

TERRORISM: TERROR AND EXPLOSION
“...importance of fire and the construction of bombs...”¹

More than five years ago the explosions which occurred in New York represented the beginning of “the war on terrorism,” which is still ongoing. In the meantime many events, in different parts of the world, characterized by greater or lesser destructive explosions, with larger or smaller numbers of victims, have been labelled, without any reservation, as terrorist “acts,” “actions” or “attacks.” Is it possible to explain terrorism by analyzing the relationship between the words “terror” and “explosion” (the phrase “bomb attacks” can be the explosion of an airplane “as a bomb,” as well as the explosion of a suicide bomber who activated a bomb on himself)? Perhaps this sort of definition of terrorism does not have to be *narrow*² and can have certain advantages as opposed to other definitions?

“DEFINING TERRORISM” – TERROR OF DEFINITIONS

The inflation or “explosion” of texts concerning terrorism, which attempt to define terrorism, always anew, are a consequence of a fear of terrorism (“fear of fear”) and are the “terror” of terrorism itself. The difficulty with limiting terrorism and with locating the strength of its reasons and existence are quite different:

¹ “É essencial assinalar a importância dos incêndios e da construção de bombas incendiárias como bombas de gasolina na técnica de terrorismo revolucionário.” Carlos Marighella, *Manual do guerrilheiro urbano (Minimanual of the Urban Guerilla)*, 1969. The Brazilian revolutionary defines terrorism as: “Terrorism is an action, usually involving the placement of an explosive or firebomb of great destructive power, which is capable of effecting irreparable loss against the enemy” /O terrorismo é uma ação, usualmente envolvendo a colocação de uma bomba ou uma bomba de fogo de grande poder destrutivo, o qual é capaz de influir perdas irreparáveis ao inimigo/.

Lenin, in his text “From the Defensive to the Offensive” (*Ot oboroni k napadeniju*) published in September 1905, speaks of the passing from individual terror to “military operations, together with the people”. “The bomb has ceased to be the weapon of the solitary “bomb thrower” /*odinocki bombista*/, and is becoming an essential weapon of the people. (...) Bombs can be manufactured anywhere and everywhere. They are now being produced in Russia on a far larger scale than any of us know. (...) Matters in Russia are obviously heading towards that. Consider reports in the legal newspapers about bombs found in the baggage of peaceful steamer passengers.” *Lenin Collected Works*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972, volume 9, pp. 284-285.

² Antony Coady uses the adjective “narrow” for Marighella’s theory of terrorism, while David Rodin, twenty years later, places this definition into the “Tactical and operational definitions” of terrorism and is not at all happy with it: “Clearly this is too narrow”. C. A. J. Coady, “The Morality of Terrorism,” *Philosophy* 60 (1985), p. 47; D. Rodin, “Terrorism without Intention,” *Ethics* 114 (2004), p. 753.

1. The lack of a legal definition of terrorism. None of the debates, up to now, having their institutional locus in the UN General Assembly and its Legal Committee in the 1970's and the 2000's, have successfully defined international terrorism and have, in fact, made a distinction between it and other forms of political violence (there is no clear difference between a terrorist, offender by conviction /*Überzeugungsverbrecher*/,³ freedom fighter and, for example, legitimate self-defense by a national liberation movement).⁴

2. Traditional fear of revolt and revolution. All of today's definitions of terrorism are removed of any sort of connection with the French Revolution, that is the Jacobean terror, as well as the rich tradition of terrorism in Europe during the last and 19th centuries. The agent of terrorism and the carrier of extreme violence (extreme and shocking force) does not always have to be one who is weak, rather it is usually (or simultaneously) one who is strong (the state – state terrorism or terrorism done by the state).

3. The erasure or censure of the history of secret relations between “the strong” (states) and “the weak” (terrorists, terrorist groups). The governments of certain states or their administrations, are primarily responsible for the strength, organization and even the existence of these gangs. The governments of the most powerful states have usurped their own rule (“world governance”), damaged the sovereignty of other states, badly protected the interests of their own peoples and put their own sovereignties (their own citizens) in harm's way. Conversely, “terrorists” have not managed to transform themselves into carriers of the interests of minorities and the weak, those who want equality and to take part in world governance, rather their “enthusiasm” has changed into fanaticism or into “enthusiasm for something abstract” /*ein Begeisterung für ein Abstraktes*/ (this is an important characteristic of Mahometanism or Mohammedanism; Hegel, for example, compares it to the terrorism of Robespierre).⁵

4. The “institutionalization” of hypocritical argumentation (double standards) which

³ G. Radbruch, *Strafrecht II*, in *Gesamtausgabe*, Band. 8, 1998, S. 127.

⁴ In 1999 the United Nations adopted a convention on the financing of terrorism. This convention contains an “embryonic definition” of terrorism. J. Friedrichs, “Defining the International Public Enemy: The Political Struggle behind the Legal Debate on International Terrorism”, *Leiden Journal of International Law* 19 (2006), p. 74.

⁵ “La religion et la terreur was the principle in this case (Mahometanism), as with Robespierre, la liberté et la terreur.” G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, New York, Dover Publications, 1956, p. 358.

“strengthens” the sovereignty of privileged states and the immunity of their citizens. The philosopher exclusively solves state and world governance problems. He creates the argumentation which justifies violent means for the protection of existing institutions and existing balance of power: the right to violent intervention, the right to preventive war and preemptive attack, the emergence of “asymmetric war,” the legitimacy of targeted killings, the right to forcible regime change, detention without trial, the justification of torture etc.

The explosion, or more precisely, several massive explosions that occurred in September of 2001 in New York have to do with terror. Before I attempt to explain the proximity of the word “terror” to the word “explosion” (this word assumes a bomb, dynamite, petroleum, fire/Greek fire or naphthalene), it is necessary to quickly review several directions in which the discussion of terrorism has gone in the past five years. The question is, is it possible to overcome the difficulty with defining terrorism – the assumption being that a correct definition of terrorism will end terrorism and put a stop to any future possibility of terror – with several added premises which further complicate the matter?

The event, which seems to repeat on an annual basis and is signified by two numbers and a slash between them (9/11; there are no other numbers to mark the year or add to this date), which I am using here as a paradigm of a “terrorist act,” is usually explained with the help of the following words (all these words and phrases are supposed to clear up and explain the words “terror” and “terrorism”):

The event (9/11), firstly, is not even an event, it cannot have the status of an event, because nothing unexpected occurred, because everything was prepared, because terrorism is not a beginning but rather a response to terror which preceded it and in the end provoked it; The event then, opposite and apart from the phenomenological frame of the previous sentence, represents complete surprise and a terrorist act is fundamentally unpredictable; because it already occurred, it can happen again, at any time and any place; just as death can always be an unwelcome surprise, therefore, one such event represents a constant threat; This event produces panic and then the death of many innocent people who were, completely by accident, present at the time of the explosion (randomness); The death of innocent people and the material damage are only the secondary goals of these events, which have a clear political background and intention; this sort of political violence is in principle carried out in secret.

The final two characteristics of terror are quite important and should be set aside from this

chain of designations as they have been cunningly marginalized recently: (1) Secrecy⁶ is the key mark of terror (fear, uncertainty and anxiety precede any appearance of a source or object of fear⁷). A secret army spreads fear⁸. The violence which comes out of secret undoubtedly leads us towards the mysteries of secret knowledge and the secret preventive actions of secret services (without any control by the public and with poor results) who are the main subjects of the war against terrorism and against invisible and secret enemies. (2) Violence is quite close to terror because terrorism in fact repeats or tries to repeat a sort of establishing, or institutional violence (sovereign in any event), which lies at the heart of every state. Terrorism follows the practices and beliefs of state institutions, that something can be achieved, changed, realized or created through violence⁹. Attempts to erase previous violence, or stop an even greater expected or unexpected violence, by creating more violence in the world, have frequently resulted in only a temporary interruption of violence. Often confusion and even greater insecurity followed. In a phrase – even greater terror¹⁰.

A sketch of a possible complication with defining terrorism begins with the addition of several elements that is making connections between things that should not stand side by side. If the key condition for determining terrorism is the concept of “terror” – sometimes it seems that differing definitions completely put this aside, if we then add two key segments of terrorist practice (“secrecy” and “violence”) to terror, we have the possibility of using one instructive analogy (or contra-analogy). The status of the analogy and analogies in general, is quite contentious. It expands meaning, but creates infinite uncertainty. The following analogy, which is frequently repeated and made St. Augustine famous, is especially unsuitable because it attempts to be something greater than the “regular” and “imprecise” analogy:

““Remove justice,” says Augustine in *De Civitate Dei*, “and what are states but gangs of bandits */latrocinia/* on a large scale? And what are bandit gangs */latrocinia/* but kingdom in

⁶ C. A. J. Coady, “Defining Terrorism”, *Terrorism. The Philosophical Issues*, ed. I. Primoratz, Hampshire-New York, 2004, p. 4.

⁷ “Terreur subite, dont on est bouleversé sans sujet apparent” */terror épouvante/*. W. von Wartburg, *Französisch Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Basel, 1966, Band. 13, Teil 1, S. 264.

⁸ M. Hughes, “Terrorism and National Security”, *Philosophy* 57 (1982), p. 5.

⁹ V. Held, “Legitimate Authority in Non-state Group Using Violence”, *Journal of Social Philosophy*, Vol. 36, No. 2, summer 2005, p. 183.

¹⁰ When Immanuel Kant attempts to define moral terrorism */moralische Terrorismus/* and a terroristic manner of representing history, he cites the hypocrisy of so called ecclesiastics */Geistliche/* who predict the total destruction of religion and the imminent appearance of the Antichrist, and “in doing so they are performing precisely what is requisite to call him up”. Moral terrorism predicts that the human race is in continual retrogression toward wickedness. “Doomsday is at our doorstep; and the pious enthusiast */Schwärmer/* by this time is already dreaming of the restoration of all things and a renovated world after the time that this one will have perished in flames” */im Feuer untergegangen ist/*. *The Conflict of the Faculties*, London, University of Nebraska Press, pp. 144-145.

miniature?”¹¹

What makes St. Augustine’s sentence absolutely unacceptable is the conditionality, the intervention at the beginning of the sentence, with which he “ruins” the “elegant and excellent pirate’s answer to the great Macedonian Alexander”¹² – “remove justice”, “set justice aside”. Perhaps something can be put aside sometimes (after all, the analogy always insists upon some sort of reserve, on the necessity to close ones eyes or wink and move past what will destroy it); in this case however, justice or injustice is the carrier of this comparison between empire and piracy, and in a certain way (in)justice is only possible within the one or the other, and not one apart from the other. This is an important question, and Thomas Nagel pointed out its urgency and the importance of the analogy and sovereignty.¹³ Here, I am not interested in the bandit’s brave response, nor the imperial world play (Alexander asked him, “what are you doing here, on the sea, since when are you suddenly a “pirate” when until recently you “operated” on the streets and land and were a “bandit””), nor games concerning the dimensions of the thefts, nor the political correctness of Augustine (“*remota iustitia*”), nor the position of the hidden adviser-philosopher Aristotle who is always behind Emperor Alexander listening to this criminal’s answer (the philosophers function, it seems, is to find an adequate response to the terrorism of the pirate and bandit) etc. My question should come from the position of the passenger who is travelling together with Lenin’s passenger on the sea, from the position of the passenger who is searched before a flight (the Emperor now asks “what are you doing in the sky, since when are you suddenly a “terrorist” when until recently you...); my questions should be the question of the one who possesses weakness, helplessness /*imbecillitas*/, and not innocence. My question is in reality the imbecile’s question, the question of someone who has yet to decide¹⁴ (who almost certainly cannot decide) between several sovereigns none of whom guarantees protection but rather keeps him (the imbecile) ignorant and in terror:

Therefore, did the small ship “leave” the great navy, and if so how, did the one who is

¹¹ Saint Augustine, *The City of God*, London - New York, Dent & Sons, Vol. 2, Book IV, chapter III, p. 115. “*Remota itaque iustitia quid sunt regna nisi magna latrocinia? quia et latrocinia quid sunt nisi parua regna?*”

¹² “The king asking him how he durst molest the seas so, he replied with a free spirit: “How darest thou molest the whole world /*ut orbem terrarium*/? But because I do it with a little ship only, I am called a bandit /*latro*/: thou, doing it with a great navy, art called an emperor.” Ibid.

¹³ T. Nagel, “The Problem of Global Justice”, *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 33, No. 2, pp. 113-147.

¹⁴ Leibniz’s advice, concerning the complicated situation when a sovereign cannot provide security, is interesting, and similar to Hobbes’ ruminations. In a letter to Mr. Falaisaeu, written in Hanover on July 8, 1705 he first gives the state the name used by the Latins /*les Latins*/, *Respublica*, and says that it is a large society whose goal is the common security /*la seureté commune*/. “It is permitted to subjects to swear an oath of fidelity to the enemy /*de prester serment de fidelité à l’ennemi*/ of their master who has conquered them, their master not being able to do anything to insure their safety.” *Die Werke von Leibniz*, ed. O. Klopp 1884, Hanover, Volume IX, letter number CCCXXXI, 142-143.

searching me “place” bombs into the luggage of the one who is about to kill me?

Does the responsibility of the state for the existence of terrorism have to precede any sort of response, by the state(s), to the terrorist’s violence?

The responsibility of the state already assumes the terror of the state. Responsibility should perhaps begin with the state’s ignorance in defining, formatting and expecting its enemy; responsibility is already the weakness of the state (the state is the imbecile, the state has epilepsy “because the fear of darkness and ghosts is greater than other fears”¹⁵) which recognizes the existence of one more or many more sovereignties and more “monopolies” on the use of violence; the responsibility of the state is manifested through its rhetoric of righteousness and the call for innocent citizens to aid it and defend it from evil (“innocent” or “righteous” this is, indeed, a sacrificed and uncared citizen).

What does an empire do then and how does it constitute itself through the termination and creation of piracy (terror and insecurity follow these violent processes)?

Here are some elements which can possibly confirm Augustine’s analogy and increase the difficulty in defining terrorism:

Terror. Terror is an “organ” of the state and is located in the foundations of sovereignty. The government introduces and controls terror (the highest possible level of fear)¹⁶, introduces a fictional invisible enemy or real enemy (danger) and terrifies its own “organism” (the sovereign turns his sovereignty, his citizens, his *civilitas* or *socialitas* into *imbecillitas*).¹⁷ Here are several differing visions and versions of terror as mentioned by Hobbes. I leave them in their initial “unaltered states,” before Hobbes’ interventions and theories that (1) fear is the cause for states, that (2) mutual fear establishes the state, that (3) only the state can surpass fear of a future evil, that (4) the government of a state (sovereign) is capable of and responsible for being “stronger” than fear and ensuring the security of its citizens etc.

Fear of power invisible (...) when the power imagined, is truly such as we imagine, True Religion.

¹⁵ *Leviathan, The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. W. Molesworth, London, 1839-1845, Volume III, p. 317.

¹⁶ “The division under the head of fear */metum/* are defined in this way: sluggishness */pigritiam/* as fear of ensuing toil (...) fright */terrorem/* as paralyzing fear which causes paleness, trembling and chattering of teeth, just as blushing is caused by shame; timidity */timorem/* as the fear of approaching evil; consternation */pavorem/* as fear upsetting the mental balance; pusillanimity */exanimationem/...* confusion */conturbationem/...* faintheartedness */formidinem/...* Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations*, London, William Heinemann, 1927, pp. 346-348. In the article “Peur” (fear) in the *Encyclopédie* (1751-1765) *terreur* begins when *peur* (fear) breaks our spirit */abat notre esprit/*.

¹⁷ S. von Pufendorf, *De Officio Hominis et Civis. Juxta Legem Naturalem Libri Duo*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1927, pp. 19-21, 99.

Fear, without apprehension of why, or what, *Panique Terror*;¹⁸ called so from the Fables, that make Pan author of them;

This Passion (*Terror*) happens to none but in a throng, or multitude of people.¹⁹

I comprehend in this word *fear*, a certain foresight of future evil */futuri mali/*.²⁰

Fear is a trouble or vexation of the mind, arising from the apprehension */fantasias/* of an evil at hand, which may hurt or destroy. Danger is the nearness of the evil feared.²¹

The fifth fragment is from Hobbes' translation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. Hobbes does not follow the Greek text; rather he constructs, takes away and adds on, makes up and erases²² (or adds fragments by Aristotle from his other works²³). This *something* of Aristotle's (this *object* of fear, this hostile */ehtra/*) which is near and threatening (at the end of the final fragment), and which Hobbes calls "evil," seems to be endlessly "near at hand." Despite the fact that the words "fear" and "terror" appear mixed in these sentences, they without a doubt signify the arrival of "something" that destroys and from which cover is difficult to find. However, terror possesses two additions in relations to Hobbes' use of the word "fear": Pan, the god who terrifies passengers, the only mortal god (Hobbes' *Leviathan* is also mortal), adds surprise to fear and in so doing transforms it into terror (Hobbes constructs a system of expressions for

¹⁸ Spinoza, in a very complicated fragment, attempts to demystify this terror. On one hand it should not be possible in a rightly constituted republic; on the other hand, criticizing Hobbes, this sort of terror cannot be defeated by the empire or emperor and this terror is "the cause of the destruction of the Roman dominion". "In a rightly constituted republic such terror does not arise but from due cause */similis terror non oritur, nisi ex iusta causa/*. And so such terror and consequent confusion */confusio/* can be attributed to no cause avoidable by human foresight." "Yet in the extreme difficulties of a dominion */in maximis tamen imperii angustiis/*, when all, as sometimes happens, are seized by a sort of panic terror */terrore quodam panico/*, all, without regard to the future or the laws, approve only that which their actual fear */metus/* suggests, all turn towards the man who is renowned for his victories, and set him free from the laws, and continue him in command, and entrust to his fidelity all affairs of the state.", *Tractatus Politicus, The Chief Works of B. de Spinoza*, Vol. I, London, 1883, chapter X, §10, pp. 383-384.

¹⁹ *Leviathan*, Volume III, p. 44.

²⁰ *De Cive, The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, Volume II, p. 6. "Ego ea voce futuri mali prospectum quemlibet comprehendo".

²¹ *The Whole Art of Rhetoric, The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, Volume VI, pp. 456-457.

²² This part is a combinations of the sentences from 1382a32, where Aristotle proves the proximity of danger that causes fear, and a fragment found 10 rows later, which speaks about the signs which announce the proximity of the "object" of fear, that is near at hand (Hobbes adds the word evil). *The "Art" of Rhetoric*, London, William Heinemann, 1926, p. 202-203. Heidegger, in the spring seminar of 1924, analyzes, in detail, precisely this portion concerning fear. Aristotle's designation of fear is for Heidegger a paradigm of phenomenological description because the first analysis is of what fear is in itself, and then what fear is for me and for us all. *Grundbegriffe der aristotelischen Philosophie*, GA, Band 18, Frankfurt am Main, Vittorio Klostermann, 2002, S. 250-253.

²³ For example, a fragment from *Nicomachean Ethics* where Aristotle speaks of courage: "Now it is clear that the things we fear are fearful things, which means, broadly speaking, evil things; so that fear is sometimes defined as the anticipation of evil." III, 1115a, London-Cambridge, W. Heinemann-Harvard University Press, 1939, p. 155.

the description of this “phenomenology of surprise” - invisible, imagined, religious, mythic, panicked, plural, malicious, future, destructive, hurtful, dangerous, close, threatening, hostile); and second, in contrast to fear, terror has, within itself, something infectious and explosive, because that which is found near (at hand) attacks a “multitude of people” (“explosion” is, foremost, a medical term which for a long time signified a sudden invasion of symptoms on an organism or on a multitude of organisms).

Hobbes’ famous response to this greatest of all problems contains two ideas: the idea of the greatest (supreme) */superanus/* and the idea of the one, only and unique */unus/*. The Sovereign-Leviathan is supposed to offer protection from this terrible danger and is imagined as a grandiose giant and as the One who contains “multitudes of people” within itself. It rises as a tower above the city and nothing can surprise it.

The sovereign, Hobbes’ answer to terror (terrorism), must, within itself, unite, order */imperare/*, and flawlessly compress a multitude of differing elements. The Leviathan is, therefore, structured like a bomb.

“All against one”.²⁴ The limits of this enormous capsule which rises above the city represent, in fact, the limits of Hobbes’ analogy and the paradox of sovereignty. It seems that the danger from outside, from other sovereigns (how is it possible that there are several who are “*superanus*”?), is complimentary to the strength of control inside a sovereignty. The sword found in the right hand of the Leviathan, raised in the air high above the city, is analogous to the keys which lock doors and separate citizens from insecure streets (from the bandits, *Strassenraub*)²⁵ or the swords which passengers carry²⁶.

“They who travel, carry their swords with them, because they fear thieves */qui iter facit, cum telo est, quia metuunt latrines/*.” That is Hobbes’ adequate argument for kingdoms and towns to build walls (“cities are compact with walls”) and, in so doing, completely protect themselves from their neighbours.

What is always interesting with the analogy is the moment at which it surpasses the limits its

²⁴ Charles and Clifford A. Kupchan, “Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe”, *International Security*, Vol. 16, No. 1, summer, 1991, p. 118.

²⁵ “Ensuring the safety of the citizens’ lives and property requires that police superintendence extend to the roads and streets */die Aufsicht der Polizei auf den Strassenbau/*.” J. G. Fichte, *Foundations of Natural Right*, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 255. “When we walk the streets at night in safety, it does not strike us that this might be otherwise. This habit of feeling safe */diese Gewohnheit der Sicherheit/* has become second nature...” *Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, London, Oxford University Press, 1952, addition for § 268, p. 282.

²⁶ “They who go to sleep, shut their doors; they who travel, carry their swords with them, because they fear thieves. Kingdoms guard their coasts and frontiers with forts and castles; cities are compact with walls; and all for fear of neighboring kingdoms and towns */urbes moenibus, tueri solent, metu vicinarum civitatum/*.” *De Cive*, Ibid, Volume II, p. 6.

author has set for it. If, for example, the Leviathan itself could be the passenger, with its sword above every city on the globe²⁷, then analogously, sovereignty would not have to be static but global, and it would not be confined to the state but would be cosmopolitan. Analogously, terrorism and the war against terrorism could truly signify the beginning of cosmopolitanism and mark an exit from the “state of nature” and state of war which sovereign state have found themselves in, up to now. The problem with the analogy is that today every fiction and every foolishness which can be constructed based on Hobbes’ text and visual fantasies (maps and differing gravures of Leviathan which follow his texts) seem actual and possible. The reason behind this is perhaps the fear which is constant in every epoch. Besides this, fear (more precisely, terror) is found in the sources of Hobbes’ analogies and fantasies. Fear lends a certain dynamic to the entire theory of sovereignty and collective security. Sovereignty simply regenerates through terror. Therefore, the manifestation of terror (terrorism) as a simultaneous response to danger or terror, should begin on the streets, fall from the sky, and appear on the horizon. Cleansing the streets, cleansing the sky or cleansing the sea signifies the moment at which it is no longer enough to simply “close the door” and go to sleep, rather it is necessary to close the streets, reduce the public space, ransack houses²⁸, close the borders, cancel flights, isolate the suspicious etc. Unity (“even greater unity”) or Greatness (“greater than the greatest”) should begin only with the exclusion, taking away and mutilation of a part of the whole. This common logic, which is dictated by terror, is itself terror before terrorism and differing theoretical responses to terrorist violence. Fear, more precisely the rush towards objectifying and naming fear (it is enough to follow Hobbes’ insistence on the word “evil” in Aristotle’s theory of fear; the nearing of the “object” of fear to the closest possible distance (“at hand,” as he says); Hobbes chooses the word “apprehension” and not, for example, “impression” for Aristotle’s word “*ek fantasias*”,

²⁷ On the 13th of January, 1945 in a lecture in Hamburg, Carl Schmitt speaks of an end to the “oceanic area (space)” /*Ende des ozeanischen Raumes*/ which is inherited by an “area (space) in the air” /*Luftraum*/. North America, *Quasi-Insel Nordamerika*, is becoming, according to Schmitt, *Luftimperium*, who rules over the world because it borders every country on this planet. A review of Schmitt’s lecture in Hamburg is found in Wilhelm Stapel’s diary “Tagebuch, 13.1.1945“, *Schmittiana. Beiträge zu Leben und Werk Carl Schmitts*, Hrsg. Piet Tommissen, Berlin, Duncker & Humblot, Band V, 1996, S. 85.

²⁸ “The state does not know what goes on inside a person’s house; but it does have the authority to supervise what happens on the street that a person must, after all, traverse in order to enter his house. Therefore, citizens cannot assemble /*versammeln*/ inside a house without the police knowing about it; and the police have the power, as well as the right /*die Macht habe, sowohl als das Recht*/, (since the street is subject to their authority) to prevent such an assembly /*die Versammlung zu verhiden*/, if it arouses their suspicion.” J. G. Fichte, *Foundations of Natural Right*, p. 258.

In a letter to Hobbes in 1674(?), Leibniz goes over the institution of *ius praeventionis* in detail, in the context of the right to rebel and resist the danger which comes from a tyrant: “...people who see the danger approaching will have the right to join together in alliances” /*coeundi in foedera illis qui periculo propinqui videntur*/. T. Hobbes, *The Correspondence*, Volume II, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1991, p. 732, 735.

“*fantasia*”) creates confrontation followed by unity and compactness. I would like to differentiate between two well known versions of this logic:

- “All against anyone”²⁹ or the theory of the “unjust enemy”/*hostis iniustus*/.³⁰ One state is always the enemy, this being the condition for the union of all other states, just as the common enemies of all (the enemies of the global sovereign-passenger) are international terrorists. Fear (terror) is always found in the shape of confronting violence which comes from this same fear (terrorism): fear of a state which is secretly arming with destructive weapons (Kant) or fear of a group which has a great bomb. Other important factors for defining terrorism can be (1) that this state or groups are armed by “all” and that (2) confrontation or war with them never follows the norms of international law.

- “Homeopathic strategy”. Hegel’s (but not only his) anticipation of homeopathic medicine³¹ and the “translation” of this strategy into its political theory is illustrated in the famous fragment from the *Phenomenology of Mind*,³² where the government of a state is capable of, from time to time, “building” an enemy (“ordering” a war) in order to maintain its unity and save the state from returning to a “state of nature”. The enemy (war) is simultaneously a part of the organism (poison, non-organic of the organism) and something completely foreign to the organism, with which the organism is suppose to start a conflict (illness, fever, crisis, war) in order to win against it and in so doing maintain its (the organisms) integrity and whole³³.

(The homeopathic strategies in Hegel’s text sometimes take unbelievable and completely surprising shapes. In one aphorism from his Jenaer period, bomb appears as the main trope and remedy for laziness and inactivity. Hegel says that original and completely miraculous

²⁹ The first clause of Article 11 of the “Charter of the League of Nations” stipulates that “Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League”. Kant didn’t make it clear if everyone together has a right to (preventive) intervention or every (any) state which is under threat and fear has this right (Cf. Lectures on “Jus naturale belli” from 1784, *Kant’s Vorlesungen, Vorlesungen über Moralphilosophie*, Band XXVI, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1979, S. 1372-1373.). Another version of this rule is also found in Frederick of Prussia’s book *Anti-Machiavel* from 1740 (*The Refutation of Machiavelli’s Prince or Anti-Machiavel*, Ohio, Univ. Press, 1981, p. 161. In a manuscript published in 1848 titled *Réfutation du prince de Machiavel* this paragraph was changed).

³⁰ Turkey is for Leibniz what Poland is for Kant. In 1672 Leibniz attempts to persuade Louis XIV to conquer Egypt in order to once and for all destroy barbarian Turkey, the greatest threat to European unity. The term “*hostis iniustus*” was used by many jurists before Kant, who takes it from Achenwall. For Kant, Poland brings danger, it does not deserve sovereignty and Kant compares it to Turkey, in his anthropology lectures from 1784/85. In recent years George Cavallar, Susan Shell, Harald Müller and Heinz Gerd Schmitz all wrote of Kant’s understanding of the “unjust enemy.”

³¹ Hegel was aware of Samuel Hahnemann’s work, the inventor of this method.

³² G. W. F. Hegel (1807), *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 272. This fragment is Hegel’s variation of several ruminations by Bodin concerning civil war as a cure and anti-dote.

³³ Sovereignty is the organism. “The idealism which constitutes sovereignty is the same characteristic as that in accordance with which the so-called ‘parts’ of an animal organism are not parts but members, moments in an organic whole, whose isolation and independence spell disease.” *Hegel’s Philosophy of Right*, § 278, p. 282.

acts (in a phrase, great books) resemble a bomb /*gleichen einer Bombe*/ falling on a dull town /*faule Stadt*/ in which everyone lays about with a beer in hand. It is precisely this crude self-serving, this is the meaning which Hegel insists upon, which attracts lightning /*Krachen des Donners*/ or a bomb.)

CHILDREN'S TOY / CHILDREN'S POPGUN

Between 1266 and 1268 Roger Bacon composed his *Opus Tertium*. This text was written for the Pope, the ruler of the Christian world to which Bacon belonged, and its intention was to find an answer to terror. Namely, all 13th century chronicles speak of a wide belief in the imminent arrival of the Antichrist. As a result Bacon, with the help of his incredible imagination and through his perfect scientific spirit, attempts to get a fix on his(the Antichrist's) arrival and lessen his own, the worlds and of course the Pope's (Guy Fulcodi, private secretary of Louis IX was elevated to the Papacy in 1265 as Clement IV) terrible panic. All of Bacon's actions are focused on locating and recognizing the Antichrist, imagining all of his powers and discovering all of the strength of his transformation. Because of this, Bacon studies languages, writes textbook on the Hebrew language, insists upon the existence of an authentic text of the Bible, and all this with the goal of converting or killing infidels and schismatic. Namely, Bacon believes that the Antichrist has been met by a tribe (the Tartars /Tartaros/) which hailed him as the God of Gods³⁴. According to Bacon the Tartars belong to a different race which invaded the southern world as far as the Holy Land, while the Goths and Vandals came from the north. The west is therefore under duress on all sides. Despite the fact that for Bacon the arrival of these barbarians, Tartars, is sure proof that the Antichrist has arrived, his main evidence for this is found in the all encompassing confusion in the world. The Antichrist is, therefore, acquainted with and makes use of all the secret power of nature. He employs magic, but also utilizes mechanical inventions, mathematics and geometry, and of course philosophy³⁵. Philosophy is one of Bacon's main efforts in this distribution of roles before the confrontation with the Antichrist. Apart from the philosopher's "ability" to recognize a coming danger (or, one that is already here, with all its signs, "at hand," but still undiscovered), to advise a prince, the Pope or a military leader, the function of the philosopher is the distribution of scientific knowledge and experimental science into all spheres of the community. Bacon's task is to uncover the significance of

³⁴ R. Bacon, *Part of the Opus Tertium*, ed. A. G. Little, Aberdeen, The University Press, 1912, pp. 11-12.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p. 17-19.

certain discoveries of science for the protection of the Christian empire from its enemies /*contra infidels et rebelles*/. Furthermore, the philosopher Bacon guides the research of differing sciences and insists that they pursue the sciences and discoveries which have advanced the most and which will most benefit the community and world. What is most important for the community and what the philosopher certainly has to announce and formulate, ruins this “evil principle,” which similarly uses the progress of science “freely and effectively, in order that he may crush and confound the power of this world.”³⁶ Therefore, one of the Antichrist’s abilities is to bring destructive forces into the world and in so doing draw the world’s attention from believing that he is subject to any sort of danger. Despite the fact that Bacon gives the Antichrist an important role in the uniting of these barbarian tribes which were *de facto* the real threat to the church, his(the antichrist’s) conflict with the philosopher is completely intellectual. Namely, the Antichrist has great power in his use of science, greater than Aristotle, Alexander the Great’s advisor (Bacon also mentions Augustine and different accounts of Alexander’s conquests), had.³⁷ Bacon’s intention is to not only outwit the Antichrist, perhaps for the first time in history, but to also surpass the advisory skills of the pagan Aristotle who, emulating the devil, “delivered the universe” /*tradidit mundum*/ to the tyrant Alexander³⁸. The power of a philosopher who is able to “give” the world to a politician or warrior, speaks greatly of the ambitious nature of Bacons work and to the importance of science to military objectives. While recounting the many wonders during Alexander Magnus’s wars Bacon does not miss the opportunity to mention the wise advice given by Aristotle which enabled the deaths of hundreds of thousands. Even if it is unclear what sort of technological wonders Alexander had, what sort of secrets Aristotle whispered in his ear, certain accounts of the number of victims and grandiose occupations could again become active today³⁹.

Roger Bacon’s great idea, which was suppose to be of greatest benefit to the community and Christian west, because it solves the problem of latent terror, was imagined as a great bomb (projectile; Bacon calls it *instrumentum*).⁴⁰ The *Instrumentum* is constructed, it is made (*struere* means to construct)... it is that which must be equipped, provided. This instrument

³⁶ *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*, Volume II, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1928, p. 633.

³⁷ “Et hac scientia mirabilis utetur Antichristus, et longe potentius quam Aristoteles, quia sciet plura longe quam Aristoteles.” R. Bacon, *Part of the Opus Tertium*, p. 54.

³⁸ *Ibid*, p. 53.

³⁹ “In his attack on the Persians Alexander had 32,000 foot soldiers and 4,500 horsemen, while King Darius had 600,000 soldiers. Alexander lost 120 horsemen and nine foot soldiers” /*et novem perdites defuere*/. *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*, Volume II, p. 633.

⁴⁰ R. Bacon, *Part of the Opus Tertium*, p. 51.

which has yet to be constructed is suppose to “destroy armies and castles at any distance”,⁴¹ to kill even before the enemy draws near⁴², to create a horrible noise which stirs up fear (meaning, it responds to terror with even greater terror), and should have the explosive power to kill as many people as possible at once. If this idea were to be accepted by the Church and prelates and princes in the future, and if different sciences (astronomy, geometry, optics, chemistry, mathematics etc.) were developed and realized, then this would certainly “spare Christian blood” */ut parcatur sanguini Christiano/* (this is why the hyperboles with the number of victims and Alexander’s conquests are important)⁴³. This weapon is suppose to give the advantage to whoever possesses it, to create a total asymmetry in relation to the enemy and is probably completely symmetrical and complimentary to the terror in which Bacon lived and which provoked his fantasy. The source of this idea is also an analogy which Bacon describes in his book *Novum Organum*⁴⁴. This is a toy, popular in his time, popular today (only with boys probably), always popular: the child’s popgun (*ludicris puerorum; ludicrum* also means stage, stage play, entertainment, *puer* is the nominative, child). The popgun (containing compressed air, this is all Bacon says) is one of his examples which serves to explain the third motion */motus tertius/*, liberty */libertatis/* (the first two motions being “resistance” and “connection”)⁴⁵. Motion, which in its essence contains freedom, belongs to bodies which “strive to escape from preternatural pressure or tension and to restore themselves to the dimensions suitable to their nature”.⁴⁶ This shift marks movement as escaping from tension and from compression.

But it is far more necessary (because much depends upon it) that men should know that violent motion */motum violentum/* is nothing more than this motion of liberty, that is, of escape from compression to relaxation */scilicet a compressione ad relaxationem/*. (...) Then, indeed, when each part pushes against next, one after the other, the whole is

⁴¹ “(...) et ideo omnem exercitum, et castrum, et quicquid velit destruere, et non solum prope, sed in quacunque distantia voluerit.” Ibid, p. 52.

⁴² “Moreover, against foes of the state */contra inimicos republicae/* they have (Bacon means scientists and their last discoveries) discovered important arts, so that without a sword or any weapon requiring physical contact they could destroy all who offer resistances. There are many kinds of these inventions. Some of these are perceived by no one of the senses, or by smell alone, and of these inventions Aristotle’s book (Bacon mentions a book of secrets) explains that of altering the air, but not those of which I spoke above. These last are of a different character, since they act by means of an infection. There are others also that change some one of the senses, and they are diversified in accordance with all the senses.” *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*, Volume II, p. 629.

The word “sword” does not exist in the original Latin text. Frankfurt am Main, Minerva GMBH, 1964, p. 217.

⁴³ Ibid, p. 634.

⁴⁴ *Novum Organum*, “Aforisms”, Book two, XLVIII.

⁴⁵ The multitude of examples should be examined in detail and an attempt should be made to reconstruct the shapes of the different objects Bacon mentions.

⁴⁶ “Per quem corpora se liberare nituntur a pressure aut tensura praeter-naturali, et restituere se in dimensionum corpori suo conveniens.”

moved. And it not only moves forward, but revolves at the same time, the parts seeking in that way also to free themselves or to distribute the pressure more equally.

Several centuries before Hobbes and his *Leviathan*, Bacon manages to describe the Leviathan's deconstruction and explosion in detail. The sovereign ("whole") is broken up into many part and this forceful process, in which every part liberates itself from an influential whole, can be called a condition of liberalism. Bacon elegantly leaves open the possibility that the whole still exists, but formed in a completely different way and with a "just" distribution of pressures amongst its parts. But why this motion is a violent one? Is it because the whole fell apart previously? Is it because some parts were sacrificed during the liberation of others? Is it because some other whole or some other space suffered the consequences of this explosion and revolution? The change in the status of the whole is probably what caused Bacon to call this *motus libertatis* violent. The lessening of pressure between the parts should completely deform the whole, but should not destroy it⁴⁷. That is of greatest importance. Conversely, another experience with explosives, in which Newton's understanding of projectiles and great hate of liberalism is found, only temporarily consents to the change of the whole. Hegel mentions the bomb at the end of his book on natural law:

Thus is not philosophy which takes the particular for something positive, just because it is a particular. On the contrary, philosophy does so only if the particular has won independence as a single part outside the absolute cohesion of the whole */sondern nur insofern es außer dem absoluten Zusammenhange des Ganzen als ein eigener Teil Selbständigkeit errungen hat/*. The absolute totality restricts itself as necessity in each of its spheres, produces itself out of them as totality, and recapitulates there the preceding spheres just as it anticipates the succeeding ones. (...) As nature enters that form, so it remains in it, just as a shell starts suddenly towards its zenith and then rests for a moment in it */wie die Bombe zu ihrer Kulmination einen Ruck tut und dann in ihr einen Moment ruht/*; metal, when heated, does not turn soft like wax, but all at ones becomes liquid and remains so (...). Just so, the growing individuality has both the delight of the leap in entering a new form and also an enduring pleasure in its new form, until it gradually opens up to the negative, and in its decline too it is sudden and brittle */bis sie sich allmählich dem Negativen öffnet und auch in ihrem Untergange auf einmal und brechend ist/*.⁴⁸

Bacon mentions this toy, "which is made in many parts of the world" */quod fit in multis mundi partibus/*, several times, filled with gunpowder, which produces explosions and brings joy to

⁴⁷ When Mao Zedong speaks of "The Place of Antagonism in Contradiction" (*On Contradictions*, 1937) in his political writings, he describes, identically to Bacon, this "transfer" into another state: "Before it explodes, a bomb is a single entity in which opposites coexist in given conditions. The explosion takes place only when a new condition, ignition is present. An analogous situation arises in all those natural phenomena which finally assume the form of open conflict to resolve old contradictions and produce new things."

⁴⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *Natural Law. The Scientific Ways of Treating Natural Law, Its Place in Moral Philosophy*,

children. This is not a toy in the shape of a gun or any sort of gun which we know today; rather it is a prototype of a bomb or firecracker. It seems that this is a small capsule, the size of a finger */ad quantitatem unius digiti/*,⁴⁹ which is filled with gunpowder, and which with a throw to the ground or against a hard object, produces a boom, an explosion,⁵⁰ noise, a flash, smell and of course, an explosion of children's laughter and fear. Bacon mentions this toy three times, he formulates it differently three times but always in the context of the famous Gideon (not Alexander this time) who was able to destroy, with only three hundred men, a great army of Midianites. This is in fact the beginning of the use of Greek fire. Bacon talks of this event when "small bottles are broken, and lamps, and fire rushes out with an immense noise" destroying everything before it. More interesting than the endless debates and suppositions concerning the true inventors of gunpowder and the true source of fear which inspired Bacon⁵¹, is most likely the power of his fantasy to combine science, legend, fear and certainly a special feeling ("feeling of liberty" or perhaps the power of sublime of which Burke and Kant later write) which every explosion releases and which he noticed on the face of a child. The following sentence anticipates the centuries ahead of him and explains the great project which should come to an end with the discovery of an instrument which destroys all fear while at the same time infinitely creating it:

By the flash and combustion of fires, and by the horror of sounds */sonorum horrorem/*, wonders can be wrought, and at any distance that we wish – so that a man can hardly protect himself or endure it. Example is a child's toy of sound and fire */puerile de sono et igne/* made in various parts of the world with powder */pulverem/* of saltpetre, sulphur and charcoal of hazelwood. This powder is enclosed in an instrument of parchment */instrumentum de pergamenno/* the size of finger, and since this can make such a noise that it seriously distresses the ears of men, especially if one is taken unawares, and the terrible flash is also very alarming */et coruscation simlitter terribilis turbat valde/*; if an

and Its Relation to the Positive Sciences of Law, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1975, p. 132.

⁴⁹ R. Bacon, *Part of the Opus Tertium*, p. 51. In *Opus Majus* Bacon compares this toy to the thumb of a man */ad quantitatem pollicis humani/*. p. 629; p. 218.

⁵⁰ Both words are connected and add to one another. An "explosion" and "bomb" both concern a sound and most frequently the animal. "Boom" is onomatopoeia, an imitation of something that banged, of a very loud noise, just as "meow" is an imitation of a cats meow. Behind every "boom" hides an explosion. If I am Greek, when I vocalize a word which has "bomb" in it */bombos, bombo, bombile/* then this is an onomatopoeia (analogously, if I say "bomb," and don't know Greek, this means that I heard an explosion, survived, and then said "boom," said "bomb;" meaning this is the onomatopoeia of an explosion). In Greek *to bombo* is an unaltered sound, onomatopoeia, barbarism (*bombos*, deep sound, humming, buzzing; but this is also what bees are called, or the buzzing of bees, "bumblebee" */bombile*, in Greek/). In Plato's *Protagoras* (316a), the author describes Socrates' surprise during a meeting with Podicus, the teacher of rhetoric: "(...) for I regard the man as all-wise and divine, but owing to the depth of his voice the room was filled with a bombing sound */fonés bombos/* which made the talk indistinct." Bomb is the name with which an explosion is signified (*plaudo*, is a strike/blow in Latin, *plodere* is to strike, but to hit one another; hand against hand, applause). *Ex-plosio* or *ex-plaudere*, signifies the act of hunting or the group pursuit of an animal, it consists of the slapping of hands and yelling which is all suppose to scare the animal and forcing it into a trap.

⁵¹ Cf. J. P. Partington, *A History of Greek Fire and Gunpowder*, Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons, 1952, p. 75.

instrument of large size were used */instrumentum magne quantitatis/*, no one could stand the terror of the noise and flash */terrorem soni, nec coruscationis/*. If the instrument were made of solid material */de solidis corporibus/* the violence would be much greater */tunc longe major fieret violentia/*.⁵²

Bacon underlines that the greatest violence of this explosion is not solely found in the fire which burns people and things, rather it is found in the terror of noise, flashing and glittering.

No clap of thunder can compare with such noises. Some of these strike such terror */tantum terrorem/* to the sight that the coruscations of the clouds disturb it incomparably less.

Terror writes these words. Bacon endlessly insists upon our common obsessions, and with the strength of his imagination, which is always ready for something much worse, he surpasses every one of our possible fears (from a storm, thunder, fire, choking etc.). *Instrumentum*, its future fatal explosion (for decades expected), together with a multitude of “children’s” explosions which have already occurred, seems to be the only *therroethical* response to terror which is for now known.

⁵² R. Bacon, *Part of the Opus Tertium*, p. 51.