

Bachelor-thesis  
*Criminal Minds*

# Us versus them

A comparative discourse analysis of  
a terrorist's constituency  
comparing  
revolutionary terrorism and single-issue terrorism

Thomas Verdoes  
T.S.Verdoes@students.uu.nl  
3250202  
Word Count: 12.169  
16 January 2013

# Index

Introduction	3
Chapter One: Definitions and concepts	6
Defining Terrorism	
Written History of Terrorism	
Relation With the Constituency	
Revolutionary Terrorism and Single-Issue Terrorism	
A Terrorist's Discourse	
Chapter Two: Revolutionary Terrorism of the Rote Armee Faction	12
From the Baader-Meinhof Groupe to the RAF	
'Das Konzept Stadtguerilla & Die Rote Armee aufbauen'	
The Urban Guerilla Concept: Attacking their enemies	
Built the Red Army: Criticism of the 'Passive Allies'	
Conclusion	
Chapter Three: Single-Issue Terrorism of the Army of God	19
The Terror of Pro-life	
Three Different Sources	
Attacking the Enemy	
The Supportive Community from the Terrorist's Point of View	
The Enabling Community from the Supporter's Point of View	
Conclusion	
Conclusion	26
Bibliography	30
Primary Sources	
Secondary Sources	

## Introduction

Like so many other cities with a large student population, West-Berlin's radical student movement initiated a violent protest against the leading class in 1968. Violence erupted throughout West-Berlin, and police often clashed violently with students. During one of these standoffs with the police, radical journalist Ulrike Meinhof ushered a statement that would summarize the new course the radical left had set: "This fascist state means to kill us all! We must organize resistance. Violence is the only way to answer violence. This is the Auschwitz Generation, and there's no arguing with them!"<sup>1</sup> In these new radical circles, Andreas Baader and his lover Gudrun Ensslin met Meinhof, and from the 1970's onwards they decided to overthrow the 'fascist state' with any means necessary. They formed a group which first was called the 'Baader-Meinhof Gruppe' and later gained notoriety under the name 'Rote Armee Faction' (RAF). Beginning with planting small bombs in department stores as a way to protest the bourgeois decadence, they soon radicalized, and until their official disbandment in 1998 they robbed, bombed, kidnapped and killed to achieve their desired idealized society.

Fourteen years after the founding of the RAF, in 1984, the United States encountered a new terrorist threat it hadn't encountered before. Although abortion had been legalized under certain circumstances since 1973 in the United States, the first real act of violence as a reaction to this legalization came more than ten years later. In 1984, Michael Bray who was a fierce anti-abortionist, set fire to seven abortion clinics in the mid-Atlantic region with two accomplices. Bray was associated with the extreme Christian group 'Army of God' (AoG). This group, which according to their website strives to 'save the unborn'<sup>2</sup>, has become more violent over the years, and from 1993 onwards they began to target humans in their fight against injustice. The AoG still exists to this day and still commits terrorist acts to end the 'killing of innocent unborn'<sup>3</sup>.

These two different organizations both operated in a different time and a different country. The biggest difference perhaps between these two organizations is that the first tried to overthrow the government and consisted of a small group whose ideas weren't supported by a big portion of the rest of society. The latter is the opposite: although they use the same kind of violence, they don't want to overthrow the government, and they want to accomplish one single goal, a goal which has a lot of support from the rest of society. The RAF wasn't satisfied until the (according to the RAF) fascist government was overthrown and a new anti-imperialist communist state was formed. The AoG however is a so-called 'single-issue terrorist group', whose primary goal isn't widespread political

---

<sup>1</sup> R. Law, *Terrorism: A History* (Cambridge 2009), 267

<sup>2</sup> 'Army of God', [www.armyofgod.com](http://www.armyofgod.com) (27 November 2012)

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*

change but solving a single specific issue. Other examples of this recent form of terrorism are animal rights terrorists and environmentalists terrorists.<sup>4</sup>

Single-issue terrorism and a more revolutionary kind of terrorism differ in many ways. Revolutionary terrorism has often been performed by an isolated group from the rest of society. The new government and society they want to create often are a utopian society driven by an extreme ideology, like an anarchical society or a theocratic society, and many inhabitants oppose these extreme ideologies. The RAF for example wanted to create a communist society, and many opposed the extreme views of their ideal society. Single-issue terrorism, however, mostly has a goal with which many agree. Although their methods are often criticized, their goals, like providing better living circumstances for animals or struggling for a better environment, are often agreed with by a significant part of society. The AoG for example wants to abolish abortions, which a lot of Americans applaud.

How do these more revolutionary terrorists react to their environment? How does this differ from how single-issue terrorists react to their environment? An assumption can be made that since the goals of the single-issue terrorists enjoy more popularity among their environment, they are a less isolated group than the revolutionary terrorists. This is an interesting topic to research, since one of the most important breeding grounds for radicalization is the isolation a certain social group lives in.<sup>5</sup> To prove that the RAF was a more isolated group than the AoG, an analysis of the language they use is a useful tool. One might expect that the revolutionary terrorists use a harder tone to denounce their enemies and have more enemies and fewer friends in general. So the central question is: can an analysis of language prove that revolutionary terrorists are more isolated from their environment than single-issue terrorists? I will argue that this indeed is the case, and I will compare the two case studies of the Rote Armee Faction (revolutionary terrorism) and the Army of God (single-issue terrorism).

This research offers a relevant new angle in the debate concerning terrorism. Single-issue terrorism is a relatively new phenomenon and this new form of terrorism has received little attention in recent publications about terrorism.<sup>6</sup> This research will give a better understanding of single-issue terrorism by comparing it to revolutionary terrorism. I hope that in the future more attention is given to the distinction between these two different forms of terrorism. Besides that, this research encourages further researchers to reflect on whether the theories and methods on how to counter revolutionary terrorism are also applicable to single-issue terrorism. Since I will argue that revolutionary and single-issue terrorism are in fact very different from each other, especially with regard to the contact they have with their environment, a new method to counter single-issue terrorism besides revolutionary terrorism might be desirable.

---

<sup>4</sup> G. Davidson Smith, 'Single Issue Terrorism' (version 1998), <http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/com74e.htm> (26 November 2012)

<sup>5</sup> L. Richardson, *What terrorists want. Understanding the enemy, containing the threat* (New York 2007), 2

<sup>6</sup> R. Monaghan, 'Single Issue Terrorism, A Neglected Phenomenon?', *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 23:255-265, 2000, 1

Since this research is only the beginning of an analysis of the difference between revolutionary and single-issue terrorism and only compares one group of each side to the other, more research is necessary in the future. By comparing more groups of each side with each other, and by looking at other aspects of the terrorists' culture besides language (like lifestyle and culture), more can be revealed about the difference in which revolutionary and single-issue terrorism react to their environment.

Many different theories have been used to describe terrorism. This research mainly focuses on the relationship the terrorists had with their environment. Scholars and terrorist experts like Louise Richardson<sup>7</sup> and Vincent Ruggiero<sup>8</sup> have written extensively about these topics. Both have taken a step from the analyses of terrorists themselves to a different level of analyses. The attention of both writers is focused on the environment, or the 'third player' (besides the offender and the victim) in the interaction the terrorists have with the rest of society. With their theories in mind; I will take a closer look at the language both groups used. I will use a discourse analysis for this, popularized by Michel Foucault. By deconstructing the language the terrorists use, I shall analyze their systems of thought in which they construct the subjects and the world of which they speak. This will provide useful insight in the way they are and were connected to their environment.

With these theories I will look into some primary sources. Of both the RAF and the Army of God, I will use different primary sources to deconstruct their language. These include websites and pamphlets. The RAF has provided their followers with certain pamphlets on their way of thinking, of which I will scrutinize 'The Urban Guerrilla Guide' and 'Built the Red Army' and use three other sources as further support. From the Army of God, I will use a documentary made by American television channel HBO named 'Soldiers in the Army of God', a book written by the killer of abortion doctor John Britton, Paul Hill, called *Mix my Blood with the Blood of the Unborn*, and a book which interviews certain members of the Army of God called *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill*. All these sources give great insight into what the relationship of the RAF and the Army of God was with their environment.

To answer this comparative research question, I will first give an introduction to terrorism, in which I will discuss different kinds of terrorism and the important relationship terrorist groups have with their environment. Next I will give a short summary of the history of the RAF and about the sources I have used. Then I will deconstruct the sources of the RAF, and look at how the RAF reacted to their environment through these sources. After this, I will perform the same procedure for the Army of God. Next, I will compare the results, and describe overlaps and differences between the languages of both sources. But first, the next chapter will define the concepts of terrorism.

---

<sup>7</sup> Richardson, *What Terrorists Want*, 2

<sup>8</sup> V. Ruggiero, 'Brigate Rosse: Political violence, criminology and social movement theory', *Crime, Law & Social Change* (2005) 43, 10

## Chapter One: Definitions and Concepts

Terrorism is, and has always been a wildly discussed and controversial topic, and it has often been over-simplified and generalized. The first time the word 'terrorism' was used it was to describe the terror ('La Grande Terreur') of the French Jacobins in revolutionary France. Terrorism is not a modern concept. It is as old as human civilization, and this phenomenon has occurred throughout many different civilizations, ranging from the Roman Empire to fascist Germany. Defining terrorism is a difficult task, and almost every different governmental entity, including the FBI and the AIVD, has a different definition of terrorism. When one would ask random people on the street to describe terrorism, most would react like the Associate Justice of the United Supreme Court, Potter Stewart, who tried to describe pornography by claiming 'I know it when I see it'.<sup>9</sup> This chapter will try to define terrorism plus provide the reader with a short history of the theory about terrorism, and next it will pay close attention to the relationship terrorism has with its environment, to two different forms of terrorism and to the way language can provide a better understanding of terrorism.

### Defining Terrorism

It proves to be quite a challenge to define terrorism. Everyone has got a different interpretation of a subject like this, and even for a simple word like 'violence', it proves to be difficult to give a precise definition of it. What is considered violence is culturally variable, which is why Anton Blok calls it a cultural construction.<sup>10</sup> This also goes for terrorism. One person would call someone who would bomb a military convoy a terrorist, while someone else would call that same person a freedom fighter. Although this is considered a cliché, it still happens to this day. A famous example is the Taliban fighters, who were dubbed 'terrorists' by George Bush when they attacked the United States, but who were called 'freedom fighters' by Ronald Reagan a few decades earlier when they were attacking the Soviet Union instead of the United States.

Many different writers have tried to give a definition to terrorism, and some of them conflict with each other. Political scientist Louise Richardson describes terrorism as deliberately targeting non-militants for political causes. According to her, it's not the cause that makes a terrorist a terrorist, but it is the method.<sup>11</sup> Richardson doesn't consider state terror a form of terrorism, but historian Randall D. Law does. On the other hand, he agrees with Richardson that terrorism is not an ideology, and he describes it as a tactic or a 'toolbox'. Terrorism, according to Law, is an act of symbolic violence in a 'theatre'.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Law, *Terrorism*, 2

<sup>10</sup> A. Blok, 'Zinloos en zinvol geweld', Henk Driessen en Huub de Jonge (red.), *In de ban van betekenis. Proeven van symbolische antropologie* (Nijmegen 1994), 4

<sup>11</sup> Richardson, *What Terrorists Want*, 2

<sup>12</sup> Law, *Terrorism*, 3

But what is this method, tactic or toolbox? Many agree that the main weapon of a terrorist isn't a bomb, gun or Stanley-knife, but fear. Fear proves to be more crippling for a society than any real weapon, and the main instrument to spread this fear is through communication. Terrorism in the twenty-first century has become a more dangerous threat than ever, not because of the higher amount of victims or the more destructive attacks, but because terrorists can evoke fear into everyone around the world within minutes since the rise of mass media. This method, described by Alex Schmid as violent communication<sup>13</sup>, isn't primarily used to harm the direct target, but it's merely instrumental to achieve a calculated impact on a wider audience. The media are essential in giving the terrorists the exposure they want.<sup>14</sup> In short, the essence of terrorism is fear, which can only be spread by means of communication. It proves to be a powerful tactic, and in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, fear itself proves to be the greatest thing to fear.

### **Written History of Terrorism**

Since the origin of terrorism, political scientists, social scientists, psychologists and philosophers have discussed this phenomenon. Until the eighties, research was fixated to banish further terrorist violence, and therefore, the research up to this period was highly concentrated on the causes of terrorism. When looking for the causes of terrorism, certain factors were named for the existence of terrorist groups. Four major factors have been used to explain the causes of terrorism. Two were on the level of the individual, which were the ideological background of the terrorists and the biographies of the terrorists. The two others were on a different level of analyses, which were the dynamics within a terrorist group and the interaction the terrorist group had with the state.<sup>15</sup>

This however could only partly describe the terrorist phenomenon, and research was often subordinate to the political views of the researchers. Cultural processes were neglected, and no attention was given to the reaction of society or politics to the terrorist groups once the groups were formed. However, at the end of the eighties, studies of terrorism finally caught up with the movement within social sciences that made culture the center of discussions, or 'cultural turn' as it is called, and researchers began to use more varied sources and studied them more intensively. From this moment onwards, more attention was given to the cultural background of terrorism. Societal causes were put

---

<sup>13</sup> 'Definitions of Terrorism' (version 2006), [http://web.archive.org/web/20070527145632/http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism\\_definitions.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20070527145632/http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html) (26 November 2012)

<sup>14</sup> P. Wilkonson, 'The Media & Terrorism: A reassessment', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 9, no. 2 (1997), 207

<sup>15</sup> J. Pekelder, 'Historisering van de RAF: geschiedschrijving over dertig jaar links Duits terrorisme, 1968-1998', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, vol. 119 (2006), 11

more to the background in favor of psychological and cultural factors. There was also more focus of the further development of terrorism (not only the cause and beginning).<sup>16</sup>

From the second half of the nineties onwards, the research of terrorism wasn't as isolated from political, societal and cultural context as before, and the researcher's attention shifted from a focus on the terrorists and the victims themselves to the interaction the terrorists had with their environment, or 'Umfeld', which I shall describe in the next paragraph. Furthermore, new research provided better understanding of the terrorist discourse. Not only did terrorist studies caught up with the cultural turn, but they also caught up with the linguistic turn, which in short was the focus on language within science and philosophy. The linguistic turn produced a new wave of terrorist studies, and a greater interest arose in the language terrorists use. There was a growing attention for the war-rhetoric of the terrorists, which I will discuss in my last paragraph. Researchers who have researched the role of the Umfeld and the rhetoric used by the terrorists have paved the way for my further research which combines these two aspects. Next I will discuss two sources by the RAF, which I will then dissect to demonstrate the isolation of the RAF.

### **Relation With the Constituency**

It is clear that terrorists have a complicated relationship with the public. A terrorist group can't survive without its environment. First, as described above, its primary goal is to spread fear among their environment. However, a terrorist group also can't survive without support of their direct environment, which provides them with manpower, supplies, and are sympathetic towards their causes. Every terrorist group needs a constituency, or 'Umfeld', which consists of followers who give the terrorists their much needed new recruits, practical support and recognition.<sup>17</sup> The role of the terrorist constituency plays an integral part in the creation and survival of terrorist groups. An example of a terrorist constituency are Islamic fundamentalists who don't perform terrorist acts themselves, but who support Al Qaida in their actions.

When one analyses the different levels of the relationship terrorists have with their environment, the terrorist constituency is a small supporting group, positioned between the terrorists and the rest of society. Many different successful counter terrorist experts have proven that the best way to battle a terrorist group is to separate it from its constituency ('Like a fish out of the water'), like the British success encountering communist terrorists in their former colony Malaya.<sup>18</sup> The terrorists' constituency is not immersed in the strategic or tactical implications of the violence. The

---

<sup>16</sup> D.K. Gupta, 'Terrorism, History, and Historians: A View from a Social Scientist', *Journal of American History*, Volume: 98, Issue: 1 (1 June, 2011), 97

<sup>17</sup> J. Pekelder, 'From Militancy to Democracy? The Radical Left in West Germany in the 1970s', *Creative crises of democracy (Brussel 2012)*, 2

<sup>18</sup> V. Nolan, *Military Leadership and Counterinsurgency: The British Army and Small War Strategy Since World War II* (London 2012), 91



constituency observes the terrorists' actions and this affects the degree of support it returns. The constituency determines whether the actions of the terrorists are legitimate, and the more desirable their causes are, the more support it will return.<sup>19</sup> In short, the goal of the terrorist organization is essential in the involvement the terrorist constituency has with that group. A popular goal creates a large, strong and driven constituency, while a terrorist group with less popular goals will have less support from their constituency.

### **Revolutionary Terrorism and Single-Issue Terrorism**

Many different distinctions have been made between different kinds of terrorist groups. I will make a distinction between two different sorts of groups, and with the theory of the terrorist constituency in mind, I will explain why this is important for my research. The distinction I would like to make is the distinction between 'revolutionary' and 'single-issue' terrorists. The term single-issue terrorism is widely accepted, and I will introduce a new term, revolutionary terrorism, to put on the opposite side of single-issue terrorism. Single-issue terrorism, or special interest terrorism, has been the most common form of violent political extremism in the Western world in the past two decades. Single-issue terrorism involves the use of terrorist acts for the purpose of forcing a government and/or population to modify a single issue that is of concern to the terrorist group. This could be one of many single issues: animal rights, environmental protection and anti-abortion. Single-issue terrorists don't have an overall political agenda, and don't want to overthrow a government or force a major alteration in the manner in which people live. Most strikingly, in many cases, the overall cause the terrorists try to accomplish is fairly popular among large groups of citizens. The terrorists' emphasis is fixated on coercing and forcing the people to take a desired action.<sup>20</sup>

Single-issue terrorism is a relatively new phenomenon. Before this, the goal of the terrorist wasn't necessarily to force their 'audience' to stop being involved in the specific single issue, but they wanted to make a radical change to society, to create a revolution. They often wanted to overthrow the regime for ethno-nationalistic causes (The National Liberation Front in Algeria), religious causes (Islamic Group in Indonesia), or to create a desired society (anarchists in nineteenth-century Russia). By means of terrorist attacks, they wanted to 'educate' the public about the topic and mobilize them to overthrow the regime. This (as I will call it) revolutionary terrorism typically advocates dramatic societal change and therefore does not receive the broad support the single-issue terrorists get in their communities.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> H. Criado, 'Bullets and Votes: Public Opinion and Terrorist Strategies', *Journal of Peace Research*, 48: 497, (2001), 4

<sup>20</sup> W. Dyson, 'The Emergence of Special Interest/Single Issue Terrorism', *Institute For Intergovernmental Research* (Florida 2001), 1

<sup>21</sup> A.W. Kruglanski et al., 'Workings of the Terrorists mind: Its Individual, Group, and Organizational Psychologies', in: D. Bar-Tal (ed.), *Intergroup Conflicts and Their Resolution: A Social Psychological Resolution* (New York 2001), 206

## **A Terrorist's Discourse**

Now that I have discussed the scientific interest in the terrorist constituency which was influenced by the cultural turn, I will elaborate on the interest in the language of terrorists which was in turn influenced by the linguistic turn. Terrorists often make use of what scholar Richard M. Weaver has called 'ultimate terms': they talk of their own group and principles with 'god terms' which represents the ultimate good, like 'liberation' and 'justice', and for the enemy they use 'devil's terms', including 'imperialists' and 'capitalists'.<sup>22</sup> These easily expressed phrases are used not only to create a gap between the terrorists and the enemy, but also to enhance the own group's solidarity. Boundary creation is important for a group, and many social scientists agree that boundaries that are at the collective level of 'us and them' increase the solidarity within a group.<sup>23</sup> Expression plays a big part in this process of unity and exclusiveness, with anthropologist-linguist Edward Sapir stating that "'He talks like us' is equivalent to saying 'He is one of us'".<sup>24</sup>

Would an analysis of a terrorists' text support this claim? If one would read between the lines of a primary source of both forms of terrorism, especially with the ultimate terms in mind, could a difference in isolation be proven? To disclose this, a discourse analysis could be a useful method. Although philosophers as old as Aristotle have discussed the idea of a discourse, the term 'discourse analysis' became popular after philosophers like Michel Foucault began to use it more extensively. With a discourse analysis, Foucault and many others have tried to deconstruct a text to uncover its underlying meaning, which could be many things. Foucault was interested in the power structures which were inhibited in several texts, but a discourse analysis can be used for many other instances. Although a discourse analysis isn't a 'hard' science and doesn't provide any definitive answers, it can give insight into a text with which we can gain a comprehensive new view of a question/problem. By analyzing certain texts with a discourse analysis, we can contemplate a problem from a higher stance which leads to new insights into a topic.<sup>25</sup>

According to the information presented, an assumption can be made that there must be a difference in language that the two different kinds of terrorists, revolutionary and single-issue terrorists, use. Since revolutionary terrorists receive less popular support than single-issue terrorists, will this also reflect in their language? As discussed in the introduction, my hypothesis is that an analysis of language will support the notion that revolutionary terrorists were/are more isolated. I presume that I will encounter more 'enemies' and less 'friends' or sympathizers among the literature

---

<sup>22</sup> B.A. White, 'Richard M. Weaver: Dialectic Rhetorician' (version 1982), [http://www.mmisi.org/ma/26\\_3-4/white.pdf](http://www.mmisi.org/ma/26_3-4/white.pdf) (16 December 2012)

<sup>23</sup> Ruggiero, 'Brigate Rosse', 10

<sup>24</sup> R.J. Lifton, 'Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism' (version 1989), <http://www.rickross.com/reference/brainwashing/brainwashing19.html#Loading the Language> (18 December 2012)

<sup>25</sup> 'Discourse Analysis', <http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/~palmquis/courses/discourse.htm> (15 December 2012)

of the revolutionary terrorists, as well as a harder tone with more ultimate term. The next two chapters, I will discuss two different terrorist groups that each represents one side, the Rote Armee Faction on the revolutionary terrorist-side and the Army of God on the single-issue terrorist-side. Of both, I will analyze different sources, and I will compare the conclusions I derive from these analyses.

## Chapter Two: Revolutionary Terrorism of the Rote Armee Faction

Germany still has to cope with a lot of unresolved traumas of the past. The Holocaust is the first one that comes to mind. However, there have been many other events which still have an impact on the current German society. In 2003, a more recent trauma was put to the center of attention again. In that year, controversy arose with the announcement of a gallery with art pieces centered on the German terrorist group 'Rote Armee Faction' (RAF). People even took offence from the working title: 'Mythos RAF'. The RAF has always been a controversial group, and their texts remain notorious to this day. The language used in their texts is an interesting subject to study, since the terrorist activity of the RAF went hand in hand with self-invention of language.<sup>26</sup> The writings were written by the leaders of the RAF, like Ulrike Meinhof, who were key players in the creation of a language that justified violence to the point of killing.<sup>27</sup> The more radical the RAF became, the more isolated they became of their general environment. Before I will prove this with the use of two texts by the RAF, I will first give a short summary of the history of the RAF.

### **From the Baader Meinhof Groupe to the RAF**

Like many other countries in the sixties, Germany encountered a new radical Left in this period. In Germany, this Left is considered more radical than the Left in other countries, mainly because this generation was even more dissociated with the previous generation than the Left in other countries, which can be attributed to the passiveness of the old generation to stand up to the Nazi regime, and there was much criticism on the fact that many Nazi collaborators were still active in politics. Petty criminal Andreas Baader, his lover Gudrun Ensslin and radical journalist Ulrike Meinhof met through radical student circles, and they decided to form a group, which was soon called the 'Baader Meinhof Groupe'. Although there were other radical socialist groups in Germany around that time, they were eclipsed by the Baader Meinhof Groupe in terms of publicity and impact, which can mainly be attributed to the charisma of their leaders and their fierce brochures<sup>28</sup>, which will be discussed later.

They started off by setting of small bombs in department stores to protest the bourgeois decadence, but they soon radicalized with the aim to end the German regime which they compared to the fascist government thirty years earlier. Shootouts with the police produced deaths on both sides, and from '72 onwards they began targeting United States' military presence in Germany, killing four soldiers and injuring dozens. After these killings, Baader, Ensslin, Meinhof and other leaders were quickly apprehended and put in prison. The RAF activity was however far from finished.

---

<sup>26</sup> S. Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism : Language, Violence and Identity* (New York 2009), 13

<sup>27</sup> Ibidem, 44

<sup>28</sup> Pekelder, 'Historisering van de RAF', 198

The RAF quickly reconstituted, and this so called second generation kidnapped a prominent member of the board of directors of car-producer Daimler-Benz and head of an influential industrialists' association in reaction to the hunger strike in which many imprisoned former RAF leaders were operating. When it became clear they were not going to be released from prison, Baader, Ennslin and another leader, Jan-Carl Raspe, committed suicide, staging them to appear as if they were killed by their jailors. This, coupled with the mysterious suicide of Meinhof earlier, caused a new sense of popularity for the RAF within a small group, and until their disbandment in 1998, the RAF was reconstituted many times.<sup>29</sup>

The deaths of the leaders, which turned them into martyrs for the left, were the main cause why the RAF survived as long as it did. As described before, a strong supporting constituency is essential in the survival of a terrorist group, and many sources indicate that the RAF was a very isolated group.<sup>303132</sup> This isolation was mainly caused by their extreme actions. Many other Left grouped talked about a taking up the arms for violence, but with exception of a few, most of the groups stayed in the discussion-stage. The RAF was highly critical of what they called the talkers, and they advocated the primacy of practice. The strategy they adopted was urban guerrilla, using the example of many ethno-nationalistic conflicts. They wanted to bring a guerilla fight to the streets, and they even trained in Jordan to adopt this fighting style. After I will have discussed certain texts by the RAF, it will become clear that the way they wrote about this primacy of practice and urban guerilla warfare were essential in the ideology of the RAF and important in explaining why the RAF was so isolated.

### **‘Das Konzept Stadtguerilla & Die Rote Armee Aufbauen’**

In 2009, a book called *The Red Army Faction, A Documentary History*, was published which contained all of the translated documents (manifestos and communiqués) published by the RAF between 1970 and 1977. These texts were collected for the primary reason that ‘this book is intended as a contribution to the comrades of today – and to the comrades of tomorrow – both as testimony to those who struggled before and as an explanation as to how they saw the world, why they made the choices they made, and the price they were made to pay for having done so.’<sup>33</sup> Because of their loyalty towards the members of the RAF, the texts collected by these editors would probably have been kept intact as much as possible, therefore I consider them to be reliable sources. I will use two texts from the book, the first one is ‘Das Konzept Stadtguerilla’ (The Urban Guerilla Concept) from April 1972, and the second one is ‘Die Rote Armee aufbauen’ (Built the Red Army) from June 5<sup>th</sup> 1970.

---

<sup>29</sup> Law, *Terrorism*, 270

<sup>30</sup> Pekelder, ‘Historisering van de RAF’, 206

<sup>31</sup> Pekelder, ‘From Militancy to Democracy?’, 18

<sup>32</sup> Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof*, 116

<sup>33</sup> A. Moncourt and J. Smith, ‘The Red Army Faction, A Documentary History: Projectiles for the People’ (version 2009), <http://www.germanguerrilla.com/red-army-faction/index.html> (2 December 2012)

Both texts have been written in the voice of the collective. Some sources attribute them to Ensslin, but Ensslin herself said that Meinhof was the ‘voice’ of the RAF.<sup>34</sup> Both sources give great insight into the isolation of the RAF. The Urban Guerilla Concept is mainly fixed on attacking their enemies (the cops, media etc.), while Built the Red Army is more a ‘call-to-arms’ to coerce the rest of the Left to pick up the weapons for an armed struggle. Both texts show the isolation of the RAF in a different way. Before I will analyze these texts I will give a short summary of both.

The Urban guerilla Concept is a pamphlet in which the RAF informs the reader of their standpoints. It begins with an attack on their enemies, which in the case of the RAF are many. They not only attack institutes like the police and the government, but they also act aggressive to certain critics of the RAF. When accusations and counteraccusations have been made, the document focuses further on the justification of the Urban Guerilla strategy. The main reason why the RAF is justified in this strategy is, according to them, that the German Federal Republic is a key player in the U.S.-led global capitalism. Since this system was considered to be the most sinful of the evils, the RAF was permitted to destabilize the regime as much as possible. They credit the student movement of 1968 as the roots of the RAF, but they argue that the student movement failed because they weren’t focused on action; their primacy was discussion and not deeds. This is why the RAF promotes the primacy of action in the fourth paragraph. Since the working class of Germany wasn’t ready yet to pick up their arms and the intellectuals with the failed student-movement had proven that they wouldn’t/couldn’t lead the revolution, the RAF was justified to set an example for the rest to follow. The whole manifest is interwoven with hate against the real enemy: capitalism coupled with global imperialism.<sup>35</sup>

Built the Red Army is a different pamphlet, and it opens with ‘there’s no point trying to explain what’s right to the wrong people.’<sup>36</sup> At first instance, one might express that the wrong people are the German government, the right wing or any of their other enemies. However, it quickly becomes clear that they are addressing other left-wingers. They clearly attack anyone who doesn’t carry out the primacy of practice standpoint of the RAF, which is almost the whole of the left-wing of Germany. In the end, they call out for action, and use harsh language to make this clear to the reader. They end the pamphlet with the battle cry ‘Develop the class struggle, organize the proletariat, start the armed struggle, build the red army!’<sup>37</sup> Apart from these two main sources, I will also use three other sources: the pamphlet ‘Dem Volk Dienen’ (Serving the people), a book filled with quotes from Ulrike Meinhof called *Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism : Language, Violence and Identity*,

---

<sup>34</sup> Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof*, 83

<sup>35</sup> ‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ (Version 2009), [http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71\\_04.html](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71_04.html) (13 December 2012)

<sup>36</sup> ‘Built the Red Army!’ (Version 2009), [http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70\\_06\\_05.php](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70_06_05.php) (16 December 2012)

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem

and a third book written by a former member of another Leftist terrorist group, Bewegung 2 Juni, called *How it All Began: The Personal Account of a West German Urban Guerilla*.

### **The Urban Guerilla Concept: Attacking Their Enemies**

When reading the Urban Guerilla Concept, it becomes clear the RAF had many enemies. One target which is quickly noticed is the media. They are highly critical of the media, which according to them spreads lies about them: ‘Almost everything the newspapers have written about us—and the way they write it—has clearly been a lie. Plans to kidnap Willy Brandt are meant to make us look like political idiots, and claims that we intend to kidnap children are meant to make us look like unscrupulous criminals.’<sup>38</sup> A lot of writers, including writers from the Left, have also been critical of the RAF, with left-wing author Günter Wallraff denouncing the RAF and claiming they weren’t a leftist group since they compared police with swine who could and should be killed. Countering these criticisms, the RAF proves to be more defensive than when attacking the media, and they take a step back from the glorification of violence by stating that they might not have gone through with certain operations if they knew beforehand that innocent casualties would fall. They, however, always claim that their actions are correct, and maintain that armed struggle to overthrow the Federal Republic is justified.<sup>39</sup>

Other enemies are people the RAF sarcastically call ‘comrades’. They claim that many of those have betrayed them, and that ‘many comrades spread untruths about us too’<sup>40</sup>. They place them among their enemies, and quickly place them among the many ‘consumers’<sup>41</sup> who oppose the RAF. Of course, the police and the government are a popular target in this pamphlet as well. The police are referred to as ‘pigs’ or ‘swine’<sup>42</sup>, and the state and the associated ideology of capitalism and imperialism are targeted many times (‘In exchange for development aid and military support for the U.S.A.’s wars of aggression, the Federal Republic profits from the exploitation of the Third World...’<sup>43</sup>). The function of urban guerilla is underlined many times (‘to destroy certain aspects of the state structure and to destroy the myth of state omnipotence and invulnerability’<sup>44</sup>), as is the importance of practice over talking (‘we will not talk about “armed propaganda”: we will do it’<sup>45</sup>). They end the pamphlet by quoting one of America’s Black Panther leaders, Elridge Cleaver, by asserting that people are either with – or against them (‘There is nothing in between.’<sup>46</sup>).

---

<sup>38</sup> ‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ (Version 2009), [http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71\\_04.html](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71_04.html) (13 December 2012)

<sup>39</sup> Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof*, 88

<sup>40</sup> ‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ (Version 2009), [http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71\\_04.html](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71_04.html) (13 December 2012)

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem

<sup>44</sup> Ibidem

<sup>45</sup> Ibidem

<sup>46</sup> Ibidem

This text clearly shows many of the ‘devil terms’ Richard M. Weaver has written about (see previous chapter). It is an aggressive text, riddled with many ‘devil terms’. It is obvious that they give devil terms to their real enemy, which is the state. Some of the terms thrown at the state are ‘fascist’, ‘capitalist’ and ‘imperialist’. Meinhof often used metaphorical language, and often made equations with the Nazi past (Nazi Germany instead of Federal Republic, Auschwitz instead of Vietnam).<sup>47</sup> In an interesting turn of point of view, Meinhof accuses the state itself of terrorism by stating ‘this act of terrorism against the people is intended to force identification with the state by causing fear and confusion in the populace’.<sup>48</sup> However, it is also interesting to note that they also place the people who speak untruths about them at the other end of the political specter. Even if these ‘traitors’ were on the Left, the RAF place them outside of the Left by claiming ‘They are only consumers.’<sup>49</sup>

This clearly shows that ‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ uses language to construct a presentation of an environment for the reader to adapt to. Everyone who opposes them, even if they were from the Left, gets labeled with a devil term. That the RAF was critical of its enemies and critics might come as no surprise, but they were also critical of the ones who were supposed to be their allies: the rest of the Leftists who don’t directly oppose them. An analysis of Built the Red Army clearly shows that the RAF wasn’t only isolated from its enemies, but was also isolated from their allies.

### **Built the Red Army: Criticism of the ‘Passive Allies’**

Although The Urban Guerilla Concept also contained some criticism about the passive Left, Built the Red Army is primarily written to shake up the Left. It was written two years before The Urban Guerilla Guide, and its tone is a lot less defensive. This pamphlet does not only create a chasm between the Left and the rest of the ‘bourgeois’ society, but it also clearly shows that the RAF was even within the Left a very isolated group. Everyone who lets imperialism have its way (which is everyone who doesn’t take up the arms according to the RAF) is guilty of ‘social democratic bullshit’<sup>50</sup>. The RAF wants to shake up the Left; they must ‘stop lounging around on the sofa in your recently-raided apartment counting up your love affairs and other petty details’<sup>51</sup> and most of all, they must choose sides with the RAF: ‘Forget about the cowardly shits, the bootlickers, the social workers, those who only attempt to curry favor, they are a lumpen mob.’<sup>52</sup> In short, they must stop talking and start acting.

---

<sup>47</sup> Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof*, 14

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*, 130

<sup>49</sup> ‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ (Version 2009),

[http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71\\_04.html](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71_04.html) (13 December 2012)

<sup>50</sup> ‘Built the Red Army!’ (Version 2009),

[http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70\\_06\\_05.php](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70_06_05.php) (16 December 2012)

<sup>51</sup> *Ibidem*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibidem*



The RAF members themselves recognized that there was a risk of being isolated if they would be continuing the way they did, but they nevertheless held on to the strategy of armed resistance, because that was the only way to realize the full potential of revolutionary struggle.<sup>53</sup> Other texts underline this difference between German left and the RAF. In for example 'Dem Volk Dienen' (Serving the people) from 1972, they state: 'Whenever certain elements of the revolutionary left try... to accuse *us* of acting for the wrong reasons and positioning ourselves wrongly, they fail to resolve the mismatch between *their* assessment of the current state of class warfare and *their* envisaged methods of revolutionary intervention – what *they* are doing is trying to turn something into *our* subjective problem that is actually both *their* and *our* objective problem.'<sup>54</sup> One quickly notices the extensive use of 'us/our' and 'them'.

Another external source shows the isolation of the RAF with the rest of the Left, even with the ones who do take up the arms. In the book *Wie Alles Anfing* (How It All Began), a former terrorist of the Leftist terrorist group 'Bewegung 2 Juni' called Bommi Baumann, explains how this terrorist group was formed and how he took part in this group. He also describes the contact the Bewegung 2 Juni had with the RAF. Not surprisingly, this wasn't a warm relationship. Even though Bewegung 2 Juni was one of the few Leftist groups who did put the primary of practice into action, that still wasn't enough for the RAF. They accused Bewegung 2 Juni of 'you're running through endless numbers of apartments, you keep fucking women and smoking hashish – no doubt that's fun for you, but this thing *can't* be fun for you, this here is a difficult job.'<sup>55</sup> In short, the RAF was even isolated from the Leftist group who did perform actions by claiming they were amateurs.

However, the most remarkable example of isolation is found in the Serving the People text, when the RAF separates itself not only from the government, imperialism or even the Left itself, it's when it separates itself from 'most people'. They state that 'Most people say, "It's unacceptable." Most people say, "The masses do not want this."<sup>56</sup> This proves that the RAF at this point had created a chasm between themselves and the rest of society, including an important part of their constituency. The 'us and them' feeling is finalized when they end the first audio performance by the RAF in 1972 with the words: 'Long live the RAF'. Communist groups often chose to end their speech with 'long live the people' or 'long live the revolution', but by 1972 it had become clear that the RAF weren't a group belonging to the people anymore.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Pekelder, 'From Militancy to Democracy?', 11

<sup>54</sup> 'Serve the People: The Urban Guerilla and Class Struggle' (version 2009), [http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/72\\_04.php](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/72_04.php) (22 December 2012)

<sup>55</sup> B. Baumann, *How it All Began: The Personal Account of a West German Urban Guerilla* (Vancouver 2002), 106

<sup>56</sup> Colvin, *Ulrike Meinhof*, 110

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem*, 110

## Conclusion

So what can we conclude from an analyses of these texts? When reading any text by the RAF, it immediately becomes clear that the RAF was an immensely isolated group. Their enemies, which were the state, media and other ‘harmful’ institutions, were fiercely criticized, but an important observation is that the RAF didn’t stop there. With their blind fixation on the primacy of practice, they detached themselves from many people who would have likely been their ally. Instead of adopting a new line of action, they attacked the passive Left for being too lazy and for not wanting to get their hands dirty. Even some of the Leftist groups who did take up the arms were criticized.

This creation of a chasm even went further, and in 1972, they had almost completely dug a ditch around themselves by attacking ‘most of the people’. It is surprisingly that, even with the isolation the RAF encountered, they were active for so long. As described before, an important factor for this was the charisma of the leaders, who were seen as martyrs and who gave the rest of the RAF enough determination to keep the fight going. In 1998, the RAF stopped their actions, and in their final statement they declared they should be seen as heroes/martyrs of the German resistance instead of terrorists.<sup>58</sup> The end of the RAF was a long time coming, but in a different country and at a different time, the end to a conflict surrounding another terrorist group is nowhere in sight. The Army of God still is active to this day, and in the next chapter I will argue that they are much less isolated from their environment as the RAF has been.

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibidem, 234

## Chapter Three: Single-Issue terrorism of the Army of God

On July 29, 1994, Paul Hill approached an abortion clinic in Florida, where he shot clinic doctor John Britton and his bodyguard at close range with a shotgun. After this, he threw down his shotgun and waited to be arrested. He was condemned in court to die with a lethal injection, and before he died, Hill's spiritual advisor, Rev. Donald Spitz, met with him. Hill remained until his death the only one of fifty-four prisoners on death row who remained entirely unrepentant for his crime.<sup>59</sup> Spitz noted that Hill was 'smiling most of the time', and that 'he has not wavered one inch from believing that what he did is right.'<sup>60</sup> Spitz is one of the founders of the Army of God, and he is considered their official spokesman. The Army of God is a Christian anti-abortion organization operative in the United States, which is taking up 'all godly action necessary, including the use of force, to defend innocent human life (born and unborn)'<sup>61</sup>. Abortion proves to be a controversial topic in the United States to this day, and in this chapter, I will analyze several texts from the Army of God to prove that the Army of God enjoyed much support among its constituency. Before I will prove this with certain primary sources, I will first give a short introduction about the history of the Army of God.

### **The Terror of Pro-life**

Although abortion had been legal under certain circumstances in the United States since 1973, the violence of the anti-abortion movement really started a decade later. In 1984, Rev. Michael Bray, who is considered to be the intellectual father of the anti-abortion movement<sup>62</sup>, and two others set fire to seven abortion clinics. After this, a group called The Army of God (AoG) claimed responsibility. After 1984, they claimed responsibility for numerous attacks against clinics and people. The group is a radical Christian group, and although most members also oppose other 'sins' like homosexuality, their primary goal is to stop the 'killing of innocent unborn'<sup>63</sup>. In the eighties, no actual people were harmed in the anti-abortion struggle, but this changed in the nineties. In 1993, anti-abortionists began targeting humans, and the next five years seven people were killed. The most well known of these killings is the example described in the paragraph above, where Paul Hill killed well known clinic doctor John Britton and his bodyguard.<sup>64</sup>

Some of the terrorists, like Shelley Shannon who shot physician George Tiller in both arms, claimed association with the AoG, while in other cases the terrorist worked on his/her own but the

---

<sup>59</sup> J. Stern, *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill* (New York 2004), 169

<sup>60</sup> J. Kennedy and B. Mahlburg, 'Paul Hill Executed' (Version 2003), <http://www.rickcross.com/reference/a-abortion/a-abortion23.html> (25 December 2012)

<sup>61</sup> 'Army of God', [www.armyofgod.com](http://www.armyofgod.com) (25 December 2012)

<sup>62</sup> Stern, *Terror in the Name of God*, 148

<sup>63</sup> 'Army of God', [www.armyofgod.com](http://www.armyofgod.com) (25 December 2012)

<sup>64</sup> Law, *Terrorism*, 323

AoG approved and supported their actions. An example of this is Paul Hill, considered to be the most visionary member of the movement<sup>65</sup>, who had Michael Bray as his unsolicited spokesman and Donald Spitz as his spiritual advisor. The AoG is best described as a virtual network, rather than an actual organization. The terrorists do not usually communicate with each other, which is why it is so very hard to stop them. Members of the Army of God do meet from time to time; they however stay out of illegality by discussing their goal (stopping abortion), and not talking about concrete plans or tactics.

It is interesting to note that the AoG forms a significant part of its own constituency. Since this group isn't illegal, they can publicly support the few members who do commit terrorist acts. They do so with conventions, protest rallies and mostly with websites. An example is the website 'The Nuremberg Files' created by Neal Horsly, in which he provides the names and addresses of doctors and clinic workers who perform abortions. Names marked in grey are the ones that have been wounded; those with a stripe through them have died. In an interview, he is proud he can be of help to the 'people who go and blow their brains out.'<sup>66</sup> This quote, and many others, shows the interesting relationship the anti-abortion terrorists have with their constituency, which I will analyze with the use of three sources I will describe below.

### **Three Different Sources**

Many sources prove to be quite useful in studying the language used by the AoG. There are countless websites, including their homepage, where they post their views about terrorism. A lot of the texts were and are written by people who have never ever performed any terrorist acts, and I will analyze these sources not only to gain a better understanding of the terrorists' point of view but also that of their supportive community. For my research, I will use three main sources. The first is a book written by Paul Hill after he shot of John Britton, called *Mix My Blood with the Blood of the Unborn*. In this, he describes the killing, the aftermath, and the book is primarily meant as a justification for his action. This book can be read digitally on the Army of God website, which is why it's probably unaltered and is therefore a reliable source.

The other two sources aren't written sources by the terrorists, but they are accounts of interviews with members of the AoG (both supporters and terrorists themselves). The first one is a documentary by HBO filmed in 2000, called 'Soldiers in the Army of God'. This documentary 'stars' certain members of the AoG, including Paul Hill, Michael Bray and many others. And lastly, I shall use a book written by Jessica Stern, called *Terror in the Name of God*. In this book, she has conversations with AoG members, including many of the ones named before. She visits a convention

---

<sup>65</sup> Stern, *Terror in the Name of God*, 162

<sup>66</sup> 'Soldiers in the Army of God 4/7' (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uuTJLUPJZY> (15 December 2012)

of the AoG called the White Rose Banquet, and she later has separate interviews with Michael Bray and Paul Hill. All three sources give great insight into the relationship the anti-abortion terrorists have with their constituency. Although an interview is a different source than a source that has been written by members of the AoG themselves, I still maintain that these sources are useful for my research. The spoken word can be just as informative as the written word, and in this case, they tell a lot how the terrorists were personally connected to their environment.

### **Attacking the Enemy**

Like practically every text written by a terrorist, the different sources of the AoG are filled with devil terms. The term might be even more applicable than with other texts, because the concept of the devil term proves to be quite literal when analyzing the different sources of the AoG. The abortionists aren't just enemies; they are described as pure evil. In the book *Terror in the Name of God*, Donald Spitz literally speaks in terms of 'evil is increasing'<sup>67</sup>, and many of the sources compare the abortionists with the worst figures of the bible. Spitz says these crimes have happened before, and claims that 'Pontius Pilate slaughtered unborn children.'<sup>68</sup> Paul Hill makes the term devil term literal when he claims that 'the abortionist knife is the cutting edge of Satan's current attack.'<sup>69</sup> Other devil terms include 'baby butchers'<sup>70</sup> to describe the abortionists and 'abortuaries'<sup>71</sup> to describe abortion clinics. The clinic doctors are often dehumanized, with Paul Hill continuingly referring to his victim in the HBO documentary as 'the abortionist', not 'John Britton'.<sup>72</sup>

Other uses of language to construct an image of their enemy, is to graphically describe their actions. In the White Rose Banquet program, Jessica Stern read a description of an abortion: 'Some of them are dead by having their small, soft bodies literally wrenched apart and pulled through suction tubing; others are neatly cut here and there by a knife-like instrument – an arm brought out first or maybe a leg with other appendages and organs to follow...'<sup>73</sup>. These kinds of descriptions can be read on practically every anti-abortion website, and they are many times coupled with gruesome (and often fake) photos.

Like the RAF, Nazi Germany proves to be a popular metaphor for the abortion issue, and are the most wildly used of the devil terms. Jonathan O'Toole claims 'It is like living in Nazi Germany.'<sup>74</sup>,

---

<sup>67</sup> Stern, *Terror in the Name of God*, 152

<sup>68</sup> Ibidem, 152

<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, 167

<sup>70</sup> Ibidem, 147

<sup>71</sup> Ibidem, 159

<sup>72</sup> 'Soldiers in the Army of God 2/7' (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9fz97K2Ni4> (15 December 2012)

<sup>73</sup> Stern, *Terror in the Name of God*, 149

<sup>74</sup> 'Soldiers in the Army of God 1/7' (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5d1n0zDngPl> (15 December 2012)

Paul Hill compares abortion doctors with Joseph Mengele in his book<sup>75</sup>, and Michael Bray talks about the ‘current Holocaust’<sup>76</sup>. They all claim that there is still hope to end the abortion-issue, and many are convinced that judgment will be served to the ones responsible. Again, comparisons to Nazi Germany are made, where Bray claims that ‘In a couple of years we will prosecute those who did this, like in Nuremberg.’<sup>77</sup>

Nazi Germany is not only used to create an image of their enemies, it’s also used to justify their own actions. Paul Hill makes many references to the Holocaust in *Mix My Blood with the Blood of the Unborn* to explain his own actions: ‘Suppose, for instance, someone had shot and killed the notorious Dr. Joseph Mengele who practiced at Auschwitz. Wouldn’t this have been warranted, under the circumstances, to prevent him from continuing his torturous and murderous experiments?’<sup>78</sup> and ‘If individuals should not bomb abortion clinics, would it have also been wrong for individuals to have bombed the tracks that led to Auschwitz?’<sup>79</sup>. The bible is the other major source of justification, and every source quotes many different bible verses, like Paul Hill did in his book: “‘Preserve justice, and do righteousness, for my salvation is about to come and my righteousness to be revealed.” (Isaiah 56:1)’<sup>80</sup>.

Every anti-abortion source I have analyzed uses the term ‘defensive act’. They keep stressing the fact that they are not attacking a regime, but they are defending the unborn. Violence against clinics or personnel is always described as ‘defensive actions’ or ‘justified homicide’, and other God terms (see chapter two) includes ‘saints’ or ‘martyrs’ to describe the (fallen) soldiers in de the Army of God.<sup>81</sup> Paul Hill doesn’t even perceives his actions as violence, and claims that ‘I would not characterize force being used to defend the unborn as violence.’<sup>82</sup> The AoG mirrors the accusations against them, and they accuse the abortionists and the government of terrorism themselves. Hill for example turns the tables by upholding that ‘Any nation that legalizes abortion throws a blanket of fear and intimidation over all its citizens who rightly understand the issues involved.’<sup>83</sup> Language is used to denounce the enemy, but it also clearly shows the strong supporting constituency of the terrorists. I will now dig deeper into the connection between the terrorists and the constituency.

---

<sup>75</sup> P.J. Hill, ‘Mix my Blood with the Blood of the Unborn’ (Version 2003), <http://www.armyofgod.com/PHillBookForward.html> (24 January 2013)

<sup>76</sup> ‘Soldiers in the Army of God 2/7’ (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OX5-FfyxfTg> (15 December 2012)

<sup>77</sup> ‘Soldiers in the Army of God 3/7’ (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9fz97K2Ni4> (15 December 2012)

<sup>78</sup> P.J. Hill, ‘Mix my Blood with the Blood of the Unborn’ (Version 2003), <http://www.armyofgod.com/PHillBookForward.html> (24 January 2013)

<sup>79</sup> Ibidem

<sup>80</sup> Ibidem

<sup>81</sup> Stern, *Terror in the Name of God*, 159

<sup>82</sup> P.J. Hill, ‘Mix my Blood with the Blood of the Unborn’ (Version 2003), <http://www.armyofgod.com/PHillBookForward.html> (24 January 2013)

<sup>83</sup> Ibidem

### **The Supportive Community from the Terrorist’s Point of View**

Like other terrorists, the AoG clearly creates/identifies its enemy, and the members and supporters clearly construct an ‘us versus them’ situation. In the previous paragraph I have presented their image of ‘them’, the abortionists and everyone who support them. Now I will describe, with the primary sources presented before, how the terrorists saw ‘us’. Paul Hill’s book makes a couple of references to his terrorist constituency and, as will be presented, it proves to be a very enabling and supporting community. Hill doesn’t write like someone who is detached from a significant part of his environment. He opens his book with some acknowledgements, and he writes ‘I extend my heartfelt thanks to the many people who have encouraged and prayed for me, and my family, during the last few years. The Lord has used your love and concern to sustain and uplift us in a wonderful way.’<sup>84</sup> This shows the support Hill had, and other passages demonstrate that he often talks about ‘we’ and ‘us’, like ‘we should joyfully accept any persecution that may come to us for defending the needy’<sup>85</sup>. In other passages, he includes ‘the people’ as his allies: ‘If people’s children will not be defended by the government, they must be defended by the people.’<sup>86</sup> In another passage, he clearly divides his allies and enemies: ‘Those who protect abortionists are protecting violence; those who protect the unborn are preventing violence.’<sup>87</sup>

However, it is interesting to note that he considers the protection of the unborn as more than just violence. In contrast with other terrorists, he does not necessarily advocate the primacy of practice. Even people who don’t directly take action are part of ‘us’: ‘Those who lack the calling or ability to kill, or take other forms of direct defensive action, should not necessarily consider themselves to be cowards, and dismiss themselves from the duty to uphold this aspect of the Moral Law.’<sup>88</sup>, and ‘Virtually everyone willing to serve can play a vital role in promoting this duty as they consecrate their various God-given talents and abilities to this task. A body cannot function without the use of all of its members—even the ones that seem insignificant.’<sup>89</sup> This clearly shows that Hill considers everyone who opposes abortion, even those who don’t take directly take action, as his allies. In short, this shows that Hill didn’t assume a sharp dividing line between him/the AoG and the rest of society, but that he considered everyone who opposes abortion his allies.

One more interesting thing to note when analyzing Paul Hill’s text is that for him, and probably for religious terrorists in general, God is part of his constituency. There are many accounts of him blessing God for giving him the courage to shoot Dr. Britton, and of his conviction that God supports his actions. This, in his eyes, omnipresent entity is the most important constituency he has.

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibidem

<sup>85</sup> Ibidem

<sup>86</sup> Ibidem

<sup>87</sup> Ibidem

<sup>88</sup> Ibidem

<sup>89</sup> Ibidem

Besides that the anti-abortion standpoint is popular among many Americans, this is also a very important reason why the AoG is a much less isolated group than the non-religious RAF for example.

### **The Enabling Community from the Supporter's Point of View**

Since the Army of God consists of both terrorists and supporters of their actions, I will also show the extent to which the community supported the terrorists from the community's point of view. The HBO documentary 'Soldiers in the Army of God' clearly shows many people who are balancing between talking about and promoting terrorist acts, and actually performing a terrorist act. Bob Lokey is one of those people, who runs a website and claims that he had inspired many to stand up to abortion. His website claims that 'homicide is justified, when it is necessary to protect human life.'<sup>90</sup> Although he hasn't performed any real terrorist acts, he often talks about it, and claims that 'what we do is what Paul Hill did. We end abortion on demand with the most direct means available to us.'<sup>91</sup>

He and many others meet annually in the White Rose Banquet, named after the student movement in Nazi Germany to resist the regime. This Banquet is partly meant as a meeting between members, and also to raise money for the many 'martyrs' who are serving time in prison. Lokey meets many others, like Neal Horsley, creator of the Nuremberg Files website, and David Leach, author of the Army of God manual, which lists ways to damage abortion buildings from putting super glue in locks to two simple bomb recipes. The documentary and *Terror in the Name of God* both show the strong supportive community behind this White Rose Banquet. It proves to be a proud community, and everyone wants to talk to the outsiders who document them, even when it becomes clear they are writing/documenting on terrorism. Since they don't discuss specific plans, this meeting remains legal.

One very important aspect of the strength of the community is the presence of the internet. The main communication source of the AoG is the internet, and every member of the AoG can spread his/her ideas or have contact with anyone from the group within seconds. Since the rise of the internet, it is much easier to communicate and for terrorists to have contact with their constituency. The rise of the internet has changed the interaction a terrorist has with its constituency, which is why modern terrorists have more opportunities to get in contact with supporters, and therefore probably are less isolated relative to terrorists before the internet-era.

### **Conclusion**

The information presented shows a group with a very interesting dynamic. The AoG proves to be a group which is balancing between terrorism and supporting terrorism. All sources support the claim that the terrorists had a strong enabling community supporting them, which proves that an analyses of a terrorists' discourse can demonstrate the relationship of a terrorist and its environment. Although

---

<sup>90</sup> 'Soldiers in the Army of God 1/7' (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5d1n0zDngPl> (15 December 2012)

<sup>91</sup> Ibidem



every source provides us with harsh language towards their enemies, the AoG considers many people to be their allies. The book by Paul Hill shows that he reckons many people as his allies, even the ones who don't directly act. Besides this, there are many signals found from non-terrorist members of the AoG that they give the members who do commit terrorist acts all the support they need.

In the documentary, some footage is shown from Paul Hill's trial. When the verdict is spoken, a woman causes a stir, claiming Paul Hill is innocent and a hero in an escalating war.<sup>92</sup> This outburst exemplifies the strong community which surrounds the anti-abortion terrorists in their struggle. Paul Hill was executed in 2003, and became another martyr for the Army of God. The recent killing of abortion clinic doctor George Tiller in 2009 by Scott Roeder proves that this conflict is far from over.

---

<sup>92</sup> 'Soldiers in the Army of God 5/7' (Version June 2009), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hEojgg!QRWI> (15 December 2012)

## Conclusion

Since the rise of the single-issue terrorists, relatively few of the groups that engage in this kind of terrorism have ceased to exist. It proves to be very hard to stop single-issue terrorism, and this research might shed new light on the reason for this. There is still a lot of research needed to understand this relatively new phenomenon. This thesis argues that language can be a very useful tool to understand how single-issue terrorism interacts with its environment in comparison with a more (traditional) revolutionary kind of terrorism. In this conclusion, I will concretize why the language used by terrorists can indeed prove that revolutionary terrorists are more isolated from their environment than single-issue terrorists. Furthermore, I will give some suggestions for further research to fully understand the main difference between constituency support of both groups.

This research has focused on the language both terrorist groups have used/use. My hypothesis was that an analysis of language could prove that revolutionary terrorists were more isolated from their constituency than single-issue terrorists. My expectation was that this could be attributed to the conceivable harder tone the revolutionary terrorists might use, coupled with a more secluded vision of their constituency, which consists of less allies than the single-issue terrorists. For this research, I have compared the two case studies of the Rote Armee Faction (revolutionary terrorism) and the Army of God (single issue terrorism), and an analyses of different sources of both groups have provided this research with an answer to the research question.

To begin, the assumption that revolutionary terrorists used a harder tone to denounce their enemies has proven to be false. In fact, with regard to their enemies, both texts by the RAF and the AoG have many aspects in common. The first resemblance that quickly comes to mind when analyzing texts by both groups, is that they both make extensive use of the ultimate terms, described in chapter one. Both make use of numerous devil terms and sometimes they even use the same ones. While the RAF mainly used Leftist devil terms like 'bourgeois' and 'imperialistic' and the AoG predominantly used religious devil terms like 'Satanic', they both shared the terms with which they compared their enemies to the Nazi's. For example, they both compared the government with the Nazi regime and they even both used the same symbolic event, Auschwitz, to denounce what they are opposed to (Vietnam with the RAF and abortion clinics with the AoG).

Furthermore I found another resemblance, which is that they both use God terms to enhance their own group's solidarity. The one predominantly used by both groups is the term 'martyrs', in which they portray themselves not as the enemy but as the denigrated heroes. I haven't focused on this issue since this research is not about the internal dynamics of a terrorist group, but about the external dynamics it has with its environment. This however is also a likeness both groups' languages share. A final comparison between the terrorist's discourse of both groups show that they both turn the tables

when it comes to the term ‘terrorism’, and that the ones who really are the terrorists, in their eyes, are the enemies who accuse them of terrorism like the government, and not themselves.

In short, both groups use devil terms, sometimes even the same ones, to denounce their enemies. They both use a harsh language, and they both use God terms to create an image of their own group. It can be concluded that there is much resemblance between both groups when it comes to language to create an image of themselves or their enemy for their followers to adept to. However, here the word ‘followers’ is crucial, for the main difference between the languages of both groups lies in the way the followers are addressed. The way in which both groups interact with their environment using language proves to be essential in understanding the difference in isolation both groups had with their constituency.

That the AoG is a single-issue terrorist group becomes clear when analyzing their texts since, in contrast to the RAF, they talk about their acts in terms of defensive acts. They don’t want to overthrow a government; they just want to protect one issue that is of great importance to them. This difference in objective results in a different degree of involvement from the environment of both groups. After a thorough analyses of the language used in a certain amount of primary sources from both groups, it becomes obvious that a main difference between both groups in terms of contact with their constituency is apparent: that the ‘us and them’ distinction between both groups is very different.

The most important conclusion one can derive from an analyses of the RAF pamphlets is that the RAF was detached from a big part of their environment which could have been part of their constituency. They attack many people, including everyone on the Left who didn’t pick up the arms, which it turns out was almost the complete Left. Even the ones who did fight, like Bewegung 2 Juni, were criticized for being too amateurish. That the ‘us’ in ‘us versus them’ proved to be a quit small group was finalized in their 1972 text ‘Serving the People’, where they distanced themselves, rather curious when one looks at the title of the pamphlet, from ‘most people’. In short, after an analysis of the language of many RAF sources, the RAF proves to be a very isolated terrorist group.

The analyzed AoG-sources describe an image of a constituency which is almost the complete opposite of the constituency of the RAF. All sources support the claim that the terrorists have a strong enabling community supporting them. The terrorists consider many people as their allies, and have thus a larger hence stronger constituency. Of course, the non-terrorist members of the AoG are a natural part of their constituency and give the terrorist members of the AoG all the support they need. However, they count many more as their allies, since they also reckon everyone who actively voices his or her oppression to abortion as an ally, whether that person takes action or not. Summarizing, ‘us’ includes many, which leads to the conclusion that the AoG have a strong constituency, even to this day.

In conclusion, the hypothesis that an analysis of language can prove that the revolutionary terrorists were more isolated from their constituency than single-issue terrorists were can be confirmed. Although the language used to denounce their enemies has many similarities, the language

in which they address their constituency and the language in which the constituency addresses them, has many differences. The RAF proved to be a very isolated group, isolated from the passive Left, the active Left, and ‘most of the people’. The AoG on the other hand has a very supportive community, which includes members of the Army of God and anyone who actively voices his or her opposition to abortion. These conclusions have been made with a discourse analysis of the language terrorists use.

As interesting as this conclusion may be, further research is still needed to definitely prove the important role language plays in verifying that single-issue terrorists are less isolated than revolutionary terrorists. A comparison between the RAF and the AoG shows a lot of different variables which might prove to be other reasons why the RAF was more isolated than the AoG, other than the fact that they were different kinds of terrorist groups (revolutionary and single-issue). For example, the internet is an important factor for the strong constituency of the AoG, and the RAF was active before the internet-age. Another variable includes the fact that the AoG, as a religious group, already has the greatest constituency of all, which is their idea of an omnipresent God, who already gives them all the support they need for their actions. Lastly, a final reason other than the difference in revolutionary and single-issue terrorism that caused the RAF terrorists to be more isolated than the AoG terrorists could be the fact that the AoG isn’t an illegal group, since most of the members don’t perform terrorist acts, in comparison to the RAF which always has been an illegal group.

To acquire a falsification of these variables and to prove that it was indeed the difference between single-issue terrorism and revolutionary terrorism that caused a difference in language regarding their environment, instead of variables like the presence of internet, more research is needed in the future. The language of other single-issue terrorists and revolutionary terrorists should be compared, like the revolutionary terrorism of Al Qaeda (which in contrast to the RAF is religious and has access to internet) with another single-issue terrorist group which isn’t religious and which is illegal (in contrast to the AoG), like the eco-terrorism of the Animal Liberation Front. This could prove that it is indeed the difference between revolutionary and single-issue terrorism that causes the difference in the language used when communicating with their constituency. However, I am convinced that further research will support the claim that it is indeed the difference between revolutionary and single-issue terrorism that causes the difference in signs of isolation found in the language used by the terrorists. Therefore language is a very useful tool to analyze the relationship terrorists have with their constituency.

The last RAF assassination was in 1991, where members of the RAF shot and killed German manager and politician Detlev Karsten Rohwedder. Mr. Rohwedder was in charge of privatizing the assets of the former German Democratic Republic. Eighteen years later, in 2009, the last anti-abortion associated murder was carried out by Scott Roeder, who shot Dr. George Tiller (nicknamed ‘Tiller the baby-killer’ by the anti-abortionists) while he attended church service. The AoG quickly issued a statement in which they called Roeder an ‘American hero’. It is clear that terrorism, whether it is

revolutionary or single-issue terrorism, is far from being extinct. In this global internet age, dominated by multi-media communication, terrorism more and more proves to be a threat. 'The War on Terrorism', how doubtful this term may be, is a war which can't be won, and as George Santayana famously remarked: 'Only the dead have seen the end of war'. This however doesn't mean we can't suppress terrorism as much as we can. The key to this problem lies in the relationship of the terrorists and their constituency. By analyzing as much of the terrorists as we can, whether it's their culture, psychology or use of language, the more we know about them, and the more we can control them. For the popularity of the term 'discourse analyses' isn't the only accomplishment of Michel Foucault: his most famous quote also applies to this research, in the notion that 'knowledge is power'.

# Bibliography

## Primary Sources

### Books

Baumann, B., *How It All Began: The Personal Account of a West German Urban Guerilla* (Vancouver 2002)

Colvin, S., *Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism : Language, Violence and Identity* (New York 2009)

Stern J., *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill* (New York 2004)

### Websites

‘Army of God’, [www.armyofgod.com](http://www.armyofgod.com) (27 November 2012)

‘Built the Red Army!’ (Version 2009),

[http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70\\_06\\_05.php](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/70_06_05.php) (16 December 2012)

Hill, P.J., ‘Mix my Blood with the Blood of the Unborn’ (Version 2003),

<http://www.armyofgod.com/PHillBookForward.html> (24 January 2013)

Kennedy, J. and B. Mahlburg, ‘Paul Hill Executed’ (Version 2003),

<http://www.rickross.com/reference/a-abortion/a-abortion23.html> (25 December 2012)

Moncourt, A. and J. Smith, ‘The Red Army Faction, A Documentary History: Projectiles for the People’ (version 2009), <http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/index.html> (2 December 2012)

‘Serve the People: The Urban Guerilla and Class Struggle’ (version 2009),

[http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/72\\_04.php](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/72_04.php) (22 December 2012)

‘The Urban Guerilla Concept’ (Version 2009),

[http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71\\_04.html](http://www.germanguerilla.com/red-army-faction/documents/71_04.html) (13 December 2012)

### **Documentary (as viewed on Youtube)**

‘Soldiers in the Army of God 1/7’ (Version June 2009),  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5d1n0zDngPI> (15 December 2012)

‘Soldiers in the Army of God 2/7’ (Version June 2009),  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9fz97K2Ni4> (15 December 2012)

‘Soldiers in the Army of God 3/7’ (Version June 2009),  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9fz97K2Ni4> (15 December 2012)

‘Soldiers in the Army of God 4/7’ (Version June 2009),  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uuTJLUPIJZY> (15 December 2012)

‘Soldiers in the Army of God 5/7’ (Version June 2009),  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hEojgglQRWI> (15 December 2012)

### **Secondary Sources**

#### **Books**

Colvin, S., *Ulrike Meinhof and West German Terrorism : Language, Violence and Identity* (New York 2009)

Law, R., *Terrorism: A History* (Cambridge 2009)

Nolan, V., *Military Leadership and Counterinsurgency: The British Army and Small War Strategy Since World War II* (London 2012)

Richardson, L., *What terrorists want. Understanding the enemy, containing the threat* (New York 2007)

Stern, J., *Terror in the Name of God: Why Religious Militants Kill* (New York 2004)

## Articles

Blok, A., 'Zinloos en zinvol geweld', Henk Driessen en Huub de Jonge (red.), *In de ban van betekenis. Proeven van symbolische antropologie* (Nijmegen 1994)

Criado, H., 'Bullets and Votes: Public Opinion and Terrorist Strategies', *Journal of Peace Research*, 48: 497, (2001)

Dyson, W., 'The Emergence of Special Interest/Single Issue Terrorism', *Institute For Intergovernmental Research* (Florida 2001)

Gupta, D.K., 'Terrorism, History, and Historians: A View from a Social Scientist', *Journal of American History*, Volume: 98, Issue: 1 (1 June, 2011)

Kruglanski, A.W. et al., 'Workings of the Terrorists mind: Its Individual, Group, and Organizational Psychologies', in: D. Bar-Tal (ed.), *Intergroup Conflicts and Their Resolution: A Social Psychological Resolution* (New York 2001)

Monaghan, R., 'Single Issue Terrorism, A Neglected Phenomenon?', *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 23:255-265, 2000

Pekelder, J., 'From Militancy to Democracy? The Radical Left in West Germany in the 1970s', *Creative crises of democracy* (Brussel 2012)

Pekelder, J., 'Historisering van de RAF: geschiedschrijving over dertig jaar links Duits terrorisme, 1968-1998', *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, vol. 119 (2006)

Ruggiero, V., 'Brigate Rosse: Political violence, criminology and social movement theory', *Crime, Law & Social Change* (2005)

Wilkinson, P., 'The Media & Terrorism: A reassessment', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 9, no. 2 (1997)

## Websites

'Definitions of Terrorism' (version 2006),

[http://web.archive.org/web/20070527145632/http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism\\_definitions.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20070527145632/http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html)

(26 November 2012)



'Discourse Analysis', <http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/~palmquis/courses/discourse.htm> (15 December 2012)

Lifton, R.J., 'Thought Reform and the Psychology of Totalism' (version 1989),  
[http://www.rickross.com/reference/brainwashing/brainwashing19.html#Loading the Language](http://www.rickross.com/reference/brainwashing/brainwashing19.html#Loading%20the%20Language) (18 December 2012)

Smith, G. Davidson, 'Single Issue Terrorism' (version 1998),  
<http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/com74e.htm> (26 November 2012)

White, B.A., 'Richard M. Weaver: Dialectic Rhetorician' (version 1982),  
[http://www.mmsi.org/ma/26\\_3-4/white.pdf](http://www.mmsi.org/ma/26_3-4/white.pdf) (16 December 2012)