International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)
ISSN: 2319-7064
Index Copernicus Value (2016): 79.57 | Impact Factor (2017): 7.296

Terrorism is Unethical Arguments against Terrorism

Dr. Urmi Ray

Abstract: ***Terrorism is unethical not because it revolts against the exploitation by the powerful over the weak but unethical because it attacks the civilians who are not directly responsible for their cause. That is why unlike wars, insurgency and revolution this 'ism' fails to get public support.***

Keywords: Innocent killing, consciousness raising, collective guilt, unethical

Terrorism is an act of political struggle where the underprivileged goes against the system, to make their claims heard by attacking the innocents. Although the terrorists believe that the innocents are not so, as they are the ones who elect such a corrupt Government. But when we discuss the issue of terrorism we come across more arguments against it than in favour of it. Who would support such an act of violence, terror and bloodshed? We human beings are basically peaceful in nature, thus we cannot entertain the barbaric acts, moreover such acts can in no way be termed as just, ethical especially where slaughtering of non-combatant, innocent civilians is involved.

Let us now go on to check whether terrorism is really a war for national liberation as they state it to be so. In defining a 'just war' the terms 'colonialism', 'racism', 'self-determination', 'alien occupation', etc. are often used. But can we identify terrorism with any of these positions. The war for National Liberation must be supported by all citizens, because the victory from it would be enjoyed by all of them. But indiscriminate violence, the most remarkable feature of terrorism, cannot be accepted by the citizens, nor can it bring good to all of them equally.

Just War was morally justified because it was defensive, it does not involve undue use of force nor, does it injure the non-combatants. Terrorism, on the other hand, uses violence and that too on people who are "innocents", who are in no way related to their cause.

Again, 'Just War' adheres to the Principle of Double Effect, i.e., direct killing of non-combatants or innocents is prohibited, though it might cause **unintentional** innocent-killing.This spirit is absent in terrorism.

Moreover 'Just War' believes in the good to be achieved of the war – should be proportional to the evil resulting from the war. This is known as **Principle of Proportionality**. But the devastating effect and major loss resulting from terrorism can never be claimed to be proportionate to the small amount of good if any (mainly the benefits of the terrorists) achieved. Hence terrorism actually denies this principle. If terrorism claims to be a Just War, then C.A.J. Coady states that, it has to follow the rules of just war – which it does not. The traditional conditions of both just ad bellum (conditions of a morally justified launching of a war) and of Jus in Bello (conditions of the just prosecution of war in progress) – have been violated by terrorism as pointed out by Haig, in his article "Terrorism And Morality." St. Thomas Aquinas laid down a few conditions of Just War, which are surely in accordance with the conditions of jus ad bellum and Jus in Bello and these conditions are:-**First**, just war should be declared by a legitimate authority. Terrorism is not declared by any legitimate authority like the government of a state or its head. **Second,** humans should never be treated as means but should be treated as end**.** Terrorism uses human lives as their means to reach their goal. Thus the means used by the terrorists cannot be called just. Therefore the concept of 'Just War' is not applicable in case of terrorism.

If the most brutal acts of terrorism directed at innocent civilians (in the form of threat or murder) are permitted, when committed by members of a liberal movement; then human rights will suffer a severe setback because all human beings are entitled to enjoy their right to life. Acts that violate any human right are morally wrong because, such acts do not adhere to the principle of respect for persons. Hence terrorism cannot be justified, even in the garb of liberation movement.

David Long, says that freedom fighting refers to a political goal, whereas terrorism refers to a tactic used to attain the goal. Even if we justify the goal, its means can not at all be justified. Ascribing such high valued expression to the acts of terrorism does not make the acts 'Just'.

Now let us go on to examine Devine and Rafalko's three arguments which support terrorism.

The **first argument**, i.e., 'Economy of Scale' argument seems to be preposterous because, to sacrifice innocents for the terrorist's cause, and to think that it is being 'cheap' on their account is something most repulsive to reason. When the terrorists state that this is a cheaper method to revolt then do they mean that human lives are cheap – as unaccountable human lives go at stake with the implementation of this so-called 'cheap' method? To set free a single member of this group taken captive by the government, the terrorists go on to kill thousands of innocents. Does this mean that the life of their members is valuable, not of common men? But the terrorists do not protect their member's lives also, as it is often seen that when their part of work is done then they are chucked off as they might prove to be dangerous, or they may be of no use later. Thus the members themselves do not have faith in each other because a breach is also noticed sometimes among the members of the same group. In this context we can remember the incident of Indian Airlines flight IC 814, which was hijacked and taken to Kandahar in December 1999. The act was believed to be the handiwork of ISI Pakistan, because Harkat-ul-Ansar claimed responsibility for the act, which was committed to get Maulana Masood Azhar free from Indian captivity. They held the plane for 9 days, and even killed one passenger on

board. Does this argument hold that the 'price' of one terrorist is more than hundreds of innocent people? The utilitarian view holds that each person is equal than anyone else. This view is also supported by humanistic standpoint. In this regard we can quote deontological Hastings Rashdals Axiom of Equity, which says: "I ought to regard the good of one war as of equal intrinsic value with the like good of anyone else."(The Annals Vol.463; Ed.By M.E Wolfgang, PP 40-47).

Moreover this argument of "Economy of Scale' is fallacious for other reasons too –

It commits the error of 'Species mistake' because the terrorists treat human beings as mere things. The species which has unconditional value is made identical with things having only instrumental value. The citizens of the country are seen as commodities. M. Martin says that it is the right of every human being to be treated as a person and not a thing, and this is his natural right which must not be violated. Moreover the mass massacre which are common occurrences on both sides, are prominent evidence against the projected argument. Again 'cheap' or 'economic' is a relative term which surely involves ambiguity. The above mentioned argument stands on a false presupposition that all cheap things are acceptable. It is false as our everyday experience states that the major premise of the argument is not correct. Hence the conclusion becomes redundant.

All cheap things are acceptable.
Terrorism is cheap.
Therefore, terrorism is acceptable.

The Economy of scale argument is therefore, invalid for its false major premise. It has admitted an improper generalization.

Secondly, the 'Consciousness Raising' argument also fails as without causing violence and bloodshed and through passive resistance, marches, sittings and non-cooperation the public can be made aware of their institutional injustices.

Killing of innocents is in no way necessary for this objective, at least, not in a democratic system. Gandhiji has proved this through his implementation of non-violent method to bring Swaraj in which he was successful.

Again this argument fails to accept the fact that people are sometimes competent to react against their felt grievances, and also that people can sometimes be their own guide. As J.S. Mill argues in 'On Liberty' that, men are their best judges; they are rational enough to understand whether they are provided with justice or not. [Although this is not true in the case of illiterates or morons, can they be made to realize such a truth ever, by any such violent policy? Rather, they would start hating such institutions which make the world a chaotic and unstable place to live in]. Thus this argument also denies the presence of reasoning faculty in men.

Thirdly, this argument of 'Consciousness Raising' imposes a subjective view on the mankind as such by an improper generalization. Here the argument takes a leap from particular to universal, which can never produce certainty. The terrorists however, are content with the probability of the conclusion that follows.

Fourthly, this argument creates a dilemma for the people – whether they should go against the terrorists and support the government, or should support the terrorists and go against the government. In both the cases they would face difficulty. If they do not abide by the government – then they would be punished for it; and if they go against the terrorists then they would be slaughtered ruthlessly. The logical form of this argument would run as follows: - If p then q and if r then s; either p or q; either q or s where p=people go against the terrorists and support the government, q=the terrorists will kill them, r=people support the terrorists and go against the government, s=they will be punished (where the ultimate punishment implemented by the government may be death).

If the people are in both-ways insecure, then how can the terrorists claim to save them from oppression?

Among the three argument of Devine and Rafalko, the third argument is the **'Collective guilt'** argument. In their article "On Terror" in the *Annals* (vol.463), Devine and Rafalko themselves have shown inconsistencies in this argument, which are mentioned below:-

According to Spinoza "when everybody is guilty then nobody is guilty". Here the government, the people in it, the terrorists – all are guilty. The government is guilty for depriving those who have formed terrorists, and also guilty for making policies which go against the terrorists. The people of the government, i.e., the citizens are guilty because they do not protest against such exploiting policies made and implemented by the government and finally, the terrorists are guilty for taking lives of innocent women and children. Since all are guilty here the concept of 'guilt' stands no longer.

Secondly, those who justify bombing say, Israeli women and children in an airport, pointing to the responsibility of the victims for the oppression of Palestine, would be equally right if they point out that their victims are also subject to the sin of Adam.

Thirdly, when the terrorists go on to rectify the citizens of a particular government, they should keep this in mind that those citizens themselves do not know that, they are following the 'wrongs' of the government. First, the individual must know that wrongs do happen and it is only then, can we correct them.

Fourthly, a collective body or a single person can only be held responsible when there is a causal connection between one's faulty action and a harmful outcome. But the terrorists can show no causal connection between an innocent's deed (i.e., the acts of omission or commission by the innocents) and the so-called wrong doings of the government. If this be the case then, they cannot charge the innocent citizens for the wrong doings of the government. Even if a person gets involved into some wrong-doing of the government, being a part of the system, he cannot be targeted for the untoward situation, because it might be the case that he does not know what is right or is, perhaps, unaware of his dereliction of

duty. In fact, only those can be properly blamed who are responsible for implementation of such indiscriminate violence.
For example, Daniel Pearl, the wall-street journalist, was abducted from Karachi in Pakistan in 2002 by the terrorists, who tried to use him to negotiate with the US government for release of some Pakistan nationals held captive. Pearl was beheaded after a short while, even before any such negotiations took place. Surely, this cannot be the right way to remedy the society.

Fifthly, the entire country's population or the members of a national group are so diverse in their views (which is really healthy, or else a stagnancy or a stunted growth of a society, viz., nation would be found as believed by J.S. Mill); that no relevant solidarity as the terrorists suppose, exists between them; wherefore they cannot be held to be guilty collectively. So ascribing collective responsibility to the entire population whole citizenry, must be rejected. If the terrorists cannot persuade the citizens to believe in the justice of their cause, then it would be simply a failure on their part and this would imply that their cause is not really strong.

This argument of 'collective guilt' involves the fallacy of circularity, because the terrorists think that people, along with the government are guilty, whereas the government, along with the common people think otherwise.

Moreover if people are implicated for guilt by association then one fails to understand why those Arabs are exempted, who live in Israel and contribute to their economy – and this is also true for the Palestinians who are employed in Israel.

Another observation proving that terrorism is wrong states that – "The wrong is so grievous that something must be done" can never imply "the wrong is so grievous that anything can be done" to make it right. This means that the government policies and its oppressions do not reach to those extents where anything can be done to rectify them (where the 'anything' involves massive loss of the society).

Moreover, politics to the terrorists may be an end in itself in their cognitive world, but for the common citizens politics serves as the mean to an end.

Again, the individuals are so preoccupied with their own routine life that, it is absurd to hold them responsible for every cause that needs remedy. Instead of lamenting and brooding upon the fact that the citizens have not done anything for the upliftment of the society, the terrorists might as well start doing something for a good cause without getting involved in barbaric and inhuman acts.

The Sophists believe in subjective morality. This means that an action is not right or wrong intrinsically, but it becomes right if the subject thinks it to be right and, accordingly, would become wrong when other consider it as something wrong. Thus the morality of an action changes with varying individuals and their viewpoints. Now, if there is no such thing as objective norm of 'goodness' and 'justice', with which we may judge our acts as good or just, then the standard of moral judgment would be the law of force /coercion. This further leads to the doctrine "might is right", which has been modified by the terrorists and used at their own convenience.
Lastly, it can be argued that, when the terrorists cannot give lives then they can have no right to take them. Moreover by doing so they are extinguishing the individuals' future capacity for good by killing him or her.

A close examination of the pro-leftist argument

Now let us turn to the pro-leftist arguments and those given by Tarnovsky for a closer examination. All those arguments in defense of terrorism are, in essence, untenable.

Tarnovsky's ethical argument in favour of terrorism fails because **first**, the nature and purpose of revolution or insurrection is not identical to that of terrorism. Revolution involves the support of almost the entire population of the country and, hence, the change is caused from within where end or purpose is also accorded by the majority of the people. This is not true in case of terrorism. So the question of a choice between revolution and terrorism is not very relevant.

Secondly, the act of 'deliberate killing of the innocents' tantamount to 'murder' which in itself is immoral. If such deliberate killing is not for self defense, and if it is justified, then this would mean that there is something about the person killed, by virtue of which the justification is possible. This means that the person killed is not at all innocent. But if he is innocent and, in no way related to their dispute then killing of that person would obviously be unjust. On what ground, then, did Tarnovsky try to justify killing less people as more ethical than killing more? Moreover, the dignity of life, which each human being possesses, cannot be destroyed under any circumstance. Thus, Tarnovsky's assessment of killing less people is simply a quantitative evaluation of human life, which is humiliating.

Again, losing life in a just war or in a revolution implies some notion of martyrdom and, hence, can be ethically justified as dying for a great cause; whereas losing life in a terrorist attack merely implies ill fate for the victim. This can neither be ethically justified nor can it be logically substantiated.

The violence, which Karl Marx suggests during class struggle, is actually counter-violence without which the exploited sect of the society could not have been rescued. Marx himself opposes terrorism because of its premature attacks against the state due to which the proletariat movement could run into grave danger. It must to be remembered that, Marxist violence did not lose its revolutionary nature because, unlike terrorism, it did not make use of indiscriminate violence.

Terrorism, it is often said, borrows its inspiration from Marxism; this however, is not right as it never followed the path of Marxism in the truest sense. Karl Marx places incenses importance on man and his freedom, which the terrorists certainly do not.

Again the terrorists might even state that, they have drawn their inspiration from anarchist ideologies; but they miss the main spirit of anarchism where liberty and freedom is depicted as a genuine moral principle. According to the anarchists, freedom of others is a necessary condition of one's own freedom.

Firstly the argument for the justification of terrorism as a revolt against colonialism and imperialism is nugatory, because any revolt must follow certain norms of society. The teleologists think that, for an action to be morally justified, it must be connected to some kind of human welfare. The action, in other words should be concerned with less harm and more benefit of the people. But terrorism leads to more harm and less benefit. Instances have been found where terrorists have performed terrorism for their personal benefits, and did not consider the desire of the common men, i.e., did not look into the fact, whether they really want such a change – then how can the question of benefit arise at all ?

Secondly, the exercise of the right in the present context invariably involves murder (because terrorist attacks involve killing of innocent people who are not aggressors) which, in principle, or in practice, cannot be justified.

Though Wilkins argued in favour of using terrorism as an instrument of self defense, he imposed certain restrictions – first, terrorism should be limited to the members of the community which is collectively guilty of the violence committed; secondly, terrorism should be confined to 'primary targets'; thirdly terrorism should be directed initially at the perpetrators of violence.

These restrictions imply that unrestricted use of violence or terror tactic cannot be used even in the name of self-defense.

The argument 'On last resort' also fails. As when the government asks the terrorists enter into a dialogue, many a time they withdraw themselves from such negotiations. Moreover terrorism, as used by the terrorists state clearly that, it is not used by them as the last resort as it is pre planned carefully and consciously as a means only, after judging its repercussions on the public and the government. Indeed talk of 'having no alternative' needs to be construed in terms of certain goals and purposes in order to have sense made of it since there are usually other 'alternatives' which are inconsistent with certain values or ends which terrorism is believed to embody.

Again though a community may become so downtrodden and threatened in their conditions of life that to assert their dignity, they may react with an act of terrorism. This is no doubt, a possible case. But the common cases are those which involve a certain amount of pre planning.

Sartre as well as Beauvoir made freedom the primary value in morality, which is placed by them over and above the value of life. But terrorism does not ensure such a freedom to mankind.[i]

Now let us now focus on the four internalist arguments of Gerry Wallace against terrorism:

Gerry Wallace in his paper "**Area Bombing, Terrorism and Death of Innocents"**as found in the edited volume of *Applied Philosophy*explains four 'Internalist arguments', which claim that killing innocent people can never be morally justified.

First, he says that, killing or taking some one's life is not justified at all. It would be justified if the person killed is not innocent genuinely.

Secondly, he says if it is justified to kill innocents deliberately then the terrorist's acts towards the victims is also justified. But surely there can be no such justification to cover the misdeeds of another person; nor can the justification be for the good of other, if some innocent person has to sacrifice his life. This would be manifestly wrong since nothing can justify the victim's loss for others' gain.

Thirdly, many terrorists claim that their act is just revenge towards the society which made them terrorists. But killing of innocents cannot be justified in the name of retaliation for what the terrorists themselves have suffered, because to retaliate in this way is simply to repeat the original deed. So how can such deeds performed by them are justified now, if they were not justified originally. No doubt, the terrorists suffered but they make the society suffer – but two wrongs cannot make a right. Moreover the innocents, who are killed in the war of terrorism, did not make the terrorists suffer in the past. Thus such a revenge of the terrorists towards them is not only meaningless, but totally unjust.

Fourthly, Gerry Wallace states that, anyone and everyone can perform the deed of killing innocent human beings. People who kill them for no reason at all do not seem to possess a sound moral character, as no sensible human being can do something like that even if that killing brings any good consequence.

The argument of making a free moral choice is repugnant. In this argument it is said that the terrorists should also enjoy their rights to choose what actions they should perform as rational human beings. But given this right, the terrorists, misuse it for their own convenience. Thus the terrorist's claim for a moral choice to do immoral acts (like killing, abduction, bombing, hijacking etc.) is contradictory – The argument fails because no one has the right to harm others. Again their claim to choose their actions directly confronts with the identical claim of their victims who, unlike them, are innocent. In fact the terrorists are ready to enjoy the rights to moral but not prepared to carry out the corresponding duties attached to these rights.

Here we find two rights conflicting, with one another. One is the right of the terrorists and the other is the right of the common people, i.e., right to life. The utilitarians state that

[i] Value of life to these existential philosophers was secondary as the life can be valuable only if it be subject to liberty and freedom. If humans are always at the mercy of others and if at every moment our desires, autonomy and individuality are curbed then that life is equivalent to death itself. Thus to them life should be defined by the freedom one gets.

among the two rights, the one would be accepted which would yield maximum benefit to maximum number of people. Here right to life of the common people is more fundamental than the right to choice of the terrorists.
Moreover, in the name of destroying the evils of the government, the terrorists aim at destroying the capacity of the government to protect the rights of its citizens, which, finally, frustrates the citizens who then go against their government for its ineffectiveness and hence, the main purpose of the terrorists get served. (For example, in the case of 26/11 the Mumbaites reacted, against the government's incompetence with 'Enough is Enough'. This also was the theme of the film entitled 'A Wednesday' which was made immediately after this attack).

We need to discuss the arguments that point to the defects of terrorism. Devine and Rafalko, in their article 'On Terror' mention some general objections that can be raised against any form of terrorist activity. These are mainly of three kinds – (i) terrorist's actions are counter-productive to their own cause; (ii) terrorists are incoherent in the pursuit of an indefinable objective; (iii) terrorists direct their campaigns of terror in precisely those societies that allow other means of redress and appeal of injustice.

If we take the **first argument** then we would see that the terrorists are not always successful in achieving their goals. They provide terror to disunite the mass of a particular region, but, by implementing such violent acts, they see that the society becomes more strongly united. The assassination of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the then P.M. of India in 1984, by Sikh militants of Punjab, unified the entire country against them, which was reflected in the mass murders and riots against the Sikhs. So, their actions are mostly self-defeating.

If we look into the **second argument**, we find that the terrorists are incoherent. This argument basically states that, the demands of the terrorists are so outrageous that they can hardly be met and even when they are met, the terrorists put forward newer demands. Thus they have a never ending list of demands to be fulfilled by the government. So it is useless to at least try to fulfil any of their demands.

Thirdly, terrorism targets free society – a society where the desired changes of the terrorists could be brought about by other means. Violence against a state, which provides pacific change –is surely unjustified. Terrorism gets success due to the media support through publicity. The media can thoughtfully build up public opinion against the governmental atrocities; instead it is used and manipulated to publicize the violent acts of the terrorists to terrorize the citizens and, thus, to create pressure on the government to fulfil their own demands. The terrorists, who claim to bring revolution or change in the system, could take up the method of litigation in the courts, or resort to other options available in such a free society. They could even build up option for a civil disobedience against the governmental injustices, instead of taxing the extreme measure of violence. This possibility shows signs of incompetent leadership on the part of the terrorists.

The terrorists might retort that they had already tried out those other methods mentioned above, but since they seemed to be futile they are compelled to take the up arms to petrify the government, to make their work done. Moreover they say, who would listen to the minority who is always kept aside in the society? Would the government really listen to their hardships if they do not make the government listen to them forcefully? The question remains. Although public opinion is an important feature of democracy, does the government give importance to such opinions of any and every one of the country? Can any layman freely express his problems to the government, is the government accessible?

Again it is said that the government ought to listen and ought to accept the decision of the majority i.e., 51% of population. Is it reasonable to say that we should agree with the 51 instead of the remaining 49? The question of the morality of an action cannot be settled through majority vote. Moreover, in real life, it is seen that 'majority' in a country is actually formed of the people who do not want to get entangled with any problem what they require is just a happy, peaceful and secured life.

Thus the terrorists often state that, if a society cannot decide its controversial issues by 'ballots' then it would have to choose 'bullets'.

Next we would like to consider why terrorism is considered unjustified on socio-ethical, political, psychological and logical grounds:

C.W. Kegley views terrorism as a menace and a threat to undermine the very foundation of civilization. He ascribes 'Seven Sins'[1] to terrorism:
1) It exalts violence – which includes bloodsheds.
2) It suppresses moral instincts.
3) Repudiates politics.
4) Spreads totalitarianism.
5) Destroys democracy.
6) Exploits freedom and
7) It shapes the will of civilized society to defend itself.

Moreover we can add further observations –
Terrorism obviously abuses fundamental human rights of the victims. As the terrorists claim that, they themselves are deprived of their rights and hence revolt against the society, similarly the innocents can also protest against the terrorists on the same ground; namely, they are deprived of their right to life. The 'right to freedom' was recognized as one of the five fundamental rights of man, which every human being possesses by nature. This right was made a part of an international goal by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, and Mackenzie listed it among the most important of the human rights as we find in the book *The Anatomy of Terrorism* by D. E. Long; P.139. On the other hand, the terrorists think themselves to be the guardians of the society and hence, they forcefully impose their opinion upon the entire population. To do this they employ any method whatsoever to suit their temperament, craze and ability — methods which directly violate the basic ethical precepts.

The terrorists destroy the peace and sanctity of human life. By nature men are peace loving and do not wish to live in panic. R.M. Hare says, "What makes terrorism wrong in

most cases is that people do not want to be killed or bereaved".[2]

Suicide terrorism is another method used by the terrorists to get their work done by the government. Such a form of terrorism was introduced by LTTE of Sri Lanka to compel the government to withdraw military forces. This method was adopted by various groups of Lebanon, Chechnya, Kashmir, West Bank, and other places as an effective method to influence modern democracies in favour of the terrorist's goal.

The bombers are usually young people who are brain washed and trained in the terrorist's cause since their adolescence. They are the future citizens of the country who could do a lot of constructive work to benefit the society but, before their potentiality could even be used, they are made to sacrifice their lives – This is a loss to the society, and, hence country.

Terrorism is unjustified because apart from terrorizing the common people, the terrorists sometimes, simultaneously, carry out anti-social activities like drug – trafficking, kidnapping for ransom, bank robbery and so on. They do these things to generate economy which they need to carry on their terrorist activities, like ruining the organization, buying arms and ammunitions etc. Thus apart from their main activity, which is no doubt illegal, they also break other laws of the country.

Terrorism is such a strategy that it does not let the terrorists to get converted to normal people, even if they realize their mistakes and want to get back to the mainstream. Rather if the leader of the organization comes to know of such intentions, they are simply killed. Terrorism, therefore, gives no chance of reformation to the terrorists and those who choose to be terrorists for some reason or other, are compelled to remain so throughout their lives. So a terrorist by choice becomes a terrorist by compulsion. Thus just discussed, it can be inferred that respect for human autonomy is tarnished by the philosophy of terrorism. Moral philosophers such as Sartre in *Bingand Nothingness* and R.M. Hare in *Essays on Political Morality* have held 'respect for individual autonomy' as a basic moral principle. A person is said to be autonomous only when he is self-governing and not controlled by any other external influence. The terrorists fight for 'autonomy' and protest against the government as they are deprived of their freedom; they themselves curb the autonomy of the citizens as well as of the other members of their group once they become terrorists. This is because sanctioning autonomy to the members of their group or to the citizens at large might disturb their plans and their implementation. In their opinion persons have no value as human beings; they are simply symbolic enemies or human collaterals to bargain for some political demand. If this is the level of respect they have towards people then how can they in turn expect any respect?

The Maxim 'man is an end in himself' is reduced to 'man is a means, an instrument in himself', because the terrorists target and use common men as their tools to achieve their goal. In a fight for e.g. just as weapons, if damaged, get replaced, - so also men are used as means to reach get the terrorist's goals; and in the process, if one man gets killed, others are kept ready to be picked up for the terrorist activities. This indeed demeans the respect and dignity for humanity, beings do not possess instrumental value; they are intrinsically valuable.

Haig says, as found in D. E. Rapoport's book *The Anatomy of Terrorism*, man's cultural or ethnic, religious or racial identity or heritage must be respected, and the principle of respect for person states that, persons should be seen as unconditionally worthy agents. It is, moreover, the duty of any human being to act morally toward any moral being, because many deontologists admit that, it is the sense of morality that differentiates human beings from other beings. But according to the terrorists, we find, such rights and duties are irrelevant.[3]

It seems then that terrorism adheres to the organic theory where an individual is viewed merely as a tiny cell in the huge organism of society. Like an expert doctor, the terrorist is determined to ampute the defective cells and organs in order to make the body (i.e., society) survive in good health. The value of the individual is assessed in terms of his utility to the society. So, it seems that according to the terrorists, all individuals should enthusiastically sacrifice themselves while serving the ends of the society. But such a notion is self-stultifying because, if all individuals sacrifice their lives then who would be left to enjoy the beneficial consequences of terrorism?

The terrorists might argue by stating that what they do in the form of assassination or mass murder is analogous to what a state does in the name of capital punishment.

Similarly, if common men fall prey to Government's mistakes then, instead of killing them, they need to be explained as to what the wrong is and further that they perform such wrongs. Moreover the control principles of justice clearly state that a person is only responsible for what he has done when he does it voluntarily or when he could have avoided it. But the innocents do not voluntarily perform such wrong deeds: It is only the government that voluntarily does so. Thus the targets of the terrorists should be the government and not the laymen. By carrying out indiscriminate violence at all times and in all places, the terrorists actually commit barbarism which is opposed to civilization, denying completely the moral and legal rights of the victims. They raise their voice as the government does not do justice to them, but do they do justice to – either to the government or to the society?

Terrorism is destructive as it shows no constructive endeavour; it is purely a negative notion and no negative notion can be beneficial for the society. In history also we find instances of destruction, but those destructions are constructive as they either save a clan or race or they help to conquer states or are aimed towards the benefits of the society.

Moreover it is to be noted that terrorist's position gets into self-contradiction, when they deny civilization (and its attributes) through their barbaric activities to establish a

civilized system of governance and also when they create cross border violence to establish democratic rule, because if they aim at establishing a democratic government within their own state territory they must fight their battle within their own boundaries.

The terrorists do not abide by the governmental laws because according to them such laws are made in such a manner that they do not accommodate them (the terrorists). Hence they conclude that along with them the citizens should not also abide by the government because like them they too are exploited by its policies. Thus the terrorists here commit a naturalistic fallacy – deriving 'ought' from 'is'. As they 'do not obey the government so people 'ought' not to obey the government.

According to David Hume, 'is' statements differ categorically from 'ought' statements, as both speak of a different kind of relation, where – 'is' statements refer to the world of facts, and 'ought' statements are related to the world of values. R. M. Hare supports Hume in expressing that 'is' statements are descriptive, while 'ought' statements have some sort of recommendatory force; they are not descriptive at all. Hence deriving 'ought' from 'is' is like defining a non-natural element in a naturalistic manner.

The terrorists also commit a number of logical fallacies in the form of fallacy of relevance, fallacy of presumption and that of ambiguity.[4] The fallacies of relevance committed by them are as follows:

1) The fallacy of 'ad populum' – an appeal to emotion – this takes place when reasoning is substituted by expressive language and other devices calculated to excite enthusiasm, excitement, anger or hate. The strategically planned speeches of Osama Bin Laden of Afghanistan or Prabhakaran of Sri Lanka, or Yasser Arafat of Palestine excite the listeners to a state of religious or patriotic frenzy, which ultimately enables them to achieve their goal.
2) The terrorists commit the fallacy of 'ad verecundiam' – an appeal to inappropriate authority. The political goal of the terrorists is often settled and implemented by some fanatics or by dogmatic leaders like Bin Laden who surely did not have such authority.
3) The terrorists also fall prey to the fallacy of 'ad baculum', i.e., an appeal to force. They use covert force or threat of force to bring about the acceptance of their position. They think that only force can make people listen obey them but such a thought has no rational basis.
4) The terrorists commit 'fallacy of presumption', i.e., the fallacy of converse accident, when they generally apply the 'collective guilt' argument. Such a fallacy takes place when a principle that can be applied to a handful is applied to all. This is something like inductive generalization in logic where the logicians pass from 'some to all'. The terrorists may experience the fact that some of the government officials are immoral and exploiters, from which they come to the conclusion that the entire government is guilty, and therefore, needs to be overthrown.
5) The terrorists also commit the 'fallacy of division'. Here they impose the attribute of whole on the part. According to them since the entire government is guilty, each and every member being a part of it is equally guilty. Iriansky observes, when one wants to deal with the corrupt government (bourgeoisie regime), i.e., the bourgeoisie in the abstract (at the class as a whole), one starts hitting at any bourgeoisie – because every bourgeoisie is a criminal. This is a reflection of the need for a scapegoat.

The abstract targets (the state or the government) are inaccessible. So terror tactics are applied upon those who are easily available, namely, the citizens of the government.

These are fallacies committed by terrorists when they give arguments in favour of their action.

As citizens of a country the terrorists should abide by the laws of the country. No doubt they are morally justified to protest against the government oppression of that particular country. But breaking law and bringing about indiscriminate violence to the government which is elected by them, cannot be morally justified.

Now if the terrorists break laws in this way then they are either convicted according to the penal code of that country, or they are not considered as citizens any longer and are sent to exile (e.g. Laden was exiled by the Saudi government in 1991). Hence they would possess no right to protest against the government. Any protest from any citizen of a foreign country (just as Laden was sheltered by the Taliban government of Afghanistan) cannot be entertained by the government. Here the terrorists can reply by saying that obedience towards the government is one's 'primafacie' duty; but saving one's country from the oppressive government is his 'actual duty'. W.D. Ross distinguishes between 'prima facie duty' and 'actual duty' where he says that, the former indicates a duty that is always to be acted upon unless it conflicts on a particular occasion with an equal or stronger duty.[5] Hence, prima facie duties are not absolute and in the event of conflict, it is not the prima facie duty, but the actual duty that should be performed, as the situation demands. At this point we can admire the terrorists' noble intention, but we can at the same time question that by killing the innocents which part of the country do they hope to save?

The terrorists claim that they, by using such (brutal) methods, create an ideal society.

First, the question arises can a positive goal be achieved by a negative method? Secondly an ideal society should have two aims – of ensuring no harm to its members, and the other of helping its members to live happily. Does terrorism fulfil any of these criteria an ideal society? The answer is in the negative.

These principles correspond to three principles of conduct – harm no one, to give every man what is his own, and to live piously Leibnitz attacks the three motives of these three principles[6] – the first principle is attached to the motive of self-interest or self regard, which is to be subject to prudence, and prudence consists in the maxim of doing to others what we would wish for ourselves. Hence, if one wants goodness from others, then one has to be good to

others. But the terrorists, by harming others, can never be good to them.

The second principle is attached to sense of humanity, which corresponds to love. The terrorists, however, neither love their country, nor their citizens, nor, again do they love themselves. Thus on the part of the terrorists sense of humanity is nil.

The third principle refers to the motive of religion. Leibnitz believed that God has an important role to play in the implementation of moral law. The third motive is then twisted by the terrorists to suite their purpose which is far from morality. Thus the terrorists' dream of an ideal society does not stand at all, as the motives entailed here are not terrorists' motives.

As C.A.J Coady in his book *The Morality of Terrorism* remarks that, "one of the reasons why people are so disturbed by terrorist activities is that they find such activities deeply undermining of social realities with which their lives are enmeshed and which provide a background of normalcy against which they can go about their ordinary living".(p.66) The constant fear of the citizens that they might be attacked by the terrorists at any time and at any place, takes away their energy and mental strength. This, in turn, robs the nation of its energy and spirit, thus hampering the well-being of the nation and of its people. In the modern times people seem to accept their death by terrorist activities as their natural destiny. This shows the feebleness of the minds of the common people which, undoubtedly, is a result of such never ending violence upon them.

Now, even if people realize that the existing government is incompetent, then also they would not like to take the risk of replacing this government with people who make their lives miserable (i.e., the terrorists). Between the two evils they would rather choose the lesser evil. For example, people of Afghanistan might not have been satisfied with the Nazi bulla government but surely they would not accept the Taliban government either.

Patriotism is not merely love for a piece of land, but it is love for a country which also includes its citizens. So it can never mean hatred for the numerous people living in it. How can the terrorists claim to be patriots, when they indiscriminately kill the innocents of a country? Many of them again posit the fact that their activity is for upholding Nationalism. But instead of upholding nationalism they are rather creating a 'perverted nationalism' which does not serve any one any good.

Terrorism would be greatly criticized by the environmentalists too, as the acts of violence disrupt the natural environ. Use of chemicals and bio-chemical weapons by the terrorists can cause great damage to nature. Moreover, due to such activities, a country's natural resources might be at stake leading to inconvenience of not only trade and commerce, but also of agriculture as the lands may become barren.

Finally, it can be stated that the terrorists could be defeated by the following irrefutable argument which can be found in the article "On Terrorism", by R. M. Hare, in the *Journal of Value Enquiry*; (Ed. By E. Laszlo and J. Wilbur P. 246), as follows:-

Either the terrorist must be prepared to use sufficient force against the representatives of the state to dislodge it from power, or he must resign himself to live as an internal alien in a world shaped by the state power.

It is well known that the terrorists' strength is not a match to confront the state, and its machinery; they therefore adopt clandestine methods.

Therefore, he must refrain from his political plans to dislodge the state from its power by use of violent or hostile means.

The argument may be logically formed us:-

p v q
~p /∴q.

p=terrorists must be prepared to use sufficient force against the representatives of the state to dislodge it from power.
q=he must resign himself to live as an internal alien in a world shaped by the state of power.

Thus from the above arguments it is clearly seen that terrorism cannot be justified in any way, as the arguments against it are strong and indeed logical. Moreover, in a civilized society, such barbaric acts like terrorism cannot be entertained at all.

The acts of terrorism seem to have different meanings in time of peace than of war. In times of war terrorist acts come within the frame of Jus in Bello and are interpreted as war crimes against humanity. In peace time, its commission invites concern of the humanitarian group as well as of all involved in the general well being of this blessed earth. Thus acts of terrorism, whenever committed, is illegal, immoral, unlawful and should be condemned in absolute manner.

Earlier we had mentioned about the just war theory, but the classic just war theory does not really apply when the war or struggle is not between nations, but between a nation and a non-nation or non-state group. The just war theory had been named by some thinkers as C and this new theory where the war is between the state and some non-state organisation is termed N. Through N the terrorists try to justify their view by stating that, they also have right intentions in fighting such a war; they too believe in the principle of proportionality (as they want to bring good over evil), this war, according to them, is the last resort since the government had always given them a deaf ear. Again as far as the principles of just cause and legitimate authorities go, – it can be said that if not all but some terrorists group do abide by such principles. In those cases such groups would be said to fight from within the moral realm. Where they actually depart from the realm is, in the 'in Bello' portion of just war theory. They can maintain the principle of proportionality though, but they do really go against the principle of discrimination, which must be accepted unanimously without any doubt.

At this point the terrorists go into denial. They present several reasons for denying their departure. They say that

they can rightly seek vengeance, and can rightly apply the notion of 'collective responsibility' to blame to almost everyone in their opponent's side, and can rightly fight as they do so out of necessity. But all their arguments fail. Most importantly, they fail because of the ease with which they discount the status of their enemies. By their rhetoric, their enemies are guilty of crimes. But once their rhetoric is challenged, it becomes clear that it is morally impossible for terrorists to defend their own people, while butchering their enemies. In effect, terrorists who target 'innocents' deserve all the criticisms that they receive, for, in spite of their efforts, they do not uncover legitimate exceptions to the discrimination principle. Rather they violate the principle, in a most serious fashion. As they violate the principle jus in Bello – their 'war' cannot be considered as just. In fact in no way can we call terrorism moral neither can we morally support it. Such claims of the terrorists are therefore, superfluous and merely redundant.

Finally on being enquired the terrorists would state that to them purely innocents would be those who are neither directly nor indirectly related to harm them, and they would be children, infirm, physically and mentally handicapped as they do not elect the Government who exploit the so called terrorists. But it can be asked to them, then why do they have to die in their attacks? To this they perhaps would retort that those are not intended but are collateral damages which are even found in wars. But in wars the targets are not the non-combatant common civilians as found in this 'ism'. Hence if there is any motive behind terrorism then that is not liberation of common mass but merely fulfilling personal interests of the terrorists, at the cost of innocents' life which no ethics, no logic can justify ever.

References

[1] Kegley, C.W. 1990.*International Terrorism*.St.Martin's Press: N.Y. P.21
[2] Hare, R.M. 1967.'On Terrorism'.*Journal of Value Inquiry*, ed.E. Laszlo and J. Wilbur.Springer:Australia. P.246
[3] Rapoport, D.E. 1982.*The Anatomy of Terrorism*. Pergamum press: N.Y. P.248
[4] Copi, Irving M and Cohen, C.1998.*Introduction to Logic* (110th Ed.).Pearson Education: Asia.PP. 162-199.
[5] Cahn, S.M and Marcie, P. 1998.*Ethics*.Oxford. University Press: N.Y. P. 488.
[6] Hostler, John. 1975.*Leibnitz's Moral Philosophy*. General Duckworth and Co. Ltd: London. P.55-63.