revolutionary chic. It will be seen in the next chapter, that they were less organised than the Irish, and less ideologically concise than the anarchists, while surpassing both in their manipulation of the media.

\(^{91}\) Wright, *Terrorist Propaganda*. pp39-40
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Chapter Seven: New Colour and New Clothing

The German New Left terrorists and Propaganda of the Deed

Propaganda of the Deed, as used by the RAF and 2JM, incorporated traditional elements of the concept, while also demonstrating innovation and adaptation, as it again underwent contemporary interpretation. The anarchist glamour surrounding the word ‘terrorist’ was once again openly embraced by the RAF. Carlos Marighella, whose manual was used heavily by the RAF, wrote:

> The accusation of “violence” and “terrorism” no longer has the negative meaning it used to have. It has acquired new clothing; a new color. It does not divide, it does not discredit; on the contrary it represents a center of attraction. Today, to be “violent” or a “terrorist” is a quality that ennobles any honorable person...¹

This self-glorification transmitted throughout New Leftist terrorist propaganda. Their goals lacked concrete purpose, their justifications resounded with poetically empty rhetoric, but it is in their strategy, tactics, campaign, and glorifications that the RAF’s understanding of Propaganda of the Deed can be analysed.

Theoretical Purpose

The RAF operated on a platform of zero politics, which makes defining their purpose through the propaganda highly problematic. They were not so much trying to convince society of the benefits of their re-imagined future, as arguing that the current system was irrevocably flawed. This made their ideology quite difficult for the masses to understand. In addition, their revolutionary abstraction was so abstractly communicated that few could follow it. However, when they wrote of their purpose, the RAF portrayed themselves as rebels against the capitalist monopoly and mainstream media, champions of the internationally oppressed, underdogs fighting an unjust system. Their re-imagined future, therefore, was undermined by their lack of tangible projections and goals.

¹ Marighella, *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*. p20
As previously noted, Propaganda of the Deed was designed to provide the circumstances in which the state would discredit itself, mainly through an overreaction to terrorist violence. RAF terrorists tried to demonstrate the West German state was fascist, imperialist and authoritarian, to which any alternative was superior. They were not, like the Irish, attempting to achieve nationhood, but create a platform in which their rage could become popular, acceptable, and challenge the capitalist monopoly. This included a rejection of their main propagandistic adversary, the Springer Press. According to their ally, 2JM:

Springer would rather risk seeing his workers and clerical staff injured by bombs than risk losing a few hours working time, which means profit, over a false alarm. To capitalists, profit is everything and the people who create it are dirt.²

Anti-media and anti-capitalist propaganda was a central theme in the propaganda. Discrediting the biggest media corporation in West Germany had the purpose of creating a vacuum in authoritative reporting, which might encourage the reader to support New Left views. Additionally, it was an attempt to demonstrate the commoditisation of the working class; and to enlighten it to the industrialised, and thereby disposable, nature of their existence. Where actual unrest was minimal, the terrorists sought to exacerbate perception of conditions in order to win recruits to their cause.

Another element of their theoretical purpose was to champion the oppressed, mostly in Third World countries. The irony here is that the suffering of the oppressed in the Third World was far outside their comprehension, with RAF members complaining about the lack of Coca-Cola machines in the Palestinian camps. Nonetheless, they adopted anti-Vietnam War sentiment to champion Vietnamese civilians. The RAF declared:

West Germany and West Berlin will no longer be a safe hinterland for the strategists of extermination in Vietnam. They must know that their crimes against the Vietnamese have made them new and bitter enemies, that there will be nowhere in the world left where they can be safe from the attacks of revolutionary guerrilla units.³

² Wright, Terrorist Propaganda. p81
³ Ibid. p81
These new and bitter enemies were the RAF; however, they had little understanding of the actual struggles of the Vietnamese. Nevertheless, this championing could win to their cause the broader support for the anti-war movement. This hoped to recruit the moderate Left to the extreme Left of the RAF.

Heinrich Boll, future winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature, was accused of sympathy for the RAF, yet he criticised their apparent lack of purpose. He described them as desperate but ultimately aimless:

...a declaration of war made by desperate theoreticians...by people now being hunted and denounced... Meinhof has declared war on this society, she knows what she is doing and what she has done, but who can tell her what she ought to do now?\(^4\)

Boll coined this as a “war of six against sixty million.”\(^5\) These odds were a term that the New Left would adopt with pride. It is easy from RAF propaganda to see what they didn’t want. When it came to their purpose, which combined a re-imagined future based on abstract ideology and a rejection of the present, understanding the RAF became problematic. This problem with the New Left had governments and political analysts confused around the world: what did the New Left want exactly? And did they even know? The violence seemed to be a build-up of impotent rage, exploiting New Leftist ideologies to provide a justification for their violence, without an alternative world model.

*The Urban Guerrilla Concept* is the main RAF tract that discussed the purpose of the group.\(^6\) It progresses through the metropolis, the student revolt, the primacy of practice (that is, the need for direct action), the role of the urban guerrilla, and the legality of their actions. It accepted that its base was in the student revolt, and refuted the dismissal of the contradiction of expectation and reality: “bourgeoisie society and bourgeoisie ideology.”\(^7\) The tract concluded, summing up the purpose as:

---
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Building the urban guerrilla means conducting the anti-imperialist struggle offensively. The Red Army faction creates the connection between legal and illegal struggle, between national and international struggle, between political and armed struggle, and between the strategic and tactical aspects of the international community.\(^8\)

Therefore, the purpose of the RAF was to engage in offensive action, which combined strategic and tactical methods, on an international scale using political violence. However, this still did not establish the end goal of the New Left.

The RAF must have understood their purpose better than they communicated it. Unlike the Irish, the RAF purpose was ideologically abstract, which made its manifestation more comparable to the Russian anarchists. They operated on a platform of zero politics, so while their purpose was ultimately to create change, it did so without a tangible imagined alternative. This was replaced with a highly abstract re-imagined future based on the rejection of the present. They were anti-mass media, anti-capitalist, and believed their purpose was to champion the oppressed masses of the third world. On these points, they readily justified violence.

**Justification for Violence**

The RAF justified their transition to violence on the basis of a mistrust of the mainstream media to accurately represent peaceful protests; as an offensive self-defence; and a necessary reaction to what they saw as the ceremonial orderliness of their society which had been undermined by the weakness of the Old Left. The propaganda which justified this violence came from Meinhof and various jointly written RAF directives.

In 1968, Meinhof published “Counter Violence.”\(^9\) This article was directed at claims by the Springer Press that the student movements were acts of terror. In this, she argued that the student rebellions in Germany were not terrorism: they were acts of self-defence. The student

\(^8\) Ibid. p32  
\(^9\) Meinhof, *Everybody Talks About the Weather... We Don’t*. p234
rebellions were largely a rejection of established university policy which had enabled, if not engendered, the totalitarian nature of Hitler’s Third Reich.

The students have learnt through bitter experience...that they cannot achieve their goal by being quiet and well-behaved. They have to be noisy and persistent. They have understood that ceremonial orderliness does not allow room for critical; content or democratic discussions, and that certain professors will have to suffer some unpleasant experiences if they refuse other forms of discussion.\(^\text{10}\)

This ceremonial orderliness was interpreted as blind obedience and a discouragement of critical engagement. Violence was the only self-defence against what they saw as institutionalised control.

...at the moment it seems only noise and absolute impatience can make this clear to the professors. To label this terrorism is to overlook the self-defense aspect of student actions...\(^\text{11}\)

This impatience manifested as action: protests and demonstrations, nominally. This soon escalated to violence. The RAF could be understood as the most frustrated of New Left terrorists, impatient for the conditions of revolution to arise, and therefore determined to construct them.

The RAF placed a heavy emphasis on action. They saw the ineffectiveness of the Old Left as the direct product of inaction, talking instead of acting. A self-titled communique, the “Rote Armee Fraktion,” stated in 1970:

There is no point trying to explain the right thing and the wrong thing to people. We don’t have long enough. We don’t have to explain the Baader liberation to the intellectual babblers, the pant-shitters, and the know-it-alls, but to the potentially revolutionary segments of the people, to those who can immediately grasp the deed, because they are prisoners themselves, to those who don’t care about the blather of the Left, because it remains without consequences and deeds.\(^\text{12}\)

The justification of violence, therefore, was a rejection of the peaceful methods of social change: discussion, protest, demonstration, critique. The RAF believed the time for talking had passed, and all that remained was the time for action. It was time for deeds to talk, for the

\(^{10}\) Ibid. p237
\(^{11}\) Ibid. p238
\(^{12}\) Karin Bauer, “In Search of Ulrike Meinhof.” Ibid. p63
revolutionary community would see them, understand them, and support them. In truth, not many did understand exactly what the RAF was about. This justification hinged on the premise that violent action was integral to the struggle due to the failure of peaceful protest.\(^\text{13}\)

In her 1968 article, “From Protest to Resistance,” Meinhof justified the transition to violence using relativity. The stone-throwing, the arson, the petty vandalism of New Left protestors was no worse than the torture in South Africa, the bombs in Vietnam, or the campaign of the Springer Press against the New Left, according to the propaganda. The Springer Press was held responsible for the oppression of the German people due to the nature of its reporting. It was depicted as the aggressor, while the terrorists acted in self-defence.\(^\text{14}\) Springer’s reporting had allegedly incited the shooting of SDS leader, Rudi Dutschke, by a right wing gunman in 1968.\(^\text{15}\) The shackles of common decency were broken: counter violence was required to combat the violence of the Right. Meinhof believed that the line dividing protest and resistance was crossed with the attack on Dutschke. The article was a call to arms issued to the New Left. Meinhof concluded on a threatening note: “The fun is over. Protest is when I say I don’t like this. Resistance is when I put an end to what I don’t like.”\(^\text{16}\)

This came to a head when the Social Democrats and Conservatives merged to form the Grand Coalition, thereby controlling ninety-five percent of West Germany’s parliament in 1966.\(^\text{17}\) Some in the APO saw their activities from that date rendered ineffective. Armed struggle became the only option. Like many terrorists before them, they had become disillusioned with other methods of resistance. Meinhof wrote:

[The RAF were] deeply disappointed by the actions of the student movement and the APO, it became necessary for the RAF to declare the idea of armed struggle.\(^\text{18}\)

\(^\text{13}\) Red Army Faction, *The Urban Guerrilla Concept*. p24
\(^\text{14}\) Meinhof, *Everybody Talks About the Weather... We Don’t*. p241
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This idea, announced formally in 1970, was the RAF’s first communique urging the transition to armed struggle. Violence became a necessity. This was backed up by Ensslin, who said:

“[t]his fascist state intends to kill all of us. We must organize resistance. Violence can only be answered with violence. This is the generation of Auschwitz, you cannot argue with them.”

The ‘generation of Auschwitz’, with whom the RAF engaged in retaliatory violence, was an insult designed to smear contemporary German political leaders, at a time when it was difficult to find politicians who did not have any (sometimes remote) Nazi ties. It was therefore part of the RAF’s strategic intent to discredit them before an international audience through violence. As stated in the first manifesto: “We will not talk about armed propaganda, we will do it.”

The transition to violence was therefore justified as an act of self-defence, a necessary reaction to reject the ceremonial obedience of their present. The institutions of peaceful protest were under the control of moderates, who the RAF discredited as the authoritarian Auschwitz generation. Violence, similar to that of the anarchists and the anti-colonialists, was represented as retaliatory in response to the violence of the state. Distrust of the media further encouraged their expansion into violent action.

**Strategic Method**

The strategic method of the RAF had a similar intent to previous waves, while they innovated within the bounds of their terrorspace. They adopted a spectacular strategy of violence designed to capture the international media’s attention, but, there were incremental differences in their adoption of modern technologies. They also cooperated internationally with other groups, and primarily sought the release of their imprisoned leaders. Their strategic method involved well-publicised campaigns such as the May Offensive; acts such the Lufthansa 181 hijacking; and the assassination of high profile individuals.

---
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The 1972 May Offensive comprised five bombings which targeted Americans as symbols of imperialism, and symbols of ‘fascist’ German authority: the police, the judiciary, and the media. These attacks were consecutively timed, indicating a high level of organisation by the RAF. They warned in advance that “the armed struggle has only begun...only violence can help, when violence rules.”\(^{21}\) To that effect, the May Offensive attacks came one after another. On 9 May 1972, US Military Headquarters in Frankfurt were car-bombed, killing one and injuring thirteen. On 12 May 1972, the third and fourth floors of police headquarters in Augsburg and Munich were pipe-bombed, injuring ten.\(^{22}\) On 15 May 1972, Judge Wolfgang Buddenberg’s (who was investigating the RAF) car was bombed. On 19 May, the Springer publishing house in Hamburg was bombed, injuring thirty-eight. On 24 May, US Military Headquarters in Heidelberg was bombed, killing three and injuring five.\(^{23}\) The main aim of the May Offensive was achieved: panic and terror. Journalist Neal Ascherson observed in 1972: “The sinister glamour of the Baader-Meinhof has created legend and panic.”\(^{24}\) This damaged the credibility of the government, which responded with emergency meetings, intensive police measures, and hard-line legislation.\(^{25}\) Shortly afterwards, the core members of the group were arrested and imprisoned. Their capture, however, provoked more spectacular violence.

Aircraft hijackings were rife in New Leftist terrorism.\(^{26}\) These acts were carried out by many groups, and sometimes on the behalf of other groups. The hijackings started relatively harmlessly: the terrorists would hijack a plan, reroute it, and demand the release of imprisoned comrades in exchange for the hostages. This tactic was initially effective. The hijacking of the German Lufthansa Flight 181 was undertaken by the PFLP on behalf of the RAF on 13 October 1977. The aircraft was hijacked after it left Majorca by four PFLP terrorists under the name ‘Commando Martyr Halime,’ and flown to Rome. There, the PFLP demanded the release of the
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ten imprisoned RAF terrorists and two Palestinian comrades. This request was denied, and the plane was flown to Larnaca, Bahrain, and Dubai before landing in Mogadishu. On 18 October, Flight 181 was stormed by German GSG 9 Commandos, who killed three of the hijackers and rescued the eighty-six hostages. Following this failure, a RAF communique had an ominous message about a change in their operations:

> Our objectives will now be only the capitalist profiteers and their lackeys... We shall hijack no more planes, but we shall blow them up in flight when our target is there. We shall act everywhere, in tearooms frequented by their painted women, in select clubs, in luxury cinemas, at galas, premiers, and in high places of finance.27

This threat echoed in the international media. There would be no future negotiation by either the government or the terrorists.

The RAF practiced selective and high-profile kidnappings turned assassinations. This may have been inspired by Carlos Marighella, who wrote in his *Minimanual*:

> The urban guerrilla follows a political goal, and only attacks the government, the big businesses and the foreign imperialists...28
> Thus the armed struggle of the urban guerrilla points towards two essential objectives:  
> 1. the physical elimination of the leaders and the assistants of the armed forces and of the police;  
> 2. the expropriation of government resources and wealth belonging to the rich businessmen...29

For the RAF, this included Americans as representatives of the ‘imperialist’ capitalist world system, as well as German financiers, industrialists, and law enforcement. One prominent hostage-assassination was that of the industrialist Dr. Hanns Martin Schleyer, president of the German Employers Association. On 5 September 1977, Schleyer was kidnapped by the Red Army Faction. He was being escorted from his office to his home address, when his driver braked to avoid a pram in the middle of Vincenz-Statz road. The police escort crashed into the back of Schleyer’s Mercedes. The RAF moved: shooting Schleyer’s entire escort, anaesthetising and kidnapping him.30 He was held prisoner for forty-three days.

28 Marighella, *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*. p21
29 Ibid. p24
The RAF commando group, which included Mohnhaupt, sent a series of demands to the West German Federal Investigation Office. They included the immediate cessation of the investigation, the exchange of Schleyer for ten imprisoned members of the RAF, international flights, and 100,000 marks for each prisoner.\(^\text{31}\) As negotiations progressed, they made more demands, such as an appearance on television, and airtime for a videotape proving Schleyer was alive. The security forces did the exact opposite, and instituted a complete media blackout and delaying tactics while the investigation continued. Worried, the RAF sent a tape to the Agence France Press in which Schleyer was filmed saying “if they track my kidnappers down, that means my death; my kidnappers will be forced to kill me.”\(^\text{32}\) The exchange continued until German GSG retook the Lufthansa jet on 18 October 1977. This was followed immediately by the deaths of Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, and Jan Carl Raspe in custody in Stammheim prison. Upon receiving this news, RAF commandos drove Schleyer into a field and shot him that same day. They sent a communique to the French newspaper, Liberation: “The fight has only just begun.”\(^\text{33}\)

The strategic method of the RAF therefore comprised high-profile attacks undertaken in co-ordination with a media strategy to optimise propaganda. This was demonstrated with bombing campaigns such as the May Offensive. They also ensured maximum propaganda output in their kidnapping of Schleyer, and group suicide of the RAF leadership in custody. This had symbolic significance in accordance with their ideology, and were designed to tarnish the government’s domestic reputation.

**Tactical Method**

In prison, the RAF leaders had access to books, and accumulated libraries. Amongst the titles in their collection was The Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla by Carlos Marighella, and others such as Armed Rebellion, The Explosives Expert, Assassins and Saboteurs, and The Special Forces
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Handbook. This information influenced the tactical command of Mohnhaupt when she assumed leadership of the RAF upon her release. The main tactics used during, and after, the imprisonment of the core leadership were kidnappings, shootings, and bombings. In the Red Army Faction’s *Urban Guerrilla Concept*, they frequently referred their audience to the teaching of Marighella’s *Minimanual of the Urban Guerrilla*. The *Minimanual* emphasised the use of firearms and explosives to achieve terrorist goals.

Ordinary firearms were part of the tactical terrorist equip. In *The Urban Guerrilla Concept*, the RAF claimed that its organisation required a structure to provide “safehouses, weapons, cars, and documents. What one needs to know about this, Marighella describes...” Marighella recommended the theft of these things by force or by purchase, especially firearms.

The urban guerrilla’s reason for existence, the basic condition in which he acts and survives, is to shoot... The urban guerrillas weapons are light arms, easily obtained, usually captured from the enemy, purchased, or made on the spot. Light weapons have the advantage of fast handling and easy transport.

Marighella preferred INA .45 submachine guns or any automatic assault weapon with a short barrel to enhance concealment. To that end, he encouraged terrorists to gain technical proficiency over their weapons:

The urban guerrilla’s life depends on shooting, on his ability to handle his weapons well and to avoid being hit... To learn how to shoot and to have good aim, the urban guerrilla must train himself systematically, utilizing every practice method shooting at targets, even in amusement parks and at home.

The early RAF travelled to Jordan and trained with *Al-Fatah* in order to gain technical proficiency. There, they were instructed on the use of Kalashnikovs, rifles, howitzers, and grenades. They were made to go for long runs to build their endurance, and have their
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weapons on them at all times. They were taught reconnaissance, and camouflage.\textsuperscript{40} This extended to urban skills, such as how to rob banks. There were many issues between the RAF and their hosts, including the RAF’s naked sunbathing and sexual licentiousness which offended the Palestinians. To the last charge, Baader replied: “Fucking and shooting are the same thing.”\textsuperscript{41}

The RAF itself claimed that it did not shoot to kill, declaring in their manifesto: “The cops shot to kill. Sometimes we didn’t shoot at all, and when we did, we didn’t shoot to kill.”\textsuperscript{42} This is debatable. The three propagandist examples here are shootings aimed at the judiciary and the capitalist-industrial complex. On 12 November 1974, the West Berlin Chief Judge Geuter Van Drenkmann was shot four times as he opened his door to RAF members. The act, according to police, was in revenge for the death of Holger Meins in prison.\textsuperscript{43} Drenkmann was the long-standing president of Germany’s highest court of appeal, and although he had no direct involvement in the RAF cases, his death was still powerful propaganda. Again, on 7 April 1975, RAF terrorists ambushed Chief Federal Prosecutor Siegfried Buback’s car in Karlsruhe and shot him dead.\textsuperscript{44} Buback was described as the “enemy of terrorism” because of his role prosecuting the leaders of the RAF.\textsuperscript{45} Three months later on 30 July, the head of Dresdner Bank, Juergen Ponto, was shot in his own living room as he resisted RAF kidnappers.

Kidnapping gained popularity in the New Left wave. In 1970, twenty-six foreign diplomats were kidnapped by diverse terror groups around the world, and in ten years, the annual rate had nearly doubled.\textsuperscript{46} Kidnapping was well-suited to Propaganda of the Deed by virtue of the media attention it attracted, and the relatively low operating costs it incurred. On 28 February 1975, two members of the 2JM, Ralph Reinders and Andreas Vogel, kidnapped the leader of the
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Christian Democrat Party, Peter Lorenz, while he was travelling. He was held captive for five days, while the kidnappers negotiated with the Brandt government. The press reported that the Brandt government “gave in” to the terrorists’ demands and “released five jailed leftists and flying [sic] them out of the country.” In this light, and particularly with this language, the kidnapping was a propaganda success – more so than accidentally blowing up the hostages.

Bombings played a less selective role in RAF terror. The fighter which led these terrorists down the explosive path was Marighella:

[D]ynamite must be well understood. The use of incendiary bombs, smoke bombs...Molotov cocktails, grenades, mines, homemade destructive devices, how to blow up bridges, tear up and put out of service railroads and railroad cars, these are necessities in the technical preparation of the urban guerrilla.

Much like the Russian anarchists, the RAF made preparations to obtain explosives and learn how to use them. One event of note was the siege-bombing of the West German Embassy in Stockholm, Sweden, on 25 April 1975. The six member RAF cell who undertook the operation were called “Commando Holger Meins,” and planned their attack for the same date as the RAF trial was due to begin. Equipped with fifteen kilograms of explosives and submachine guns, they seized eleven hostages and rigged the embassy with TNT. Their demands were simple: the release of the RAF leaders from prison. When they were refused, the terrorists replied: “we are not negotiating. If our demands aren’t met we shall shoot a hostage every hour. Victory or death!” Two hours later, the Embassy’s economic attaché, Dr Hillegaart, was shot and his body left hanging out of an embassy window. Swedish police planned to storm the building, but at midnight the embassy was instead rocked by a series of apparently accidental explosions. Three died, including one of the terrorists. It is thought that the bombs were inadvertently detonated.
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Therefore, the tactical method of the RAF relied on conventional firearms and explosives. Once they had trained with this equipment to gain technical proficiency, they engaged in a number of attacks. Some, such as the Embassy bombing, still failed due to amateurism. Again, the terrorists demonstrated en route opportunism by targeting their victims in transit. They also incrementally adapted tactics from the previous waves by expanding into kidnapping.

**Systematic Campaign**

The violence, when employed as a systematic campaign, had a series of crests, much like the ideological Waves of Terror. The first generation RAF campaign represents an escalation; the Stammheim trial represents endurance; the German Autumn a second escalation; and the follow-on by second generation RAF exhaustion.

In order for escalation to occur, the terrorist had to turn their own weaknesses into strengths, and embrace their natural advantages. This was outlined quite clearly by Marighella.

1. He must take the enemy by surprise.
2. He must know the terrain of the encounter.
3. He must have greater mobility and speed than the policy and other repressive forces.
4. His information service must be better than the enemy’s.
5. He must be in command of the situation and demonstrate a decisiveness so great that everyone on our side is inspired and never thinks of hesitating, while on the other side the enemy is stunned and incapable of acting.\(^53\)

These tenets allowed the terrorists to escalate and endure the battle against the oppressive state. They used local knowledge to be familiar with the terrain, they moved fast, and with surety. This enhanced the endurance of the group, and control the terrorspace by taking the initiative and forcing the state to fight on their terms. The RAF valued its small numbers: “The concentration of violent power in the hands of the few can occur unopposed if it is done quietly...”\(^54\)

---
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Terror began with Baader and Ensslin’s political arson, symbolically rejecting the capitalist-industrial complex and the Vietnam War. The RAF engaged in a series of bank robberies to raise funds for their terroristic campaign. In Spring 1972, they were ready, carrying out a series of bombings against American installations in West Germany, including the Heidelberg Headquarters of the US Army mentioned earlier. There followed a series of gun battles with police, which eventually resulted in the capture of the core RAF leadership, and their imprisonment on a special floor in Stammheim prison. Clearly they had not implemented Marighella’s Manual to its fullest extent.

Much like the Irish terrorists in Frongoch, prison was not the end of terrorism. It was there, in their cells, that the media legend of the RAF really came to be. The Stammheim trials were a media showcase, the greatest inadvertent platform for terrorist media manipulation. At first, the core leadership were kept in separate prisons in conditions of sensory-deprivation, which Meinhof compared to Auschwitz. Michael Burleigh suggested that:

Insofar as the RAF prisoners had a strategy, it was to dramatise and publicise their predicament, making it seem as if the democratic German state had finally let slip its mask to reveal its Fascist inner heart.

With agitation by an outside pressure group, Red Aid, dramatizing the situation, the terrorists were moved into a specially constructed wing in Stammheim, and conditions improved. Each prisoner had a six person cell, yet Baader complained his was too small. They were given suites. They complained they were bored: they were given access to books, each amassing libraries. They went on public hunger strikes, yet Baader secretly ate food brought to him by his lawyer. They didn’t like the colour of their prison walls: they were allowed to choose the new paint

---
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Baader had a sore back: their doctor insisted they were all given electric blankets.\textsuperscript{62} The electricity required for this meant they could also use night-lights after the wing lights went out. Their lawyers also colluded with them, smuggling in three pistols, a camera, and five strips of plastic explosives.\textsuperscript{63}

If this behaviour was not exasperating enough, it also transferred to the courtroom. Stephen Aust wrote: “At no time of the “underground struggle” did the RAF have so magnetic a power of attraction as they did when imprisoned.”\textsuperscript{64} And they made the most of it. The RAF leaders launched appeal after appeal; they were unruly in the court room and argued over definitions and semantics; prepared excessively long statements to irritate the judges; dismissed their state-awarded lawyers and tried to represent themselves; spoke out of turn; abstained from attending, and when attending, stood when they were told to sit.\textsuperscript{65} Baader would shout when his microphone was turned off: “So maybe you’re in charge of the microphones, but you’re not in charge of this trial, not by a long way.”\textsuperscript{66} They were even removed from the courtroom altogether for their behaviour. The terrorists found their political significance while in jail, and outside its walls, sympathy for the movement grew.

The guilty verdict signalled to the free RAF a new beginning, rather than an end. The surviving leadership of the RAF received their sentences on 28 April 1977, after a lengthy 192 day trial.

The defendants Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin and Jan-Carl Raspe are found guilty of jointly committing the following crimes:

\hspace{1cm} a) Three murders in conjunction with six attempted murders,

\hspace{1cm} b) One further murder in conjunction with one attempted murder.\textsuperscript{67}
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They were also found guilty of bomb attacks and twenty-seven other attempted murders. This verdict triggered a wave of violence referred to by the media as the German Autumn. It started on 30 July, with the shooting of Juergen Ponto. The RAF attempted to fire home-made rockets into a federal prosecutor’s office later that summer. In September 1977, under Mohnhaupt’s direction, they kidnapped Hanns Martin Schleyer. When this too failed to bring about the release of the gang, the PFLP hijacked Lufthansa Flight 181 on their behalf. Upon hearing of the failure, the RAF leaders committed suicide in prison.

Guevara did not encourage self-destruction. He believed that “the essential task of the guerrilla fighter is to keep himself from being destroyed.” This was a pre-emptive strike on behalf of the RAF. Facing life in prison, they also faced the certainty of fading out of vogue, and, like the anarchists, becoming ancient icons of a dead revolution. Death in custody was the final stroke of the propagandist pen, and one that would keep the flame of the New Left terror alive longer than expected. Mohnhaupt had been groomed for terrorist leadership by Baader in prison, and she went on to implement Guevara’s strategy as a systematic campaign for years to come. Guevara wrote:

> The blows should be continuous. The enemy soldier in a zone of operations should not be allowed to sleep; his outposts ought to be attacked and liquidated systematically. At every moment the impression ought to be created that he is surrounded by a complete circle.

Fuelled by the deaths, Mohnhaupt’s campaign would last until 1982, although RAF terror endured a full 28 years until 1998. It became an exhausting struggle, as RAF members and their ideology became increasingly divorced from the society they claimed to represent (and were largely ineffective after the 1980’s). This was something that even they were aware of, and in a definitive statement when they disbanded, said:

> The RAF emerged from a liberation action nearly 28 years ago on May 14, 1970. Monday we are ending this project. The urban guerrilla group known as the RAF is now history.
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The group had come to a “dead end.” The eight page statement also said that “It was a strategic error not to build up a socio-political organization next to the illegal, armed one.” This may have come with reflection on either the Irish or the Palestinians, as they had both legitimate and illegitimate wings of politics. However, the RAF lasted nearly thirty years and claimed thirty victims: the RAF had exhausted itself and any public sympathy it once had.

In summary, the RAF valued its small numbers, and struck continuous blows in a systematic campaign. They showed signs of the endurance, escalation, and exhaustion pattern identified earlier, but this manifested distinct to their terrorspace. Endurance in terrorism was directly tied to obeying the manuals of Marighella and Guevara. There were also two separate escalations, the May Offensive and the German Autumn. The most exhausting aspect was the legal proceedings of their trial, around which there was considerable media attention.

### Glorification

The RAF was unique in its exaltation of the revolution and glorification of martyrdom to an extent. Similar to previous waves, the activists rejected their contemporary circumstances and believed that society was fundamentally flawed. They were different from preceding waves in their sloganism to exalt the revolution, and created a personality cult around their martyrs by naming commando squads after the fallen. They also demonstrated a Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm, as will be explored shortly.

### Exaltation

The exaltation of the terrorist cause in the West German New Left wave of terror was markedly different to those that passed before. This comes again from the platform of zero politics upon which it performed. In the place of heroic exaltations or nihilist bravado, the RAF sufficed with fashionable catch-phrases that captured the revolutionary abstraction - the *enfant terrible* attitude of the New left, without contributing anything substantial. The greatest irony is that the exaltation of the revolution was encapsulated in tiny catch-phrases and empty slogans as equally devoid of meaning as the consumerist marketing strategies they so disliked.
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Not all of the slogans were created by Meinhof, but she popularised them in her articles. One, that caught her attention during an SDS conference, came from Fritz Teufel, a member of *Kommune 1* in West Berlin.\(^{73}\) She quoted him in “Setting Fire to Department Stores:”

> “It is still better to set fire to a department store than to run one.” Fritz Teufel can sometimes turn a very pretty phrase.\(^{74}\)

This slogan captured the attitude of the RAF, while affirming its anti-capitalist stance. The greatest crime, in their eyes, was to be complicit with the capitalist state. Statements such as this echoed with false militarism. The article relativised the violence of the individual and the violence of the state. Being a terrorist, or at least having the chic glamour of one, and with it contempt for bourgeois life and its trappings, was in itself an exaltation of the RAF way. This small, symbolic catchphrase sufficed for many of the New Left, in place of actual action.

The same symbolism can be found Meinhof’s adoption of a Black Power slogan in her column, “From Protest to Resistance.” Although it has already been mentioned in this study, it was her most popular catchphrase, and therefore will be re-stated. She opened the column with:

> Protest is when I say I don’t like this. Resistance is when I put an end to what I don’t like. Protest is when I say I refuse to go along with this anymore. Resistance is when I make sure everybody else stops going along too. That was more or less what a black speaker from the Black Power movement said at Vietnam Conference in February in Berlin.\(^ {75}\)

The column goes on to address the violent protests that occurred in Berlin after the shooting of SDS leader Dutschke by a right-wing individual. This was the first time that the masses had moved from protest to resistance, and Meinhof’s column encouraged violence. The “shackles” of common decency were, she believed, destroyed when Dutschke was shot. Stone throwing and arson were minor compared to the state terror in the Third World, the bias of the Springer Press, and the bombings in Vietnam. She wound up the column on the ominous note: “The fun
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is over.” While it might seem trivialising to render such a veiled threat as a slogan, one must remember that this was written in 1968, before all the systematic terrorism occurred. At this stage, Meinhof’s words had still not manifested in deeds. When they did, the second statement in particular would be her most well-known slogan.

These slogans exalted the revolution in the way a nicely written ideological tract glorifying the imagined state of New Leftism did not. It broke the confusing, conflicting strains of New Leftist thought, coloured at one time or another by Marx, Lenin, Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh, or Castro, and turned it into a rebellion in a sentence. This made it easier for the broader masses to consume, and to pretend to understand. Rebellion was itself the purpose, carried with it the radical chic, and exalted the revolution in lieu of a broadly agreed upon reimagined alternative. In addition, the slogans demonstrated their discontent with contemporary society.

*Martyrdom*

Much like the exaltation, martyrdom occupied a unique place within the New Left. The only member of the RAF leadership who was religious was Ensslin, the daughter of a pastor. The New Left itself was not generally religious and yet this wave, too, had its sacrifices. The first of the highly visible New Left martyrs in Germany was Holger Meins, then Ulrike Meinhof. She was followed by the group suicide of Andreas Baader, Gudrun Ensslin, Jan-Carl Raspe, and the attempted suicide of Imsgard Moller.

Meins has been mentioned rarely because, although he was part of the core RAF, he does not appear to have been a propaganda leader. Meins participated in the May Offensive, and was captured in the same sting as Baader on the 2 July 1972. The greatest significance of Meins, however, came with his death. He died from a self-imposed hunger strike under the lens of the German media in Wittlish prison, on 9 November 1974. On his deathbed, Meins wrote to his comrades:
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“…everybody dies, anyone. Only question is how, and how one lived, and that issue’s clear enough: fighting pigs as a man for the liberation of mankind: a revolutionary, in battle – with all ones love for life, despising death. That’s the way for me: serving the people – RAF.78

His position was not universally agreed upon within the RAF. Ensslin in particular was displeased with this situation, for she saw the act as a measure of defensiveness instead of war. However, she wrote: “You decide when you die. Freedom, or death.”79 And when he did eventually die, there was immediate uproar.

His father was informed that Meins had died of a heart-attack, which was immediately exploited by the RAF to create suspicions about the manner of his death.80 Meins, as they portrayed him, had been indirectly murdered by the German state. Carrie Collenberg suggested that his deathbed photograph was probably published in Stern magazine as a gesture of good faith.81 However, it had an adverse effect.

The pictures of the dead Holger Meins were probably published so as to prove that there was nothing to hide. These images were intended to convey a message: we didn't kill him, he did it himself, and it was outside our power to prevent it. But photos don't always say what they are meant to. The exhibition of the dead man was to prove power, and by so doing the distance to the prisoner was removed. He was exhibited like a trophy.82

This played right into the hands of the RAF. Meins became the first significant martyrised terrorist of the German New Left. He was not the first to die: that honour could go best to Petra Schelm, the young hairdresser turned terrorist who was shot by police in 1971.83 The manner of Meins death provoked so much media attention that it had greater effect. The RAF capitalized on his martyrdom by naming a terrorist cell after him. On 6 April 1986, the ‘Commando Holger Meins’ team bombed an American-patroned Berlin nightclub, killing two and wounding one hundred and fifty.84

78 Aust, The Baader-Meinhof Complex. p207
79 Ibid. p208
80 AAP-Reuter, "Death of Anarchist in Jail." p6
81 Carrie Collenberg, "Dead Holger," German Monitor, no. 70 (2008).
82 Ibid.
83 Becker, Hitler's Children. p240
84 AP, "Berlin Blast Kills Two," The Canberra Times 6 April 1986. p1
The next to die was Ulrike Meinhof. Again, she was no real victim of the German state, but her death was propagandised as one. Deaths in custody evoked questions, and Meinhof’s suicide was no different. Some sources suggest that the real cause of her suicide was actually bullying by fellow terrorists, when they turned on each other in Stammheim prison. Her character was savagely criticised. Baader called her “one of those liberal cunts;” Ensslin called her “the knife in the back of the RAF;” and Meinhof herself thought she was an “elitist swine.” On 9 May 1976, Meinhof hanged herself from the grill of her cell window. Controversy immediately followed, as some thought she had been murdered. Two autopsies confirmed that there were no signs of struggle, and therefore it must be suicide. It was reported in international newspapers that:

...Mrs Meinhof’s lawyer, Mr Michael Oberwinter, said he would formally charge the judicial authorities with her murder... The lawyers complained that neither they, nor the dead woman’s next of kin had been allowed to see the body...

Rallies and protests occurred throughout Germany. On 11 May 1977, over a thousand Meinhof mourners clashed with police in Frankfurt’s main shopping district. The protest escalated with demonstrators throwing petrol bombs at police. Seven police officers were injured, and twelve demonstrators were arrested. Public feeling for Meinhof fluctuated, while the RAF honoured her as they did Meins: the shooting of federal prosecutor Siegfried Bruback was undertaken by the ‘Commando Ulrike Meinhof’ team. The memory of her was kept alive and reinforced.

The hijacking the Lufthansa 181 by the PFLP on behalf of the RAF was discussed above, as was the RAF retaliation in shooting Schleyer when their demands were not met. The news reached the imprisoned RAF members on 18 October 1977. On 19 October, Baader, Raspe, and Ensslin were found dead in their prison cells. The two men had been shot in the head, while Ensslin was hanged. Imsgard Moller was found alive with multiple stab wounds in her chest, and taken
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to hospital.\textsuperscript{89} The deaths were ruled as suicide, and evidence suggests that the weapons had been smuggled into the terrorist’s cells. They had resolved to commit group suicide long before the failure of the Lufthansa hijacking.\textsuperscript{90} Mohnhaupt knew months beforehand, although RAF members around the world remained shocked and suspicious.\textsuperscript{91}

With the martyrdoms of the German New Left, a different pattern emerged. They venerated their fallen leaders by naming their commando units after them, creating a personality cult around the individuals. The commando cells invoked the memory of sacrifice, and also encouraged the endurance of the terror. This also demonstrated an adherence to the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm, in which terror was the objective, and death was inconsequential. Suicide in custody was, in itself, a symbolic act of propaganda. It was a final act of defiance against the authority of the German state. As shown by Meins, the terrorists had more power in controlling their death than the government had in controlling their lives. Their sacrifices inspired more Leftist terror around the world, as many in the Left were prompted by Moller’s claims that they were the victims of the German state and the American CIA.\textsuperscript{92}

\textbf{The Aftermath}

West Germany had three chancellors during the main years of RAF activity: Kiesenger, Brandt, and Schmidt.\textsuperscript{93} Kurt Kiesenger, chancellor from 1966-1969, has a peculiar role in the history of West German terrorism. Under Kiesenger, in 1968 the emergency laws were passed which exacerbated extreme radicalism in the New Left. These laws enabled the federal government to open mail, tap phones, and use the army in the place of police troops in the event of internal disturbances.\textsuperscript{94} This, according to Reuters, provoked “nation-wide demonstrations by students
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and workers, who feared it could pave the way for a new dictatorship." The RAF had demonstrated minor control over their terrorspace, and yet had proven surprisingly influential.

The RAF saw themselves as defending the people against this so-called dictatorship. While their purpose was very abstractly presented in the propaganda, it appeared to be motivated by a desire to champion the oppressed masses in the Third World. It manifested as a rejection of the mainstream media and the capitalist system. The New Left ideology was forward-facing but communicated incomprehensibly. This made their future projection appear empty, an abstract reimagined alternative.

This lack of purpose bled into the New Left justification for violence. Like previous waves, they justified the violence as necessary, self-defensive, and the only method left due to the failure of peaceful agitation. The argument that terrorist violence was relative to the war in Vietnam became less persuasive when the war wound up in 1975. In addition, the masses failed to see the New Left terror as an impotent reaction to the ceremonial orderliness of fascist existence: if anything, the RAF became the unnecessary disruption to theirs.

The strategic method of the RAF was undermined by the vagueness of their purpose, leaving them without clearly defined strategic goals. Because of the lack of a tangible purpose, the RAF had little else to demand but the release of their leaders from jail. The more they demanded, the less willing the West German government was to consider it. Strategically, their violence was characterised by high levels of international cooperation, hijackings, assassinations, and well-publicised attacks such as the May Offensive. These acts were symbolic, targeted at capturing media attention, and attempted to undermine government reputation.

The tactical campaign relied heavily on the use of firearms and explosives to control hostages, and their manuals encouraged the theft of weapons from the government for this purpose. The RAF trained in Jordan to overcome their amateurism and gain technical proficiency. Their
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targeting was generally selective, with bombings and shootings, aimed at specific symbolic individuals. Their relatively low death-toll can be attributed to this discrimination. Americans as ‘imperialists’, industrialists, politicians, and financiers were targeted throughout this wave. Their attacks often occurred in transit, demonstrating en route opportunism. Although they threatened indiscriminate attacks with blowing up airplanes, this was not actually undertaken.

These tactics were employed as part of a systematic campaign. The pattern of endurance-escalation-exhaustion was undertaken on a much grander scale, and was not linear in its intensification of violence. It rose, ebbed, and receded based on the available strategic leadership. Escalations were represented through the May Offensive and the German Autumn. The RAF also believed that small numbers contributed to endurance and terrorist success, with the striking of continuous blows. By turning the legal trial into a media circus, they maximised propaganda and exhausted the authorities and themselves.

Exaltation of the revolution was rooted in the belief that society was fundamentally flawed. However, without any imagined alternative future, the RAF relied on slogans. This may have been due to several factors: the contending strains of New Left thought which would have confused even the most ardent follower, the lack of ideological understanding amongst the group itself, or the tactical choice to spoon-feed the masses understandable slogans that demonstrated their commitment to the revolution without becoming bogged down in the ideological particulars.

Martyrdom in the RAF was characterised by the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm. Death was an act of defiance, and of control. The terrorists controlled their deaths and not the German authorities their lives. The martyrs were revived later, in the form of commando units which bore their name, and thus reinvigorated their memories. It created a personality cult around dead fighters. This in itself carried another message: it reminded the public of where the terrorists had come from, and where they would continue to go. Of course, the manner in
which the New Left attacked their own could have had an impact on their veneration of martyrs, particularly Meinhof and Meins.  

This exploitation of Propaganda of the Deed was faced by Willy Brandt throughout his chancellery. Brandt had a moderate approach to terrorism: his response was to expand the federal criminal police service from 934 agents in 1970, to 1,779 agents in 1972. These officers pursued a decapitation strategy, targeting the terrorist leadership. However, when Lorenz was taken hostage by the 2JM in 1975, Brandt acceded to terrorist demands, paid the ransom and released captive terrorists, incidentally validating hostage-taking as a terrorist strategy. Brandt retired when it was discovered that his closest advisor was an East German spy. Helmut Schmidt took his place in 1974.

After the Buback and Ponto murders in 1977, Schmidt declared a relentless “War Against Violence” at the funeral of Buback. This marked a turning point for counter-terrorism, as an uncompromising attitude was adopted. When Schleyer was kidnapped, Schmidt refused to pay the ransom and compromise. When Lufthansa Flight 181 was hijacked, Schmidt’s commandos killed the terrorists and freed the hostages. A government spokesman stated in 1977:

...the Government knew that if it surrendered to the hijackers and free the guerrillas, who include key members of the Baader-Meinhof gang, it would only have been a matter of time before they returned to Germany and began a fresh wave of bombings and killings.

This inspired the suicides of the Baader-Meinhof gang, and a fresh wave of violence under the leadership of Mohnhaupt. Her first major attempt was Operation Stallion: the failed bombing assassination on the motorcade of Alexander Haig, the new Commander in Chief of NATO in 1979. Sponsored by East Germany’s government, the RAF continued training with weaponry

---

96 Aust, *The Baader-Meinhof Complex*. p204  
97 Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p240  
98 AAP-Reuter, "Schmidt Pledges "War against Violence"." p4  
100 Ibid.  
101 Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p258
such as RPG-7 rocket launchers and military grade explosives. There were attempted bombings at US community headquarters and the Max Planck Institute in Schmargendorf in 1981.  

In 1982, eight active RAF members handed over their weapons and resigned, no longer believing that the fight was justified. The second generation ended with the capture of Mohnhaupt in 1982. It is interesting to note that Schmidt was re-elected to office in 1980 based more on his economic plan than his strong counter-terrorism stance, which indicates how far terrorism had fallen on the political agenda. This lack of relevance was an undermining feature for the continuity of the RAF. 

For all their grand-standing, the RAF’s significance was ultimately undermined by their incomplete revolutionary abstraction. Julian Preece opened *Baader-Meinhof and the Novel* with the statement:

...Andreas Baader, Ulrike Meinhof, and Gudrun Ensslin exerted no real influence on German politics. They left behind no great works. The RAF, which was their creation, enjoyed no mass support and never posed a danger either to the state or to the public. The total number of fatalities in the 28 years of RAF existence is little more than the number that can die on the roads in Germany in a bad week.

In some ways, Preece is correct. The terrorists did not produce any legacy of outstanding ideological tracts to outlast them. Meinhof wrote very well, but she was the paradigmatic Leftist lens through which members within the society viewed political woes: she was no Karl Marx. One possible reason for this could be the pre-existing wealth of old and new Left ideology. The RAF were significant, not for what they wrote, but for how they embodied the spirit of the New Left. They embraced the revolutionary chic, and simply followed manuals of Marighella and Guevara. Their propaganda output was in line with those pre-existing strategies, although most likely for less ideological and more dramatic reasons.
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In other ways, Preece is incorrect. The value of a terrorist group, and its ability to orchestrate an atmosphere of fear, does not reside solely in a high death toll, but in how well the strategy of Propaganda of the Deed is exploited. One well-publicised death can have greater impact than a dozen obscure deaths, and it was in feeding that media-frenzy that the RAF proved particularly adept. They managed to drag the hostage-situation of Schleyer out forty-four days, and incorporate the act into a variety of well-publicised events, not limited to an international hijacking and a national terrorism trial.

It must be noted, much as with other terrorist groups examined thus far, that not every terrorist’s career ends in death. Many survived: Brigitte Mohnhaupt, Astrid Proll, and Horst Mahler for example. Mahler, the RAF lawyer and terrorist, served fourteen years in prison for his activities. He turned a full political circle, denouncing the RAF’s justification for violence, and become an outspoken German nationalist, identifying with the extreme right and ‘skinheads’. The new colour and the new clothing of extreme Left had gone out of fashion, as the RAF themselves recognised. While the international media had focused on them, by 1979 a new wave was already rising and expanding, ready to dominate the international media and the phenomenon of terrorism itself.
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Chapter Eight: Sword and Prayer

The rise of Salafist Terror

Islam is so all-pervading an element that there is little religiosity, little fervor, and no regard for externals. Do not think from their conduct that they are careless. Their conviction of the truth of their faith, and its share in every act and thought and principle of their daily life is so intimate and intense as to be unconscious, unless roused by opposition. Their religion is as much as part of nature to them as is sleep or food.

Lawrence of Arabia, “The Twenty-Seven Articles”

Religious terrorism, represented predominantly by Salafist terrorism, is the current wave of terror in Rapoport’s theory. This chapter focuses on jihadi Islamism, as it represents the energy of this wave. The historical context is examined through influences such as the Golden Age of Islam, which is highly mythologised in the present day, as well as pan-Arabism, the Iranian revolution, and the Gulf War of 1990-1991. This will be followed by a discussion of the Salafist ideology and frequently used terms, such as jihad and jahiliyya. Finally, the chapter introduces the propagandists such as Osama bin Laden and Ayman al-Zawahiri, and affiliated groups including the Afghan Service Bureau, al ‘Qaeda, and the Egyptian Islamic Jihad.

The secondary research question of this of this study is could Propaganda of the Deed have been transmitted from earlier waves to the current Salafi jihadists? Going back to the nineteenth century, sanctioned pogroms against the Russia Jewish population led to their leaving Russia. Many emigrated to America, but some travelled south towards Jerusalem. With them, migrants took memories of Russia and its revolutionary terror. This may have created a social consciousness of terror, which was then used by Irgun against the British to force the creation of the state of Israel. As a result, Palestinian groups like the PLO and PFLP engaged in terrorism to recover the Palestinian homeland, reinforcing that regional memory.

Palestinian terrorists, in addition to influencing and training the RAF, had been operating in the Middle East for decades. The Palestinian issue is exploited in al ‘Qaeda propaganda. Barak Mendelsohn investigating the links between Palestinian terrorists and al ‘Qaeda found:

When Al ‘Qaeda referred to the Palestinian problem, it was often in support of its own propaganda efforts. For instance, bin Laden used the term ‘the abandonment of Palestine’ as an example of the poor condition of the umma following the destruction of the Ottoman Caliphate and its replacement by a host of ‘tyrant’ leaders.²

Al ‘Qaeda exploited the Palestinian problem to enhance its regional reputation, which drew on the greater popular support (and anti-Semitic sentiment) in the Arabic community. Mendelsohn also suggested that the elimination of Israel was part of al ‘Qaeda’s long term agenda, which indicated converging goals and interconnectivity between the two factions. Salafist terrorists may have been inspired to implement Propaganda of the Deed by both regional examples.

It is also probable that Salafist terrorists have familiarity with Fanon, who was a Muslim. Algeria was once part of the Islamic Maghreb, and has a large Muslim population. It is likely that the more educated terrorists such as bin Laden and al-Zawahiri had familiarity with Fanon’s work or the terror group Front de Liberation Nationale (FLN), with which he was affiliated. Wretched had an established presence in the Islamic world, when it was translated into Persian by Ali Shariati for the Iranian Peoples Mujahedeen.³ Soon after, it was translated into Arabic with some omissions. Additionally, Kepel found that Algerian terrorism, though technically anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist, became established within the sphere of political Islam.⁴ Therefore, two possible conduits for Salafist familiarity with Propaganda of the Deed are Irgun/PFLP and Fanon’s manifesto.

Revolutionary Islam

As with most revolutionary contexts, Salafi jihadism had no single point of growth, but was rather the incubation of many factors which manifested in extreme political ideology. The rise of revolutionary Islam is the subject of considerable historical attention, so this section touches
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briefly on some of the factors which produced the historical context, essentially cherry-picking those deemed most significant by experts in the field. This chapter focuses on the Golden Age of Islam, the rise of pan-Arabism, the mandate and division of Palestine, Cold War tensions, the Iranian Revolution, and the Gulf War. The Israeli-Palestine conflict and the Lebanese Civil War (1975-91) also had an impact on radicalism.

The Golden Age of Islam refers to the period when the Islamic Caliphate, from Arabia and expanding through the North African Maghreb, was under the rule of the Abbasid dynasty. The Umayyad dynasty assumed power in 680, marking a theological split between Sunni and Shia Muslims. Umayyad power declined until roughly 750, when the Caliphate was retaken by the Abbasids, led by a descendant of Muhammad’s uncle. This period historically and mythologically provided the foundations for contemporary Salafist glorification of the Caliphate. Caliphs ruled as actual, and then titular, authorities until 1258. Under Abbasid rule, the Arabs flourished. Islam expanded along the Great Silk Road, seized more territory with the fall of the Persian Empire, and interacted with other ethnicities, faiths, and ideas, in a deep cultural exchange. Baghdad was the world centre for philosophy, medicine, and science. Among the discoveries was recognition of the circulation system in the human body by al-Nafis (d.1288), the astronomical discovery that the world went around the sun (and not vice versa), and the invention of mathematical fractions by al-Uqlidisi circa 950.

The Abbasid Caliphate was invaded by the Mongols in 1268-69, having already suffered the territorial loss of Syria, Morocco and Tunisia. The Mongolian il-Khans converted to Islam, but they did so while retaining Mongolian shamanistic elements. Taqi-ud-Deen Ahmand ibn Taymiyya believed that the state was an institution whose responsibility was to uphold and defend Islam. Thus Mongolian-style Islamism, to Taymiyya, was apostasy that had to be
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resisted. Catherwood cited Benjamin and Simon, who carried the analysis of Taymiyya’s beliefs further:

By asserting that jihad against apostates is justified – by turning jihad inwards and reforming it into a weapon for use against Muslims as well as infidels – he planted a seed of revolutionary violence in the heart of Islamic thought.\textsuperscript{10}

The remnants of the Caliphate were then taken by the Mamluk Turks of the Ottoman Empire, and experienced periods of geographical expansion and contraction. The nominal Abbasid Caliphate ended when Sultan Selim took the title Caliph back with him to Istanbul in 1517.\textsuperscript{11} The paradigm for the Golden Age in a modern Salafist understanding is that the Caliphate ruled as a total political and religious authority, with no secular division of faith and state.\textsuperscript{12} Towards the end of the Abassid Caliphate, political institutions had become increasingly secular, and the Caliph was merely a spiritual guide. The Ottoman Empire maintained the political and religious status quo to an extent, but in Turkey’s drive to modernise after WWI, officially the Caliphate was abolished in 1924. On the political and religious status quo, Ira Lapidus wrote:

Thus, despite the common statement that Islam is a total way of life defining political as well as social and family matters, most Muslim societies did not conform to this ideal. They were in fact built around separate institutions of state and religion.\textsuperscript{13}

Lapidus went on to state that Islam, while limited in engineering the modern nation-state, remained a pervasive influence in civil society.\textsuperscript{14} Specifically, Lapidus wrote: “Islam continues to define national identities precisely because it remains the basis of community life and personal religious belief.”\textsuperscript{15}

This political and religious fusion was described by T.E Lawrence in the opening of this chapter. The Arab Revolt of 1916, in which Lawrence was complicit, was one of the strongest early
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\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
sentiments of pan-Arab nationalism against the Ottoman overlords in contemporary history. Yet, as an expression of nationalist awakening, it had religious undertones. There are competing interpretations. Some historians believe Arab nationalists took part in the 1916 revolt in pursuit of independence from the Ottoman Empire. Others suggested that many Arabs were comfortable to continue under Ottoman rule because it was still Muslim. Some claim that the revolt was artificially instigated by Allied Powers to replace the Ottoman Empire with a province of their own. Others contend that it was a naked grab for power by Sharif Hussein of Hijaz, who believed that “the Ottoman Empire had never been ‘the best hope of defending Islam from political and intellectual encroachments of Christian Europe.’” He was prepared to collude with European sovereigns, however, provided they guaranteed his own sovereignty. These interpretations are not mutually exclusive, and all contain elements of truth. A message from Lord Kitchener to Hussein in 1914 confirmed the religious dimension to Arabic nationalism in the Middle East:

Til now we have defended and befriended Islam in the person of the Turks; henceforward it shall be in that of the noble Arab. It may be that an Arab of the true race will assume the Caliphate at Mecca or Medina and so good may come by the help of God out of all the evil which is now occurring.

Lord Kitchener’s enticement of a potential Arabic Caliphate reinforces its significance during that time. The religious dimensions of the nationalist revolt in 1916, and the historical symbolic importance of the Caliphate in Islamic cultural memory, made an attractive bargaining chip.

Catherwood indicated that Osama bin Laden frequently evoked the betrayal myth as a cause of Arabic suffering. This is because, as portrayed by Lawrence of Arabia, the British were duplicitous in their dealings with Hussein. While they promised the Arabs independence, they did so envisioning British overlordship on one hand, with Russian and French concessions on
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16 This is contended by Efraim Karsh and Inari Karsh, “Myth in the Desert, or Not the Great Arab Revolt," *Middle Eastern Studies* 33, no. 2 (1997).
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the other. As a result, the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 was “old fashioned imperialism of the worst kind.” Britain would receive Baghdad, Basra and parts of Jordan; France would take parts of Lebanon, Syria, and (what is now) Iraq; and Russia would get parts of Turkey and the Caucasus. Palestine was to be placed under international rule – although this changed within a year to grant the British a League of Nations mandate. In 1948, this location would be renamed Israel. Turkey ended up retaining independence, with a significant loss of territory. It was the Arabs who suddenly had Christian overlords. Catherwood argued that the betrayal myth amongst Arabs has been oversimplified, but is nonetheless still widely believed in the Middle East.

The creation of Israel exacerbated tensions in the region which were duly exploited by Cold War powers, as the new Arab states did not recognise the Israeli right to exist. Israel was initially backed by the USSR, but in 1958 it switched to America. This was in part due to US intervention (also referred to as ‘invasion’) in Lebanon to prevent an extremist government. This is contested: some claim the cause of the political instability in the Middle East was communist subversion, while others claimed it was Arab nationalism. This was not the only Cold War dabbling in the Middle East which may have influenced political extremism. Although arming the mujahedeen in Afghanistan is attributed to President Ronald Reagan’s doctrine following the 1980 election, his predecessor President Jim Carter authorised “the supply of lethal weapons” as early as December 1979. This took form in supplying foreign-made .303 Enfield rifles to maintain US deniability, although Reagan later equipped the mujahedeen with US-made Stinger missiles to use against Soviet forces. This project cost the United States roughly

22 Ibid. p169 Sir Henry McMahon promised Sharif Hussein and his Hashemite tribe a significant amount of territory with no mention of such overlordship.
23 Ibid. p169
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US$5 billion, while the cost to Afghanistan was eight years of conflict and over a million lives.²⁹
Significantly, it would give credence to the myth of Afghanistan as the country where even superpowers would fail.³⁰

Rapoport claimed that the fourth wave of terror began in 1979, marked by the Iranian Revolution, which had a huge influence on Islamist ideology. Shia extremism, particularly that undertaken by Islamic Group and Hezbollah, influenced and inspired the Sunni extremists to action of their own. The revolution was sparked on 19 August 1978. The first floor of the Rex Cinema in Abadan was set ablaze with an incendiary mixture of thinner and roghan, by either religious militants or the Shah’s SAVAK secret police, killing over 400 people.³¹ This act of terror catalysed months of wildfire uprisings against the shah’s modernisation policies, autocracy, and economic inflation into a popular revolution supporting the Shia cleric, Ayatollah Khomeini. The impact of the revolution on regional politics was twofold; it inspired Shia and Sunni alike to believe that a theocratic state was attainable, and it encouraged the emergence of radical violence in the Middle East. Iran quickly rose as a regional power, rejecting Western and Eastern ideology and standing as a geopolitical player in its own right. As suggested by Gilles Kepel in *Jihad: the Trail of Political Islam*:

> Before purges, executions, and atrocities tarnished its image, the revolution demonstrated that a movement springing from a broad spectrum of society could bring down a powerful government, even one closely connected to the United States.³²

However, according to Kepel, “[t]he Iranian revolution’s heaviest impact in the Middle East was felt not in Palestine, where it was merely a source of inspiration for jihad, but in neighbouring Lebanon.”³³ Iran encouraged the establishment of Hezbollah, which led to decades of conflict, although Lebanon had been tumultuous since the civil war in 1975. From 1980-1988, Iran was
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²⁹ Burleigh, *Blood and Rage*. p369
³⁰ This myth could also have begun with the rout of the British in the first Anglo-Afghan war in the nineteenth century, however, the propaganda refers only to the withdrawal of the Soviets in 1989.
³³ Ibid. p123
preoccupied in war with Iraq, which had, in line with increasing aggression from Saddam Hussein, invaded it on irredentist pretences.

Two years after failing to defeat Iran, Hussein invaded Kuwait, with what Catherwood believes was the mistaken impression that the West would not interfere. President George H. W. Bush organised an international coalition, including many Arab states, and launched an intervention aimed primarily at defeating Iraqi forces, protecting the vast oil reserves, and preventing further Iraqi incursions into Saudi Arabia. Operation Desert Shield in 1990 defended Saudi Arabia from incursion, while its air component Operation Desert Storm in 1991, expelled Iraqi forces from Kuwait. The continued presence of American soldiers in the Gulf, even on the invitation of the Saudi royal family, became an issue of contention for radicals. Eugene Rogan noted:

America’s single-minded pursuit of a military solution...led many to believe that the United States used the war to establish its military presence in the Gulf and to dominate the regions oil resources. The fact that thousands of American troops stayed in Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states years after the liberation of Kuwait only deepened these concerns.

This impression was not easily overturned. In addition, the presence of female American soldiers in Saudi Arabia, defying local customs, offended many Salafists.

As a result, there were many factors in the rise of violent Islamism: factors both historical and modern, and both real and imagined. Salafists also harnessed contentious issues for support, such as pan-Arabic nationalism, anti-Semitism, and the Civil War in Lebanon. It used myth, (usage here referring to myth as an imagined construct with elements of historical interpretation) to draw people together, and channel revolutionary consciousness. The Golden Age of Islam is glorified, while the fall of the Ottoman Empire meant that many held, and continue to hold, Western powers responsible for the divisions that followed. (The more recent history of the extremism, between the years of 1991 to 2013 is discussed in chapter nine.)
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Salafi Jihadism

There are multiple interpretations of Islamic faith, so care must be careful not to construe Islam as a singular bloc. According to Mary Habeck:

> As a religion of over a billion people, Islam does not always present a united face, and it is practised in a variety of ways: syncretised forms in Indonesia and Africa; traditional beliefs in rural areas of central Asia, Egypt, Iran and North Africa; secularised variants in Tunisia, Iraq, Syria, and Turkey; and mystical Sufi sects, which dominate large swathes of the Muslim world.\(^{37}\)

Only Islamism in its political, ideological and violent use is considered in this thesis, and it is the Islamism adopted by *Salafi jihadis*. The concept must be further defined as Islamism as a political doctrine is just as factionalised as Islam is religiously. One can be an Islamist without seeking the violent overthrow of the existing order.

The use of the term “Islamism” here refers to its radical interpretation by *salafi jihadists*. As clarified by Habeck:

> The main difference between jihadi’s and other Islamists is the extremist’s commitment to the violent overthrow of the existing international system and its replacement by an all-encompassing Islamic state.\(^{38}\)

This explanation is succinct and adopted for this research, but is ultimately simplistic, as *jihad* is constantly being re-interpreted and has different meanings to each person. In 1998, Emmanuel Sivan noted:

> One reason that it is hard to pin down the idea of jihad is that it has an experiential base as well as a theological-juridical one, having been dragged through more than fourteen hundred years of history over an area stretching from Spain to Central Asia.\(^{39}\)

This analysis is corroborated by David Cook. At its simplest, there are two forms of *jihad* (translating as ‘struggle’): the greater internal struggle to be true to Islam, and the lesser external struggle to defend Islam, which is a collective pursuit. When *jihad* is interpreted as a purely defensive measure, it is at odds with Islam as a hegemonic religion, in light of


\(^{38}\) Ibid. p4

Muhammad’s conquests. The abolition of the Caliphate in 1924 meant that there was no one with the religious legitimacy to declare lesser *jihad*.\(^{40}\) *Jihad* had to be symbolically and metaphysically redefined by extremists. Cook suggested that modern *jihad* was largely shaped by the Koranic interpretations of Sayyid Qutb:

> Qutb basically sees jihad as the means by which Muslims ensure that the proclamation of the message of Islam can be heard – ridding the world of structures or powers that stand in the way of peacefully and noncoercively proclaiming the truth.\(^{41}\)

*Jihad*, then, is the method by which the greater *Salafi* message is communicated, and that method is violence: both offensive and defensive. Terrorists believe that *jihad* will enable Muslims to re-establish the caliphate.\(^{42}\)

*Salafi jihadism* is explored by Ann-Sophie Hemmingsen in “Salafi Jihadism – Relying on fieldwork to study disorganised and clandestine phenomena.”\(^{43}\) Her fieldwork in 2008 focused on engaging with individuals who self-identified as *Salafi jihadists* and had been convicted under terrorism legislation to ascertain the specific attracts of the ideology. Her working definition is below:

> Salafi jihadism is an elusive and heterogeneous phenomenon characterised by, among other things: a strict Salafi interpretation of Islam; *takfir*; rejection of democracy and other man-made systems; and the justification of the use of violence against enemies by references to a narrow interpretation of the Islamic concept of *jihad*.\(^{44}\)

This description of Salafi jihadism highlights the functional components of the ideology which manifest frequently in the propaganda. Her research found that *Salafi jihadism* is reducted by definitions of terrorism, and exists in a specific milieu that ascribes to an international collectiveness, where *jihadis* feel connected to one another through the following of the ideology. To follow on from this, further terms must be discussed.
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Other terms require defining before progressing, such as jahiliyya. Translated literally, this means the “Age of Ignorance,” referring to pre-Islamic barbarism. However, William Shepard extrapolated that this, when used in the Koran, carried greater meaning. It was used to communicate hostility and resistance to Islam, an aggressive response against its monotheism, and specifically referred to the social and spiritual condition of non-Islamic peoples who followed pagan traditions. This was re-interpreted in the sixties by Qutb, who theorised that jahiliyya was not something of the past, but pervades the present. Everyone who was not living in accordance with Sharia and Islam was living in jahiliyya: a state of being controlled by dark desires and animalistic passions, superstitions and ignorance, with no moral or intellectual boundaries. Qutb took this further: it was not only non-Muslims who are in jahiliyya, but also Muslims who are not as devout as he believed they ought to be, metaphorically putting “Islamic signs over the camp of depravity and decay.”

Other terms used in the following section are:

Ahl-al Dhimma: “Protected Peoples”, non-Muslims living in Muslim lands and paying a special jizya tax in compensation for not participating in jihad.

Dar al-harb: “The abode of war,” areas which are not governed by Sharia law.

Dar al-Islam: “The abode of Islam,” Muslim-governed areas where Sharia is held as law.

Sharia: or Islamic Law, is a set of principles encoded in the Koran which incorporates the six pillars of Islam, and enforces a code of conduct over various aspects of life such as law, economics and politics, through to relationships and personal conduct.

Shahid: a martyr who dies in the service of Islam, who is able to receive automatic entry into paradise and all the privileges therein.

---
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Takfir: an ancient concept revived by Taymiyya and Qutb; to “declare a Muslim a non-Muslim,” and is therefore an apostate who deserves to be killed. This is used to sanction violence against Muslim rulers and populations.49

Ulema: community of Islamic scholars.

Umma: the greater Islamic community.

Nizam: the idea of Islam, not as a personal religion, but as a comprehensive ideology which provides for all parts of a society; be it cultural, political, economic, judicial, etc.50

An imagined state of Islam.

Hakimiyya: a modern construct, which posits the extreme sole sovereignty of Allah, whose sole jurisdiction it is to rule over humankind and create laws.51

Al-Adou al-Baeed: the far enemy, an encompassing term referring to the Western world, primarily the United States of America.

Al-Adou al-Qareeb: the near enemy, local Muslim regimes viewed as apostate.52

Revolutionaries

The Salafi jihadists represented a new and distinct energy from those previous waves. One of the earliest theorists for later Islamism was Taymiyya, whose ideas had a direct impact on Hasan al-Banna. Al-Banna founded the Muslim Brotherhood in the 1920s. Its propaganda had an impact on the Egyptian Islamic Jihad group, which was responsible for several high profile terror attacks. Several years later, ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam formed the Afghan Service Bureau with Osama bin Laden. The Bureau merged with Egyptian Islamic Jihad (EIJ), creating the foundation for al’ Qaeda. The current leader of al’ Qaeda, and a prominent propagandist, is Ayman al-Zawahiri. These revolutionaries and their groups are most relevant to this study because of their significance in the rise of Salafi jihadism, representation of its predominant energy, and


51 Ibid. p37

their contribution to the propaganda discourse. Other Salafi groups operating at the time of this research include Boko Haram, Islamic State, and Al Shabaab, which will be discussed briefly in the next chapter.

Going back to the thirteenth century, Taymiyya (1262-1328) was a Muslim scholar whose writings re-established several ancient Islamic concepts, and influenced Hanbali scholarship and Wahhabism in Saudi Arabia. Though it would be anachronistic to refer to him as an Islamist, his writings were of great importance to later extremists. Of significance were the concepts of dar al’harb, dar al’Islam, and jihad. Ibn Taymiyya lived in Turkey shortly after the fall of the Abbasid Caliphate to the Mongols. When the Il-Khans converted to Islam, this meant that Muslims could not technically declare jihad on them. Taymiyya addressed this issue of legitimacy by re-defining the meaning of dar al’harb: according to Taymiyya, it could be applied to Muslims who were not living in strict accordance with Sharia, as opposed to non-Islamic lands. Catherwood explained that, jihad could be (and was) declared upon the Il-Khans as apostate Muslims in a fatwa by Taymiyya. Johannes Jansen observed that:

Although this condemnation of the Mongols was dictated by the particular circumstances of the Mamluk-Mongol conflict of the thirteenth century, many modern Muslims prefer to regard this condemnation as generally applicable and valid for all places and all times.

Ibn Taymiyya’s most important writing on this topic was The Religious and Moral Doctrine of Jihad, which will be analysed later. His significance was twofold. He was important insofar as he reinterpreted these concepts, and in doing so inspired the scholar al-Wahhab in the
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eighteenth century. Al-Wahhab influenced Sayyid Qutb in the twentieth century, who in turn influenced Islamist terrorists in modern day.\(^5^9\)

The first to draw upon Taymiyya in modern times was Hasan al-Banna (1906-1949). Al-Banna was a devout Egyptian schoolteacher who founded the influential Muslim Brotherhood (\textit{Al-Ikwan al-Muslimeen}) in 1928.\(^6^0\) He displayed what Ana Soage described as a totalitarian interpretation of Islam, coupled with the belief that violence was a legitimate tool to bring about the desired state.\(^6^1\) Islam, to al-Banna, was a blueprint for governing all aspects of life: government, personal, judiciary, culture, and so on. Accordingly, he believed the Muslim conquests were motivated by truth and brotherliness, as opposed to ambition and riches. Any decadence or depravity linked to Islam since that time was, in al-Banna’s mind, the result of deviation from the true course.\(^6^2\) In his beliefs, one can see an early image of the imagined Islamic Caliphate. The government of this imagined state was not a representation of popular will, but an instrument of top-down Islam. This image was, and continues to be, attractive to Muslims from many political persuasion. The Brotherhood, over time, has been extreme, moderate, and in some cases, politically legitimate.

The Muslim Brotherhood comprised mainly large numbers of the Egyptian lower-middle class. Its goal was deeply Salafist. It viewed the contemporary world as in a process of inevitable decay, for which the only salvation was a commitment to fundamental Islam. The re-establishment of the Caliphate was therefore high on its agenda.\(^6^3\) Al-Banna stated:

\begin{quote}
God is our objective; the Quran is our constitution; the Prophet is our leader; Struggle is our way; and death for the sake of God is the highest of our aspirations.\(^6^4\)
\end{quote}

\(^{59}\) Catherwood, \textit{A Brief History of the Middle East}. p113
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\(^{62}\) Ibid. pp300-301
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The group did not begin with violence. It had a broad and general appeal, growing swiftly: by 1948, there were half a million sympathizers.\textsuperscript{65} It became internationalist, subsequently spreading throughout Syria, Jordan, Sudan, Algeria, Palestine, and Iraq. This may be because it involved itself in contemporary areas of discord. It embraced the twentieth century nationalism in North Africa with a new and non-Western alternative, which would supposedly assist in keeping imperialism, foreign domination, and colonialism at bay.\textsuperscript{66} It was influenced ideologically by Qutb, who was also executed in 1966 as a result of his membership of the group.

The Brotherhood began attacking British and Jewish shops in Egypt, in the hopes it would hasten the departure of the British. Instead, the group was banned for fomenting terrorism. A member of the Brotherhood retaliated by assassinating the Egyptian Prime Minister Nokrashay Pasha in 1948.\textsuperscript{67} Al-Banna was then killed in 1949, possibly by Egyptian security forces.\textsuperscript{68} The group survived the loss of its leader, and was briefly repressed as a result of Qutb’s ideology. It resurfaced in a more peaceful model in the 1980’s, and has endured until the current day, and has been particularly active in Egypt since the Arab Spring of 2011. John Calvert, an expert on Egyptian Islamism, wrote that some still:

\begin{quote}
...view the Brotherhood as possessing a hidden agenda, one built on an unbending desire for theocracy, the realisation of which will stymie the promise of universal human rights... Further, they regard the Brotherhood as the facilitator, if not the incubator of politically motivated violence. It is no accident, they say, that many of the \textit{jihadi}s operative in recent decades, were affiliated either directly or indirectly with the Muslim Brotherhood.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{quote}
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Calvert goes on to discuss the flexibility of the group, and its ability to employ political pragmatism over religious fundamentalism. In 2011, it formed a political wing, the Freedom and Justice Party, which won the majority of seats in the 2012 Egyptian election.\footnote{Ibid. pp50-51}

Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966) was a member of the Muslim Brotherhood. He began as a low-born moderate nationalist of the Egyptian Wafd Party, but, after a two-year tour of the United States as a student from 1948-1950, he developed a more radical opinion of politics. He was persecuted by the Nasser regime for his membership in the Brotherhood, and for his criticism of the regime’s failure to address what he saw as a decayed state.\footnote{Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islam (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010). p11} The significance of Qutb’s writings was described by Calvert as “formulating the theoretical bases of Islamism in the post-colonial Sunni Muslim World.”\footnote{Ibid. p1} Shepard agreed, stating that “Both as a writer and as a martyr, he has been a major influence on Islamic ‘resurgence,’ which began shortly after his death.”\footnote{Shepard, “Sayyid Qutb’s Doctrine of Jahiliyya.” p521}

Qutb’s significance came from two important concepts propagated within the modern Salafist community: the concepts of \textit{jahiliyya}, and \textit{takfir}. His own writing was influenced by that of Abu Ala Mawdudi (1903-1979), Abu Hasan Nadwi (1913-1995), and his younger brother Muhammad Qutb (1919-2014). Qutb redefined the concept of \textit{jahiliyya} as a rejection of divine authority, which thus attacks Islam itself.\footnote{Ibid. p524} It was no longer a period of time or “Age of Ignorance” but a condition, like a disease, which sickened the human spiritual state and in doing so, damaged the purity of Islam. This, according to Shepard, was a totalitarian concept: similar to the

\footnote{Ibid. pp50-51 Shortly before the election (won by the Brotherhoods candidate, President Muhammad Morsi) the Egyptian military shut down parliament and awarded itself new and extensive powers which rivalled the president’s. Morsi countered this after he was sworn in by retiring the existing generality and promoting his own people. In late 2012, the first constitution was drafted in line with Sharia law, limiting the freedom of women and intellectuals while enshrining the power of the military. People marched in protest. The protests grew over the following six months, and the military eventually deposed Morsi and a non-Islamist president, Justice Adly Mansour, became interim president. He announced a state of emergency and martial law by the end of 2013. Pro-Morsi Islamist supporters protested, and the authorities cracked down on them throughout 2013-14, banning the Brotherhood entirely.}
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contrast between truth and error, one is either living in union with Islam, or living in jahiliyya.\textsuperscript{75}
The extension of this is takfir: the demotion of a Muslim as a faux Muslim, and therefore an apostate. Consequently, an increasing amount of Salafis and jihadis employ an “explicit takfiri point of view, plainly excising society, the ruling elite, or both from the body of the faithful.”\textsuperscript{76} Qutb’s most important writing was Milestones (1964), which became an influential Islamist terrorist script, and will be analysed in the next chapter.\textsuperscript{77}

Yet another Egyptian Salafist tied to the Muslim Brotherhood was Muhammad Abd al-Salam Faraj (1954-1982), an electrical engineer. He was involved with the Muslim Brotherhood from an early age, but soon became disillusioned with what he perceived to be its cooperation with Sadat’s regime.\textsuperscript{78} He and a small group of friends formed the foundation for Egyptian Islamic Jihad, under the spiritual leadership of the Blind Sheik, Abdel Rahman. The main document of the group was The Neglected Duty, (also translated as The Absent Obligation) written primarily by Faraj around 1980.\textsuperscript{79} Five hundred copies were distributed privately amongst its members, although it was later published on a larger scale. This text set down the group’s main philosophy, drawing on the teachings of ibn Taymiyya and Qutb. What is particularly significant about this text was Faraj’s discussion about the pillars of Islam. Traditionally, there are sixth pillars; prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, declaration of faith, alms, and the Ramadan fast, all held as obligatory.\textsuperscript{80} Faraj argued that there was a seventh obligatory pillar: jihad. This must first be waged against the local apostate Muslim regimes, and once they were cleansed, attention could be turned to the far enemy who had sustained the regimes.\textsuperscript{81} This pillar of jihad was practised by the Egyptian Islamic Jihad.
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In the 1970’s, many *jihadi* groups were growing in Egypt following the lifting of the ban on the Muslim Brotherhood. Several of these united under the leadership of Mohammad ‘Abd al-Salam Faraj in 1979 to form EIJ. The most well-known of these mergers was with *Gama al-Islamiyya*. Translating as, “Islamic Group,” *Gama al-Islamiyya* was spiritually led by Sheik Omar ‘Abdel Rahman of Al-Azhar University, and formed by university students and artisans.\(^82\) Rachel Scott noted that the educated, low-middle class members of Egyptian Islamic Jihad “would normally be considered ideal or model young Egyptians.”\(^83\) Other rank-and-file members came from what Nimrod Raphaeli called the city slums, “mired in poverty and driven with despair.”\(^84\) Benjamin and Simon claimed the group comprised forty percent artisans, “17 percent professionals, 9 percent soldiers or policemen, 4 percent farmers, and only 5 percent unemployed.”\(^85\)

One of the original members was Ayman Al-Zawahiri, who was well-born and educated, but a minor member at this time. Egyptian Islamic Jihad catalysed into action when the Egyptian President, Anwar Sadat, visited Jerusalem - a visit which bore with it the prospect of peace with Israel, which EIJ fervently opposed.\(^86\) Its major objective was to transition to direct action. The goal was to overthrow the so-called apostate rulership, and install an Islamic government under *Sharia* law, using terror. This goal would see many of the members work with ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam.

‘Abdullah ‘Azzam (1941-1989) was a teacher from northern Palestine.\(^87\) He became a member of the Syrian branch of the Muslim Brotherhood in the 1950’s, and was involved in the Arab-Israeli War of 1967. Some sources state he was a refugee of the conflict, others say that he was
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involved in the armed struggle.\textsuperscript{88} It is thought he also had connections with the PLO and other Palestinian militants engaged in the intifada against Israel. He was soon disillusioned with them, and returned to his studies. In 1973, he completed a doctorate in \textit{Sharia} law at Al Azhar University, and took up a teaching post at the Abd al-Aziz University.\textsuperscript{89} One of his students was Osama bin Laden. ‘Azzam soon became involved in the Afghan \textit{mujahdeen} struggle against the Soviet Union. In 1984, he moved to Peshawar, where he and bin Laden helped create Afghan resistance organisations under the guise of the Kuwaiti Red Crescent. It was there that the Afghan Service Bureau was formed; an umbrella organisation to fund and train \textit{mujahdeen}.

The Afghan Service Bureau (\textit{Maktab al-Khidmat}) was the first manifestation of the group of \textit{Salafists} who would go on to become \textit{al ‘Qaeda}. The funding front formed in Afghanistan from a band of volunteer \textit{mujahdeen}, who had congregated to fight Soviet Russia around 1984. Their first leader was ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam. Following the departure of the Soviets, Azzam decided not to disband, but to preserve his group for the greater struggle: to act as the vanguard of the new \textit{umma} in “the reconquest of the Muslim world.”\textsuperscript{90} ‘Azzam resettled the Bureau in Peshawar and Islamabad, and continued to provide assistance to \textit{mujahdeen} groups, despite the withdrawal of its Cold War financial backers.\textsuperscript{91}

In 1984, ‘Azzam had begun to write and publish \textit{Al Jihad}, a magazine designed to recruit and fundraise for the Afghan cause.\textsuperscript{92} His magazine extolled the virtue of individual action, and scorned waiting for a political authority to declare \textit{jihad}\textsuperscript{93} (bearing in mind that with the abolition of the Caliphate, no one had that authority). Those who did not participate with either deed or money were viewed as impious \textit{takfir}. His most important writings were \textit{Defense of

\textsuperscript{88} Kepel, \textit{Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam}; Schnelle, "Abdullah Azzam, Ideologue of Jihad: Freedom Fighter or Terrorist?".
\textsuperscript{89} Kepel, \textit{Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam}. p145
\textsuperscript{90} Philippe Migaux. “Al Qaeda.” Cited by Chaliand and Blin, \textit{The History of Terrorism}. p314
\textsuperscript{91} Ibid. p316
\textsuperscript{92} Kepel, \textit{Jihad: The Trail of Political Islam}. p146
\textsuperscript{93} Ibid. p146
Within a few years, he had struck up with the young millionaire, bin Laden, who became a primary financier of the Service Bureau.

Osama bin Laden (1957-2011) remains the most infamous terrorist of the Salafist movement. He has been the subject of extensive research. As noted by Bruce Lawrence, “[t]he more that is written about him it seems, the less he is understood.” His profile today fluctuates between that of a “kill and destroy” terrorist, and a Koranic-obsessed fundamentalist. Bin Laden was born into a wealthy Yemeni family, one of fifty-four children, and raised in Saudi Arabia. He enrolled in an engineering degree at al-Aziz University, where a compulsory component of the course was Islamic studies. Raised in a Wahhabi-friendly household, bin Laden was exposed to the teachings of ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam and Muhammad Qutb (the brother of Sayyid). In 1979, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, bin Laden turned his attention to Afghan refugees and raising funds for the mujahedeen. Soon, he formed a friendship with ‘Azzam and began setting up bases of operation for jihadists across Peshawar and Afghanistan. By 1986, he had transitioned from funding to actually engaging in battle against the Soviets.

It is thought that he may have fallen out with ‘Azzam around 1988, because he began building his own jihadi camps, and created a computer database of the thousands of volunteers and jihadi’s related to his camps. This created the term al ‘Qaeda: the [data] base. Within a year, ‘Azzam was dead in highly suspicious circumstances, and bin Laden took control of the Afghan Services Bureau. The group’s trajectory altered in 1989 with the new leadership.

---

94 ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam, “Join the Caravan.”
96 Ibid. p375
98 Ibid. p315
99 Ibid. p315
The Gulf War in 1991 was a defining time for bin Laden, freshly victorious from what many in the Salafist world perceived as their triumph over the Soviets. He offered the Saudi Royal Family the services of his Afghan mujahideen to repel the would-be Iraqi invaders – a request that was refused in such a way as to grievously offend bin Laden. Instead, the Saudi’s invited the United States in, and denied bin Laden the opportunity to be part of the official response. The Saudis attempted to contain bin Laden when his radicalism began to publicly manifest, but he evaded them and moved his operations to Sudan, where he heavily criticised the Saudi’s from afar. By 1996, he was unwelcome in Sudan as well, and moved to Afghanistan. Two years later, he was on the FBI’s most wanted list for terrorism, murder, and conspiracy. In another five years, al ’Qaeda was the most infamous terrorist groups in the world.

Under bin Laden, the ideology of al ’Qaeda changed: where ‘Azzam had focused on the reconquest of Islamic territory, bin Laden fixated on corrupt Muslim leaders and those who supported them. The movement of US troops to Saudi Arabia in 1991 was a defining moment for al ’Qaeda, as it fundamentally opposed the presence of Christian soldiers so close to the holy sites of Islam, Medina and Mecca. In 1997, a deal was struck between al ’Qaeda and the Taliban, which saw the opening of al ’Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan, and the creation of ties between the two groups, via honorary positions on each other’s councils. The concept of al ’Qaeda was being built as an international terrorist network: well-funded and well-trained. Since its inception, al’ Qaeda has been linked to ninety-nine armed assaults, thirty-four assassinations, two hundred and two bombings, and dozens of kidnappings. With the death of Osama bin Laden in 2012, Ayman al-Zawahiri took control of the group.
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The Egyptian Salafi, Ayman al-Zawahiri (b.1951) was a friend of ‘Azzam and bin Laden. Al-Zawahiri was from an elite and pious Muslim family, and gained a medical degree from Cairo University in 1974 with the highest honours. He went on to do a Ph.D. at a Pakistani university.\textsuperscript{106} When he was arrested by Egyptian authorities in 1981, many in his community were surprised to learn he had been engaging in, and leading, terrorist cells since the age of sixteen.\textsuperscript{107} Two events are thought to have radicalised him: the Arab-Israeli War of 1967,\textsuperscript{108} and the execution of Qutb.\textsuperscript{109} At a time when jihadi groups were proliferating in Egypt, it is hardly surprising al-Zawahiri had membership with so many, including a Salafi movement in 1972, a jihadi movement in 1973, and assuming leadership of a splinter group in 1975.\textsuperscript{110}

Al-Zawahiri became involved with Egyptian Islamic Jihad as the result of several groups merging. After the assassination of Sadat by EIJ, he was among the 1,200 people imprisoned throughout Egypt. Montasser al-Zayyat, also imprisoned as part of this scheme, believed that al-Zawahiri’s torture at the hands of Egyptian authorities was not proportional to his role in the assassination.\textsuperscript{111} He also had connections within the Egyptian Army as part of his belief that a military coup was another alternative means of achieving revolution. The Sadat government, having achieved its power through the Free Officers Coup, was harsher towards those who subverted its personnel. Under torture, al-Zawahiri is thought to have betrayed the whereabouts of one of his closest friends, Captain Esam al-Qamari and testified against him.\textsuperscript{112} Two years after his release from prison, al-Zawahiri went to Afghanistan and began working in field hospitals with mujahedeen. He also worked for the Kuwaiti Red Crescent in Peshawar, and established EIJ bases as he went.\textsuperscript{113} It is there, again in Peshawar, that his path crossed with bin Laden and ‘Azzam, and he forged strong ties with al ‘Qaeda. Within a few years, the two groups
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merged in earnest, and around a decade later in 2011, Ayman al-Zawahiri became leader of *al ‘Qaeda*. His most important writing is *Knights Under the Prophet’s Banner* and *Jihad, Martyrdom, and the Killing of Innocents*.\(^{114}\)

These people and groups were (and some continue to be) instrumental in the rise of *Salafi* terror in the Fourth Wave, all around the world. The way they understood Propaganda of the Deed, and the way in which it was implemented will be discussed in the following chapter. The long historical build-up for the political radicalisation of Islam: from the Golden Age through the Palestinian conflict, the Cold War, the Iranian Revolution, and the Gulf War was significant for modern *Salafi* radicalism in the fourth wave. Taymiyya and al-Banna remained rather abstract inspirations, unsurprising given the times when they lived. The others, such as bin Laden, made direct contributions to extremely radical theories and actions. How these manifested will now be discussed in Chapter Nine, Steel and Ideals.

\(^{114}\) Laqueur, *Voices of Terror*. pp426-433
Salafi terrorism has fixated the modern world since 2001, but two points must be remembered when investigating it. The first is that religious terrorism really began to take shape in 1979, and jihadi’s were largely dismissed, exploited, or ignored by the Western world through the last years of the Cold War and right up to the World Trade Center attack. The second point is that the religious wave of terrorism, while predominantly Salafi jihadism, is by no means exclusively so. Salafi, or jihadi terrorism is investigated here because it is the most representative within this period. However, religious terrorism also takes form in Christianity, Hinduism, and Sikhism for example. This chapter examines al ‘Qaeda and its affiliates’ use of Propaganda of the Deed: their theoretical purpose; the justification for violence, followed by the strategic, tactical, systematic campaigns they pursue. It will conclude by examining at the glorification of martyrdom in the scheme of exalting the revolution. It must be noted that while many attacks were undertaken directly by al ‘Qaeda, in others instances al ‘Qaeda provided financial assistance, training and advice for fighters, or inspiration for action.

Theoretical Purpose

The theoretical purpose of jihadist terrorism is based in its historical foundations and its contemporary mindset. The terrorists were, and continue to be, inspired by the idealistic memory of the Golden Age of Islam, and believed that this state of being is replicable today. The Golden Age of the Caliphate was the revolutionary abstraction. The quest to re-establish the Caliphate is intrinsic to the purpose of terrorism. Jihadist violence was necessary in order to pursue a complete and dramatic overhaul of society, to free the Islamic people from living in jahiliyya, and to live within the prescripts of Allah. The major propagandists of this purpose included Faraj, Qutb, and ‘Azzam.
"The Neglected Duty," written circa 1981, by Muhammad Salam Faraj argued that the reestablishment of the Caliphate, via *jihad*, is not simply an option for Muslims, but an obligation:

The establishment of an Islamic State and the reintroduction of the Caliphate were (not only) predicted by the Apostle of God – Gods peace be upon him – (but) (they) are, moreover, the Command of the Lord – Majestic and Exalted he is – for which every Muslim should exert every conceivable effort in order to execute it.¹

He implied that the establishment of the Caliphate was the direct command of Allah. Faraj claimed the highest Islamic authority to reinforce his argument. He stipulated that the time of Islamic awakening had come, and that upheaval was ordained:

God’s prescripts are an obligation for Muslims. Hence, the establishment of an Islamic State is an obligation for Muslims, for something which cannot be carried out becomes (itself) obligatory. If, moreover, such a state cannot be established without war then this war is an obligation as well.²

His argument of obligation is repeated dogmatically throughout "The Neglected Duty." The purpose of violence was to achieve the revolutionary abstraction: the Caliphate. It is held as the supreme goal, and the only manner in which Muslims can live appropriately under Islam. Until such a Caliphate was achieved, all Muslims lived in *jahiliyya*.

Qutb established the idea of *jahiliyya* being, not an abstract notion, but an active state dominating contemporary life, and one that was fundamentally at odds with the ideal Islamic society and culture. It represented the corruption of modern Islamic society, as Muslim societies did not live in accordance with the principles he advocated:

*Jahiliyyah* controls the practical world, and for its support there is a living and active organisation. In this situation, mere theoretical efforts to fight it cannot be even equal, much less superior, to it.³

Here, he hinted at action. He encouraged action, and described the dialectic between *jahiliyya* and a new system as a “battlefield.” Peaceful discussion was insufficient to overcome *jahiliyya*.

---

¹ Faraj, "The Neglected Duty". p162  
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³ Qutb, *Milestones*. p46
Only action could overcome the inaction, and only if it was displayed by a new group, “firmer
and more powerful than the existing jahili system.”

This group, Qutb hoped, would be under the leadership of the Prophet, foremost, and all other
leaders would act as his delegates. This earthly leader would

...cut off his relationship of loyalty from the jahili society, which he has forsaken, and from jahili
leadership, whether it be in the guise of priests, magicians or astrologers, or in the form of
political, social, or economic leaderships, as was the case of Quraish in the time of the Prophet –
peace be upon him. He will have to give his complete loyalty to the new Islamic movement and
to the Muslim leadership.

This new movement, and this new leader, were intrinsic to the struggle. The stance was as
uncompromising and totalitarian as any of the terrorist waves before them. This polarisation
divided ideological groups, without the potential for compromise. The revolution, the ideal
Muslim society, “cannot come into existence without this.” So, in order to obtain that idealised
existence, Qutb believed they needed a new group, led by a new leader, who would use action,
not just theory and words, to overcome the jahiliyya. The jahiliyya had to be expunged, for:

There is no other way of the revival of Islam in the shade of Jahiliyyah, in whatever age or
country it appears, except to follow its natural character and to develop it into a movement and
an organic system.

‘Azzam demonstrated a different approach: fard ayn. Fard ayn describes compulsory Muslim
obligations, such as prayer and fasting. ‘Azzam expanded upon this, to describe jihad in the
defence of Muslim lands as a fard ayn. He wrote Join the Caravan in 1987, during which he was
involved in the Afghan-Soviet War.

There is agreement among the mufassirin, muhaddithin, jurists and scholars of usul (religious
principles) that when the enemy enters an Islamic land or a land that once part of the Islamic
lands, it is obligatory on the inhabitants of that place to go forth and face the enemy... The
obligatory nature of jihad remains in effect until the lands are purified from the pollution of the
Disbelievers.

---
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‘Azzam preached the use of violence to cleanse the lands of the unbelievers, whom he also refers to as kuffar. He frequently quoted ibn Taymiyya and other scholars to reinforce his claim that jihad was a fard ayn. Donations were not sufficient, in his opinion. Physical jihad was required, or the “sin is not lifted off the necks of the Muslims...and none are saved from sin except those who perform jihad.”¹⁰ This was to expel the kuffar from the dar al-Islam, the abode of Islam.

The purpose of jihadi terrorism was the revolutionary abstraction, being the re-establishment of the Caliphate to bring forth a new Golden Age. This, (similar to the Irish terrorists) is an historical projection on a reimagined future. This purpose was explained as an obligation for all Muslims, and a pillar of Islam itself. Current society was under the influence of jahiliyya, and jihad was required to bring forth the revolutionary abstraction and restore Islam. The terrorists expanded on this further in order to justify the violence.

**Justification for Violence**

The purpose of terrorism was stated repeatedly as a religious obligation for every devout Muslim to act in defence of Islam. However, this interpretation was based on each propagandist’s personal interpretation of the Koran. Unlike ‘Azzam, neither Farj nor Qutb were accredited religious scholars. Faraj was entirely uneducated. So when the jihadi’s began launching their attacks in earnest in the 1990s, they were condemned by the moderate community as lacking theological legitimacy. The violence was justified in a variety of ways in an attempt to gain legitimacy. To do this, they used the Verse of the Sword and al-Adou al-Baeed rhetoric. Distrust for the mainstream media was also a component of the justification of violence. As well as Faraj, bin Laden, and al-Zawahiri were influential in this justification.

¹⁰ Ibid. p11
Faraj considered and rejected the notion of non-violent propaganda, instead of violent jihad, in 1979. While the goal to create a pure Islamic State is actually quite moderate, the use of violence to attain it, is not:

Some say that the right road to the establishment of an (Islamic) State is (nonviolent) propaganda (da’wah) only, and the creation of a broad base. This, however, does not bring about the foundation of an (Islamic) State...The truth is that an (Islamic) State can only be founded by a believing minority...\(^{11}\)

This disregard for popular revolution, and a belief in the small vanguard of radicals, is characteristic of all terrorist waves. Faraj believed the nonviolent approach was flawed because of the mainstream media. He believed that peaceful protest was inherently limited because the media was controlled by forces external to the jihadi’s. He wrote:

...how can (nonviolent) propaganda be widely successful when all the means of (mass) communication today are under the control of the pagan and wicked (State) and (under the control) of those who are at war with Gods religion?\(^{12}\)

His conclusion was that, while nonviolent propaganda must be employed in addition to jihad, it could not be the sole means of attracting support for an Islamic State.\(^{13}\) Popular support was to Faraj a negligible concern, for “Islam does not triumph by (attracting the support of) the majority.”\(^{14}\) Bin Laden also subscribed to this view: “Truth and falsehood are discerned through the Book [Koran] and the sunna – not by the amount of votes from the voters.”\(^{15}\)

The section of the Koran most cited to justify jihadi violence is referred to as the Verse of the Sword (Koran, 9.5). In this, Muhammad justified war in defence of Islam, though later verses have contradicted this to advocate peace and tolerance. The verse stipulates: “When the sacred month has slipped away, slay the polytheists wherever ye find them, seize them, beset them, lie
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in ambush for them everywhere.”\textsuperscript{16} This passage is contradicted by 114 later verses.\textsuperscript{17} However, the \textit{jihadists} reject the later verses:

\begin{quote}
To fight is, in Islam, to make supreme the Word of God in this world, whether it be by attacking or defending...
Islam is spread by the sword,* and under the very eyes of these Leaders of Unbelief who conceal it from mankind. After the (removal of these leaders), nobody has an aversion (to Islam)... * It is obligatory for the Muslims to raise their swords under the very eyes of the Leaders who hide the Truth and spread falsehoods.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

Faraj quoted preceding scholars to justify \textit{jihad} as a duty commanded by Allah, and therefore legitimate regardless of condemnation from the \textit{ulema}. The refusal of the intellectual community to condone acts of terrorism became a point of tension. In response, ‘Azzam published his fatwa \textit{In Defense of Muslim Lands}. He delved into the different sorts of \textit{jihad} – both offensive and defensive, and strove to demonstrate that \textit{jihad} was a \textit{fard al-ayn}, as obligatory a duty.\textsuperscript{19}

The effect of these internal Islamic tensions can be seen in an early bin Laden document, “Moderate Islam is a Prostration to the West.” Accepting \textit{jihad} as an obligation, he sought to attract parts of the community away from moderate Islamic leaders who condemned the \textit{jihadi} terrorism. He denounced the dialogue between the broader \textit{ulema} and the “West”, the blanket term bin Laden used for any who did not subscribe to his world view (but mostly represented by the United States). Of the moderates, he wrote:

\begin{quote}
[More] insistence from them that \textit{jihad} - what they have dubbed “struggle” – cannot produce good results for both parties, thereby disagreeing with the Word of Allah Most High: “You are obligated to fight, though you may hate it. For it may be well that you hate that which is good for you and love that which is evil for you. Allah knows [best]; you do not know” [2:216]. And His Word: “O you who have believed! Respond to Allah and the Messengers when he calls you to that which gave you life” [8:24]. And a faction of the original forefathers asserted: “\textit{Jihad} is what enlivens you.” And the saying of the Prophet: “No nation ever forsook \textit{jihad} without becoming degraded.”\textsuperscript{20}
\end{quote}
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Bin Laden combatted moderate condemnation by invoking the highest authorities: Allah and the Prophet. This was an attempt to show how the moderate community had transgressed against Islam, and were therefore implicit in Islam’s supposed decay. Hence:

We were expecting a jihad from them, but they are suddenly resolved to wage war against the mujahidin by way of dialogues and condemnation of the mujahidin. And this declaration is but the beginning; what’s to come is greater.\(^\text{21}\)

This also provides a glimpse into the totalitarian nature of bin Laden’s rhetoric. All those who do not support him are therefore against him, which he perceived as betrayal.

There was more to the justification of violence. Jihad as a fard al-ayn, for ‘Azzam, was both offensive and defensive, yet he did not seek to strike at non-Muslim regimes. He saw the enemy as kuffar who were on Islamic territory, adversaries in battle, indicated by an Imam, or if the kuffar captured or killed a Muslim.\(^\text{22}\) He did not advocate jihad against Western governments on their home soil. Faraj, likewise, prioritised the near enemy: al-Adou al-Qareeb, apostate regimes upheld by the West. The far enemy, al-Adou al-Baeed, was the West itself.

First: To fight an enemy who is near is more important than to fight an enemy who is far.
Second: Muslim blood must be shed in order to realize this victory.\(^\text{23}\)

Al-Zawahiri inverted this in “Loyalty and Enmity.”\(^\text{24}\) Al-Zawahiri painted an historical backdrop where acceptance of Israel and the Palestinian Mandate was Western imperialism borne by the United Nations, and

[against this backdrop of acquiescence to the will of the greatest criminals, those powers hostile to Islam – headed by the Neo-Crusaders – have succeeded in subjugating the governments of our lands to do their militaristic and economic bidding.\(^\text{25}\)]

Here, he referred to oil and the presence of Western troops in the Gulf Peninsula. This is where the ideology of jihad takes form and justified the violence towards Western states. Those who
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\(^{25}\) Ibid. p103
upheld the apostasy of corrupt regimes in the Middle East became legitimate targets of violent *jihad*.

The transition of violence was justified using the Verse of the Sword, to legitimise violence against enemies. While the focus was originally on the near enemy, this was shifted to the far enemy, justifying attacks on Western states and targets, while citing regional causes for discontent. Violence was also justified due to the failure of peaceful protest to be reported accurately in the media, as the media was seen as controlled by enemies of Islam. The violence was therefore in defence of Islam and against the nations which the terrorists saw as imperialists responsible for the decay of Islam. And *jihad*, as already demonstrated, was the moral obligation of all Muslims. It would not take long for this to manifest as action with greater strategic intent.

**Strategic Method**

The strategic method of *jihadi* groups involved the exploitation of spectacular acts, but with it, they also brought the unspoken strategy of maximisation, catering to the international media. This section examines the strategic aspects of *jihadi* terror within the propaganda. Spectacular attacks, assassination, hostage-taking, and targeting are discussed.

By far the most significant and spectacular terrorist attack of the modern century occurred on 11 September 2001. *Al Qaeda* launched a four-pronged attack against symbolic targets in the United States. American Airlines flight 11 was hijacked, and flown into the north tower of the World Trade Centre in New York at 8:46am; United Airlines flight 175 struck the south tower fifteen minutes later; another half hour later, American Airlines flight 77 struck the Pentagon; finally, twenty minutes after that, United Airlines flight 93 crashed into a field in Pennsylvania, presumably *en route* to the White House.²⁶ Nearly 3000 people died, and damages reached around US$7 billion.²⁷ One month after the event, *Al Jazeera* broadcast bin Laden’s “Oath of
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America,” filmed earlier with the request it be aired when the US launched direct action against
the Taliban:

Allah Most High has struck America in its most vulnerable spot, destroying its mighty buildings, praise be unto him. Look at America – filled with fear from north to south, east to west – all praise be to Allah. What America is tasting today is but a fraction of what we have been tasting for decades: Our umma has been tasting this humiliation and contempt for over eighty years.28

Bin Laden capitalised on the spectacular impact throughout his propaganda after the event. Within the breadth of the texts examined, there was no forewarning that an attack of such a massive scale was encouraged, which no doubt contributed to the success of the operation. However, as discussed above, the Verse of the Sword was taken as a legitimisation of uninhibited violence.

Other tracts, such as “Jihad, Martyrdom and the Killing of Innocents” by al-Zawahiri, legitimised the killing of Muslims and innocent collateral, such as occurred in the September 11 attacks. In this treatise, prior to September 11, al-Zawahiri wrote:

Bombarding the organizations of the infidels and apostates in this day and age has become an imperative of jihad in our war with the idolatrous tyrants, where weakened mujahidin battle massive and vigilant armies armed to the teeth: It has become next to impossible to confront them in open warfare.29

Therefore, according to al-Zawahiri’s logic, attacks on innocents were permitted by the Koran. The Muslims killed in the attacks were rebranded as apostates, kuffars, or owed blood payment. Al-Zawahiri stated that those payments were only permissible if the money was not needed for jihad: therefore, the Muslims killed in attacks are martyrs.30 Regardless of the theological specifics, the spectacular nature of the September 11 attacks cannot be denied, and the event continues to be discussed as a watershed moment.31

______________________________
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Assassination is more openly discussed in the *al ’Qaeda Manual*, with lessons about how this can be achieved. Chapter Fourteen discusses “elementary operations”, including drive-by shootings for targets on public transport, blocking in a target’s car in the street, as one entered a building, and in transit to or from work, with case studies for each operation and advice on how to avoid errors.\(^{32}\) This was a deliberate exploitation of *en route* opportunism. The assassination lesson was then expanded to include bombings, as the *Manual* stated:

> Explosives are believed to be the safest weapon for the mujahidin. [Using explosives] allows them to get away from enemy personnel and to avoid being arrested. An assassination using explosives doesn’t leave any evidence or traces at the operation site. In addition, explosives strike the enemy with sheer terror and fright.\(^{33}\)

The *Manual* then provides explanations about preparing the explosives, including the required fuse length, and detonation methods. The case studies included an undated bombing of an Egyptian Interior Minister’s car, and the bombing of a bar in Egypt in 1947, allegedly by the Muslim Brotherhood.\(^{34}\)

Whether *jihadi’s* found the *Manual* useful or not, high-profile assassination is highly prevalent. It also has a rich history in Afghanistan, with political, military, governmental, and police figures considered viable targets. *Al’Jazeera* reported that nineteen figures were assassinated between 2006 and 2012.\(^{35}\) Victims included Dr Abdullah Laghmani, of the National Directorate of Security, killed in a suicide attack in 2009; Jan Mohamma Khan, a former governor of the troubled Uruzgan province and presidential aide to Hamid Karzai, shot by gunmen equipped with suicide vests in 2011; Ahmad Khan, a parliamentarian, blown-up by a suicide bomber at his daughter’s wedding in 2012; and various police chiefs and governors.\(^{36}\) Three female Directors of Women’s Affairs were assassinated: Safia Amajan in 2006, Hanifa Safi in 2012, and her successor Najia Siddiqi in December the same year.\(^{37}\) Beyond Afghanistan, the most spectacular
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assassination by jihadi’s was the killing of Egyptian President Anwar al’Sadat by Egyptian Islamic Jihad and Gama’l al’Islamiya in 1981.38 Sadat was overseeing a military parade commemorating the 1973 war against Israel, when jihadi’s concealed in the procession attacked the presidential stand with grenades and machine guns, killing Sadat and wounding several others.39

The al ‘Qaeda Manual addressed hostage taking in the same chapter as assassinations, but with less detailed instruction.40 The most well-known cases of jihadi kidnapping were that of American journalist Daniel Pearl, a Wall Street Journal reporter who was kidnapped and beheaded in 2002 on the orders of al ‘Qaeda affiliate, Omar Sheikh; followed by Nick Berg, a Philadelphian contractor.41 Berg was kidnapped in 2004 by an al ‘Qaeda cell in Iraq led by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, soon to be dubbed as the “slaughtering sheik”42 by the Western press – a misleading term considering al-Zarqawi was a poorly educated Jordanian delinquent with a long criminal record.43 Zarqawi was responsible for Berg’s kidnapping, and attracted vast publicity when he slit Berg’s throat, and beheaded him in an amateur propaganda film made widely available.44 Following the killing of Berg, and the propaganda it accrued, there was a spate of kidnapping throughout Iraq, although statistics cannot differentiate between those undertaken by enterprising criminal gangs, and those in pursuit of terrorist goals. This is particularly difficult, as Iraq in 2003 was invaded by the Coalition governments as part of the War on Terror, and therefore experienced a general breakdown in civil order. Regardless, the Financial Times capitalised on the kidnapping panic in its story “No Easy Cure for Iraq’s Kidnapping Pandemic”.
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with David Gardner writing: “nobody is safe, absolutely no one,” and describing the kidnappings as a plague, a pandemic, a haemorrhage, and a business all in one 900 word article.45

This attitude exhibited by Gardner is significant as an outcome of unselective targeting in the jihadi terror strategy. There were some religious prohibitions addressed by al-Zawahiri which made it difficult for the jihadis to legitimise killing women, children, and innocents. Indeed, the indiscriminate nature of jihadi targeting is partly why al ‘Qaeda was perceived as such a threat to the West.46 In May 1998, bin Laden justified assaults on civilians as the price of democracy. As civilians in democracies elect their governments, they are responsible for their government’s actions and thereby legitimate targets. Bin Laden wrote:

If people do not wish to be harmed inside their own countries, they should seek to elect governments that are truly representative of them and can protect their interests... 47

And again in December 1998:

Every American man is an enemy – whether he fights us directly or pays his taxes...This is a people whose votes are won when he kills innocents; a people who, after their president commits adultery and great [sins] sees only his popularity rise – a depraved people who can never understand the meaning of values.48

While targeting the civilians of the Western world is indicative of the unselective nature of targeting, it did not negated the symbolism inherent in the target itself. The 9/11 attacks were highly symbolic: striking at the economic, military, and political centres of the United States. The geographic symbolism was also important: Manhattan, New York, is one of the cultural epicentres of the Western world. This spread the message, echoed by Gardner, that the Western way of life was under attack, and no one was safe.

47 Osama bin Laden, “The Price of American Democracy,” cited in Catherwood, A Brief History of the Middle East. p280
48 Ibid. p281
The strategy used by the jihadis exploited a combination of assassination, high-profile hostage taking, and both selective and unselective targeting. These attacks were designed to have maximum media impact, duly exploited in both written and video propaganda. The targets, including civilians, carried with them a symbolic significance, and a symbolic responsibility for the actions of their governments. This, more so than the assassination of high-ranking individuals, contributed to the perception of an atmosphere of terror.

**Tactical Method**

This atmosphere of terror was exacerbated by the tactical method. The religious terror in the earlier years of this wave was predominantly undertaken by Egyptian Islamic Jihad, while the later years were dominated by al’ Qaeda. This took tactical form in vehicle bombings, which incorporated martyrdom, and innovation in detonation methods. Suicide attacks predated Salafi jihadism, and became a high profile method of attack. This, coupled with the proliferation of military-grade weapons in the Middle East, has shaped the tactics of Salafi terror.

After the assassination of Sadat, vehicle-born bombings (referred to as VBIEDS) became a central tactic of Salafi terrorism as early as 1983. The *al ‘Qaeda Manual* noted previously:

> Explosives are believed to be the safest weapon for Mujahideen. [Using explosives] allows them to get away from enemy personnel and to avoid being arrested.

The benefits of bombings were readily apparent, and terrorists taught each other how to use them in instructional manuals. This indicates a desire to gain technical proficiency and avoid the failures of amateurism. Despite the indications in the *Manual* that explosives allowed the terrorists to survive attacks and conserve members, these vehicle bombings soon incorporated a suicide element. The most dramatic of the early attacks was not by EIJ at all. On 18 April 1983, the Shia Islamic Group (which later morphed into Hezbollah) bombed the US Embassy in Beirut. The suicide bomber drove a truck laden with over 900kg of explosives into the US Embassy,

---
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killing sixty-three, with seventeen American dead, including CIA agents.\footnote{CIA, "Flashback: April 18, 1983: U.S Embassy Attacked in Beirut," Central Intelligence Agency. np} This successful attack, although conducted by Shiites, inspired the EIJ. Vehicle bombings progressed throughout the eighties and nineties. The unique fusion of suicide bombing and vehicle bombing had a single important outcome: maximisation. It maximised visual effect, casualties, and damage.

By 2003, the tactical utility of IEDs altered again, prompted partly by the invasion of Iraq. Although VBIEDs remained a tactic, there was a rise in roadside IEDs directed at Western forces but killing indiscriminately. Many of these were remotely-detonated as Western forces entered the bomb radius. John Bokel’s \textit{Asymmetric Warfare} found that, by 2007, IEDs accounted for around 52 percent of US casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq.\footnote{Bokel, "IEDs in Asymmetric Warfare." p34} It was found that 38 percent of IEDs were detonated remotely, 17 percent were vehicle-born, 10 percent were timed, and others were triggered through victim-operation, suicide attacks, or by command-wire.\footnote{Ibid. p35} In addition, the \textit{Military Review} noted over 90 different ways that IEDs could be detonated; among them, solar and tank-tread detonations.\footnote{Ezio Bonsignore, David Eshel, and Richard Garland, "Countering the IED Threat," ibid.30, no. 6 (2006). p109} One trend shows IEDs comprised of ‘daisy-chained’ artillery rounds, commonly large calibre 122 or 152mm howitzer shells.\footnote{Ibid. p114} Other statistics from iCasualty.org indicate that IED fatalities for Coalition troops peaked in 2009 at 60.98 percent of the total.\footnote{iCasualty.org, Icasualties: Operation Enduring Freedom, (http://icasualties.org/OEF/index.aspx: iCasualty, 2009).}

Despite Bokel finding only 2 percent of IEDs were triggered by suicide terrorists, a significant number of studies have focused on this phenomenon, most likely because its propaganda appeal captured Western imaginations. This research was prompted by the attack on the World Trade Towers, but as already shown, EIJ began using suicide-operated explosives as far back as the 1980s. Another early suicide bombing by EIJ was their attempted car-bombing of the Emir of Kuwait in Kuwait City on 26 May 1985. An EIJ operative drove a car packed with explosives...
into the Emir’s motorcade outside Sief Palace, killing four and injuring eleven, while the Emir himself suffered only superficial injuries.\(^57\) Suicide terrorism within the Salafi jihadist movement, therefore, began well ahead of al ‘Qaeda. Robert Pape’s \textit{Dying to Win} is not the only study on al ‘Qaeda’s suicide terror, but by far the most quantitatively comprehensive.\(^58\) This study counted seventy-one successful suicide terrorists who operated on behalf of al ‘Qaeda between the years of 1995 and 2003.\(^59\) Pape found that al ‘Qaeda suicide attackers were typically from working and middle classes, middle-income, and well-educated “politically conscious individuals.”\(^60\) Suicide-bombers, essentially human-delivery systems, were (and are) favoured because they produced greater fatality rates.\(^61\)

Explosives were not the only weapon used in this wave. Indeed, the \textit{al’Qaeda Manual} opened with:

\begin{quote}
The confrontation we are calling for with the apostate regimes does not know Socratic debates..., Platonic ideals..., nor Aristotelian diplomacy. But it knows the dialogue of bullets, the ideals of assassination, bombing, and destruction, and the diplomacy of the cannon and the machine gun.\(^62\)
\end{quote}

Small arms formed a vital part of tactics, particularly the AK-47. The weapon is historically evocative, symbolising battle prowess, national liberation, and appearing to reinforce the myth of jihadi defeat of the Soviet Union. The most notable assault with AK-47s was in 1981, when Sadat was assassinated by AK-47 wielding jihadis.\(^63\) Suicide terrorists of the Kashmir valley are said to instruct their families “do not let my Kalashnikov fall” in martyrdom testaments.\(^64\) However, by far the goriest reminder of the conventional weapon threat was the Luxor
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Massacre in Egypt. On 17 November 1997, terrorists of al’Gama’a a’Islamiya, allies of EIJ and linked to al ‘Qaeda, carried out an attack at Luxor, close to the Temple of Queen Hatshepsut. Fifty-eight tourists were killed with automatic weapons, while others suffered knife wounds. General statistics corroborate the claim that conventional weapons still played a large part in terrorism. A US report claimed that 10,999 terrorist attacks occurred in 2009. Of those, 4,842 involved armed assaults. Of the 32,664 injured in the total number of attacks, 6,609 (just over 20 percent) were injured directly by firearms. This may be due to the proliferation of arms throughout the Middle East since the invasion of Iraq, during which significant stockpiles were stolen from unguarded facilities like Al’Qaqaa. Another contributing factor was, of course, the armament of mujahedeen by the United States during the Cold War.

Firearms and explosives were intrinsic to al ‘Qaeda and EIJ’s tactics. They, like the anarchists, issued instructional manuals on how to use these weapons, exhibiting a clear desire to gain technical proficiency in order to avoid errors. Some of these weapons were also stolen from official supplies. They innovated by combining VBIEDs with suicide bombing to ensure success. They also demonstrated an exploitation of en route opportunism, as demonstrated by instructions in the al ‘Qaeda Manual.

**Systematic Campaign**

The tactical and strategic elements combined into a systematic campaign. Central to the endurance of the terrorist campaign was operating in anonymity, hidden either in broken or urban terrain. The escalation differed from previous terrorists, combining systematic attacks with spectacular impact attacks. Exhaustion too, was represented in a different way, through invoking earlier attacks and projecting them as the coming future.

---
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The *al ‘Qaeda Manual* provided instruction on campaigns in Chapter Four, regarding the organisation of bases. This comes with twenty-two security precautions on how to operate in either urban or rural terrorspaces to avoid being caught. Chapter Eight elaborated on camouflage. The terrorist shall:

Not reveal his true name to the Organization’s members who are working with him... Have a general appearance that does not indicate Islamic orientation (beard, toothpick, book, [long] shirt, small Koran)... Avoid visiting famous Islamic places (mosques, libraries, Islamic fairs, etc.).

The intention here was to be anonymous in the terrorspace by hiding within the general population. This strategy links religious terrorism with ideological terrorism: terrorists are able to forsake certain tenets of belief for the purpose of their ideology. This concept is taken further in the next translation. The terrorist must:

Not get involved in advocating good and denouncing evil in order not to attract attention to himself... Not causing any trouble in the neighbourhood where he lives or at a place of work... Not park in no-parking zones and not take photographs where it is forbidden.

These precautions were designed to make *jihadis* appear as moderate Muslims. This would enhance their endurance as terrorists, and ensure that the attacks went ahead unimpeded.

This caution was coupled with the outward propaganda which, as in the waves before it, claimed that it could endure forever. Bin Laden’s message to the Americans in 2003 stated:

...I say to the American people: we will continue to fight you and continue to conduct martyrdom operations inside and outside American until you depart from your oppressive course, abandon your follies, and rein in your madmen.

Know that we are counting our dead...We are going to take revenge for them from your blood, as we did on the day of New York [9/11]. Remember what I said to you about that day regarding our security and your security. Baghdad – the seat of the Caliphate – will never fall to you, by Allah’s grace, and we will fight you as long as we carry our guns. If we fall, our sons will replace us.

This combination of practical survival and threatening rhetoric emphasised endurance. The *Manual* aimed to ensure the endurance of *al ‘Qaeda* members, and rhetoric presented them as

---
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an unstoppable, exhausting force which would never give up, and never cease. Invoking the
memory the World Trade Towers attack was powerful propaganda, and with it, the threat of
another attack of similar proportions. This threat would not end with their deaths, but would
endure through generations to come.

The campaign of violence had two overlapping trajectories that eventually merged: that of
Islamic Jihad in the 1980’s and that of al ‘Qaeda from the 1990’s onward. EIJ’s overt campaign
took off in 1981 with the assassination of Sadat. The region remained tumultuous, as two years
later, the Shia Islamic Group bombed of the US Embassy in Beirut (an attack that would inspire
Hezbollah to attack American Marine and French Paratrooper Barracks in Beirut in 1983, killing
over three hundred). It escalated with a spate of kidnappings in Lebanon in 1984, abducting the
US Embassy officer and CIA station chief, William Buckley, who was tortured and is believed to
have died in captivity eighteen months later. In December 1984, EIJ hijacked a Kuwaiti Airbus
Flight KU-221 en route to Tehran, in which two Americans were killed and another two
tortured. There was also the car-bombing of the Emir of Kuwait in 1985.

The first strike by al ‘Qaeda against the US occurred in in Mogadishu in 1993. American troops
were there for humanitarian purposes, but in December 1993, they were tasked with arresting
one of the city’s warlords, who were affiliated with al ‘Qaeda. A fifteen-hour street battle
ensued, and a Black Hawk helicopter was shot down, leaving eighteen Americans dead and
seventy-three injured. President Clinton withdrew the troops. The Somalian warlords were
armed and trained by al ‘Qaeda, and they claimed this as their mutual victory. In his first
fatwa in 1996, Bin Laden wrote:

...when tens of your soldiers were killed in minor battles and one American Pilot was dragged
through the streets of Mogadishu you left the area carrying disappointment, humiliation, defeat
and your dead with you. Clinton appeared in front of the whole world threatening and
promising revenge, but these threats were merely preparation for a withdrawal. You have been
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disgraced by Allah and you withdrew; the extent of your impotence and weakness became very clear.  

Emboldened by what he saw as the cowardice of the West, bin Laden escalated his attacks internationally. In 1993, he was complicit in the failed truck-bombing of the World Trade Towers. In 1996, he was allegedly financially involved with the Party of God when it detonated a 1,800kg truck-bomb at the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, killing nineteen. In 1998, there were multiple bombing attacks on American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in which more than 250 people died, provoking President Clinton to call airstrikes against al ‘Qaeda. In 2000, he arranged the maritime bombing of the USS Cole. This before his most spectacular attack: September 11.

The spectacular systematic campaign of al ‘Qaeda did not end in 2001. In October 2002, a backpack bomb exploded inside Paddy’s Bar in Bali, Indonesia, followed by a second larger car-bomb outside the Sari Nightclub. The death toll reached two hundred. The Bali Bombings were significant because they required cooperation among terrorist groups around the globe: foremost among them, al ‘Qaeda, Jemaah Islamiyah, and possibly Laksar Jihad. Two years later, on 11 March, ten co-ordinated explosions tore through four of Madrid’s commuter trains. Around 196 were killed and 1,400 wounded in what the New York Times described as the “deadliest terrorist attack on a European target since World War II.” An al ‘Qaeda spokesman went on record saying:

We declare our responsibility for what happened in Madrid exactly two-and-a-half years after the attacks on New York and Washington...This is in response to the crimes you have caused in the world, specifically Iraq and Afghanistan, and there will be more, if God wills it.
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This statement is exemplary of Propaganda of the Deed: it claims ownership of the terror, reminds its victims of past terror, and also threatens future terror. The threat of more attacks was powerful propaganda.

Escalation was systematic. In July 2005, London was bombed. In this attack, three explosions occurred simultaneously on the Circle Line near Aldgate, on the Circle Line near Edgware Road, and the Piccadilly Line near Kings Cross in central London. An hour later, a fourth explosion struck a bus near Tavistock Square. The four bombers, three of whom were native Londoners and affiliated with al ’Qaeda, killed fifty-six people and injured around seven hundred. Al-Zawahiri stated:

> London’s blessed raid is one of the raids which Jama’īt Qa‘īdat al’jiḥād (Al Qa‘īdah of Jiḥād Group) was honoured to launch… In the Wills of the hero brothers, the knights of monotheism - may God have mercy on them, make paradise their final abode and accept their good deeds.\(^\text{80}\)

The extent of al ‘Qaeda’s involvement is not known, but as with Jemaah Islamiyah, the extent of al ‘Qaeda operational involvement does not limit the propaganda value of its symbolic involvement. On the eve of the 2002 Bali Bombing anniversary in 2005, Jemaah Islamiyah again bombed two tourist resorts, killing twenty-six. This attack was part of what al ‘Qaeda called “The Great Ramadan Offensive,” despite reports that only Jemaah Islamiyah was responsible.\(^\text{81}\)

The steady pulse of spectacular attacks resulted in an abnormally high number of casualties. The maximisation of casualties was a new twist. It enhanced media coverage, and exacerbated the perception of the threat, and the tension in the terrorspace. From 2010 to 2014, there was a 58 percent rise in Salafi-jihad groups with links to al ‘Qaeda, according to Seth Jones. He found the number doubled between 2007 and 2013, prompted most likely by the unrest in Syria.\(^\text{82}\)


\(^{81}\) "Bali Terrorist Blast Kill at Least 26," CNN 2 October 2005. np

enemy’ in the Middle East, instead of hard American targets.\textsuperscript{83} His study also attributed the endurance of these groups to the high level of decentralisation of the \textit{al ‘Qaeda} network, which made it less vulnerable to government decapitation strategies.\textsuperscript{84}

The systematic campaigns of \textit{al ‘Qaeda} and EIJ combined endurance, escalation, and exhaustion on an international and spectacular level, which attests to the organisation and professionalism of the network. Instructional manuals taught terrorists how to endure by blending into their terrorspace. Propaganda waxed eloquent about the inexhaustible nature of the \textit{jihadis}, while they escalated the continuous blows systematically around the world, glorifying those who undertook them.

\textbf{Glorification}

The exaltation of the \textit{jihadi} revolution and the glorification of martyrdom was coached in a variety of ways, but also drew heavily on history. Terrorists used the Afghan-Soviet paradigm, invoking the memory of the crusades and the wonders of paradise as depicted in the Koran. The glorification of martyrdom also featured heavily in the literature. This is hardly surprising owing to the prevalence of suicide attacks which largely characterised \textit{Salafi} terror. The terrorists glorified the collective martyrdoms of their members, and exhibited a paradigmatic shift away from the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm, instead displaying a Terror in pursuit of Death mindset, where death was the primary objective and terror was merely the means.

\textbf{Escalation}

The Afghan-Soviet paradigm was identified by Ibrahim in the \textit{al ‘Qaeda Reader}. The paradigm draws on the myth of the superpower and the ‘defeat’ of the Soviets in the invasion of Afghanistan. The defeat of the Soviets is transposed to the United States, and the terrorist goals appear achievable. An \textit{al’ Qaeda} statement in 1998 demonstrated this:

\begin{quote}
We believe those who waged \textit{jihad} in Afghanistan did more than their duty. They found out with meagre resources – a few RPGs, a few anti-tank mines, and a few Kalashnikovs – the myth of the mightiest military known to mankind was annihilated: the greatest military machine was
\end{quote}
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annihilated, and with it the myth of the so-called superpower. Moreover, we are convinced that America is much weaker than Russia...\(^85\)

Afghanistan, in this paradigm, became the graveyard of superpowers, owing that defeat entirely to the actions of the mujahedeen. The paradigm exalted the revolution because it took the perception of American strength, transposed it with the failure of the Soviets, and in doing so, belittled American power and thereby enhanced the likelihood of jihadi success. This was confirmed by bin Laden in an interview in 2001:

> In the past when al-Qaeda fought them with the mujahidin, we were told, “Wow, can you defeat the Soviet Union?” The Soviet Union scared the whole world then... Where is that power now? We barely remember it.
> Allah, who provided us with His support and kept us steadfast until the Soviet Union was defeated, is able to provide us once more with His support to defeat America on the same land and with the same people. We believe that the defeat of America is possible, with the help of Allah, and is even easier for us, Allah permitting, than the defeat of the Soviet Union was before.\(^86\)

The revolutionary abstraction becomes achievable. No reference is made to specific circumstances of the withdrawal of the Soviet Union, and non-Afghan factors. One of the terms used by al ‘Qaeda to describe the Americans is “paper tiger” – a term used by Mao to describe his opponent, which may indicate familiarity with revolutionary literature.\(^87\)

The past glories were exalted and combined with more historical mythology that polarised the conflict: that of the crusades. On 16 September 2001, US President George W. Bush gave a speech regarding the proposed American response to the World Trade Towers attack. He infamously said:

> This is a new kind of – this is a new kind of evil. And we understand. And the American people are beginning to understand. This crusade, this war against terrorism, is going to take a while. And the American people must be patient. I’m going to be patient.\(^88\)

---
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The term ‘crusade’ caused immediate controversy in European political circles, but had greater significance in terrorist propaganda. It gave jihadi’s, particularly bin Laden, the fuel needed to position the conflict in polarised terms of East against West, Islam against Christianity, a primordial clash of civilisations. Bin Laden first used the term in a fatwa in 1998, referring to the West as “crusader armies spreading like locusts,” and Bush’s statement played right into his projected exemplar. In October 2001, bin Laden said:

Our goal is for our nation to unite in the face of the Christian Crusaders. This is the fiercest battle. Muslims have never faced anything bigger than this... Bush divided the world into two: “either with us or with terrorism.”

Bin Laden had called Western imperialism a crusade for years, and the American response gave him ammunition to frame the conflict as a threat to every Muslim. His propaganda presented his campaign as a defensive measure, championing the entire Islamic world, and with the weight of selectively chosen history on its side. No longer was the revolution the interest of only an extreme political minority: it was now able to be portrayed as the salvation of Islam, therefore validating the legitimacy of a projected future based on a reimagined past.

And of course, Islam itself was used to motivate. The politico-religious purpose of this Wave was its central purpose and legitimisation. The personal efforts of the jihadi would yield personal rewards and exaltation. The propaganda was tailored specifically to recruit martyrs, and exalted their sacrifice. It also tempted them with rewards. The martyr would receive all the wonders of paradise, and be exalted over other Muslims. In his fatwa in 1996, bin Laden extolled the rewards of paradise:

martyr privileges are guaranteed by Allah; forgiveness with the first gush of his blood, he will be shown his seat in paradise, he will be decorated with the jewels of belief (Imaan), married off to the beautiful ones, protected from the test in the grave, assured security in the day of judgement, crowned with the crown of dignity, a ruby of which is better than this whole world (Dunia) and its’ entire content, wedded to seventy two of the pure Houries (beautiful ones of Paradise) and his intercession on the behalf of seventy of his relatives will be accepted.

_____________________
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The individual is assured glory in the afterlife. The glory would not be just to the revolution, but to each individual (and their families) who participated, and expected to last an eternity. The terrorists glorified the collective sacrifice of martyrs above individuals. This particular exaltation ties in closely with the prolific martyrdom propaganda.

**Martyrdom**

Contemporary martyrdom broke the paradigm and shifted towards Terror in the pursuit of Death, where death is the primary objective and terror is merely the method. Self-destruction, in *jihadi* terror, was the primary objective, along with high kill rates, to the point that the terror itself is almost secondary. Dying for Allah, rather than dying in order to achieve a mission’s success, characterised this martyrdom. The effectiveness of suicide terrorism was demonstrated by Robert Pape in *Dying to Win*, and Mia Bloom in *Death Becomes Her*. The terrorists were able to manage their fatalities, choose the victims, time, place, and impact. While the modern suicide vest was lined with bolts, nails, and plastic explosive, many master bomb-makers added rat poison to encourage bleeding, thereby increasing the likelihood of death. The propaganda surrounding Islamic martyrdom operations gives this act a greater strategic relevance, and a higher psychological impact.

Early discussion of martyrdom in Faraj’s *Neglected Duty* would in some ways define the way in which martyrdom was glorified in the propaganda. A fine distinction was made: the *act* of martyrdom was highly glorified, while the individual martyrs were not. The names of martyrs are rarely mentioned in official propaganda (although that statement may not apply to word-of-mouth propaganda).

> On the authority of Ibn Masu – may God be pleased with him -, who said: ‘be careful not to say: So-and-So died a martyr, or was killed a martyr,’ for there is the man who fights for booty and the man who fights to be remembered and the man who fights so that his standing will be seen.

---
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The glorification of martyrdom depends on the intent; those who die for the glory, or remembrance are ordered to be “dragged on his face until he was thrown into the fire.”\textsuperscript{94} The intention must be to die for Allah, and the glory must go to Allah. This principle was not applied so stringently by later propagandists – like other prohibitions. For example, Faraj was opposed to the killing of women, and old men, however killing the children as an extension of killing the father was permissible.\textsuperscript{95}

The enticement to become a martyr was further explored in ‘Azzam’s \textit{Join the Caravan}. He gave ten reasons for \textit{jihad}, the eighth of which was the hope for martyrdom. Here, martyrdom is a reason to engage in \textit{jihad}: death in pursuit of terror. This is because the martyr accrued seven special favours from Allah, as bin Laden later emphasised:

- He is forgiven with the first spurt of his blood,
- He sees his place in Paradise,
- He is clothed in the garment of Faith,
- He is wed with seventy-two wives from the beautiful Houris of Paradise ,
- He is saved from the punishment of the grave, and he is protected from the Great Terror on Qiymah,
- On his head is place a crown of dignity, the jewel of which is better than the world and all it contains
- He is granted intercession for seventy people of his household.\textsuperscript{96}

‘Azzam does not address or discuss the legitimacy of martyrdom. He wrote as though it was a completely acceptable practice, and advertised it as a matter of process. Only the benefits are discussed, and the finality of death is avoided. Martyrdom here is a reason for \textit{jihad}, rather than merely being a necessary component of \textit{jihad}. This differs markedly from the glorification by those who followed him.

Before the 2001 attacks, al-Zawahiri was implicated in the writing of a document entitled “\textit{Jihad, Martyrdom, and the Killing of Innocents}.” This document used various hadiths to justify attacks against people who are normally considered non-combatants under traditional Islamic
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law: dhimmis, women, and children. It also eloquently justified and glorified martyrdom. In one story al-Zawahiri quoted the prophet:

When the Quraish approached, he [Muhammad] said: “whoever repels them from us gains Paradise; he will be my companion in the Garden.’ So one of the Ansar advanced and fought til he was slain. Thus whoever sacrifices his life in order to enjoin what is good and forbid what is evil attains the highest level of martyrdom." 97

Al-Zawahiri invoked the highest authority in glorifying the actions of the martyr. The audience for this tract was likely the general Islamic community. He borrowed the authority of the Prophet Muhammad to reinforce his argument, required because it attempted to justify the killing of unarmed women, children, and other Muslims, in addition to martyrdom operations.

The legitimisation of martyrdom was repeated, for suicide is forbidden in Islam. Its glorification was presented in diverse ways depending on the audience. For example, in Iraq, where most of the casualties of martyrdom operations were Muslim people, suicide attacks were glorified in a different manner. In a 2002 communique which bin Laden issued to the citizens of Iraq, he stressed the necessity of martyrdom operations:

The enemy’s greatest fear is urban and street warfare – warfare that the enemy knows will produce grave and costly human losses. We also stress the importance of martyrdom operations against the foe – operations that have inflicted harm on American and Israel the likes of which have never before been witnessed in their history. 98

He is referring to the World Trade Centre attacks, and to the death toll in Israel due to suicide bombing. And he is correct in this statement: suicide operations had proven most effective in America and Israel. Singer, Cohen, and Stein found that most of the 412 casualties (mainly civilian) in Israel between 2000 and 2003 were victims of suicide bombing. 99

Yet, in Iraq, where the Islamic audience may have been more receptive to theological glorification, bin Laden justified the martyrdom operations on tactical grounds, possibly due to

98 Osama bin Laden. “To the Muslims of Iraq.” Ibid. pp246-247
the fact that Iraqis were among the casualties. In October 2002, bin Laden responded to a letter written by sixty Americans, using yet another justification for martyrdom. In “Why we are fighting you,” bin Laden used religious justification, borrowing the authority of a hadith:

The umma of Martyrdom – the umma that desires death more than you desire life:
“Think not of those who are killed in the way of Allah as dead. Nay, they are alive with their lord, and they are being provided for. They rejoice in what Allah has bestowed upon them from His bounty and rejoice for the sake of those who have not yet joined them, but are left behind [not yet martyred] for on them no fear shall come, nor shall they grieve.”

Here, bin Laden represented martyrdom as a joy and an honour, quoting a hadith that appeared to confirm his position. This is can be understood as an attempt to convince the moderate audience of the validity of martyrdom operations. But it was double-edged, in that it also glorified martyrdom within the greater, international Islamic community: the martyr who could feel no fear, no pain, who was untouchable. This enticement was often repeated.

In 2006, bin Laden sent an audiotaped message to Al Jazeera News, in which he offered a truce to America. This message was taken as an act of desperation by some in the Western world. Here too martyrdom glorification can be seen.

You have tried preventing us from leading an honorable life, but you will not be able to prevent us from a noble death. Neglecting jihad, which is prescribed in our religion, is a grievous sin. The best death for us is under the shadows of swords [Paradise].
...Steadfast shall we fight you, until our strongest die, and we shall never quit the struggle until our weapons quit. I have sworn not to die except as a free [man]. Even if I find bitter the taste of death – let me not die humiliated or deceived. Peace to whoever follows the [right] guidance.

This apparent truce offer ended on a threatening note. Martyrdom, as bin Laden wanted to portray it to the Americans, was for Muslims desirable, honourable, and noble. Honourable death via jihad was presented as atonement for living a dishonourable life under a degraded form of Islam. Martyrdom is presented as the act of ultimate nobility. Finally, death during jihad was truth: this demonstrated the totalitarian nature of this jihadi terror, where the existing order is deception.
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Emmanuel Sivan discussed the role of myth in radical Islam in 1998, theorising that: “To function as a myth, reality must become a story in which the hero possesses a broader freedom of action than that of run-of-the-mill human beings.”\textsuperscript{102} He describes the crusader-\textit{jihad} myth as operating through “acts of faith achieved by emotional inclusion, not by an incremental logical process.”\textsuperscript{103} He primarily used this paradigm to address the glorification of past holy wars and \textit{jihad} as a tool of Muslim civil society. Yet, Sivan’s paradigm can also be applied to the myth of the modern martyr. The terrorist martyr myth is one of emotional inclusion, belying the theological teachings of the Koran. It is directed by leaders who utilise strategic logic: but the martyrs themselves seek the promised liberation, with the expectation of reward. In doing so, they elevate themselves, fulfilling their leaders strategic purpose and entering the martyrdom myth as heroes.

In summary, martyrdom propaganda in the religious wave was, and continues to be, a complex phenomenon. Faraj was selective about how martyrdom could be discussed, presented, and undertaken. Azzam believed it was an accepted practice, and a purpose in itself. Al-Zawahiri and bin Laden tailored directly to the audience. To likely recruits, the propaganda exalts the heroism, the glory, and the rewards in Paradise. To enemies, it threatened suicide operations would continue. To the greater Islamic world, propaganda justified martyrdom through theology and reason, while simultaneously elevating it as a necessary defensive measure. Ultimately, \textit{Salafi} terrorists could do something which few terrorist groups could: offer rewards beyond the grave. A paradigmatic shift was in play: away from death being merely a consequence of terrorism, to death being the purpose in terrorism, as represented in the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm.

\textbf{The Contemporary Situation}

\textit{Salafi} terror has not yet run its full course, so this section briefly attempts to capture some elements of the contemporary situation and summarise the earlier discussion of the six major

\textsuperscript{102} Sivan, ”The Holy War Tradition in Islam.” p177
\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. p178
themes within the propaganda. The terrorspace of religious extremists remains fluid and dynamic, with new groups adopting new tactics, and vying for influence in the Middle East.

The purpose of the terrorism was to use violence to re-establish the Caliphate, which was the revolutionary abstraction. This glorified past was reimagined and projected as a possible future, a hallmark of a historically-based wave. Terrorism was the only way that Islamic lands could be freed by *jahiliyya* of Western depravity. Islam was portrayed as in *dar al-harb*, the abode of war, and it had to be brought back into the faith through violence. Fighting *jahiliyya* was portrayed as an obligation; therefore *jihad* was also an obligation. Some even went so far as to label *jihad* as a *fard ayan*, as necessary a pillar as prayer or Ramadan.

The justification for violence was founded on the premise that the Caliphate can only be founded through violence by a believing minority. The mainstream media could not be trusted, therefore violence was required. This tied in with the anti-democratic stance, self-defensive against the pervading influence of Western political systems. The *jihadists* had scepticism for the democratic process, and argued that the majority of votes cannot create truth. Therefore it did not matter how many moderates believed that the violence was illegitimate, for the terrorists held their interpretation as paramount, and used the Verse of the Sword to reinforce their argument. *Jihad* was an obligation and a moral duty for all Muslims. Blood was intrinsic to this: the terrorists believed that blood must be shed for victory to be realised.

*Jihadis* have demonstrated a firm grasp on the importance of spectacular attacks against high-ranking or symbolic targets. The strategy focused initially on high profile assassinations of the near enemy, and international bombings targeting the far enemy. Explosives were commonly used in these attacks due to their psychological power, and *Salafi* terrorists have shown a willingness to incrementally adapt their strategy based on the terrorspace. Much like the RAF, they were able to turn the relatively common crime of hostage-taking into a spectacular media event. The most effective strategic adaptation was the legitimisation for targeting civilians. This increased the perception of the threat.
The tactical method exploited a combination of explosives and firearms, many seized from Taliban stockpiles, while statistics indicate 20.28 percent of terrorism casualties were from firearms. Explosives were propagated as the safest weapons for mujahedeen to use, with VBIEDs being highly effective. Instructional manuals demonstrated an aversion to amateur attacks, and a desire to gain technical proficiency. There was also evidence for frequent en route opportunism, for which suicide bombing was very effective. Despite the proliferation of explosives and suicide bombing, the AK-47 rifle from the much-glorified Soviet-Afghan war was the battle trophy of the mujahedeen, not the bomb.

The systematic campaign incorporated two components. The first was to instruct terrorists on how to survive, camouflaging in the general population and terrorspace. To do this, they were given permission to deceive and dissemble. The second was the rhetoric that exalted the endurance of the terrorists, claiming that the terrorism would never end, while reiterating past terrorist victories. This was compounded by the steady pulse of spectacular attacks around the world: New York, Bali, Madrid, and London. At a local level, smaller attacks (but no less deadly) happened far more frequently in local bazaars and marketplaces, but these were rarely exalted in the international propaganda.

The revolution was exalted in terms of historical triumphs, drawing heavily on the defeat of the Soviet Union. This defeat was attributed purely to the actions of the mujahedeen, disregarding other factors. Afghanistan was exalted as the graveyard of superpowers, due to jihadi prowess. There was greater importance of this paradigm: it carried with it the expectation of victory, for, if they could defeat the USSR then surely they could defeat the USA. It also drew on older history: that of the Crusades. The terrorists were portrayed as the champions of Islam in a clash of civilisations, the last defence against the contemporary imperialist expansion of the Western.

---

The manner in which martyrdom was glorified, honoured, and remembered was specific due to the religious dimensions. The act of martyrdom was glorified, but the individual martyr could not be idolised. The martyr was forbidden reward if he died for personal glory, or remembrance, instead of for the glory of Allah. The act was portrayed as an honour, an act of nobility and atonement for past sins, and for their sacrifice the martyrs would be protected and rewarded in Paradise. But it had greater strategic significance: ‘Azzam cast it as a primary method for participating in *jihad*, while bin Laden advocated it as a tactical necessity. This also represented a break from the Death in pursuit of Terror paradigm, to the Terror in pursuit of Death, where death was the primary objective.

Many of the radical influences in *Salafi* terror have already met their end. Hassan al’Banna, the founder of the Muslim Brotherhood, was assassinated by the Egyptian government in 1949, reportedly in retaliation for his role in the assassination of Prime Minister Mahmoud au-Nukrashi Pasha in 1948.105 Sayyid Qutb was executed by the Egyptian government in 1966 on charges of subversion and planning a terrorist attack. When he was given the news, he allegedly said: “Praise be to God, I performed *jihad* for fifteen years until I earned this martyrdom.”106 In another commentary, he had written: “Death, whether natural or in battle, does not represent the end. Life on earth is not the best thing God bestows on people.”107 He was buried in an unmarked grave. In another purge of radicals nearly two decades later, Muhammad Faraj was executed by the Egyptian government for his part in planning the assassination of Sadat.108 “There is no doubt that the idols of this world can only be made to disappear through the power of the sword,” Faraj wrote, and despite his death, this idea lived on.109

---
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The death of ‘Abdullah ‘Azzam was more controversial. On 23 November 1989, ‘Azzam was *en route* to a mosque in Peshawar when his car exploded.\(^{110}\) Among those suspected of the car bombing were the Russian KGB, the Afghan KHAD, the Israeli Mossad for his assistance of Hamas, the American CIA, and rival warlords nervous about his growing power and influence. These organisations aside, there was also suspicion within his own faction: al-Zawahiri himself had denounced ‘Azzam as a CIA spy.\(^{111}\) Bin Laden also had a motive: he had disagreed with ‘Azzam over the recruitment of martyrs for foreign operations, and would also be left with sole control of the Service Bureau when ‘Azzam died. Bin Laden did assume leadership of *al Qaeda*, and the attacks on foreign soil went ahead. After the US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, bin Laden fled Tora Bora and for many years it was thought he was hiding in caves in the Hindu-Kush Mountains. Instead, ten years later, he was found in Abbottabad, Pakistan, living in a walled compound close to the Pakistani Military Academy.\(^{112}\) In 2011, he was shot dead by a US SEAL team, in a raid known as Operation Neptune’s Spear, and his body was buried at sea. Al-Zawahiri assumed leadership of *al ‘Qaeda*, and is still alive at the time of this writing.

Some assumed that *al ‘Qaeda* would end with its leader, with conviction in the decapitation strategy (despite its ineffectiveness on the terrorists of the third wave). It has been four years since bin Laden’s death, and some researchers have decided that any claim that *al ‘Qaeda* was dead by extension was highly premature. James Clapper Jr., the US director of national intelligence, had dismissed the threat of *al ‘Qaeda* telling the Senate Intelligence Committee in 2012 that:

> As long as we sustain pressure on it, we judge the core of Al Qaeda will be largely of symbolic importance to the global jihadist movement.\(^{113}\)

\(^{110}\) Aryn Baker, "Who Killed Abdullah Azzam?," *Time* 18 July 2009. np
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Clapper underestimated the power of symbolism in terrorism, and the damage which *al ḍa‘eda* had already done exploiting that symbolism. Evidence from the University of Maryland’s Global Terrorism Database shows that the *al ḍa‘eda* core and cells *al ḍa‘eda* the Maghreb (AQIM), *al ḍa‘eda* in Iraq (AQI), and *al ḍa‘eda* in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) maintained a steady rate of attacks since bin Laden’s death, and even increased in Iraq.114 Jones’ article, *A Persistent Threat*, found that the number of *jihadi* groups increased by 58 percent between the years 2010 and 2013.115 There was an increase in localised *jihadist* activity between 2007-2013, and 99 percent of those attacks in 2013 were aimed at the near enemy, local apostate regimes.116

*Al ḍa‘eda* is hardly the limit of *Salafi* terror. Other significant *Salafi* threats include *Al Shabaab*, *Boko Haram*, and Islamic State (IS). The Somalian group *Al Shabaab* formally allied with *al ḍa‘eda* in 2012, and in the manifesto announcing this, Al-Zawahiri urged *Al Shabaab* to increase its suicide bombings in Mogadishu.117 Originally a nationalist group formed in response to the Ethiopian invasion in 2006, *Al Shabaab* soon gained a reputation for atrocity and hard-line *Islamism*. Its recent activities include the implementation of strict Sharia law in parts of southern Somalia (replete with stoning and amputations); the 2009 suicide bombing of a student’s graduation ceremony; blockading humanitarian aid workers during the 2011 famine which led to 250,000 civilian deaths; and of course, the 2013 Westgate Mall Massacre in Nairobi, in which sixty-seven people died.118 Part of the threat it represents, according to Richard Downie, is the simplicity of their attacks: good intelligence cannot always prevent an attack which consists only of a soft target, ammunition, and a few martyrs.119

115 Jones, "A Persistent Threat." p26
116 Ibid. p34
119 Ibid.
An associate to both *al ‘Qaeda* in the Magreb and *Al Shabaab* is the Nigerian group *Boko Haram* (translating to “Western education is sacrilege”). It first formed out of religious street violence between Christians and Muslims, and escalated into a *Salafi* gang whose hallmark was drive-by shootings. They were dispersed by Nigerian security forces in 2009, and remnants were inducted into AQIM training camps in Chad. Yossef Bodansky described *Boko Haram* as “a clear case of growing cooption and improvement of localized radical militant forces by the global jihadist movement.”\(^{120}\) The group’s activity peaked with over 400 attacks in 2012, according to the Global Terrorism Database. They normally target police and military, using firearms and explosives, with limited success.\(^{121}\) However, in May 2014, *Boko Haram* abducted more than 200 girls from a Nigerian school and attempted to auction them off in the name of Islam.\(^{122}\) *Al ‘Qaeda* did not publically support this, and it remains to be seen if the alliance will disintegrate, much as it did with IS.

*IS* (or ISIL, meaning Islamic State of/in Iraq and the Levant, as it is sometimes called) is problematic for the *al ‘Qaeda* network. The group had its roots in the original *al ‘Qaeda* in Iraq in 2003, which declined after the death of Al-Zarqawi. By 2006, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi had assumed leadership and reformed the organisation in Syria, where it fought with *Jabat al-Nusra* in the Syrian civil war.\(^{123}\) IS was the first of the Syrian rebels to take a city in March 2013, when it consolidated its hold on Raqqa, and overcame opposition from moderate Islamist militias.\(^{124}\) In January 2014, IS moved on Fallujah and took control of the Sunni city and much of the surrounds along the Turkish-Syrian border. In June 2014, IS captured Mosul and foreign
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intervention occurring at the time of writing. Al ‘Qaeda has since severed its public ties with IS.

With this decentralised sprawl of terrorist groups taken into account, allegiance’s rising and falling, it is difficult to confirm the belief that al ‘Qaeda ended with the death of their figurehead. The religious wave of terror, dominated by Salafi jihadism, is by no means over. Due to its religious dimensions, it remains to be seen whether it will change with the generational shift which has past characterised Rapoport’s waves, or if it will demonstrate greater powers of endurance.

In conclusion, the jihadist use of Propaganda of the Deed shows that they innovated the strategy to fit their terrorspace. The theoretical purpose was to create the conditions for the re-establishment of the Caliphate, and the terrorists were willing to justify acts such as suicide bombing to achieve it. Their strategic method was based on spectacular and systematic attacks, in addition to assassinations and hostage taking. Unlike the prior waves, their glorification was based in religious theory, but tantalised prospective terrorists with martyrdom rewards. Martyrdom in particular makes the jihadi religious wave distinct from those that came before it. These comparative issues are be discussed in the next chapter.

Chapter Ten: Flame and Ash

Propaganda of the Deed examined

Michael Carr wrote: “It has become something of a cliché to claim that the world has changed irrevocably in response to the unique and deadly threat of Al-Qaeda. But if the current crisis appears unprecedented, its essential parameters are not entirely new.”¹ This thesis supports Carr’s statement through a different research methodology. Both comparative historical analyses found similarities between the terrorism waves, despite the differences in purpose and ideology identified by Richard Bach Jensen in his analysis of anarchists and jihadists.² In “The Fourth Wave,” Rapoport wrote that the Narodnaya Volya created the culture of terror, leaving terrorism “deeply rooted in modern culture.”³ As a contrast, Boot found that the “script” of terrorism written by the Irish is manifest in contemporary theatres of war.⁴

This chapter explores the paradigms and paradigmatic shifts identified within Propaganda of the Deed focus groups. To do this, it will explore the use of terrorspace, and compare the propaganda themes of purpose, justification, strategy, tactics, campaigns, and glorification to speculate on how each understood Propaganda of the Deed. Through the findings, the process of terrorism is found to be both traditional and innovative. The endurance of Propaganda of the Deed and its role in influencing political violence as a traditional discourse will then be discussed. First, whether the use of Propaganda of the Deed by the focus movements influenced subsequent movements will be discussed.

¹ Carr, "Cloaks, Daggers and Dynamite." p29
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Laqueur commented that terrorism, and the use and transmission of Propaganda of the Deed, could be instinctive.\(^5\) According to Laqueur, it could be assumed that many terrorist movements, such as those in Ukraine or Poland, had never read terrorist tracts or instructional manuals. He suggested that:

they knew, even if they had not read it in books, that publicity would make their protest known; it was far more likely that they would be listened to if political pressure was reinforced by terrorist action...In some cases the decision to adopt a terrorist strategy was taken on the basis of a detailed political analysis. But usually the mood came first, and the ideological rationalization only after.\(^6\)

This was terrorism undertaken without precise doctrine, based on instincts for the struggle and its goals. The use of Propaganda of the Deed, in Laqueur’s argument, is a revolutionary instinct. Yet Laqueur did not fully explain this idea. This raises the possibility of instinct as a learned behaviour – and asks where it is being learned from to provoke such drastic change. It may be that the instinctive terror thesis is inexorably intertwined with the transmission possibilities explored below.

This thesis found there was little evidence of later terrorists discussing earlier terrorists, but this alone does not indicate a lack of familiarity, merely no public referencing. While there is no smoking gun, it is clearly conceivable that terrorists were aware of the manuals, methods, and propaganda of indirect predecessors. The focus terrorists were predominantly highly educated and deeply committed to the pursuit of the revolution. Terrorism was a study for them, as much as it was a method to achieve their goals. For example, RAF members studied Russian literature at university. In their manifesto, *The Urban Guerrilla Concept*, the RAF directly discuss anarchist terrorism, the Social Revolutionaries, and reference Lenin’s 1903 work, *What is to be Done*.\(^7\) This indicates their study of terror before engaging in it. The possibility of a revolutionary awareness which created a tradition is therefore not at all farfetched.

---
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Early in modern usage of Propaganda of the Deed, anarchists such as Most and Goldman toured America giving lectures on insurrection to audiences including Irish-Americans, who then funded the Dynamite Press. Likewise, Russian anarchist Stepniak-Kravchinsky lived and wrote in London, providing another source of revolutionary information for Irish terrorists. The relative success of Irish terrorism resounded throughout the colonised world, and was an abstract inspiration for many groups. In particular, their use of violence in addition to a legitimate political organisation was noted by FLN affiliate, Frantz Fanon.

Although Fanon did not mention the Irish terrorism in *Wretched of the Earth* (perhaps due to his wholesale condemnation of Europeans), he nonetheless drew on their experience. His research into terrorism extended back as far as the French Revolution of 1789. Fanon was hugely influential, with an international readership including of the Black Panthers in America. The book was translated into both Arabic and Farsi, and English, as many copies were found in the Belfast prison blocks which housed the Provisional IRA prisoners. In his final days, Fanon met with Jean-Paul Sartre, who was well-known to have housed the RAF and was undoubtedly a conduit for influence (more so because the RAF claimed to champion the oppressed Third World). A psychiatrist, Fanon was significant in lending credence to the theory of cleansing violence:

> At the individual level, violence is a cleansing force. It rids the colonized of their inferiority complex, of their passive and despairing attitude. It emboldens them, and restores self-confidence.

This notion of violence is found in both past-facing terror waves: the Irish anti-colonialists, and the religious *jihadists*. As a Black Muslim, it is also highly likely that Fanon was read by bin Laden and ‘Azzam, given that the content of *Wretched of the Earth* focused on decolonising Africa and the Middle East from Western powers. As a result, it was possible for later terrorists to study previous revolutionary movements.

---
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That possibility aside, an examination of the historical context has yielded another possible theory. Propaganda of the Deed could have been transmitted to the disparate focus groups through movement in revolutionary population, which may have created regional social memories for political violence, which complements Laqueur’s Instinctive Terror hypothesis.

Propaganda of the Deed was traced in two directions from its first systematic use in nineteenth century Russia. Due to pogroms in Russia, which were subtly encouraged by the tsar’s officialdom, Russian Jews emigrated south to Jerusalem; and to the west, to the United States of America. From the USA, American-Irish expatriates may have influenced its transmission to Ireland, through funding the Irish terrorists. The limited Irish success was replicated by anti-colonialist movements around the world, including in the Middle East, where the embattled Palestinians sought to recoup their previous territory from Israel. Palestinians were responsible for training the Red Army Faction, and creating a regional social memory of terrorism in the Middle East, which is currently being exploited by jihadists. Propaganda of the Deed moved with the movement of people, to create part of the revolutionary social memory (or instinct), thereby becoming a traditional method of political protest. This transmission idea is credible, as Neville Bolt also wrote that, owing to the relatable content of Propaganda of the Deed: “This allows us to conceive of insurgency movements that have grown by building on the collective memory of shared or absorbed experience or tradition across successive generations.”

The use of the novel term terrorspace allowed for broader historical conceptualisation, which ultimately led to a more constructivist approach to analysis. Terrorspace was introduced in this thesis to address the limitations in the current discourse, by providing a more encompassing term to describe the internationalism of the modern terrorism environment. This environment spans national borders, cultures, societies, and history. This allowed a holistic approach to comparative studies in terrorism, as it incorporates the interlinked dimensions of physical and

---
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nonphysical activity. As such, it could provide a basic research lens for students of the history of terror. However, the term requires greater exploration and further research.

Theoretical Purpose

If the tradition theory holds up, it could have also influenced the similarities and differences in how Propaganda of the Deed has manifested within the six major themes, starting with the theoretical purpose. The anarchists first conceived Propaganda of the Deed, and they believed that communicating their purpose was necessary to spread their ideology to the people. Each wave did this in a distinct way.

The anarchists hoped their courageous actions would inspire hope that would compel others to action, and that action would become a self-propagating tradition. Their urban community activity was also designed to increase government repression in order to spur the revolution. Conversely, the anti-colonialist Irish glorified Ireland as a legendary abstraction instead of focusing on remediable issues. They used polarizing language, in which the reclamation of Ireland would cleanse it from British socio-cultural corruption. The German New Left was more negative about their purpose, claiming that they championed the oppressed third world masses while declaring war on the emerging world system, capitalism, the class system which upheld it, and monopolies. The religious wave Jihadists glorified the Caliphate, and used religious precepts to justify re-establishing it. They believe society had to be cleansed from the jahiliyya of modern times and Western influence, and no other way was possible but jihad.

The communication of these purposes for terrorism had vital implications for the broader appeal of the movement. The Russian anarchist and the German New Left wave showed marked similarities: they were both born of long historical grievances which they believed could be remedied by a new, vogue ideology. These ideologies were theory-heavy and marked a significant departure from the current norm. Because of the relative ideological youth of anarchism and New Leftism, the purpose was not argued as concisely in the propaganda. This ideological incoherence would have limited its appeal to broader society. Billington wrote of
the anarchists that; “Ideological expectations outstripped practical possibilities.” Similarly, Konrad Kellen described German terrorism as “hardly consistent and cohesive.” Therefore they could have been perceived as a poor remedy for societal woes. They were also forward-facing, seeking to sell a reimagined future, which may not have been the most powerful propaganda.

Conversely, if the purpose was portrayed as argumentatively sound and ideologically coherent, it was more accessible and could have influenced the popularity of the movement. Specifically, the anti-colonialist and the religious focus movements had long historical build-ups; measured not in decades, but in centuries. These waves are both backwards facing, invoking the memory of the glorious reimagined past, and transposing this past upon a reimagined future. Essentially, the purpose then was to create a future based on past glories. This was consequently more accessible to the masses, which already had familiarity with the mythology. Both the anti-colonialists and the religious terrorists transcended tangible contemporary issues in their propaganda, and instead glorified the revolutionary abstractions: ‘Ireland the idea’ and the Caliphate both served this purpose. Ergo, historically-based abstractions elevated the purpose, while newer ideology-based abstractions confused it.

This was probably a contributing factor in the broader social appeal of reimagined past-based movements. Bolt also noted the similarity between the Irish terrorists and contemporary terrorists in 2008, when he wrote: “Ethnic, religious, linguistic, and national identity groups sought socio-political change through appeal to ‘an idealised nostalgic representation of the past’.” That same representation is here called the revolutionary abstraction. The anti-
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colonialist and the religious focus movements consciously reinterpreted the past, and projected it as a possible future. The exaltation of this revolutionary abstraction was vital: it removed the possibility of compromise and small-scale issues being addressed, which allowed terrorists to justify the violence.

Justification for Violence

The justification of violence had a strategic role within terrorist propaganda: it must make the violence understandable to the masses which it represents and/or targets. This was recognised by Miller in 2008, when he wrote: “A terrorist in power or seeking power will tend to justify his or her tactics of violence as a means towards the resolution of a specific issue or as a step towards a desired end.”¹⁷ This thesis found that the justification for violence incorporated this, but also went beyond it.

The anarchists justified the use of violence by challenging the state’s monopoly of force. They indicated that state violence created their own defensive and altruistic violence, which they applied with selective moral relativism. The Irish considered the use of force their lawful defensive right and their moral duty. Violence was an indispensable expression of their national identity, the highest mark of revolutionary legitimacy, and a ritual of purification. The blood and freedom paradigm became symbiotic in justifying violence. The German New Left too felt that their violence was self-defence: violence was created by violence. They held action supreme over discussion, for active resistance was the sole revolutionary mark over mere protest. Alternatively, the Jihadists of the religious wave believed that the Caliphate could only be achieved by a believing minority using *jihad*. *Jihad* was an obligation and a moral duty. This, coupled with the Verse of the Sword, stipulated the only way forward was through violence: blood had to be shed. Moreover, as they believe Islam is under attack, this is also held as a defensive action, and that action elevates the *mujahidin* above all others.

---
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An unexpected similarity in justifications arose between the New Left and the Salafis: both cited a mistrust of the mainstream media as a reason why non-violent propaganda failed. It is speculated that this is because their waves came after the rise of television technology, and the rise of global media networks. Terrorism and the media share an interdependent relationship, but with the media usually supporting governments countering terrorist organisation’s, it is logical that this divide would manifest after these developments. In addition, the media was often critical of their actions, so terrorists frequently attacked them for underreporting or misreporting. Ergo, violence was the only available means because of the failure of peaceful propaganda.

The anti-colonialist and the Salafis manifestations both emphasised a blood tithe: the blood and freedom affinity. They believed that freedom would have a blood price, and it was a moral duty to pay this. This could be attributed to their earlier congruence: their pursuit of a historical abstraction, an attempt to regain past strength. Perhaps the blood and freedom affinity re-established the modern relevance of historically-based terrorist purposes.

The broadest connection here is the universality of three interconnected themes in the propaganda: violence as self-defence, as validation, and communication. Terrorists sought to absolve themselves of responsibility, while putting the blame on the state. Blaming the state also allowed terrorists to attempt to demonstrate their “defensive” measures. This also made the terrorists themselves undergo an initiation, where the value or reputation of a member depended on their revolutionary credentials. Those with a record of action were elevated above others. Finally, violence was a communication dialectic between the state and the terrorists. The synthesis of this communication conflict became retributive. This was designed to make the violence socially acceptable in order to advertise the terrorist cause. That these three themes occurred within the propaganda of all the groups in this study suggests that it is a common component of properly executed Propaganda of the Deed.

Strategic Method
These commonalities were not found in the strategy. There are significant disparities in the strategy utilised. The anarchist method incorporated the high profile assassinations of political individuals in tandem with anarchist trials (such as Zasulich’s and the Frenchman, Emile Henry’s) to gain attention for the cause, on the premise that one such assassination was worth a thousand propaganda pamphlets. The assassination message was redolent with symbolism. This was different with the Irish anti-colonialists; they focused on removing the British security presence in Ireland, which represented the greatest threat to the revolutionaries. They relied on strategic shootings which often occurred during daylight hours, such as the Bloody Sunday assassinations.

The German New Left adopted a series of different stratagems, including hijacking flights, assassinations, hostage-taking, and other well-publicised offensives. They often targeted industrial and political figures. The RAF even used their court trials to undermine government authority. The Salafis of the religious wave were again distinct: they engaged in series of spectacular bombings which incurred high casualties. Their targets were far more non-selective: ranging from high-ranking political figures in affected regions to the civilians who died in the World Trade Centre attack. This event was heavy with symbolism: not only did it target economic, political, and military power, but also represented an assault on a symbolic cultural epicenter of the Western world.

The strategies within Propaganda of the Deed showed a common strategic intent with functional differences. Another difference was in the strategic symbolism of the targets: the anarchists targeted the tsar and his politico-military apparatus, the Irish targeted the British intelligence and police presence in Ireland, the RAF targeted the industrialists and government, while the Jihadists targeted both high-profile regional political individuals, in addition to international and regional civilians. In each wave, the terrorists targeted the perceived aggressor: the tsar was the biggest threat by virtue of his vast authority; the British intelligence in Ireland was a direct threat to Michael Collins’ successful operations; while the RAF targeted soft targets it believed were colluding with the government, and incidentally represented an
intransigent threat to the masses they claimed to champion. *Jihadi* targeting of civilians could be due to the anti-democratic current within radical propaganda, which, while it disagrees with democratic principles, also holds the voting public responsible for their government’s actions.

This examination indicates three commonalities. First, spectacular acts of strategic violence are consciously orchestrated to challenge and attempt to damage the government’s appearance of authority. This destruction of the government’s perceived omnipotence was vital for preparing the masses for the revolution, by minimising the government threat made the revolution appear more achievable. Second, the targets had symbolic significance in the institutions they represented and to the terrorists themselves, thereby carrying an additional message. The victim is a weighty symbol in the propaganda, and is therefore propaganda itself. However, as we have seen, the symbolism was different for each group, and was the product of each specific terrorspace. Finally, spectacular acts were, and continue, to be designed to achieve maximum propaganda impact. In sum, the strategic intentions of the groups were the same, while the way in which those intentions manifested was different. This pattern was followed in the tactical methodology.

**Tactical Method**

The tactics of Propaganda of the Deed show specific divergence coupled with a few commonalities. As such, there is minor continuity, but also significant change due to terrorists optimising the technology of the day to suit their need. This represents an evolution rather than a continual tradition. The tactical weapons were often based on availability: what could be bought privately, and if not, what could be stolen from government or industrial stockpiles. The most common of these were firearms and explosives.

The Russian anarchists failed in various attacks – a shooting, the Winter Palace bombing, and the Odessa Rail bombing – which was why their propagandists encouraged others to first gain technical proficiency. Their literature emphasised the transition from civilian to terrorist. The IRA were perhaps the better trained among the selected groups, given the military training of some of their members, which was recognised as necessary after the failure of the Easter
Rising. Their tactical method, relying on arms and explosives, was enhanced by their spies in British intelligence, which passed the information to the Flying Columns. This enhanced their control of the terrorspace. Using the same tools, the RAF engaged in jailbreaks, aircraft hijacking, and kidnappings. They too suffered failed attacks, notably in the accidental explosions which ended the Stockholm Embassy siege. These events enabled them to garner significant media attention at a relatively low cost. In their hands, this equipment was more coercive than destructive. Al ‘Qaeda expanded destructive measures significantly, maximising damage with vehicle bombings of massive buildings, suicide bombings in crowded spaces, and using hijacked planes as deadly missiles. That being said, they too used firearms for smaller attacks such as kidnappings. This came after the failed bombing of the World Trade Centre in 1993.

It must be noted that there were many differences in the daily, tactical component of Propaganda of the Deed. Although equipment was predominantly firearms and explosives, these instruments were deployed in tactically distinct manners. For example, the anarchists were far more public about the intended benefits of the violence they hoped to wreak across Russia. The Irish anti-colonialists had a more covert approach, and employed the use of spies to find the information necessary to give them an intelligence edge, to control the terrorspace with the resources they had. The New Left expanded dramatically into hijackings and kidnappings, using the same weapons, and showed a selective method of targeting. Jihadi’s altered this with vehicle born explosives (VBIEDs) in addition to the many other types of IED, suicide bombing, and so on. Despite their explosives finesse characterising the historical wave, it was the AK-47 that was romanticised as the weapon for liberation. Ergo, the tactical method represents constant innovation rather than tradition. While they are guided by Propaganda of the Deed, terrorists are not constrained by it at a tactical level when they adopt the technological advances of their terrorspace.

There are some overarching similarities in the historical comparisons. The first is what could be called Amateurism and the Lessons of Failure. All groups experienced a significant failure, in order to understand that these weapons required skill to use. This brings it to the second
commonality: the desire to learn their craft and gain technical proficiency to enhance the chances of success. Training, therefore, was integral to the tactical component. The final commonality is *En Route* Opportunism. From the anarchists through to the Jihadists, terrorists targeted transport systems and people in transit. In this circumstance, the target is most vulnerable, and many successful terrorist attacks have occurred as a result of this opportunism. This is linked to the idea mentioned earlier of taking the initiative, and controlling the terrorspace, as much as in conventional war. This was enhanced by a systematic campaign.

**Systematic Campaign**

The theme of systematised violence, organised in campaigns, sheds a different light on Propaganda of the Deed. The anarchists, once again, were the most vocal about how they intended to create the terrorized atmosphere. They used small numbers of terrorists engaging in sustained violence, whose numbers would make the strength of the government impracticable, while they were harder to identify in the terrorspace. From such advantage, with the initiative of action and time, they would exhaust the state with sustained violence. They failed to escalate the conflict after their assassination of Alexander II, when their assassination attempt on his successor was thwarted by police. The Irish anti-colonialists had a similar attitude. They knew it would be a battle to exhaustion, and their main goal was to exhaust the authorities, while they endured and were refreshed with new recruits. Small numbers, they believed, enhanced the likelihood of success, and force the British to use their military in a way to which they were not accustomed. The concentrated escalation of ‘outrages’ enhanced the effects of endurance and exhaustion, hence the ceasefire.

The RAF relied on existing manuals to ensure the endurance of their groups: manuals which emphasised the terrorist’s natural advantages, such as the element of surprise and small numbers. They used their trials to irritate the authorities and exhaust all involved, while outside the prison, other members continued to launch attacks. Their escalation was inexpertly applied, as the suicide of the leaders, while dramatic and providing the movement with martyrs, did not have the impact they had hoped. Later, *al’ Qaeda* and associated *jihadis* had instructional manuals which taught *jihadists* discretion, an information hierarchy, and human camouflage in
the terrorspace. It also encouraged public propaganda which mocked the authorities, and taunted them about the endurance of terrorism. The escalation of violence within this wave was sustained and international. They also maximised casualties. This use of endurance, escalation, and exhaustion, was an effective component of contemporary terrorism.

It is the application of terrorism as a sustained campaign of violence which separates the amateurs from the professionals. Humiliating the government was a primary goal in undermining its international reputation and prestige. In tarnishing government authority, terrorists hoped it would confer legitimacy to themselves. This is visible through the loose and interchangeable pattern: endurance, escalation, and exhaustion. Propagandists often waxed eloquent about endurance, and in two ways: public declarations that the violence would endure; and instructions on survival in order to prolong the violence. This included keeping numbers small so the group would be harder to capture, and an information hierarchy to thwart infiltration. Some of the propagandists acknowledged that it was a battle to exhaustion, and that the terrorists, with their natural advantages, had more staying power. Escalation was evident in the empirical record for attacks, and served to enhance the pressure created by the prior two elements. By engaging in a systematic campaign of violence, they hoped to control the terrorspace, mood of the human terrain, and the government’s actions and reputation. In this propaganda theme, the coercive intent of terrorism is readily apparent.

It is important to note that although the theme of systematic campaigns are apparent for each group; its implementation differed significantly. Even the terrorists who showed the greatest aptitude in the endurance-exhaustion-escalation pattern did not behave in the same manner, nor on a comparable scale. Systematic terrorist campaigns are so fixed within contemporary circumstances, that while there are propaganda commonalities, they are absent in the practical application. The Irish and the Jihadists both exhibited strategy and organisation in their escalation: but the escalation was different. The Irish saturated a small, domestic area in small, targeted attacks, while the Jihadists operate on an international scale with a maximised death toll.
Glorification

Exaltation of the revolution

The Russian anarchists exalted their revolution in two ways: by denouncing the contemporary situation, and by positioning the anarchist revolution as the salvation. Society was fundamentally flawed. The anarchist terrorists exalted themselves as heroes, self-sacrificing, noble, and daring – and the only possible salvation. This manifested as a veneration of the ‘revolutionary spirit’ which was to become a favored abstraction, which encompassed the revolutionary mood, actors, and circumstances. The Irish anti-colonialists also felt that their society was flawed because of the British, and Ireland required the birth of a new heroic spirit, presumably in the form of the Irish patriot, who was not a person of rank, but a commoner. This everyday hero was exalted for fighting for the common good, and for a brighter future. In this same schematic, all other civilizations were false, and only Ireland was truth, providing yet another diametric contrast.

The German New Left relied heavily on slogans and catchphrases in their exaltation propaganda, for dramatic effect. They too favored revolutionary action above all else. They believed the shackles of common decency were broken, and that society was fundamentally warped by the capitalist class. The fun, according to Meinhof, was over. One had to choose between being part of the problem, or part of the solution, and the propaganda suggested that joining the terrorists was the latter. The jihadi in the religious wave had the same deep conviction, based on jahiliyya: modern society was corrupt and in a state of religious ignorance. The only way to correct this was by action, by fighting as a mujahedeen in jihad. But they have further cause for exaltation: the Afghan-Soviet myth meant that they could preemptively claim victory on the basis of past triumph, in a similar conflict against a conventional power where they were outgunned, outmanned, and still victorious. Indeed, Max Boot wrote that society has become used to the idea of “ragtag rebels beating military superpowers.”\(^{18}\) The Bush administration played right into their hands by calling the War on Terror a ‘crusade’. This conveniently fit with earlier jihadi propaganda positioning the struggle as a battle to defend

\(^{18}\) Boot, "Kick the Bully." p49
Islam itself, using polarizing language. But, what is most distinctive is that *jihadi* propagandists alone can offer rewards for service after death.

All waves held, at varying levels in their propaganda, the belief that society was fundamentally flawed for diverse reasons, and that terrorism was the only way to expunge it. Most obviously, the Russian anarchists and the RAF propaganda positioned the terrorists as the solution to the issues, while all waves represent their fighters as heroes. Moreover, there appears to be another abstraction which is exalted: that of the revolutionary spirit, which cannot be seen or touched but is manifest in direct action. This spirit is exalted – and embodies the energy of the wave itself, albeit from the perspective of the terrorists. The revolutionary abstraction is then positioned, unconsciously or not, diametrically to the degraded social conditions. In selectively exalting parts of the revolutionary abstraction, the terrorists are essentially trying to convince the masses that they are the only solution to the current situation, instead of the aggravators.

But differences remain. The RAF’s revolutionary abstraction actually represented the lack of an abstraction, due to their intangible political goals. The anarchists were alone in hoping that the terrorist way of struggle would become immortal: that it would become a traditional way of protest in people’s lives. But, while they were the only ones with such outward hopes, the continuity of Propaganda of the Deed and terrorism stands tribute to the endurance of the strategy, albeit in different ways than the anarchists probably would have liked. The most significance difference is the power of the *jihadi* manifestation: it is the only wave which, when exalting their martyrs, also has the power to reward them *post mortem*. Death becomes of minor significance. No other wave has posed this promise. The temptations of paradise, in addition to the crusader rhetoric, may play a part in the success of martyrdom propaganda in this wave.

**Glorification of Martyrdom**

The glorification of martyrdom was present in terrorist propaganda from the beginning of the first wave. The anarchists glorified their martyrs prolifically – even before they had any to
glorify. Nechaev described the terrorist as a doomed man, merciless and cold-blooded, who was equally willing to destroy or be destroyed. Others described the terrorist as a fusion of the hero and martyr, becoming noble, terrible, and irresistibly fascinating. Figner glorified their magnetic charm. There was a personality cult for the martyrs within the propaganda, in which the individual martyr was celebrated. To the anarchists, death was never the primary intent: their sacrifice was years of terrorist action, and while any death resulting from terrorism was an acceptable cost, it was not the goal in itself.

The Irish anti-colonists had a different perspective, although they too glorified their dead. To them, martyrdom was the ultimate sacrifice: an act of heroism. Great acts of bravery were accomplished by martyrs, who were imbued with a patriotic grace. Propagandists wrote that it was better to live a short life with honour, in essence, redemption through action, than a long life of inaction. These sacrifices were expected at an anonymous level, with the heroes expecting no fame or glory for their unrecorded deeds, but a collective comparison to the mythologized heroes of Cuchulain. Martyrdom was an affirmation of the truth of the terrorist cause, and they saw it as regenerative and cleansing.

The New Left Germans wrote about the universality of death: the only question was how one chose to die. Meins protested that terrorism is a battle for life, and that terrorists, by virtue of this, despise death. However, martyrdom had its role within their wave as a symbol of defiance. The suicides in custody of the RAF leadership were a final statement: the state may control their lives but never their deaths. After the uproar died down, the RAF named commando cells after their martyrs, so the memory of the deaths was constantly invoked. This is linked to the personality cult around high-profile terrorists, such as Che Guevara.

The *jihadis* of the religious wave glorified the act of martyrdom, but not the individual. Horrible things were prescribed to those who died for the glory of being a martyr, instead of the glory of
Allah. Martyrdom was also a primary path of jihad, not just an ancillary component. One entered into jihad not just intending to die, but actively pursuing that death. David Cook noted that: “The correct attitude of a fighter is to see death as a goal.” The rewards for martyrdom were above all other rewards in Paradise, for it was the noblest death. It was also positioned as embodying truth and honour, where all other things were deception and weakness. Despite the bravado, some propaganda justified martyrdom as a tactical necessity, which stands apart from theological glorifications of martyrdom. From these four focus movements arise three interesting dynamics.

The first are the individual and collective dynamics. This was an important distinction about how martyrdom was generally portrayed. The first and third waves, the anarchists and the New Left focus movements, created personality cults surrounding their martyrs, glorifying the individual dynamic. The actions of the individuals were celebrated, and the memories of the sacrifice were glorified heavily in revolutionary memory. The anarchists did this by immortalizing their dead in writings and propaganda, while the RAF named commando cells after the fallen.

By contrast, in the second and fourth waves with the Irish anti-colonialist and the jihadis there was a collective dynamic glorifying martyrdom. Their propaganda emphasised unrecorded deeds, and the deeds of the collective. To do this, they both drew on the mythological past: the Cuchulain for the Irish, and the Crusades and the Soviet-Afghan paradigm for the jihadis. Perhaps this is affiliated with the greater popular appeal of these waves, or the historical basis and re-imagined past within their goals. In addition, both saw martyrdom as an affirming concept, believing the revolutionary truth was affirmed with the terrorist lives. Death, then, was not only a mark of personal revolutionary legitimacy, but also validation of the greater terrorist cause.

19 David Cook agrees that while martyrdom operations are relatively new amongst Sunni jihadis, they are based in martyrdom doctrine. David Cook, "Suicide Attacks or "Martyrdom Operations" in Contemporary Jihad Literature," Nova Religio 6, no. 1 (2002). p9

20 Ibid. p11
Another outcome with the second and fourth focus groups was the use of polarizing language regarding martyrdom as an act of supreme truth, compared to the implication of inaction as a deception. This polarizing language had two symbolic components: in the first it glorified the martyr as personally validating, and validation for the revolution. In addition, inaction was linked to shame: action was truth, and inaction is deception. If terrorism helped one regain honour, then inaction was shame. If martyrdom was strength, then living in safety was weakness. This may have been intended to trigger recruitment in one way or the other, either by hope or horror.

The final dynamic identified in the propaganda are the Death through Terror, and the Terror through Death dynamics. In Death through Terror, death was merely a consequence of the terrorism, and was not a goal in itself. Self-destruction was viewed as an acceptable, but only last, option once all other possibilities had failed. The anarchists accepted that terrorism would consume years of their lives, being consecrated to the revolution, and if they were executed, that was an acceptable and noble death for them. The Irish, within their historical context, saw martyrdom as the supreme sacrifice, using conventional military language, and venerated their dead as sacred. The New Left as well saw death as a last resort, once all other avenues of defiance had been exhausted. The suicide of their core leaders in state custody only came once all other methods of freeing them had failed. In these waves, death was an acceptable consequence, but it was hardly the goal itself.

The *jihadi* examined in the religious wave represent a paradigmatic shift. *Jihadis* demonstrated a dynamic of Terror through Death, where death is the primary goal and terrorism is the means. The intention of the *jihadi* martyr is to die, and to die above all else, for Allah: not fame or recognition. The intentions behind the death are held as more significant in the propaganda than the success of the mission itself. Cook found: “Victory is everything, and therefore, the
manner in which it is achieved is meaningless.” Martyrdom operations have proved to be excellent propaganda, enhanced no doubt by the maximised death toll which accompanies it, and the literature redolent in it’s glorification. This paradigmatic shift away from Death through Terror, and towards Terror through Death, is possibly the combined result of the ideological and historical context for these focus movements.

Paradigms and Paradigmatic Shifts

There were many differences and similarities in the six themes in Propaganda of the Deed for the four focus movements. There was no universal application of Propaganda of the Deed, nor was one expected in light of the uniqueness of each terrorspace. In some cases, two movements appeared congruent because of developmental commonalities, such as the Irish anti-colonialists and the Salafi jihadists; or between the focus movements for Russian anarchism and the German New Left. In other cases, commonalities can be found as a result of the historical context, such as with the New Left and Salafi focus movements mistrusting the mainstream media. As such, there were several paradigms and paradigmatic shifts identified.

Discordance arose when movements adapted to the politics or the technologies of their day. The theoretical purposes of the focus movements were distinct, based either on a reimagined future, or a reimagined past. The justification for violence also held dissimilarities, with those with a reimagined past, being the Irish and the jihadis, emphasising the necessity of a blood tithe for the revolution. The strategy, the tactics, and the campaigns were divergent, based on the available resources and technology, despite having congruent themes in the propaganda. In addition, with the glorification of the revolution and the martyr, the jihadis exhibited a paradigmatic shift into Terror through Death, which could possibly be linked to their ability to reward martyrs after death and their ideological doctrine.

It is within the broader historical context that overarching commonalities can be seen, crossing the disparities within the specific terrorspaces. While the purposes did diverge, there was, as
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21 Ibid. p17 He also identified the dichotomy where, although radical writers proclaimed martyrdom legally permissible, their statements are largely unsupported in Koranic literature.
stated above, congruency between the anarchists and the New Left, representing the reimagined future with vogue, forward facing ideologies. This could be contrasted to the Irish anti-colonialists and the *jihadis*, which had reimagined pasts with purposes based on replicating historical glories. These are two previously undemonstrated paradigms in Propaganda of the Deed.

This pattern might suggest that the next wave of terror will be a vogue ideology based on a reimagined future, breaking from the traditional past. As stated earlier, a mistrust of the mainstream media as a justification for violent propaganda arose in the two later waves, congruent with the advances in communication technology, such as colour television in 1967, and the current development of social media. This was a paradigm shift due to historical context.

In addition, there was a common paradigm across all focus groups with the violence being justified as an act of self-defence; revolutionary validation; and communication. Terrorist strategic method shared some intent, in which the spectacular acts were born of the same design: to tarnish the targets reputation, to exploit the symbolism of the victim, and to maximise propaganda impact using spectacularisation. In such, all focus groups demonstrated a common paradigm regarding strategic intent, which was employed in a manner dictated more by the group’s ideology and context than by previous instructional manuals.

Tactically, there was a paradigm of *en route* opportunism. This may be dismissed as insignificant on the basis of tactical ease, appreciating that terrorists will do what is easiest instead of what is most complex. Groups who showed the technical proficiency paradigm also had experiences with amateur failures, as part of the learning process which led to innovation. There was
evolution which was influenced by terrorist access to technology and materials, however, their quest to access greater weapons was another congruency.

All focus movements loosely showed signs of the endurance-escalation-exhaustion paradigm within the propaganda, but manifested distinctly in the deeds. The exaltation of the revolution relied to a certain extent on the hero dynamic and the revolutionary abstraction. Meanwhile, the first three waves manifested their martyrdom propaganda in a similar way: Death through Terror. It is only recently that this has changed.

From these commonalities, it is clear that Propaganda of the Deed is still enduring as a terrorist strategy. In many areas, the way Propaganda of the Deed is adopted shows change and innovation. However, the point remains that they all, nonetheless, still adopted Propaganda of the Deed. This does not represent a continual static tradition, but an evolving tradition that is constantly being augmented with experience and skill.

The struggle of Propaganda of the Deed could well be called “the battle of the narrative,” – a term coined by Max Boot. Boot also suggested that nationalist groups – such as the IRA and Al ‘Qaeda – had greater impact and social support, especially against democratic nations with a free press, as opposed to the radical fringe groups like the RAF. Walter Laqueur iterated similar findings, where he found that Irish mastery of the press was “unrivalled” and that this lesson had been well-learned by later Arab terrorists. To that end, Laqueur wrote that “Terrorism has manipulated the media, but not much persuasion was needed.” The ongoing importance of the battle of the narrative in conflict zones is tied to the endurance of the strategy itself.

### Propaganda of the Deed’s Endurance
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The overarching research question for this thesis was how Propaganda of the Deed had endured, and how it had influenced violence as a political discourse.26 There has been frequent demonstration of the manner in which Propaganda of the Deed is both innovative and traditional.

Terrorist encouragement for innovation pervades Propaganda of the Deed’s endurance to its core. Mikhail Bakunin wrote in the nineteenth century: “Poison, dagger, noose, and the like!...Everything in this fight is equally sanctified by the revolution.”27 He encouraged uninhibited violence so long as it was in pursuit of the anarchist cause, and this allowed Propaganda of the Deed to be innovative from its inception. Innovation occurred most markedly in the implementation of attacks. While all used bombings and shootings, the focus groups also innovated with advances in technology in the specific terrorspace, such as the Twelve Apostle assassination squad by the IRA, hijackings and kidnappings in the third wave by the RAF, and the expansion of suicide activities by al ‘Qaeda and associates in the current wave. They differ in target selection due in part to ideology, but also because contemporary terrorists have innovated beyond government security measures protecting high-ranking people, by legitimising attacks on civilians. Communication methodology has also adapted with modern advances in technology, with terrorists adapting quickly to use of the internet and social media. The escalation of violent campaigns, and endurance to exhaustion was also constantly transforming in the terrorspace, representing on-going innovation.

The intent behind these activities has been unconsciously conserved. All of the focus movements have similar justifications for violence as defensive, legitimising, and reactionary. Similarly, the strategic intent was to maximise propaganda, undermine the target state, and communicate a symbolic message. Tactically, they all generally employed en route opportunism, gained technical proficiency, and learned from their failures – however,

26 The term “political discourse” is used here to describe the communication between the terrorist and their audience. This discourse is normally communicated with protests, petitions, and other methods. For terrorists, it manifests as violent action and propaganda.
27 Mikhail Bakunin. “Revolution, Terror, and Banditry.” Laqueur, Voices of Terror. p69
specifically, the attacks manifested quite differently. Additionally, there was comparable belief in society being fundamentally flawed, and the only cure for society was through violent revolution. The focus groups for the first three waves also exhibited similar paradigms for the traditional use of martyrdom in terror, which was dramatically innovated in only the most recent wave. The parallels represent a traditional knowledge of Propaganda of the Deed – a concept which has endured in a comparable way throughout time and is visible in the propaganda.

Another, perhaps more practical reason could simply be that Propaganda of the Deed is highly effective as an urban communication strategy. Terrorism was not originally intended to achieve the overthrow of the state, but designed to attract attention to the cause, and therefore it is logical to postulate that Propaganda of the Deed is remarkably effective. 28 Deconstructing Propaganda of the Deed using a greater timeframe and diversity of focus movement can result in a more comprehensive understanding of how it exhibits both tradition and innovation within different cultures and ideologies. As a result, Propaganda of the Deed retained the traditional strategic intent and goals, while conversely, it innovated the violent methods, which has contributed to its endurance as foundational concept in terrorism.

NBRTC Terror and Propaganda of the Deed

It is worth speculating about Propaganda of the Deed and the escalation of the terrorist discourse into nuclear, biological, radiological, toxicological, and chemical terrorism. What impact could Propaganda of the Deed have on these predicted advancements in terrorism? Governments fear terrorists obtaining and using advanced or nonconventional weapons. P.A Karam wrote, “terrorists have made no secret of their desire to attack our allies or us with radiological weapons.”29 And indeed, statements in terrorist propaganda support his claim.

28 A different study also shows the value of the Hegelian approach in characterizing the balance of power in the democratic system. Sari Roman-Lagerspetz uses dialectics to suggest that without an opposition, a democratic government loses legitimacy so the institutionalization of an opposition’s distrust actually builds a government’s trustworthiness. Sari Roman-Lagerspetz, “The Dialectics of Democracy,” Icelandic eJournal of Nordic and Mediterranean Studies 2, no. 7 (2012).

Tactical-level terrorist operations tend to exploit *en route* opportunism, without the skill required for more sophisticated delivery technique that is required of some forms of NBRTC, such as the cooking of ricin or the construction of fissile nuclear materials. The desire for technical proficiency found in the propaganda suggests that this ability is desirable. In addition, if NBRTC terrorism was used it would also be on the principle of strategic spectacularisation. This could manifest on a less sophisticated level as dirty bombs, which, while less destructive, would still enhance terrorists propaganda output. NBRTC terrorism is therefore congruent with the high-profile attacks in the strategic method and the desired tactical proficiency found in Propaganda of the Deed, while perhaps not possible within the resources or opportunism analysed.

Mass destruction is not necessarily integral to NBRTC terrorism either. Millenarian groups, such as Aum Shinroko’s Christian-influenced doomsday cult, have ideologies more compatible with ultra-destructive NBRTC terrorism than the focus movements, as they tried to precipitate the Rapture. Aum attacked the Tokyo underground with nerve gas attack in 1995, leaving thirteen dead, and 4000 ‘worried well’. From a propagandist point of view, it was a success. Unlike the Aum doomsday cult, however, the focus movements discussed don’t want the end of the world: they want to create a new world. Unless they were to execute a large-scale NBRTC attack on foreign soil (which would require a more sophisticated operation) they risk demolishing their support base.

Terrorists don’t always exploit the newest or most sophisticated technology. In 1968, the newest technology was the SA-7 Grail.30 This surface-to-air missile was a significant advancement for its time.31 However, there is scant record of its contemporary use by terrorists, who continued to use homemade projectiles instead. NBRTC terrorism does not
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30 This was initially called the SA-7 Strela, meaning ‘arrow.’
necessarily necessitate technological sophistication, as erroneously suggested by Champion and Mattis.\textsuperscript{32} A cumulative study, \textit{Contemporary Suicide Terrorism}, provided evidence for a low-technological approach to this seemingly sophisticated type of terrorism.\textsuperscript{33} For example, in 2010, \textit{Al Shabaab} invited Muslims suffering from AIDS to become suicide bombers, which is a low-technological approach to biological terrorism.\textsuperscript{34} This authenticates the innovation and tradition in terrorism.

\textbf{Summary}

Richard Falk wrote in 1988, “what is disturbing about the phenomena of terrorism is its normality within our culture.”\textsuperscript{35} This normality could be construed as a tradition, which has endured throughout the last century and as half as a strategy for violent and extreme political protest. In some manifestations, the original formula has been retained and conserved, and in others, it has been transcended. This indicates that Propaganda of the Deed is both inherently traditional, in that it is reoccurring behaviour that has perhaps been passed from one generation to the next, but also innovative, in that each focus movement adapt the tradition to their unique terrorspace.

Propaganda of the Deed as a conceptual tradition may well be purely instinctive. It is also possible that it was transmitted from earlier groups to later groups through familiarity with each other’s work, although the focus terrorists did not directly reference one another. The Russian anarchists travelled and lectured throughout America and England, providing a possible transmission to the Irish anti-colonialist terrorists. From there, anti-colonialists such as Fanon had a significant impact on international terrorism knowledge through \textit{Wretched of the Earth}, which was read by PIRA in Ireland, the RAF and Sartre in Europe, and The People’s Mujahedeen in Iran. The manifesto legitimised terrorism (particularly against Europeans, and by extension,
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the United States) in the Islamic world, thus it is likely it was read by the likes of bin Laden and Al-Zawahiri.

The movement of revolutionaries and population could be another explanation for the strategy proliferating from the nineteenth century, with Russian anarchists immigrating to the United States, where funding began for the Irish anti-colonialists. Later, with the developments in international media during the period of the German New Left terrorists and the Salafi jihadists, those ideas could be exchanged intangibly, with inspiration coming from the international revolutionary memory, rather than acquaintance with each other’s instructional manuals. This abstract interconnectivity became concrete when groups began cooperating and training together.

There were many similarities and differences in how each focus movement understood and used Propaganda of the Deed. These findings have illuminated previously unknown paradigms and paradigm shifts between the representative focus movements in the Four Waves of terror’s analytical framework. These paradigms, it is hypothesised, encouraged the endurance of Propaganda of the Deed as a conceptual tradition. The paradigm shifts may also evidence of innovation within the history of terrorism. Many unique manifestations between the focus movements indicated paradigmatic change within the shifting historical and ideological context. These differences neutralise any historical ability to predict how a new wave will manifest, but nonetheless shed light on the terrorist operandi modus and helps assess the strategic value and tactical likelihood of NBTRC terrorism. The demonstrations of these paradigms in the usage of Propaganda of the Deed, within this analytic and methodological framework, are a significant contribution to knowledge on this topic.
Conclusion

Terrorism is neither a “storm in a teacup nor the reemergence of savage instincts nor even a consequence of resentment” but a deliberate political method of protest.¹ Propaganda of the Deed is the innovative conceptual tradition for this. It has endured too, as a form of political discourse through a combination of tradition and innovation, which allows it to conserve its strategic intent while surpassing with modern innovation within historical and ideological context. The focus movements, however, have had little direct influence on subsequent movements. This propaganda, in addition to the endurance of terrorist violence, has established Propaganda of the Deed as a conceptual and traditional method for extreme political discourse. The parameters, subsidiary questions, outcomes, limitations, and significance will be summarised below.

Rapoport’s Four Waves Theory was used to establish research parameters to loosely delimit the four main focus movements. The Russian anarchists, the Irish anti-colonialists, the German New Left, and the Middle Eastern Salafis were selected from those four movements. The selection criterion was based on how well they represented the energy of the wave, the availability of their propaganda, and how strong the empirical record was to correlate with their activities. These four focus movements were interlinked with other influential and contemporary groups and thinkers. Their propaganda and deeds were then analysed within the six propaganda themes, to see how each understood and incorporated Propaganda of the Deed into their activities.

This thesis investigated if the use of Propaganda of the Deed by the focus groups had an influence on the subsequent groups. It is optimistic to expect to find a linear progression of the concept throughout history and across so many cultures. Although the terrorists did not reference each other publicly in their propaganda, it is probable that some had a level of

¹ Jean-Paul Sarte, “Foreword,” in Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth. pIV
familiarity with their predecessors’ work. Terrorists made a study of revolution, and it is likely that they were familiar with preceding revolution. This could have been through the direct influence of key people, such as Most and Goldman, Stepniak-Kravchinski, Lenin, and Fanon. Fanon in particular is a key influence, due to the wide dispersal, popularity, and appeal of his manifesto.

It may also be speculated that the terrorists were indirectly influenced as a result of the international revolutionary memory. This memory was carried from Russia to the United States of America and the Middle East by immigration, largely triggered by the tsar’s Jewish pogroms and intolerance of the anarchists. The expatriate American-Irish community funded the anti-colonialist Irish movement, which turned to terrorism. The Irish success, albeit limited, was an inspiration to other anti-colonialist terrorist groups for the next four decades.

The next hotspot was the Middle East, where Palestinian groups – contemporary anti-colonialist Jewish groups such as Irgun with the memory of anarchist terror in Russia – may have become inspired to launch terrorist campaigns. When terrorism did eventually rise in West Germany under the New Left, they were trained by the Palestinians (and the Provisional IRA). The Palestinians also may have influenced aspiring regional terrorist groups, and later developed direct links to al ’Qaeda. Ergo, it was intangible interconnectivity, aided by population movement, which influenced Propaganda of the Deed. This contributed to the common paradigms and breaks in its use.

This research sought to investigate the differences and similarities in how Propaganda of the Deed manifested across history. It found that there were significant commonalities in the purpose of the forward-facing focus movements with vogue ideologies such as the anarchist and the New Left groups. These contrasted markedly with the past-facing focus movements which were built on projection of historical glories, such as the anti-colonialist and the jihadi focus movements. This resulted in the identification of the re-imagined future and re-imagined
past paradigm. The historical foundation of the latter may have contributed to their greater accessibility and therefore popularity.

There were also common paradigms that traversed all the waves, such justifying the use of violence in the propaganda, with all focus movements claiming that it was an altruistic and legitimising act of self-defence. In this section, the anti-colonialist and the *jihadi* focus movements demonstrated a common paradigm in their blood and freedom symbiosis (possibly from residual nationalistic components), and violence as a moral duty. In this theme, the New Left and *Salafi* movements cited a mistrust of the mainstream media. This occurred after the advent of television, and signifies a paradigm shift influenced by historical context.

There were distinct operational differences amongst all the groups in how strategic violence manifested. However, the focus movements shared a common paradigm in the strategic intent, by hoping to enhance the propaganda output through spectacular acts against symbolic targets to undermine government authority. While the intentions were similar, the specific attacks and the targets were distinct.

A similar dynamic was demonstrated in the tactics: with paradigms identified concerning the lessons of failure, *en route* opportunism, and technical proficiency. All waves shared a common theme regarding the theft of weapons and equip. This equipment was not always used analogously, and often manifested differently in the historical empirical record.

Terrorist campaigns were markedly different operationally. Though all waves exhibited elements of the endurance-escalation-exhaustion paradigm, they did not manifest in any similar way. It was distinct to each terrorspace. The only similarity resided in the intention to exploit natural advantages: small numbers, time, and the initiative.

Terrorism through all the focus movements used comparable language when exalting the revolution. They believed society was irrevocably flawed, and needed to be fixed by heroes, as
the terrorists believed themselves to be. Both the anarchists and the New Left openly wrote
that terrorism was the only salvation. In addition, all movements exalted the revolutionary
abstraction.

The most dramatic shift came with how martyrdom was glorified in terrorism: the first three
waves had a paradigm of Death in Pursuit of Terror. The *jihadi* focus groups demonstrated a
severe paradigmatic shift by showing a Terror in Pursuit of Death paradigm. The deaths were
also celebrated in two separate ways: the anarchists and the New Left had personality cults
which celebrated the individual glory of the martyr; while the anti-colonialists and the *Salafis*
celebrated martyrdom as a general collective, and as a an act of supreme truth.

These conclusions have yielded new paradigms and paradigm shifts through which one may
examine terrorism. These paradigms can provide a level of general expectations for rising
terrorist groups, but the paradigm shifts demonstrate terrorism’s adaptive and innovative
abilities. This may have contributed to endurance of the conceptual tradition as a whole. The
utilitarian value in this thesis lies in challenging the tacit acceptance of Propaganda of the Deed,
and positioning it instead as a series of active and influential themes in the propaganda which,
when analysed, illuminate underlying features of the terrorist mindset, ideology, strategic
intent, and methodological coherence; in addition to situating the terrorists within the broader
historical context.

The conclusions are limited, as expected, by the breadth of the research set by using the Four
Waves Theory. The selection of the most representative terrorist movements and major
propaganda themes was necessary for this thesis to reach the required analytic depth. In doing
so, speculation regarding the paradigms and outcomes must be limited to non-universal
generalities. It would be pre-emptive to assume that the conclusions are relevant to non-
representative terrorist movements which have not been included in the study.
Understanding Propaganda of the Deed is intrinsic to contextualising current terrorism, and its endurance throughout modern history. The study also identified new paradigms in how some terrorists seek to intimidate and coerce their targets. Propaganda of the Deed sets an important historical precedent for terrorism’s adaptive ability. It changed incrementally with each new adaptation, in areas of tactics and strategy, but the overarching strategic intent remained the same. This research has contributed to knowledge in the field through the research methodology and comparative analysis, which has yielded previously unidentified paradigms and paradigmatic shifts in terrorist use of Propaganda of the Deed, which in turn, demonstrated its endurance through tradition and innovation.

Laqueur wrote: “If terrorism is propaganda by deed, the success of a terrorist campaign depends decisively on the amount of publicity it receives.” Propaganda of the Deed in terrorism remains a threat to the modern world. It is a conceptual tradition which uses calculated media-oriented terrorism with symbolic and far-reaching intent. Its users exhibit a series of paradigms and paradigmatic shifts which has assisted its endurance and evolution throughout history. As the anarchists hoped, terrorism has become a traditional method of political protest, and as such, can never be entirely stopped. Its endurance could be based on its capacity to innovate tactically, while conserving the strategic intent. Terrorists believed this process was worth the cost, even if it meant, as declared by Osama bin Laden that they would fall “under the shadows of swords.”
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