RESEARCH ARTICLE

PUTTING HISTORICAL MATERIALISM INTO TERRORISM STUDIES

Ogunrotifa Ayodeji Bayo

School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

Contemporary discourse in terrorism studies have been polarised into two dominant schools of thought—Orthodox tradition and Critical terrorism studies (CTS). Orthodox approach argued that state has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and that terrorism is carried out by non-state actors only. While critical theorists critique orthodox approach for ignoring terrorism used by the state against its own citizens, and argued that terrorism and its nature is not limited to violent acts itself but depends on the context, circumstance and intention. In this paper, the author offered the critique of both theoretical schools for failing to provide a class analysis of terrorism, and then introduce Historical Materialism (HM) as theoretical perspective to fill this knowledge gap. HM approach to terrorism uses Karl Marx's materialist conception of history and argued that there are two form of terrorism—Individual terrorism and State terrorism, and these forms of terrorism are used by all classes in the society or state (the ruling class, working class and the lumpen class) whenever their interests is undermined or likely to be undermined. With HM approach to terrorism, the paper concluded that terrorism is an inevitable feature of the contemporary global capitalist of mode of production such that the use of terror is the tactics of all classes in the society or state rather than that of the lumpen (suppressed) class.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary interest in the terrorism study is not a new development. Though consciousness of the close connection of the society, violence and terrorism dates back to the beginning of social sciences, it however regained currency in the domain of International Relations, Political Science, Theory of history and Public Opinion, following the terrorist attacks on the western cities of New York and Washington in 2001, Madrid in 2004, London in 2005, and Oslo in 2011, and non-western countries such as Somalia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq, Yemen and Nigeria. The trickle of studies spawned by this quest has since developed into the floods of theoretical discourses. Going through the literature, it was observed that studies on terrorism[1] has been polarised between traditional

orthodox approaches and critical perspectives. However, what has been achieved so far in both theoretical directions suggests that terrorism is less understood than ever before and the war against it is less certain of being won on the terms in which it is being fought by the 'international community' given the fundamental underpinnings of terrorism itself. Despite the medley of threats, wars and violence which terrorism begets, it is not clear following the readings of both approaches, 'who actually terrorises who', what gave rise to the use of terror, and what are the role of social classes in the use of terror in the society or state. This paper seeks to fill this knowledge gap and contribute to the ongoing debate in terrorism studies by introducing Historical materialism as a theoretical perspective. This perspective will be useful in providing a class analysis of terrorism. With historical materialist approach, it will be argued that terrorism is an inevitable feature of the contemporary global capitalist society such that the use of terror is the tactics of all classes in the society or state rather than that of the lumpen (suppressed) class.

THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

In terrorism studies, two major theoretical schools have dominated the intellectual terrain of the discipline—Orthodox/Mainstream tradition and Critical theories. Plethoras

---

[1] Defining Terrorism conjures biases as one class, actor or parties in conflict stigmatizes one another. Terrorism is being defined in relation to one's class position, social background, and as emotional responses expressed by those affected 'Victims' or those who are being victimized from a particular act of terror at one time or the other. As Turk (2004) noted that the definition of terrorism stems from the context of political conflicts and ideological warfare where one class, party, and actor cast enemy as an evildoer in order to win support for his own cause. In this study, terrorism will be classified in two types (state terrorism and Individual terrorism) given the class nature of conflicts in question. Individual terrorism here is described as a form of terrorist act perpetrated by an individual or a group with a view to championing a cause or expressing grievances over a general state of affair, purposely to intimidate or coerce a government, individual or groups to

modify their behaviours. While State Terrorism here is a form of counter-terrorist acts and tactics used by the state to suppress dissent, violent opposition to its rule amongst its citizenry (particularly Individual terrorists) or other states.

*Corresponding author: bayo.ogunrotifa@gmail.com

of terrorism studies that adopt orthodox approach have been influenced by mainstream social sciences, which posits that there is independent existence to social phenomenon and the meaning they elicit (Bunyavejchewin, 2010:4). The argument of orthodox theorists is that 'a contextual consideration is not related to socio-political actors and contexts' (ibid). This ontological position which was termed objectivism by (Grix 2002:177) followed the Emile Durkheim's positivistic idea of social fact that tend to believe that terrorists will exist 'out there' no matter what the historical context may be. The tradition of mainstream social sciences where social phenomenon are treated as 'objective' science (objectivism) stems from the positivist ontology which emphasizes the existence of an existing project or social reality and such reality should be understood in terms of data and fact using method of natural science (such as data collection, theoretical deduction and statistical analysis which stresses value free approach) drives orthodox ontological position in terrorism studies, and further influence its epistemological and methodological outlook. Mainstream terrorism approaches such as realism and liberalism believe that state has a monopoly on the legitimate use of force and that terrorism are carried out by non-state actors only (Blakeley, 2009). This orthodoxy view rejects state terrorism and posits that state is legitimate and 'terrorists' are illegitimate social formation. This reflects in Bruce Hoffman's definition of terrorism as an 'acts perpetuated by a sub-national or non-state entity' (Hoffman 1998).

The obvious reality in orthodox approach is to ensure that western state terrorism is off the agenda and subtly defines terrorism in a way that delegitimizes opposition to the interest and power of the West while legitimising the Western power's own political violence (Herring 2008: 22). Since the orthodox approach focus solely on the illegal non-state actors terrorising legitimate state, the approach helps to provide cover and legitimation for the so-called American and British war on terror in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan and Yemen, which uses dangerous counter terrorist tactics, military intervention, and regime change couple with tactic support and assistance to authoritarian regimes (allies) of Bahrain, Israel and Saudi Arabia. It can thus be concluded that the ontological, epistemological and methodological foundation of orthodox approach do not question the existing social and power relations but help to sustain and maintain the existing institutional and power-relational status quo by confronting any destabilising pressures within the international system.

On the other side of debate is Critical Terrorism Studies (CTS) which seeks to uncover the ideological, conceptual and institutional underpinnings of terrorism. CTS critiques dominant orthodox approach that tend to liaise with technical capitalism, and argue that violent activities used by the state (state terrorism) against its own citizens or other states have been ignored by the orthodox terrorism scholars (Gunning 2007; Silke 2009; Jackson, Smyth and Gunning 2009, Herring 2008). Scholarly interest espousing CTS approach felt that only dissent violence directed against western interests are labelled as 'terrorism'. While challenging the arguments of orthodox approach, critical theorists questioned former's positivistic epistemology, reject its scientific methods, challenge its rational ontology, and normatively condemn its value neutral theorizing (Price and Reus-Smit 1998:261).

Critical theorists argued that 'object' in orthodox ontology does not exist independently of the 'subject' but rather shape each other in a dialectical, never-ceasing dynamics (Toros and Gunning 2009: 92). In challenging orthodox empirical verifiable social fact, CTS opines that terrorism and its nature is not limited to violent acts itself but depends on the context, circumstance and intention on one hand, and the social, cultural, legal and political processes of interpretation, categorization and labelling on the other hand (Jackson 2009:4). This ontological underpinning of critical theorists can be regarded as social constructivism—as it help to shape our understanding that actors/objects relate to each other within the confines of collectively-constructed social configurations (Price and Reus-Smit 1998). Since ontology deals with what really exist out there to know, then the question is how it can be known (epistemology). The epistemology of CTS tends to thoroughly scrutinise the origin and uses of terrorism as a discourse, and the meaning 'terrorist' attach to their actions. This epistemology can be regarded as Post-Structural Interpretivism (merging of post-structuralism and Interpretivism)—which connotes that terrorist acts can be perpetrated by anyone within a structural configuration, given the existence of a particular context. In this regards, the ontological and epistemological position of Critical theorists seems to suggest that social reality of terrorism can be understood by appealing to the interdisciplinary methodological essence of its existence. CTS therefore reject statistical analysis because it can be manipulated to support neo-liberal and neo-imperialist political agenda, and protect certain hegemonic interest.

However, CTS can be credited for espousing history, ideology, context and intentions behind terrorism beyond the narrow lens of orthodox approach. It is not clear following the review of literature at what point in its history did state and non-state actors engage or continue to engage in terrorism, what class[2] in society did non-state actors belong to, which class in society did non-state actors recruit to carry out individual terrorism? How social contradictions in the society usher terrorism within different classes? In other words, CTS failed to explain class analysis of terrorism: how social relations of production among different social class produce terrorism within and across states. The inability of CTS to address this brings us back to Historical Materialism as a theory that is needed to engage in class analysis of terrorism more than critical theory. Although, Herring (2008), Herring and Stokes (2011) and Jonathan (2011) have suggested that CTS should incorporate class analysis into its theoretical vocabulary, these appeals seems to raise fundamental concern that may pitch it against certain interests who have somewhat

---

[2] Class here in this paper connotes a group of people in society with the same relationship to the means of production. The class which owns and controls the means of production rules society. The society is divided into three distinct classes: The ruling class, working class and the lumpen class. The **Ruling class** are the group of capitalists those who control the means of production and distribution, and who formed the league of pro-business politicians who control the state instrument of power. **Working class** here refers to combination of Industrial workers, administrative staffs, and civil/public servants. **Lumpen class** here refers to a group of peasants, artisans, unemployed and other groups in the society that are not regarded as part of the working class

severed their link with Marxist and neo-Marxist scholarship, particularly in Frankfurt Critical School or Welsh school of Critical Security Studies. It is my contention here that Historical Materialism (HM) should stand alone as new theoretical tradition in terrorism studies or in the alternative be a new variant that is taking paradigmatic shift in CTS. This stems from the fact that if the focus of orthodox approach is to provide problem-solving tools (as Robert Cox 1981:128-130 argued) to combat military threats using counter-terrorism strategies against perceived enemies under the pretext of War-on Terror, CTS as far as its current literature stands is less likely to shape policy direction. That explains why Duvall and Varadarajan (2003:81) opines that critical theories is grossly overdrawn for imposing dubious categorisation and simplifying all research into either being policy relevant or having no bearing on policymaking. Therefore, HM must rise to the task of unpractical gap left by CTS in order to advance scholarship that bears implications for Policy and Practical socio-political action that will help to stem the tide of state terrorism and individual terrorism of non-state actors that are more likely to occur in the Third world countries than anywhere else in the future.

UNVEILING HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Historical Materialism is a theoretical perspective that was developed by Karl Marx (1818-1883) to explain the conditions of material life of society. Marx's historical materialism came into being as a critique of Friedrich Hegel's dialectics. Hegel in his *Philosophy of Right* (1821) developed dialectics as the logic of evolution, movement, and change and argued that material world was a reflection of a 'universal idea' or God (Hegel, 1821). Hegel further asserts that the universe is becoming a combination of being and non-being such that the inner movement of reality is the process of God thinking, as manifested in the evolution of universe and thought (ibid). The fundamental weakness of Hegelian dialectics, according to Marx, was that Hegel combined them with a mystical idealist view of life. Marx however posits that the only *spirit* was human culture, the human spirit, and human life. He further argued that human culture is the humanized and civilized world that comprises human life and human spirit; it is the world that has been created by human beings, and it is the world that is always being re-created by human beings[3].

To Marx, the social world is the objective reality of human society which is the reality of a past human life, which can only, comes into being on the basis of the creation of man through human labour, and through the supersession of an earlier form already in existence (Copleston 2003). Marx however developed Historical Materialism as the scientific law governing human development and historical succession of society. He argued that 'in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life

conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness'[4] Marx materialist conception of history provides more insight into how a new society was developing within the old: such that how contradictions in the old society give way to a new society. Marx argued that 'class conflict serves to facilitate major historical change while deeper causes of revolution lie in the autonomous tendency for the productive forces to develop throughout history' (Katz 1993:1). He therefore posited that human societies had underwent myriads of stages-starting from primitive communalist society of hunters and gatherers, and later transformed into Asiatic type of society, feudal society and to capitalist society. The implication of this is that in these earlier societies, men carry on a struggle against nature and utilize nature for the production of material values not in isolation from each other, not as separate individuals, but in common, in groups. Marx noted that:

> At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or - what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic - in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so can we not judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social productive forces and the relations of production[5]

Marx regarded the material base of these societies as the productive forces and the corresponding social relations. The productive forces in this regard constitute the instruments of production wherewith material values are produced, the people who operate the instruments of production and carry on the production of material values and the labour-power (labour skill), while the productive forces are only one aspect of mode of production in these societies, another aspect of production in these societal mode of production, is the relation of men to each other in the process of production—men's relations of

---

[3] See Karl Marx's (1843) book on 'A contribution to the critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right' available at
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/sw/penguin/early-works.htm

[4] See Karl Marx's (1852) book title: 'The Eighteen Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' available at
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1852/18th-brumaire/ch01.htm
[5] See Karl Marx's (1859) book: title: 'Preface to the critique of Political Economy' available at
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1859/critique-pol-economy/preface.htm

production, which Marx described as social relations of production[6]. Marx and Engel regarded participation in the social relations as important characteristics of human beings, and that the nature of these social relations in the mode of production of these societies is inherently in conflict with the further productive capacities. This generates internal inefficiencies, social contradiction and conflicts among classes which inevitably altered the balance of social relations, which eventually give way to higher form of society (as primitive communalist give way to Asiatic societies, and Asiatic societies give way to feudal societies). Since the focus of this paper is on class analysis of terrorism and state, more attention will be given to feudal and capitalist mode of productions as these are important in explaining the emergence of state as instrument of terror. In feudal mode of production, the primary form of property is the possession of land in reciprocal contract relations: the possession of human beings as peasants or serfs is dependent upon their being entailed upon the land. Social relation of production is between the ruling class (noble or aristocrat) and the serf (lumpen class). Mick brooks (2002) argued that 'exploitation under feudalism is clear and unveiled. Freer peasants had land to till and had to pay a rent in kind. Others had an intermediate status, working small plots to gain their own subsistence and forced to pay labour services the rest of the time, on the lord's land. The peasants pay services in money, labour or produce to the lords. Everyone can see what is going on. If the lord is in a position to force the peasant to work four days instead of three on his land, then it is clear to both parties that the rate of exploitation has been increased'[7]. This forms of exploitation which occurs through reciprocated contract formed the basis of class struggle between the landlord (noble) and the serfs.

The resultant social explosion that borne out of these class struggles was the 1381 Peasants' Revolt in England. The effect of the social dislocation caused by the peasants' revolt compelled the ruling class (the King, nobles and Landlords) to establish state structure—bodies of armed men (which were mainly drawn from the ruling class) who had a monopoly of armed might. It was at this time that political and economic powers were in the same hands (the ruling class). 'Justice in the village was largely in the hands of the lords' manorial courts. The feudal lord and his men-at-arms were police, judge, and executioners all rolled into one'[8].
State was therefore established at this time as an instrument of class rule, needed to protect the ruling class against the rebellious serfs. Despite the defeat of peasant's revolt and the resultant dispossession of land, feudal era marked a decisive stage in establishment of rational agriculture, and ushered a process of primitive accumulation by the merchants. The merchants (the future capitalists) began to turn their attention to the peasants half-employed on tiny plots of land. They began to 'put out' weaving to these households. The peasantry

became more and more dependent on their weaving income. The merchants were able to move from just supplying raw materials and supplying sales outlets, to possession of the peasants, looms and even their cottages. Through their control over outlets they held the whip hand. This was another important process whereby the feudal peasantry was reduced to proletarian status. The new economic clout possessed by the merchants is constantly at class struggle with landowner and absolute monarchy who wants to keep the peasants on the land. The class struggle between the merchants and the landowner brought to the fore the social contradiction within the feudal system that eventually give way to capitalism given the observation of Marx and Engel (1848) that:

> The productive forces represented by the bourgeoisie rebelled against the order of production represented by the feudal landlords and the guild-masters. The result is known, the feudal fetters were smashed, gradually in England, at one blow in France. In Germany, the process is not yet finished. But just as, at a definite stage of its development, manufacture came into conflict with the feudal order of production, so now large-scale industry has already come into conflict with the bourgeois order or production established in its place. Tied down by this order, by the narrow limits of the capitalist mode of production, this industry produces, on the one hand, an ever-increasingly proletarianisation of the great mass of the people, and on the other hand, an ever greater mass of unsaleable products. Overproduction and mass misery, each the cause of the other - that is the absurd contradiction which is its outcome, and which of necessity calls for the liberation of the productive forces by means of a change in the mode of production. The means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the bourgeoisie built itself up, were generated in feudal society. At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged ... the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder; they were burst asunder. Into their place stepped free competition, accompanied by a social and political constitution adapted in it, and the economic and political sway of the bourgeois class. A similar movement is going on before our own eyes ... The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring order into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property[9].

The destruction of peasant proprietorship (in the form of ownership of land by individual farmers) was regarded by Marx as an essential ingredient in the expansion of capitalism — a process which neither should nor could be prevented. The

---

[6] Productive forces comprise human labour power, technical know-how used in the means of production such as tools, equipment, buildings and technologies, materials, and improved land). While Social relations of production comprises the property, power and control relations governing society's productive assets, cooperative work relations and forms of association, relations between people and the objects of their work, and the relations between social classes.
[7] See Mick Brooks' (2002) article on 'what is Historical Materialism? A study guide with questions, extracts and suggested reading' available at http://www.marxist.com/historical-materialism-study-guide.htm
[8] See Karl Marx's (1867) Capital: a critique of Political Economy. Pp 694-809

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

capitalist society heralded a new social relations and new productive forces that is fundamentally more sophisticated and advanced than the previous societal mode of production (such as feudalism) because most of the profit or the surplus extracted from the labour of the working class is reinvested in industry, commerce, tourism, investments abroad, or other forms of capital expenditure (Calhoun 2002:22). In this regard, Marx considered the capitalist class to be one of the most revolutionary in history, because it constantly improved the means of production, more so than any other class in history. According to Marx, the introduction of private property which capitalist mode of production fosters will sharpen class antagonism between the property owning class (capitalists) and working class. While revolutionising the productive forces of the society, the need to protect private property from class antagonism of the working class and future revolution will inevitably compel the capitalist ruling class to improve upon the state apparatuses and instruments of coercion and terror it inherited from feudal era.

Under capitalism, labour-power (the capacity of the worker to labour) is a commodity like any other, in that it is bought and sold on the market. It is sold by its owner, the worker, and bought by the owner of money; the capitalist. But labour-power is different from other commodities in this respect: it has the unique property of being able to create value. This is its usefulness to the capitalist; this is why the capitalist buys labour-power (employs workers). As labour-power is consumed in production (as workers are put to work) value is created far in excess of what the capitalist has paid (as wages) for the labour-power (Clarke 1998: 57-59). This is what Marx regarded as Surplus value. Marx believed that surplus value appropriated from labour is the source of profits, which the capitalists plough back into the business for further economic growth. He concluded that the rate of profit would fall even as the economy grew and business expanded (Calhoun 2002:22). This fall in the rate of profit, of course, is due to the very expansion and excessive competition inherent in Capitalist mode of production. The fact that the capitalists have to spend more and more on what Marx called 'constant' capital (i.e. machinery, and buildings, etc) means that the ratio of the 'constant' to the 'variable' capital (i.e. the wages that are paid to the working class) has increased enormously in the course of the last few centuries.

Marx believed that social contradictions that is inherent in capitalism will emerge when the accumulation of capital is no longer sustainable due to falling rates of profit in (real) production, thus produces systemic crises such as excessive expansion, over-production, under-consumption, overstretching of credit system and falling rate of profit would in the long run punctuate economic growth and deepened recurring and cyclical depressions leading to mass unemployment, financial crisis, and systemic crisis of immense proportion that will inevitably usher conflicts within the social classes in the capitalist mode of production that will inevitably (ibid). Marx argued that one social system is replaced by another social system when it can no longer serve to develop the productive forces, that is to say the means of life, the power of man over nature. Marx believed that these structural contradictions within capitalism will inevitably necessitates its end, thereby giving way to socialism or socialist mode of production.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AND ITS APPLICATION TO TERRORISM

Terrorism is an inevitable consequence that will feature more prominently in the capitalist mode of production because the social contradiction (economic crisis) that arises out of the conflicts between the social relations and productive forces will usher a continuous struggle within classes as Karl Marx affirmed. Henk Overbeek (2004) noted that 'these social relations of (re-)production are hierarchical and exploitative. They are furthermore guaranteed by the state: in the era of the dominance of *capitalist social relations*, they are guaranteed by the capitalist state'[10]. Capitalism which fosters private property makes some people to own more than others. In other words, capitalist mode of production fosters inequality among the classes, and further divides the society into have (rich and super-rich) and have-not (the poor). In the period of capitalist crisis and contradiction, the class antagonism among the classes becomes sharper given the extreme polarisation and inequality between the rich and the poor, while capitalism cannot continue to guarantee certain social welfare scheme and economic package for employees and the citizenry. Therefore, the ruling class (Capitalists and Pro-Business political elites in power) ekes the position of 'class war' by undertaken savage cuts in living standards and harsh economic reforms, purposely to save capitalism from imminent collapse and negation. The rich and other members of the ruling class are less likely to be affected by these cut in social spending than the working and the lumpen classes. Therefore, the gap between the ruling class and the working/lumpen class become wider, and this will inevitably affects the prevailing social relations within capitalism. Reformist measures such as less pay (wages) but longer working time, mass sacking of employees, poor working conditions, cut in social spending and harsh austerity measures will be implemented Thus triggers social conflicts and class struggle among the classes. In this situation, there is potential that class struggle that will lead to strikes, protest and industrial disharmony between the working class and the ruling class. As Alan Wood (2002) noted that 'most obvious and painful manifestations of the crisis of capitalism are not only economic but those phenomena that affect their personal lives at the most sensitive and emotional points: the breakdown of the family, the epidemic of crime and violence, the collapse of the old values and morality with nothing to put in their place, the constant outbreak of wars - all of this gives rise to a sense of instability, a lack of faith in the present or the future'[11]

These contradictions caused by the capitalist mode of production and the inability of the state (domination of ruling class) to provide for Lumpen class is recipe for anarchy. This stems from that unemployed and others who cannot understand the series of frustration will be forced to response to the crisis one way or the other. Frustrated sections of the lumpen class are more likely form criminal gangs, radical

---

[10] See Henk Overbeek's (2004) working paper on Global Governance, Class, Hegemony:A historical materialist perspective. Pp.3 available at http://www.fsw.vu.nl/nl/Images/Global%20Governance,%20Class,%20Hege mony%20A%20historical%20materialist%20perspective_tcm30-42721.pdf

[11] See Alan Wood's 2002 article on Civilisation, Barbarism and Marxist view of History available at http://www.marxist.com/civilization-barbarism-history170702.htm

Islamic groups, sects, fascist and terrorist organisations, who will find more solutions to their plight and social condition by engaging in anarchism, and other forms of individual terrorist method against the state. Although, most of these organisations were formed to champion a particular cause at the initial stage, but became a political force when their ideologies found an echo and support from a sections of disenchanted and frustrated member of lumpen class who join these organisations in large numbers. The cause and ideology of these sectarian organisations comes in direct confrontation with that of the ruling class, and they engage in individual terrorism first to respond to the series of frustration and problems they faced, and second, to influence and change the behaviour of the ruling class and the state. This method of expressing grievances by the lumpen class is more likely to compel the ruling class and the state to engage in counter-terrorist strategies, capable of clamping down and suppress these individual terroristic groups, given the instrument of force and terror at its disposal. Therefore, terrorism is a tactic of all classes in class conflict, rather than just a tactic of a lumpen class. Terrorism is therefore a reflection of social relations among social classes within modern capitalism (Jonathan, 2011) such that the use of terror can be perpetrated by any of the classes whenever their interests, rights and priviledges are at stake. It must however be noted that the extent to which lumpen class-induced individual terrorism will occur varies from countries to countries. Individual terrorism by a section of the lumpen class is more likely to occur in developing countries than in developed one. This is because in the developed countries, tensions among the classes are not so tense because the state can afford, and ensure that social security benefits; unemployment stipends, single mother benefits, scholarship and student loans, pension among others are made available to the working class and the lumpen class. This is possible because there is so much capital (wealth of the state) nurtured by over-exploitation of third world countries vis-a-vis taxes and incomes from multinational firms. Therefore, there are enough resources to soften the antagonism among social classes, and ensure that sections of the lumpen class are discouraged from forming or joining sectarian groups that will engage in individual terrorism against the state.

But in developing countries, these forms of benefit are non-existent. This therefore makes social antagonism and divides among classes to be sharper especially in the period of capitalist crisis. The sharper this antagonism between classes, the more the lumpen class becomes frustrated and aggrieved. The frustrated and de-classed members of the lumpen class who are angry with the state of affair become the willing tools in the hand of groups/organisations susceptible to the use of individual terrorism against the state. The ontological position of HM's approach to Terrorism can be illustrated to a large extent, as the description of the object of enquiry from within: driving the object (terrorism)'s own processes and arguments to the logical conclusions and thus require assessing the object internally (within the society and economy) instead of externally—as orthodox approaches would want us to believe. This ontological position can be regarded as *materialism*. This is because the study of a particular historical material constellation such as terrorism must be located on the basis of how a particular society or system reproduces itself materially vis-à-vis its particular mode of production, and how social contradiction in that mode of production produces terrorism.

Therefore, such contradictions that produce terrorism are located within a particular society, state or system, and not outside. In the era of the dominance of capitalist mode of production, terrorism must be located within the context of hierarchically structured relations, orchestrated by the prevailing capitalist society or system. However, the epistemological position of Historical materialist approach to Terrorism can be conceptualised as critical historicism. This stems from its ability to place the study of history on a scientific basis by uncovering the law that govern historical changes: how the development of the productive forces brings into existence different production relations and different forms of class society, and how conflicts within these classes produces terrorism. Due to the epistemologies it uses, HM approach to terrorism aim to utilise historical method to produce more coherent and conclusive explanations. Therefore, a large number of contemporary historical studies will be important to providing a thorough methodological base for terrorism studies. Therefore, HM's aim is to explain the discourse of terrorism by making reference to the empirical essence of its historical evidences.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM IN RELATION TO CURRENT GLOBAL ACTION ON TERRORISM

Most scholarly works on terrorism particularly in the 1970s through 1990s have been consigned to the backwaters of political violence with more emphasizes on state versus non state actors. The post-cold war debate on terrorism became more politically charged following the attacks on western states since 2001. The Individual terrorists actions of *Al Qaeda*, Hezbollah, Al-Shabaab, Sunni Islamic extremist groups—such as Egyptian Islamic Jihad, some members of Al-Gama'at Al-Islamiyya, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, and the Harakat ul-Mujahidin, Salafi Group in Algeria, Irish Republican Army (IRA), Hamas, Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), Boko Haram in Nigeria, and others were subject to fresh intellectual perspectives that made contemporary debate on Global War on Terror (GWOT) more discursive. In relation to Historical Materialist approach to Terrorism being developed here is concerned, they are two types of terrorism—Individual and State terrorism[12]. Al-Qaeda and other aforementioned groups/organisations[13] are formed as organized group aiming to achieve a specific goal—economic, political or religious. They are the product of a society and are formed just like any other organisations in the west such as British Nationalist Party (BNP), Ku Klux Klan (KKK), English Defence League (EDL) and Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA). These groups/organisations are generally regarded as *non state actors*. They are formed either by a section of the ruling class due to the disagreement within the class or by a section of the working or lumpen class to respond to certain social problems or campaign for a particular ideology they held. The members of the lumpen class in the society are usually the target of these groups/organisations for recruitment and membership. Though most of these groups have

---

[12] These two forms of terrorism have been explained in the note (1) of the introductory section of this paper.
[13] As most orthodox scholars will want us to believe that these groups/Organisations ate 'terrorist' organisations, I do not share this view. It is my contention here that these groups/Organisations are just group just as their respective states are institutions to themselves. The use of the label 'terrorist organisations' should be frowned at and discouraged because it will be seen by these groups/organisations as a stigma and embolden them to fight on and engage in more terrorist actions and attacks.

supporters and sympathizers within the rank of the ruling and working class but due to their class position in relation to the means of production, they are relatively fewer than the lumpen class. The ability of these organisations to draw membership from the lumpen class depends on how on far its awareness campaign and ideology find an echo and support within the rank of the lumpen class especially in the period of economic crisis. In the period of economic crisis, the nationalistic idea of EDF and BNP often find an echo or expression within the rank of few members of the lumpen class who attribute economic recession and unemployment in Europe and America to the influx of immigrants and minorities. But majority members of the lumpen class did not join these organisations due to the provision of social security benefits such as housing allowance, unemployment benefits and other welfare packages by the state. The tendency of these organisations to be a political force that can engage in individual terrorism (against minorities and immigrants) is undermined due to its poor membership drive. And in case they engage in individual act of terror against their perceived target, they can easily be arrested by the British state due to its small population. But in the developing countries where devastating crises and contradictions of capitalism such mass poverty; inequality in educational, political and employment opportunities; ignorance due to limited educational opportunities; growing unemployment; and governmental corruption, including the misuse of resources, by which the people were repulsed and lack of social welfare schemes (Usman 1987: 21; Enwerem 1999: 125; Ale 2009: 8) are felt across the broad spectrum of the society. These problems could swell the army of vulnerable people whose disillusionment and impoverishment made them easy prey in the hands of these groups. In fact, these individual terrorists' groups/organisations often incorporate into their discourse fierce critiques of the complicity of US-dominated economic institutional arrangements in generating and sustaining structural conditions of poverty, social inequality, exclusion, dispossession, and poor distribution on a global scale, and exploit this to attract large followers amongst the lumpen class especially commoners who share in their ideologies and look up to them for solution. While observing the individual terrorist activities of Boko Haram Sect in Nigeria, Adesoji (2010) noted that 'the sect was able to attract more than 280,000 members across Northern Nigeria as well as in Chad and Niger Republic. The sect's membership cut across the broad spectrum of society, but a preponderant number of members came from its poorest groups. Thus, beyond former university lecturers, students, bankers, membership extended to drug addicts, vagabonds, and generally lawless people. Although the common denominator among all members was their desire to overthrow the secular government and to propagate Islamic law' (Adesoji 2010: 7). The growth of these organisations came as a result of leaps and bounds win the recruitment of larger layers and segments of the lumpen class in their respective countries. This makes them to be a political force to be reckoned with in their respective states. Despite having large followership, membership and supporters across the broad spectrum (of social classes) in their respective states, the over-exaggeration of its strength in engaging with the heavily militarised state structures and institutions is particularly dangerous and will violate the axiomatic sociological orders of social cohesion and stability in their respective states due to the counter-terrorist response to be unleashed by their respective states' instrument of terror. In the study of the Kano riot of 1980 in Nigeria, it was observed that Maitatsine group, who have been noted for using violence against other religious groups and non-Muslims in the Northern Nigeria, engaged in individual terrorism against police/military formation:

> On December 18 1980, the Maitatsine group went to "Shahuci" (a popular open field) to preach when the police stormed the place to prevent the sect from preaching because they did not obtain a permit. Moreover, the public had always complained of harassment by the sect whenever it was preaching. Conflict ensued between the police and the sect. Obviously, the police underrated the strength of the sect and the two police units that went for the operation were soon over-powered by the members of the sect who appeared with bows and arrows, knives and Dane guns. The sect burnt down all the thirteen police vehicles, killed four policemen and injured the rest whom they stripped off their weapons. Encouraged by the 'defeat' of the police, the sect marched in Kano city chanting 'Yau zamu sha jinni', meaning 'today we shall drink blood', in Hausa. By December 19, the sect took over strategic places in Kano city including the Fagge mosque, some schools, a cinema house and the Sabon Gari market. For eleven days, the police was unable to bring to control the sectarian riots. When the situation was getting out of control, ex-President Shehu Shagari had to invite the Nigeria Army to intervene. It took the army two days to dislodge the sect while their leader was killed in the operation. More than 1,000 members of the sect were arrested and detained in prison where they received agonizing treatment from the police. The crisis lasted for 11 days, claimed the lives of more than 4,179 people and hundreds of houses and shops were either torched or destroyed (Isichei, 1987; Okafor, 1997; Falola, 1998: 153)

For every action, there must be equal and opposite reaction, not only in Isaac Newton's mechanics but also in politics and social relations. The use of individual terrorism to create or induce fear by any group or organisation in expressing grievances against the state is dangerous and counter-productive—as this will be countered and confronted by the state—who is better armed to engage in counter-terrorism/combatants operations against the perpetrators of Individual terror. This was confirmed given the provocation, condemnation and global responses that characterised the unfortunate individual act of terror allegedly perpetrated by the Al-Qaeda on United States in 2001. That act of terror gave states the excuse to tighten their respective local laws, formulate harsh anti-terrorism act and restrict human rights (Kielsgard 2006:249-261), and perpetrated state terrorism (counter-terrorism) against certain groups/organisations linked to individual terrorism, in their watch lists. The War on 'Terror' that was spearheaded by the United States and western countries started by tightening and formulating enabling laws in their respective states, was extended abroad to Africa, Middle-Ease and Latin America. Joanna Macrae and Adele Harmers in their Humanitarian Policy Report (2003) observed that 'the US began building an international coalition against terrorism on 12 September 2001. For the first time in

its 52-year history, NATO invoked the North Atlantic Treaty's mutual defence clause, declaring that the assault on the US could be considered an attack on the entire 19-nation alliance. The US held talks with a range of countries around the world, to gather military support, access to bases and over-flight rights. The British government published a set of 'Campaign Objectives', and European Union (EU) heads of state agreed to the introduction of a counter-terrorism Plan of Action, which defined over 60 objectives covering foreign policy, home affairs, judicial cooperation and financial and economic policy. Many European countries gave their police forces new powers of investigation and detention'[14]. From all indications, it is obvious that War on Terror or Global War on Terror (GWOT) especially in the Middle-East is a war against certain groups/organisations linked to individual terrorism in the world. It is an indication of counter-terrorist pretence and tactics to further state terrorism in a foreign territory or states. The GWOT is an imperialist tactics used to support militarily and diplomatically weak regimes especially in Middle-East whose capitalist policies and oppressive dictatorship make them unpopular among their people (especially the lumpen class) and compel certain groups to challenge the status quo. As Sciullo (2010:574) argued that the United States has become the new colonial occupier in the Middle East, supplanting years of British subjugation with a renew economic and political clout. The obvious reality is that United states and its Western allies want to protect at all cost the capitalist mode of production from collapse despites its inherent crises and contradictions, and ensure its triumphant especially in the Middle-east. The implementation of capitalist doctrines and policies in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Yemen and others bring certain contradictions such as unemployment, poverty, malnutrition, lack of good health care system and infrastructural deficits, thus compel many sections of the lumpen class in those countries to seek solace in religion and join groups/organisations who believe in the use of Individual terrorism to express grievances and to topple the regimes. Therefore, the current GWOT is economic annexationist driven—where military action is linked with neo-liberal globalisation is used to forcefully integrate Middle East in to the global economy. This is achieved by fortification of weak regimes (ruling class) in the Middle-East and others around the world, so as to further unleash state terrorism against perceived groups/organisations linked to individual terrorism or fight against states that support groups/organisations that threaten western hegemonic agenda of protecting and expanding capitalism in the global space. Terrorism is therefore a reflection of social relations among classes in a global capitalist mode of production.

CONCLUSION

Today's terrorism is not fundamentally and remarkably different from that of the cold-war era given the ideological underpinning of state and non-state actors terrorism and how this reflect the dynamics of unending class struggle implicit in the hidden structures of oppression and structured contradictions in the material world which global system of capitalism represents. The discursive frame of terrorism cannot be analysed in isolation of its class nature and the socio-economic conditions that gave rise to it. This is the point

that orthodox and critical theorists ignored. It is therefore important that Karl Marx's Historical Materialism exposes the class nature of terrorism in the current mode of production (capitalism) and how non-state actors (groups/organisation linked to Individual terrorism) emerged out of the existing social relation of production among classes in the society. Homer-Dixon (2001) observes that grievances exploited by non-state actor's terrorists are compounded by 'an international political and economic system that's more concerned about Realpolitik, oil supply, and the interests of global finance than about the well-being of the region's human beings'. The social contradictions and crises of capitalism which Dussel Enrique (1983) problematized:

> The [neo-capitalist] globalization is that of a formal, performative system (the value that valorizes itself, the money that produces money, D-D'; fetishes of capital) which raises itself up as the criterion of truth, validity, and feasibility and destroys human life, trampling on the dignity of millions of human beings and not recognizing their equality or much less affirming itself as co-responsible for the alterity of the excluded and accepting only the peripheral nations, even if the debtor people perishes, fiat justitiam, pereat mundus. It is a massive assassination; it is the beginning of a collective suicide[15]

And others such mass poverty; inequality in educational, political and employment opportunities; ignorance due to limited educational opportunities; and growing unemployment. In this situation, the lumpen class are the worst hit especially in the developing countries. Socially alienated members of the lumpen class who are unable to afford the basic necessities of life, drop out of society and join an organised groups/ organisations (non-state actors) whose formation is to achieve a specific political goal. This member of the lumpen class thus became die-hard patriots of the sect, groups/organisations and engages in the use of individual terrorism to lash out at society's injustices. The responses of the state to the orgy of violence and culture of fear and threats which individual terrorism created, will be repelled with the brute force of the state instrument of terror (state terrorism), then the vicious circle of terrorism will commence. In this unending class struggle among classes in the society or states, terrorism is a tactics of all side, used and justified to yank out their grievances and protect their interests. Therefore, terrorism is therefore a reflection of social relations among social classes within modern capitalist mode of production. Finally, it is important to state that the appropriate social and public policy formulation is needed to salvage the cyclical social dislocations orchestrated the global capitalist crisis, and to discourage the youth who are mostly member of the lumpen class from joining organised groups/organisations tainted with individual terrorism. This can be achieved through equitable distribution of wealth and by taken all grievances seriously rather than police and military measures to address this problem. For Western capitalist states it is much easier to fight individual terrorism with military force, than introducing complex economic measures, such as an equitable redistributive mechanism in the global market. Putting

---

[14] See Macrae, J and Harmer, A (2003) Humanitarian Action and the 'global war on Terror: A review of trends and Issues. Humanitarian Policy Report. Available at http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/287.pdf

[15] Dussel Enrique, 1983. Ética de la liberación en la epoca de la globalización y la exclusion, 567-8.

Historical Materialism into terrorism studies and discourses will help to provide conceptual and theoretical frame for understanding and explaining terrorism beyond the lens of Orthodox/Mainstream and CTS approaches. There is no doubt that the social and economic condition plaguing the Third World especially in Africa and Middle-East, are the springboard on which Individual terrorism festers. The current global war on terror is unwinnable as long as poverty, inequality and economic oppression continue in the Third world societies. The bird that pinches on a rope will not be at rest as long as the rope itself is never at rest.

REFERENCES

Adesoji, A. (2010), 'The Boko Haram Uprising and Islamic Revivalism in Nigeria'. *Africa Spectrum*, 45(2): 95-108

Ale, A. (2009) 'Boko Haram: Soyinka Blames Government'. *Saturday Punch* (Lagos), 15 August, 8.

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

Bunyavejchewin, P. (2010) '*The Orthodox and the Critical Approach towards Terrorism: An over-view'.* Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University (*RCAPS*) Working Paper No. 10-3. Available at www.apu.ac.jp/rcaps/

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

Cox, R. W. (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2): 128-130

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

Clark, B. Stewart. (1998). *Political economy: a comparative approach.* 2nd ed, Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

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

Enwerem, I. (1999), *An Assessment of Government's Formal Responses to Ethnic/Religious Riots, 1980-1990s*, in Ernest E. Uwazie, Isaac O. Albert and Godfrey N. Uzoigwe (eds.), Inter-Ethnic and Religious Conflict Resolution in Nigeria, Maryland, U.S.A.: Lexington.

Falola, T. (1998), *Violence in Nigeria: The Crisis of Religious Politics and Secular Ideologies*. New York: University of Rochester

Frank, A. G. (1972) *Lumpenbourgeoisie: lumpendevelopment*, New York: Monthly Review Press.

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

Grix, J. (2002) 'Introducing Students to the Generic Terminology of Social Research' *Politics*, 22(3): 177

Hegel, G.W.F. (1821) 'The Philosophy of Rights'. (Translated by Dyde, S.W. [2003] available at http://socserv. mcmaster.ca/econ/ugcm/3ll3/hegel/right.pdf

Herring, E. and Stokes, D. (2011) 'Critical realism and historical materialism as resources for critical terrorism studies'. Critical Studies on Terrorism, 4(1): 5-21

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

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

Homer-Dixon, T. (2001) Why Root Causes Are Important. *Toronto Globe and Mail*, 23 September

Isichei, E. (1987), 'Assessment of the Maitatsine Religious Crisis 1980', *Journal of Religions in Africa*, Vol. 3:194-208

Jackson, R. (2007) 'Symposium: The core commitments of critical terrorism studies' *European Political Science,* 6(3): 244-251

Jackson, R. (2009) 'Critical Terrorism Studies: An Explanation, a Defence and a Way Forward' *BISA Annual Conference*, pp.1-25 available at http://www.bisa.ac.uk /index.php?option=com_bisa&task=download_paper&no _html=1&passed_paper_id=54 (accessed on 25 February 2012)

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

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

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

Macrae, J and Harmer, A (eds) [2003] '*Humanitarian action and the 'global war on terror': A review of trends and issues'.* Human Policy Group Report. Available at http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/287.pdf

Marx, K. [1859/1977] A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy**.** Moscow: Progress Publishers.

Marx, K. (1867) *Capital:* A Critique of Political Economy**.** Moscow: Progress Publishers. available at http://www. marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/

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

Okafor, F. U. (eds). (1997), *New Strategies for Curbing Ethnic and Religious Conflicts in Nigeria.* Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers

Price, R. and Reus-Smit, C. (1998) Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism. *European Journal of International Relations* 4(3):259–294

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

Sciullo, N.J. (2010) 'The Ghost in the Global war on Terror: Critical Perspectives and Dangerous Implication for National Security and the Law'. *Drexel Law Review*, 3: 574

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

Usman, Y. B. (1987), *The Manipulation of Religion in Nigeria: 1977-1987.* Kaduna: Vanguard Printers and Publishers.

****