

Terror

Israel, Palestine, and Terror, edited by Stephen Law, Continuum (2008): 17-33

Tomis Kapitan

1. Defining 'Terrorism'

Any intelligent discussion of terrorism must demarcate its subject matter, for the term 'terrorism' is differently understood and where there is no accord on its meaning there is little chance for agreement on its application or normative status. The best course is to sketch a morally neutral definition that classifies as 'terrorist' as many widely-agreed upon cases as possible. Definitions that explicitly render terrorism illegitimate make classification contentious, and it is more informative to base moral assessment on an examination of the case rather than through apriori stipulation.

Most writers on the topic agree that terrorism is (i) a deliberate use or threat of violence, (ii) politically-motivated, and (iii) directed against non-military personnel, that is, against civilians or noncombatants. Taking these as the only essential features of terrorism, the simplest and more accurate reportive definition is this:

Terrorism is deliberate, politically-motivated violence, or the threat of such, directed against civilians.¹

By contrast, Ted Honderich describes terrorism as small-scale violence, driven by a political aim, that violates national or international law and is prima facie morally wrong. He thereby counts a good deal of resistance activity and guerilla warfare as terrorist, even when directed against military personnel, while excluding the large-scale military actions of governments. Of course, he may define the word as he chooses, but given its common

currency and negative connotation, 'terrorism' has become the term of art for classifying illegitimate political violence. Not all small-scale political violence merits this description and some large-scale violence does. Exempting states from being agents of terrorism yields an unfair rhetorical advantage to established governments in any political struggle, especially since the weaponry and organization that states use in pursuing their ends through violence against civilians consistently dwarfs any amount of harm achieved by non-state actors.² The moral concerns with terrorism have to do with nature of its victims, the methods employed, or the intentions with which it is done, not the identity of its agents.

I will employ the neutral definition in what follows, though my remarks are compatible with the definition Honderich offers.

2. Honderich on Justified Terrorism

Attempts to justify terrorism on moral grounds are likely to be met with expressions of incredulity. It is more common to hear sweeping denunciations of terrorism on the grounds that it is a brutal violation of the human rights, fails to treat people as 'moral persons,' or indiscriminately attacks the innocent. Terrorism commonly generates disgust, hatred, and vengeance, not only within the targeted community, but also among the external audience with little understanding of the relevant history, rendering it a dubious strategy that might increase the determination and volume of one's enemies. Recalling Kant's insistence that war can be justified only if it is expected to contribute to future peace, it is because terrorism is capable of generating intense feelings of hatred

and vengeance that it threatens to undermine trust and the possibility of future coexistence (Kant 1983, 109-110).

Yet, it is not obvious that these considerations trump all others if terrorism is the only means for securing an overridingly justifiable end, that is, when *not* committing terrorism would have morally worse consequences. Can such a scenario ever exist? Honderich thinks that it can, specifically, whenever terrorism is necessary to achieve an end justifiable by his Principle of Humanity, namely, that the right thing—whether we are speaking of an action, practice, institution, government, society or possible world—‘is the one that according to the best judgement and information is the rational one in the sense of being effective and not self-defeating with respect to the end of getting and keeping people out of bad lives.’ To this he adds the following means-end principle: if one has a right to X and doing Y is the only means to achieving X, then one has a right to do Y. In both principles, I interpret him to be speaking of what is overridingly right.

Honderich argues that the ‘right thing’ in 1947-48 was the establishment of a Jewish national state in Palestine. However, to secure a Jewish state required a ‘decisive Jewish majority’ among the citizens, and at the time this entailed ‘transferring’ a large segment of the Palestinian Arab majority to areas outside those claimed for a Jewish state. During the 1948-49 war, this was achieved through massacre, fear-induced flight, and forced exodus, resulting in the removal of three-quarters of a million Palestinian Arabs from their homes and lands.³ Accordingly, by Honderich’s logic, since the only means of establishing a Jewish national state was through terrorism, then ‘the founding of Israel in Palestine and the terrorism for it was right in what is arguably the most fundamental sense.’ The same blessing is to be withheld from what Honderich calls ‘neo-Zionism’—

the endeavor to extend the Jewish state throughout Palestine. However, since the Palestinians also have a right to a state of their own in the remainder of Palestine, then they have a right to resist neo-Zionism, and since the only means to do so is through the use of terrorism against Israelis, then Palestinians have a right to engage in terrorism.

In response to this dramatic reasoning, it is doubtful that the establishment of nation-states is of overriding importance. By definition, a nation-state is constituted for the sake of a specific national or cultural group, and inevitably, its institutions, laws, and policies reflect the culture and interests of that people. Yet, few areas of the world are culturally homogenous, and since human beings are unlikely to abandon the habit of identifying with groups to which other collectives are unfavorably compared, the de jure favoring of one group's cultural values is bound to be feared and opposed by other groups who see it as a threat to their interests. Nationalism—the doctrine that favors the establishment of nation-states—is plainly a recipe for restriction, resentment, and retaliation. It has also given rise to interstate belligerency; not only did it underlie the massive world wars of the first half of the 20th century, it has continued to threaten stability in the Balkans, central Africa, and southern Asia in the 21st. To the case at hand, the forcible establishment of a Jewish state in the Near East has been at the center of Middle East tensions for the past 60 years, and continues to fuel both the American invasion of Islamic territory and resistance to that invasion.

The establishment of nation-states cannot be justified by appeal to the Principle of Self-Determination, arguably, a component of international law. Any attempt to accommodate the world's 5000 or so national groups through the nationalistic interpretation of that principle, namely, 'a state for every nation', would generate

inconsistent demands for sovereignty in culturally heterogeneous regions. In today's world, there is an increasing need for individuals to identify themselves as members of the global community, to work for the common interest, and to recognize that the world and its resources belong to all its inhabitants. Too frequently, the demand for national allegiance is exclusivist, pointing an individual in an opposite direction, threatening the prospects for global cooperation and the existence of weaker national groups. Viewed in its proper light, the Principle of Self-Determination derives from the same root as the doctrine of popular sovereignty, conferring upon the inhabitants of politically-defined regions the right to be self-governing, regardless of their national, ethnic, or cultural complexion. The massive violation of this fundamentally democratic principle is the chief moral failure that has shaped the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.⁴

If we are serious about 'keeping people out of bad lives,' as Honderich urges, then there is plenty of reason to resist nationalism, and if terrorism can only be justified because it is the means for creating nation-states then Honderich's argument fails. But an argument is one thing; its conclusion is quite another. Despite his reasoning, perhaps a distinct justification can be given for Palestinian terrorism.

3. Radical Existential Threats and Legitimate Responses

Any community can be subjected to threats and attacks stemming from civil disorder, government oppression, foreign invasions and occupations. Normally, the job of defending a community is vested in the sovereign power, but the sovereign might fail to deliver, especially if it is weak or is itself the aggressor. Just as individuals have a right of self-defense in the absence of police protection, so too, a community has the right to

collective self-defense when state protection is unavailable—at least when it is legitimately constituted within the territory where the aggression occurs.

Nowhere is the justice of collective self-defense more manifest when a community faces an aggressive threat to its very existence. This can take different forms, with attempted extermination of its members being the clearest case, but also through dispersion, enslavement, forced conversions of its members, destruction of its vital institutions, appropriation of its natural resources, or seizure of its territory. Each of these threats to a community's survival is an existential threat and, typically, will be viewed as unjustifiable by that community insofar as it places value in its own survival.

How is collective self-defense against an existential threat to be pursued? Presumably, some moral constraints like those propounded in just war theory are relevant, for no community—state or non-state—is justified in resorting to violence unless it has a just cause and employs violence as a last resort, through a competent authority, with expectations of success, etc. (Valls 2000a). The following are what might be called the standard measures of self-defense a community may undertake:

- (1) offers of direct negotiation with the aggressor to resolve the concerns that have led to the aggression;
- (2) appeals to a recognized sovereign or external powers to forcibly intervene to stop the aggression;
- (3) appeals to international agencies, institutions, and laws in order to arbitrate and work towards a peaceful resolution;
- (4) resort to non-violent resistance to halt or retard the aggression.

If these measures fail, then the community has the right to,

(5) resort to military resistance, whether through conventional or guerrilla warfare, against the aggressor's military forces within *jus in bello* guidelines.

While this latter measure is usually accorded to organized states, a community not under state protection has the right to direct its members to take up arms in pursuit of collective self-defense.

Suppose that the leadership of a community faced with aggression has good reason to believe that the aggression constitutes an unjustifiable existential threat. Suppose further that the community has repeatedly resorted to the standard measures for self-defense, but without success. Then the targeted community faces a radical existential threat. Such a situation qualifies as a 'supreme emergency' and a paradigmatic just cause—namely, to eliminate or reduce the threat—if anything does. Would terrorism then be a justifiable option?

I think so. Working within the confines of the just war tradition as far as we can, it should be noted, first of all, that the criterion of just cause is readily satisfied. Moreover, nothing prohibits satisfaction of the requirement of competent authority, either through endorsement by the acknowledged leadership of the community or by the community itself through the best available means of determining consent.⁵ Similarly, the condition of right intent is satisfiable insofar as the goal of the contemplated action is to end or reduce the existential threat. Recourse to terrorism might also satisfy the requirements of proportionality and last resort given that the aggression is unjustified and that standard measures of self defense have been tried and have failed. Because of gross disparities in economic and military resources between the aggressor and the targeted community, and because of the continual technological improvements in protection of military personnel,

terrorism might be the only means of resistance available. It would then be a *Machiavellian* course of action, viz., a last resort violation of accepted standards by a sovereign entity for the sake of an overridingly just goal, namely, to combat an unwarranted existential threat. Suicide terrorism, in particular, is viewed by its agents as a strategy of last resort when embroiled with a ‘zero-sum’ conflict (Pape 2005, 89-94).

If a proposed act or campaign of terrorism is to be justified, however, its proponents must have evidence that there is a reasonable hope of success that they might enable the community to reach the goals related to the just cause. This is often the most difficult *jus ad bellum* condition to satisfy (Fotion 2004, 49-53), and some, like Michael Walzer (1988, 240) and Haig Katchadourian (1998, 27), argue that terrorism never works to advance a group’s ultimate goals. But there are counterexamples. For one thing, state terrorism has frequently achieved desired goals; the American ‘manifest destiny’ was partly achieved through terrorism against native Americans, and it has been argued that the terror bombing of Japanese cities in 1945 hastened the end of WWII. Non-state terrorism has also been effective (Wilkins 1982, 39; Pape 2005, 61-76), e.g., as Jewish terrorism in the late 1940s was instrumental in securing a Jewish majority in Israel. In general terms, it is not too difficult to understand how a threatened community’s resort to terrorism against an aggressor could be successful in advancing its goal of self-preservation.

1. The aggressor concludes that the price of its aggression is too high and, to avoid violence against its own civilian population decides to abandon or suspend its aggression.⁶

2. Recourse to terrorism might draw attention to the grievances of the threatened community. As a result, it might increase its support and external powers might be caused to intervene to bring an end to the aggression because of larger political ramifications or general humanitarian concerns.⁷
3. By retaliating against aggression, the threatened community gains credibility and recognition, both from external parties and from other members of their own community who might thereby become more confident, more hopeful, and more committed to joining a resistance whose likelihood of success is increased with greater participation and unity (see Fanon 1963, 38 and Pape 2005, chapter 6.).

Two further conditions enhance the case for terrorism. First, the probability of success is increased if the aggressor has itself used terrorism against the community under threat. Such parity of means in the method of violence might strengthen the conviction in external observers, as well as in the aggressor's own population, that it is appropriate to return terrorism for terrorism or that tit for tat violence has escalated out of proportion. An asymmetrical use of terrorism, by contrast, runs the risk of evoking contempt for the threatened community among external parties and in alienating members of the threatened community who would normally be opposed to such tactics.

Second, barring a pure utilitarian consequentialism, concern for a just distribution of the value of the expected consequences must also be factored in, and this engenders a direct challenge to any attempt at justifying terrorism. If one party is innocent of an aggression against another, then the latter's violence against the former in pursuit of redress would be a gross violation of justice (Primoratz 2004a, 20-21). So, how could violence against civilians be justified if they innocent of the terrorists' grievances?

Answer? It is incorrect to suppose that civilians are automatically ‘innocent’ of their community’s aggression against another community (Holmes 1989, 187). Civilians might support their governments through overt political action, e.g., political rallies in favor of the aggression, disseminating information and propaganda in favor of aggression, working within political organizations to generate or sustain the aggression, or, more simply, by paying taxes. Moreover, if the aggressor has a representative political system that operates under the principle of popular sovereignty, then citizens share responsibility for the laws, policies, and actions of the state insofar as these represent collective consent. Citizenship in a representative system is voluntary; it can be renounced, even if there are dramatic consequences for so doing, e.g., imprisonment or exile. Those who voluntarily join *any* association or institution share in responsibility for its actions, and this responsibility is not avoided by belonging to the political opposition or having been critical of the government’s policies and acts, even though, in such cases, one’s culpability might be of a lesser degree. In sum, terrorism is justified only if a further culpability condition is satisfied, namely, that civilians within the aggressor community share in the responsibility for that aggression.⁸

This departure from the jus in bello rules is less dramatic than might appear, for there is no reason why the demand of proportionality, the prohibition on illegitimate means, (e.g., rape, nuclear weapons, nerve gas, etc.), and the requirement of humane treatment of captives, cannot be satisfied. Finally, while the principle of noncombatant immunity is abandoned in the case of a radical existential threat, a variant remains: in redressing a grievance, those innocent of that grievance are not to be targeted. In other words, there is no reason why terrorism cannot discriminate, targeting only those members of the

aggressor community who are guilty of that aggression (Valls 2000a, 76). The truly non-culpable, e.g., children, the mentally ill, and so forth, should be immune from attack.

Let me now bring this to a head. I have argued that where various conditions are met, then terrorism against an aggressor can be justified. More precisely, if the members of a community have adequate evidence that

- their community is subjected to an unjustifiable radical existential threat from an identifiable aggressor (hence, that the jus ad bellum conditions of just cause and last resort are met);
- a projected campaign of terrorism would satisfy the jus ad bellum conditions of competent authority, proportionality, right intent, and reasonable hope of success;
- the aggressor is using terrorism against their community (the parity of means condition);
- the adult civilians of the aggressor are culpable of the aggression that constitutes the existential threat (the culpability condition); and
- the jus in bello demands of proportionality, legitimate means, humane treatment of captives, and discrimination (do not target innocents) are to be respected;

then their recourse to terrorism against the aggressor community for the purposes of ending or reducing that threat is morally justifiable.

4. Palestinian Terrorism

Using the argument from radical self-defense, there is a prima facie case for the legitimacy of both past and current Palestinian terrorism directed against Israelis. First, there should be little doubt that Zionism poses an existential threat to Palestinian

communities throughout Palestine. The threat, perceived by Palestinian leaders since the early 20th century, has been demonstrated in many ways:

- Israel's expulsion of Palestinians in 1948 and 1967 and the refusal to repatriate Palestinian refugees.
- Israel's colonization, land confiscation, and the imposition of economic and other forms of structural constraints upon Palestinians in the occupied territories from 1967 until the present.
- Israel's systematic violation of the human rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories in the form of assaults upon Palestinian towns, villages, and refugee camps with tanks, aircraft and artillery, assassination squads, torture, collective punishment, detention without charge, and deportations.
- Israel's refusal to comply with international resolutions regarding settlements, occupations policies, and withdrawal from the territories occupied in the 1967 war.
- Israel's opposition to peace initiatives, e.g., repeated calls for an international peace conference on the Middle East, the Rogers Plan of 1969-70, the Reagan Plan of 1982, Prince Fahd's peace plan of 1981-1982, the PLO's offer of peace in 1988, and the Arab League's proposals of 2002.
- Israel's assassinations of Palestinian political leaders, extending from the 1970s to the present.
- The expressed intention by the dominant Israeli political parties to retain control of the West Bank or large segments thereof, as demonstrated by the Labor Party's early support of the Allon Plan and its subsequent expansion of the settlement

network during the 1990s, the Likud's election platform vows to retain all of the West Bank and its rapid acceleration of settlement building when in power, and the publication of official Israeli maps showing the West Bank as part of Israel (Reinhart 2002, chp. ix).

- Israel's refusal to permit establishment of a viable Palestinian state in the occupied territories, as revealed by Moshe Sharett's agreements with Abdullah (Rogan 2001), the consolidation of its control over the West Bank during the Oslo period, Ehud Barak's breaking off talks at Taba in Jan. 2001 (Reinhart 2002, chp. II), and Ariel Sharon's rejection of the Arab League's peace overtures in spring 2002, the 2002 Geneva Accords between moderate Israelis and Palestinians, and the Bush Administration's 2002 'Road Map' for peace.
- The virtually unquestioned support for Israeli military and political policies by the United States.

This existential threat is unjustifiable because of its violation of the human and political rights of Palestinians, including the right of self-determination (Halwani and Kapitan 2007, chp. 1). In light of it, Palestinians have a just cause for employing standard measures of self-defense in their quest for their survival as a community in their home territory.

Second, the Palestinians have attempted the standard measures of self-defense in combating the existential threat posed by Zionism.

- As early as 1913, Palestinian leaders sought accommodation with the Zionists (Hirst 2003, 154). The major Palestinian political organization, the PLO, has tried diplomacy by entering into direct negotiations with representatives of the Israeli

government and various Israeli groups and individuals (Shehadeh 1997), and in 1988 the Palestine National Council ratified the two state solution, thereby explicitly recognizing Israel's right to exist. The Palestinian Authority under Arafat and Abbas had repeatedly stressed its acceptance of the two state solution.

- The Palestinians have also appealed to external agencies for assistance (for example, the League of Nations, the United Nations, the Arab League) and to external powers, they have supported international resolutions calling for a two-state solution to the conflict (see the record summarized in Finkelstein 2005, 294-300), and in April 2003 they endorsed the Bush Administration's Road Map.
- The Palestinians have repeatedly used techniques of non-violence in combating the Israeli occupation (Holmes 1995, Saleh 2003, Abunimah 2006, 49-51), and have sought and received the help of like-minded Israelis, but to no avail.
- The Palestinians have resisted established militaries, viz., the British military in 1936-39, the Zionist forces in 1947-48, and the Israeli military since the establishment of the Jewish state.

None of these measures have been successful in ending or abating the existential threat they face, much less in securing their self-determination. In the atmosphere of ongoing hostilities accompanying the American occupation of the Middle East, there is even less likelihood that these standard measures of self-defense will be successful. By emasculating Palestinian diplomacy, intensifying the control over the West Bank, Israel has deprived young Palestinians of hope, leaving terrorism one of the few avenues of active resistance left. Thus, there is good reason to conclude that the Palestinian in the

West Bank face a radical existential threat, in which case terrorism presents itself as a last resort strategy for that community.⁹

Third, recourse to terrorism has produced at least some desired results for the Palestinians, even though it has not yet secured Palestinian self-determination nor ended the existential threat posed by Israel. For one thing, it has alleviated the Palestinians' sense of impotence against a powerful adversary and, thereby, strengthened the confidence, resolve and unity among Palestinian communities. For another, it has succeeded in keeping attention riveted upon the conflict and, thus, upon Palestinian grievances. For over eighty years, beginning with the British commissions of the 1920s, extreme violence has caused external players to play a more active role in resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and perhaps no other contemporary political conflict has been subject to as much scrutiny and attempted amelioration. It has led some Israelis to question policies of the Israeli government in the occupied territories, and, in a few instances, it has caused the Israeli government to make some concessions to the Palestinians (Pape 2005, chapter 5).

Fourth, the remaining conditions for justifying the Palestinian's campaign of terrorism are satisfied. Palestinian militancy has received enough popular support from the Palestinian residents of the territories to sanction at least the general strategy of violence against Israeli civilians, a support that intensifies whenever the Israeli military increases the amount of terrorism it employs against the Palestinians. Not only is the parity of means condition thereby satisfied, but since Israel is a representative democracy with large percentages of its adult citizens publicly supporting the measures that constitute the existential threat to the Palestinians, the culpability condition is also met.

The Israeli electorate has placed in power men with a record of violence against Palestinians civilians, including Menachem Begin, Yitzhak Shamir, Yitzhak Rabin, and Ariel Sharon. This electorate has not been blind to the pasts and policies of these men, and this is concrete evidence that it supported terrorism against Palestinians (Finkelstein 2005, 300-301, Schememann 2002). In 2004, despite the deaths of over 3000 Palestinians since September 2000, they returned the Likud party to power, doubling its number of seats in the Knesset. According to a March 2002 poll published in Ha'aretz on 12 March 2002, 46 percent of Israeli's favored expulsion of Palestinians from the occupied territories and 60 percent favored 'encouraging' Palestinian citizens of Israel to leave. In a 2005 poll, 65% of Israelis expressed opposition to a full Israeli withdrawal to the 1949 armistice lines or abandoning the 'neighborhoods' that surround East Jerusalem—the very settlements that 'have destroyed the contiguity of the West Bank and cut Palestinians off from Jerusalem and each other' (Abunimah 2006, 52).

While these facts do not justify every act of terrorism committed by Palestinians, they constitute a strong prima facie case that the Palestinian terrorism has been justified in some instances. Not all Palestinians agree. Since recourse to terrorism has also damaged the Palestinians' reputation and provided the Israeli government with a pretext to tighten its control over the West Bank, to impose further restrictions upon its residents, and to intensify its own violence, many thoughtful Palestinians have condemned such actions 'considering that pushing the area towards an existential war between the two people living on the holy land will lead to destruction for the whole region' ('Urgent Appeal to Stop Suicide Bombings,' Al Quds 20 June 2002).

Yet, despite this reasoned appeal, the undeniable fact is that the Israeli political leadership remains determined to expand the Jewish state beyond the 1949 armistice lines, with or without Palestinian resistance. The Israeli settlements are integral to this expansion, for not only are they portrayed as irreversible facts on the ground, they are instrumental to the argument that the only way to end hostilities is by separating the two communities by either transferring the Palestinians out of the area or isolating them within increasingly infeasible disconnected ‘bantustans’ (Reinhart 2003. chps V, IX). It is ludicrous to think that these settlements in occupied territory are driven by a desire for security; if anything, they multiply Israel’s security concerns. Not only must the Israeli government continue to expend large amounts of money in protecting their inhabitants, but Palestinian outrage and frustration will only intensify with every dunum confiscated and every Israeli house built. Unless there is a collective decision on the part of Palestinians to concede defeat and evacuate their ancestral homeland, these emotions will seek outlets. Recourse to terrorism is one way of checking the Zionist ambitions which otherwise would very likely proceed unopposed and beneath the radar of world opinion and concern.

If their recourse to violence is likely not to be successful in ending the existential threat Palestinians face, can their terrorism be justified by any other argument? That is a complex matter that I have addressed elsewhere (Halwani and Kapitan 2007, chp. 3). But, at this juncture, reasoning often fades before reality. If we remember that young Palestinians in the territories have lived their entire lives under military occupation that has featured routine brutality, dispossession, and humiliation, we should not be surprised if they feel impelled to react with terrorist acts in which they fail to see their victims as

innocent. That large numbers from any society should be so consumed by humiliation, outrage, despair, and vengeance that they repeatedly find violence as the only outlet, is a vivid testimony to the political failure of international diplomacy and the moral failure of the world community.

Notes

1. Similar definitions can be found in several sources, e.g., Garnor 2001 and Coady 2004, 5.
2. See Glover 1991, 257, 273; Gordon and Lopez 2000, 110-111; and Jaggar 2005, 208. That states can commit criminal acts of warfare has long been recognized, as shown by the emergence of international agreements like the Hague Conventions, the Geneva Conventions, and numerous UN resolutions.
3. See the documentation of this Zionist campaign of ethnic cleansing in Khalidi 1971, Flapan 1987, Morris 1987, 1999, 2001, and Pappé 2006. In his diaries, Theodore Herzl advocated discrete expropriation of Arab property and removal of the poor Arabs from the land (Patai 1960, vol. I, p. 88). Subsequent Zionist leaders such as David Ben-Gurion and Vladimir Jabotinsky explicitly favored forced transfer of the Arabs from Palestine to make way for the establishment of a Jewish state (Flapan 1987, 103; Gorny 1987, 270; Morris 1999, 659, and 2001, 42-44; Segev 1999, 407).
4. I have argued against the nationalist interpretation of the principle of self-determination in Kapitan 2006 and in Halwani and Kapitan 2007. See, also, some of the critiques of nationalism in Acton 1967, Parekh, 1999, Petrovic 1994, and Dahbour 2003.
5. Andrew Valls writes: 'if an organization claims to act on behalf of a people and is widely seen by that people as legitimately doing so, then the rest of us should look on that organization as the legitimate authority of the people for the purpose of assessing its entitlement to engage in violence on their behalf' (Valls 2000a, 71). Virginia Held (2005, 185-188) points out that while democratic authorization of a leadership is not

always possible when democratic mechanisms are inhibited, this does not preclude the requirement of legitimate authority from being satisfied for acts of terrorism by non-state groups.

6. Pape 2005, chapter 5, claims that groups such as Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah, and the Tamil Tigers, began with more conventional guerrilla operations but after these operations proved ineffective, they resorted to suicide attacks which proved successful in coercing governments to negotiate.

7. The motivation of intervening parties can vary. Some might see intervention as a means of either harming or defeating the aggressor or as an opportunity to extend influence over the threatened community. Others might be caused to act because to prevent violence between the two communities from escalating. Such intervention has repeatedly taken place since WWII, especially in Africa. The intervention by Western powers in the Balkans in the 1990s was partly caused by a desire to halt the continued aggression and atrocities in Bosnia and Kosovo.

8. Similar reasoning can be found in Wilkins (1992, 21-22). See also, Virginia Held who writes that ‘If a government’s policies are unjustifiable and if political violence to resist them is justifiable (these are very large ‘ifs,’ but not at all unimaginable), then it is not clear why the political violence should not be directed at those responsible for these policies’ (Held 2004, 65). Note that the ‘consent’ one gives through membership in a voluntary association is a general intention to abide by, and accept responsibilities for, that association’s policies and acts, whatever these might be.

9. The Hamas leader, Dr. Abd al-Aziz Rantisi, assassinated by Israel in April 2004, stated that suicide bombings against Israel are the ‘weapons of last resort’ because ‘Israel

is offering us two choices, either to die a meek lamb's death at the slaughter house or as martyr-bombers'. www.infoimagination.org/islamnm/second_intifada.html, accessed on July 14, 2006

References

- Abunimah, A. (2006), One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Coady, C. A. J. (2004), 'Defining terrorism,' in Primoratz (ed) Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues. London: Palgrave, pp. 3-14.
- Finkelstein, Norman. 2005. Beyond Chutzpah: On the Misuse of Anti-Semitism and the Abuse of History. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Flapan, S. (1987), The Birth of Israel. New York: Pantheon.
- Garnor, B. (2001), 'Defining terrorism: is one man's terrorist another man's freedom fighter?' Institute for Counter-Terrorism. www.ict.org.il 25 June 2001, accessed on 15 November 2006.

- Glover, J. (1991), 'State terrorism.' in R. G. Frey and C. Morris (eds), Violence, Terrorism, and Justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 256-275.
- Gordon, N. and G. A. Lopez (2000), 'Terrorism in the Arab-Israeli conflict', in A. Valls (ed), Ethics in International Affairs. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 99-113.
- Halwani, R. and T. Kapitan (2007), The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Philosophical Essays on Self-Determination, Terrorism, and the One-State Solution. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Held, V. (2004), 'Terrorism and war'. The Journal of Ethics 8, 59-75.
- Held, V. (2005), 'Legitimate authority in non-state groups using violence'. Journal of Social Philosophy, 36, 2, 175-193.
- Hirst, D. (2003), The Gun and the Olive Branch: The Roots of Violence in the Middle East (third edition). London: Faber and Faber.
- Holmes, R. (1995), 'Nonviolence and the intifada', in L. F. Bove and L. D. Kaplan (eds), From the Eye of the Storm. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Honderich, T.(2006), Right and Wrong, and Palestine, 9-11, Iraq, 7-7. . . Boston: Seven Stories Press.
- Jaggar, A. M. (2005), 'What is terrorism, why is it wrong, and could it ever be morally permissible?' Journal of Social Philosophy 36, 2, 202-217.
- Kant, I. (1983), Perpetual Peace and Other Essays, translated by T. Humphrey. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Kapitan, T. (1995), 'Self-determination and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict', in L. Bove and L. Kaplan (eds), From the Eye of the Storm. Amsterdam, Rodpoi, pp. 223-248.

- Kapitan, T. (2006), 'Self-determination and international order', The Monist 89, 2, 356-370.
- Katchadourian, H. (1998), The Morality of Terrorism. New York: Peter Lang.
- Khalidi, W. ed (1971). From Haven to Conquest. Beirut: Institute of Palestine Studies.
- Morris, B. (1987), The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947-1949.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, B. (1999), Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict 1881-1999.
London: John Murray.
- Morris, B. (2001), 'Revisiting the Palestinian exodus of 1948', in E. Rogan and A. Shlaim (eds), The War for Palestine: Rewriting the History of 1948. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp . 37-59.
- Pape, R.A. (2005), Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. New York: Random House.
- Pappe, I. (2006), The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Patai, R. ed. (1960), The Complete Diaries of Theodore Herzl. New York: Herzl Press and Thomas Yoseloff.
- Primoratz, I. (2004), 'What is terrorism?' in I. Primoratz (ed), Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues. London: Palgrave, pp. 15-27.
- Reinhart, T. (2002), Israel/Palestine: How to End the War of 1948. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Saleh, A. (2003), 'The Palestinian non-violent resistance movement', Alternative Palestinian Agenda, <http://www.ap-agenda.org/11-02/overview.htm>.

Schmemann, S. (2002), 'Not quite an Arab-Israeli war, but a long descent into hatred',
The New York Times 22 April 2002.

Segev, T. (2000), One Palestine, Complete. New York: Metropolitan Books.

Shehadeh, R. (1997). From Occupation to Interim Accords: Israel and the Palestinian Territories. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Valls, A. (2000), 'Can terrorism be justified?' in A. Valls (ed), Ethics in International Affairs. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 65-79.

Wilkins, B. T. (1992), Terrorism and Collective Responsibility. New York: Routledge.