TAFFD's Journal
ISSN 2643-4938 (online) · ISSN 2769-0490 (print)

OPEN ACCESS

Analysing Concepts of Terrorism in Igor Primoratz's Mindset: The Nigerian Experience

Kalu Osinakachi Akuma

Published in TAFFD's Journal, Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 33–42, 2021
Article page https://journal.taffds.org/articles/analysing-concepts-of-terrorism-in-igor-primoratzs-mindset-the-nigerian-experience-1-33

CC BY 4.0 **Licence**

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Transdisciplinary Agora for Future Discussions Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Licence terms: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This page was added by the journal. The article begins on the next page.

Analysing Concepts of Terrorism in Igor Primoratz's Mindset: The Nigerian Experience

Kalu Osinakachi Akuma
Email: osinakachikaluakuma@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Conscious observation of Nigeria's current society ravaged by the effects of terrorism creates curiosity about what continues to motivate the terrorists and those who support terrorism. For Igor Primoratz, terrorism is the deliberate use of horrific violence against innocent people who, on any credible understanding, are not responsible for the real injustice or suffering of the terrorist fight. Thereby intimidating them into a course of action they otherwise would not take. Perhaps as Primortaz thinks, there could be a moral justification for terrorism as we shall seek to find out. The investigation's main thrust is to explain the concept of terrorism (in Primortaz's mindset) and discover its effects on society and individuals. The Boko Haram insurgence and local (Fulani) herders' attack already provide a worthy case study for this investigation. How terrorism and terrorists have succeeded in advancing a "fear culture" in Nigerian society is a question to be addressed.

KEYWORDS: Terrorism, Boko Haram, Fear Culture, Morality, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION
There is no reasonable society that celebrates the loss of lives and properties. The terrorist tendencies in Nigeria have done her more harm than good and prickle a curious mind. The recent attacks of Boko Haram and the local Fulani Herdsmen raise some critical questions like; who is a terrorist? What motivates them? Furthermore, can the Act of Terrorism be morally justified? Especially as the saying goes, "one terrorist is another man's freedom fighter." However a close look at terrorism from the spectrum of Igor Primoratz, who from a philosophical viewpoint sees terrorism as "violence melted against the innocent with the view of intimidation and coercion of other people" (Primoratz 2013 p.174), forms the motivation of this research.

PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES
Terrorism is an act of violence. Since that is the case, it supposes other forms of violence. However, whether those who suffer the pains of the act of the terrorist are innocent of it remains complicated. Moreover, the justification of their action also remains problematic. The problems posing this research could be articulated thus:

a. What is Terrorism? Who is a terrorist?
b. Can terrorism from any moral theory be justified?
c. How does terrorism lead to a fear-based society?

Thus, as the phenomenon of terrorism raises numerous questions, the objectives of this research aim to achieve threefold aims;

a. To unravel Primoratz's concept of terrorism to his definition serves as a backdrop to this research's second aim, which is the core base of the study.
b. The moral standing of terrorism
c. In the words of Primoratz? "terrorism causes outright fear for our own life and the life of our families and friends' (Primoratz 2013 p.3), which causes fear culture.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY
Faced with many terrorists attack, the value of this research is narrowed down into the following three:

a. *Theoretically:* it serves as a clear understanding of what terrorism is to avoid conceptual misplacement- knowing the type of violence that should be tagged terrorism and who is a terrorist.
b. *Intellectually:* this research will enlighten its readers about the reality of terrorism globally, especially as it has been

perpetuated in Nigeria, calling to their mind how dangerous it is.

c. Finally, the work helps in *character formation,* especially from the moral point of view, pointing out what makes terrorism so morally repugnant to most people, which will allow an open-minded person "decipherably" to know if terrorism is morally justifiable.

SCOPE OF STUDY

The scope of this work is on the Primoratz concept of terrorism. However, since in terrorism, there is state and non-state terrorism (insurgency), this research focuses on "non-state terrorism" insurgencies (Boko Haram and The local Fulani Herdsmen in Nigeria). Hence, other thinkers' ideas are used to prove some points in correlation with the investigation of defining terrorism and its moral standing in Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

This investigation adopts the expository method and analysis of experience. The expository method aids in dissecting Primoratz's notion of terrorism, defining who a terrorist is, the problem of terrorism, its moral implications, and justifications, which culminates in how it leads to a fear-based society. The experience analysis contextualises Primoratz's notion of Terrorism in Nigerian society, bringing up the attacks of Boko Haram and local Fulani herders as a case study. These case studies will help us know if Nigeria's (Boko Haram and Local Fulani herders) attacks are morally justifiable.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since terrorism is discussed in the philosophical milieu, it answers the question of meaning and the moral implications of terrorism. Philosophy only contributes significantly to this debate at the conceptual and moral levels. The moral question of terrorism is also dependent on how it is defined. In an attempt to find a universally acceptable definition for terrorism, some have concluded that it is simply impossible to define the term because of its complexities. However, an observer would know it when they saw it. Weinberg *et al.* (2004, 777-778).

The *Federal Bureau of Investigation* defines terrorism as unlawfully using force or violence against property or persons to compel, intimidate, or coerce the civilian population, a government or any segment thereof to promote political or social objectives, Lomasky (1991, p.86-87). Alex Schmid and Albert Jongman see terrorism as an anxiety-inspiring way of repeated violent action used by (semi-)clandestine persons, groups, or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal, or political reasons. In contrast to the assassination, the direct targets of violence are not the real targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly or selectively from the target population and serve as message generators." Jongman (1988, p.28)

In defining terrorism, Primoratz seeks to overcome relativism and double standards that often plague debate about terrorism. His primary concern is to investigate the main ethical approaches to terrorism in terms of its consequence, rights and justice, "supreme emergency," and the collective responsibility of citizens. With a rigorous yet accessible analysis of a range of moral positions, from accepting terrorism when its consequence is good on balance to its absolute rejection. For Steven Lee, on the cover page of *Terrorism: A Philosophical Investigation,* "this rigorous voyage is to help those who are morally perplexed by terrorism to know that it is morally wrong." It may be morally justified only when the entire person faces an actual moral disaster, which should be understood in a highly restrictive way.

Primoratz accepts a view of terrorism that does not make room for questioning a victim's innocence. Indeed, many of the most common justifications of terrorism attribute liability to its victims: political leaders or religious figures, for example. He shunts these aside, however, to the category of political assassination. While this might be appropriate, it avoids a big chunk of the terrorism debate, namely, are there individuals otherwise classified as non-combatants but who remain liable to harm nonetheless? These might include, for example, any civilians providing war-sustaining aid, no small population in asymmetric war. In response, Primoratz argues that,

1) This is a different moral problem, and

> 2) The vast majority of terror victims are not liable for any harm because they are entirely innocent. Furthermore, he builds those two assumptions into his definition of terrorism. (Primoratz (2013, p.123)

Once terrorism is limited to those innocent, primoratz faces two tasks. First, he must refute those philosophers who impose a measure of collective responsibility on all civilians under their membership in a state that practices injustice. Here, he takes on two recurring arguments by Barry Buzan and Burleigh Taylor Wilkins that hope to establish a firm measure of culpability among members of a policy that supports an unjust government. Primoratz's arguments are smooth and edifying. He persuasively defuses the notion of collective responsibility by arguing that a) many ordinary citizens support their government only nominally, if all, and b) whatever support they offer does not warrant injury or loss of life.

These are not new arguments, but primoratz presents them in a straightforward and easily comprehended way that will be appreciated by students new to the field. Once he established the innocence of terror victims, he can turn his attention to three-argument arguments that might nevertheless justify terrorism, whether by state or insurgents. These arguments are at the core of the book and include consequentialism (terrorism might bring about net benefits), rights arguments (terror victims do not suffer rights violations) and supreme emergency (extreme situations legitimate terrorism as a last resort to forestall). He rejects the first two arguments and restricts the range of the third.

Looking at consequentialism, one would agree with Primoratz that the goal of terrorism can never outweigh its consequences. According to an article by John F. Burns in *New York Times* on October 08, 2001, terrorists want to coerce compliance with their will by inflicting fear. Terrorism is efficient when its benefits outweigh its costs (Posner 1998, p.243). Darrell Trent states, "One man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter."This is a complex calculus for some non-terrorists to understand. (Sustain 2002). The benefits of terrorism often seem indeterminate or too intangible to quantify.

MEANING AND CHARACTERISTICS OF TERRORISM

Terrorism has been the focus of a global debate. Though the discussion has been fruitful, there is no agreement on any of the main questions on terrorism, conceptually, morally, or politically (Primoratz 2013 p.1). It has been -plagued by a lack of clarity about its subject matter. Who is a terrorist? Furthermore, What is Terrorism? For all plausible accounts, terrorism is a type of violence. Violence is an emotion-laden matter, mainly directed at life and limb, as most terrorist violence is the most frightening type. It is utterly unpredictable and potentially ubiquitous.

Etymologically, 'terrorism' is derived from the term "terror." Originally the word meant a system, or regime, of terror. At first, this meaning was imposed by the Jacobins, who applied the terms to themselves without any negative connotation (Primoratz 2013, p.5). subsequently, it came to be applied to any such policy or regime and expressed a strong negative attitude, as it generally does today(Primoratz *Ibid*).

Hence, for Primoratz, if Terrorism is to be discussed in the philosophical milieu, it is best defined as "*the deliberate use of violence, or threat of its use, agonist innocent people; to intimidate some other people into a course of action they otherwise would not take*" (Primoratz 1990, p.221-222). Defined this way, one can see that terrorism has two targets. First, one or a group is attacked to intimidate another person or group into doing something ordinarily they otherwise would not do. In terms of importance, the indirect target is primary, while the direct target is secondary. The secondary are those directly attacked innocent people (Primoratz 2013, p. 129-38). In the context of political conflict that falls short of war, the clear category has a similarly broad scope: it includes all expected government officials, police, and members of security services.

The direct victim(s) of terrorism are "innocent" because they are not guilty of any action (or omission) the terrorist could

plausible bring up as a justification. They (primary target) are not attacking them (terrorists); therefore, the terrorists cannot justify their actions in self-defence. They are not waging war or shooting the terrorist, nor on those whose behalf the terrorists presume to act; therefore, they cannot say they are merely war. The direct victims are not responsible, on any plausible understanding of responsibility, for the (actual or alleged) injustice, suffering, or deprivation inflicted on them or on those whose case the terrorists adopt which is so grave that violence is considered (Primoratz 2013, p.113)

In talking about terrorism, it is divided into *state and non-state terrorism.* State here implies nation or country (independent group like Nigeria, Russian, Israel, America, or Pakistan). Hence, any terrorism that is not carried out by the state is Non-state terrorism, otherwise known as 'insurgency'. Nevertheless, all terrorism is *prima facie* extremely morally wrong.

To be sure, the distinction between state and non-state terrorism does not always apply. Attempts at drawing hard and fast lines might be complex because of the widespread phenomenon of terrorist organisations receiving direct and indirect support from states. Building on this backdrop, a swift division of terrorism into state and non-state is no longer feasible as the moral assessment becomes much more complex (Primoratz, 1990)

Looking at the Primoratz view of terrorists, the terrorist's victim is innocent from the terrorist's point of view, even if we grant the terrorist his assessment of the policies at issue. He believes this captures the obscenity of terrorism. The terrorist kills or maims people he knows deep in his heart to be innocent.

FEAR AS A TOOL FOR TERRORISM

For Primoratz, the subject of terrorism is not emotionally laden only because terrorism is fear-driven (frightening). It not only triggers our apprehension or outright fear for our own lives and those of our family and friends, it often stirs our distinctively moral emotions leading to fear culture (Primoratz 2013, p.2). Terrorism causes terror (extreme fear), and when successful, it does so.

Fear is one of the factors that even make terrorism morally distinctive. For Primoratz, terrorism uses violence and fear (Primoratz 2013, p.114) to destabilise or degrade the existing social order.

Terrorism is the opposite of governance. It is the strategic production of terror to undermine a society's capacity to endure the uncertainties of existence- to make society insecure by producing a social condition of fear (Sparks 2015, p.201). A significant factor in the success of terrorism lies in the fear and social paralysis it induces through the media, particularly television and social media. Terrorists thrive on exposure to their message. The connections created by the press between most parts of the world directly favour Terrorism (Ackoff and Strumpfer 2003)

Fear and terror are treated as if they are of a kind. It is not so; while anxiety is produced in response to objective threats, it responds to the uncertain element of those threats. On the other hand, terror is made by a certainty of life's destruction. For example, someone becomes afraid when he knows that he has cancer. He is unsure what will happen or how to act, but once he knows the tumour is killing him, he starts to experience it, so there is no doubt; then they are terrorised. A politics involving terror creation requires destructive acts to the people being intimidated. It is politics that deploy violence. However, power cannot be gained by the use of violence alone. When acts of violence produce terrorising situations, they barely last longer than violence itself. For this reason, terror produced by acts of violence cannot stay for very long and, in terms of power, has little effect after it is finished. Terrorism only has political value in producing uncertainty when it is a servant of fear's politics (Spark 2003, p.204).

MORAL JUSTIFICATION OF TERRORISM

Many scholars have questioned the justification of terrorism. The argument does not rule out the possibility of no terrorism whatsoever, or terrorism employed in our world so far, or which is likely to be used in it

is morally justified. Moreover, should that be the conclusion we reach, it should be a conclusion of some impotence.

Therefore, we should look to the authoritative consequentiality account of terrorism in the writing of philosophers like Kai Nielsen, who points out that terrorism, not on its own, but combined with others 'more conventional methods, has proven.

> An effective tactic to derive an oppressor in South Vietnam and Algeria may have been justified in chile, Angola, and Mozambique. Concerning terrorism, historical experience has not been uniform; therefore, whoever wants to judge terrorism exclusively in terms of its consequence cannot claim it is never justified (Nielsen 1981 p.446-449).

Many remain unimpressed by the consequentialist's defence of terrorism regarding its good consequences. They feel that the consequentialist account incomplete other considerations with great moral weight and point out that terrorism is morally unacceptable even with good consequences. These considerations are the following:

The Separateness of Person: This principle holds that the terrorist does not separate those they think are guilty of the crime they are fighting against from the innocent citizens. Although it is said that terrorism is indiscriminate violence, however, this may not be true if taken literally. Every human being is an individual. He is a person separate from others, unique, with an irreproducible thread of life and a value that is not commensurable with anything else. The terrorist does not understand this.

b. *The Respect of the Person:* The terrorist does not respect the separation of persons. S/he is not in a position to show respect to persons. This principle can be viewed differently, but the terrorist is bound to offend against it on any plausible destruction. The principle urges respect for each person's core of individuality on one interpretation.

c. *Guilt of the Innocent*: This principle holds that the terrorists are guilty of killing innocent people to carry out their attack. Terrorists deliberately and systematically attack, kill, and severely harm innocent people, even though they claim guilty.

d. *Moral Dialogue*: This occurs when a group of people engages in sorting the value that will guide their formulations of the social good. For Primoratz, the terrorist should not be in the position or allowed to justify his actions towards his victims in free and equal dialogue. This is *ipso facto* an immoral act.

e. *Moral Equality*: Moral equity is the primary evaluative criterion for ethical judgment. It is based on the overall concept of fairness, justice, and right.

f. *Secrecy:* This principle holds that secrecy is the key to the terrorists' actions and principles of action. This is why Primoratz invites people to be morally suspicious of activity and policies that have to be kept secret. Concerning moral compass, in particular, he insists on publicity. Stressing that if the terrorists cannot satisfy publicly, his action has an honest question mark.

According to Primoratz, the objections to terrorism are incompatible with some of the most fundamental moral beliefs many people hold. People who do have these beliefs will find the consequentialist justification entirely unconvincing. Such explanations will not be seen as showing that terrorism is morally permissible under certain circumstances but as telling against the ethical theory, implying that terrorism is justified whenever such circumstances occur (Primoratz 1997 p.226).

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Looking at the current situation of Nigeria, plagued with terrorism (insurgencies), there is difficulty in deciphering who a terrorist is or which act is terrorism? Furthermore, the proscription of Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) as a terrorist group continues to create tension considering the mission of IPOB in contradistinction to Fulani Herdsmen and Boko Haram.

Nevertheless, through Nigeria Terrorism Prevention Act 2011, the Nigerian government has passed various legislation making terrorism a grave transnational criminal offence. The legislation proscribes all manner

of terrorist activity in Nigeria is the *Terrorism (Prevention) Act, 2011*. According to this body.

> Any calculated and extreme use of violence or threatened violence, perpetuated by malice, to cause severe harm or violence against governments, individuals, and their assets to gain political, religious, or ideological goals through coercion or intimidation or instilling fear in the civilian population is known as Terrorism (Apende Issac et al., 2015)

For Primoratz, every attempt to define terrorism must acknowledge the core meaning of "terrorism" as the use of violence for intimidation and definitions that sever the connection between "terrorism" and "violence" or between "terrorism" and "terror" (Primoratz, 2012). Hence, he presented a definition that helped in the moral discussion of terrorism, focusing on four traits that make it morally repugnant: violence, the innocence of its direct victims, intimidation, and coercion. Hence, terrorism means *the deliberate use of violence, or threat of its use against innocent people, to intimidate other people and coerce them into doing what they would otherwise not do* (Primoratz, 2012). This definition is well-fitting for the actions of the Herdsmen and Boko Haram.

In 2017 according to *Premium Times Newspaper*, Nigeria was ranked the third most terrorised nation globally for the third year. It had previously occupied the position in 2015 and 2016, respectively. The country has been battling the Boko-Haram insurgency in the North-East for years, occupying the same ranking in 2015. Nigeria, Afghanistan and Iraq have not changed to date, making the first and second 2021 GTI (Global Terrorism Index). According to the report, the first ten countries that suffered the most significant impact of terrorism in 2016 are Syria, fourth; Pakistan, fifth; Yemen, sixth; and Somalia, seventh. Turkey, India, and Libya are ranked eighth and tenth, respectively (Ukpong, 2017). This ranking also is characterised by the vivacious concurrent act of the Fulani Herdsmen, who kill at ease. The Fulani Herdsmen crisis remains a significant issue in Nigeria. However, thousands were killed, many were expelled from their homes, and the Nigerian government was unwilling to take forceful action against them. Instead, they are requesting pieces of land from states to provide for the rampaging herders who have been known for wreaking havoc in specific communities in Nigeria. Recently, the rate at which they commit these crimes has increased exponentially. According to *The Institute for Economics and Peace Statistics*, 1,229 people were killed in 2014, up to 63 in 2013, and Benue State experienced the most brutal hit in recent times. In May 2015, five days after the end of Governor Gabriel Suswam's administration, over a hundred farmers and their family members were reportedly killed in villages refugee camps located in the Per, Ukura, Gafa, and Tse-Gusa local governments.

The biggest threat to Nigeria's security has been a devastating insurgency led by the terrorist sect Boko Haram and the late three years of the notorious Fulani Herdsmen blood bath. It is important to note that those two groups are non-state terrorist group-insurgents, even though one cannot distinctively affirm thus because no one can tell if no state or nation funds them. Nevertheless, this reign of terror under the auspices of Boko Haram and the Fulani herders has increased the fear climax of the citizens of Nigeria. This is because the contagious effect of fear disseminated through information makes one feel unsafe in the society he finds himself in.

According to Primoratz, in his analysis of terrorist-induced fear, drawing from Thomas Hobbes's famous portrayal of the state of nature and the critical rule of all-pervasive fear that makes the state so horrible. (Primoratz 2013, p.115) sees terrorism like that, which carries the fear that spreads throughout the society quickly and affects everyone. This is because; fear generated from terrorist attacks disrupts social life and destabilises society at large (Primoratz 2013 p.113)

The act that makes provision for and about offence relating to conduct carried out or purpose connecting with terrorism as enacted by the National Assembly of the federal republic of Nigeria, a terrorist is:

> Anyone who knowingly attempts or threatens to do an act preparatory to or furtherance of an act of terrorism.

> Commits to doing anything reasonably necessary to promote an act of terrorism or assists or facilitates the activities of the person engaged in the act of terrorism commits an offence under this act. Thus, it means a show that is deliberately done with malice, forethought, and to harm the country or organisation, conforming them to perform or abstain from performing any action, seriously intimidate a population. Moreover, this act seriously destabilised or destroyed the country's fundamental political, constitutional, economic, or social structures.

Among the three groups of proscribed terrorists, (Boko Haram and Fulani Herdsman) are recognised and cruising comfortably on the Global terrorist index. The one making it third (IPOB-Indigenous people of Biafra) remains Unacceptable to international observers as Nigeria still hold that they are terrorist. International bodies like European Union, United Nations, and countries like France, America, and the United Kingdom also reject the Nigerian proscription of IPOB, a terrorist group.

The Nigerian army Director of Defense Information, Major General John Enenche, Pronounced that IPOB is a terrorist organisation after a reported clash between military personnel and IPOB members in Umuahia, Abia. Maj. Gen. Enenche explained why is announced IPOB as a terrorist organisation stressing that members of the group used "stones, Molotov cocktails, machetes, and broken bottles, among others, on a military patrol on September 10, 2017." (Ndujihe, 2017) Still on that, the southeast governors equally condemned the activities of the IPOB in the region after the army's pronouncement on IPOB.

The federal government equally insists that IPOB is a terrorist organisation. They maintain that not even the Fulani herdsmen reported to have clashed with and killed farmers, raped women, and destroyed farmlands could be placed on the same level with IPOB because IPOB carved out a territory for itself within Nigeria. Thus, the federal government said it had begun blocking the foreign funding source for IPOB? (Ndujihe 2017)

Just 24 hours after the Nigerian army pronounced IPOB a terrorist organisation, the eighth senate President of Nigeria, Hon. Bukola Saraki condemned the categorisation of IPOB as a terrorist organisation, saying it is unconstitutional. For him:

> Only legislation from the Nigerian National Assembly could make such a pronouncement valid. He added, "I also wish to state that the labelling of the group as terrorists by Governors of the southeast state and the Nigerian military is unconstitutional and does not follow due process." Because our laws make explicit provisions for taking such action, and not following the due process makes nonsense of the constitutional provision. I am confident that the president will do the needful by initiating the due process". (Ndubuihe 2017)

Despite the arguments, the Nigerian government maintains that IPOB is a terrorist organisation, especially with signing the group's proscription by the Nigerian President, Muhammadu Buhari (Braithwaite, 2017). According to Braithwaite Onikepo, IPOB is not mainly known for violence, at least not murder, bombing, or extreme violence typical of terrorists (Braithwaite, 2017). She compared the Fulani Herdsmen, who are senselessly unleashing pains on innocent, defenceless rural communities across the country. They are selfishly invading and destroying their farms and means of subsistence so their cows can graze, killing and maintaining people, raping their women, looting, and always carting the little valuables that these rural people have struggled for (Braithwaite, 2017).

Though, Nnamdi Kanu, the leader of the IPOB, is on record for sourcing funds, in his own words, "to buy bullets and guns." Since he could not gather the required funds for the project and did not embark on the journey, does this qualify him and IPOB terrorists? Can *men's rea* (guilty) with no *actus reus* (guilty mind) constitute a crime? (Braithwaite 2017).
Since IPOB set up a Quasi-Military wing, many might argue that the Biafra National Guard and Biafra Intelligence Service kitted in uniforms and training qualify as a terrorist group. Hence, Kanu threatened to ensure that

the November election in Anambra state in 2017 did not hold thus terrorism if he could only achieve this obstruction by using force and intimidation (Braithwaite, 2017).

CONCLUSION

As a moral philosopher, Primoratz clearly emphasised the danger of Terrorism (Primoratz 2013 p.7) in man's existential struggle and stressed how to look at terrorism from a philosophical viewpoint. For him, in looking at terrorism, one needs to put aside both the identities of those employing terrorism and their ultimate aim and the related issue of the moral standing of the policies and politics they oppose. These will help one understand terrorism that is not plagued by relativism (Primoratz 2013, p.20).

Primoratz suggested how to define terrorism. For him, the definition of terrorism needs not to be purely descriptive and need not cover the entire range of everyday use of the term; however, it may legitimately be prescriptive. Building on this backdrop, he defined terrorism as "the deliberate use of violence, or threat of its use, against innocent people, to intimidate some other people and coerce them into doing what they otherwise would not do (Primoratz 2013 p.170)". Hence, terrorism is violence that aims to strike terror (great fear) in the hearts of people not directly attacked (Primoratz 170).

Primoratz affirms that state terrorism is worse than non-state terrorism (insurgency). He followed to justify this by arguing that civilians or everyday citizens are not innocent of the wrongs terrorists fight against. Such an argument relies on some notion of collective responsibility.

He (Primoratz) affirmed this claim in three ways stressing that the vast majority of direct victims of terrorism are innocent:

1. It treats the human person as a means and offends the fundamental moral convictions every human person shares, like separateness of persons and respect for persons.
2. Terrorism violets the fundamental human right (basic human rights of those victimised by terrorism) during the transition stage.
3. Terrorism is often and all the time morally wrong even if a supreme emergency is involved (Primoratz 172).

Hence, terrorism becomes morally distinctive because its deliberate violence inflicted on innocent people is compounded by the proximate aims of intimidating and coercing others. It is pertinent to note that despite all that Primoratz discusses about cornering terrorism, he does not look at the pivotal causes. For *The United States Institute of peace, Teaching Guide on International Terrorism: Definitions, Cases and responses*, the cause of terrorism appears to be varied. No sole factor leads people to engage in the Act of Terrorism. They categorised motivations to include ideological, psychological, and strategical.

1. **Psychological Perspective:** Those involved in terrorism may do so for purely personal reasons, based on their psychological state of mind. What motivates them may be nothing more than hate or the desire for power.

2. **Ideological Perspective:** Ideology is the beliefs, values, cardinal plans, and principles that make a group identify its particular aims and objectives. Ideology might stem from religion or political philosophies and programs.

3. **Strategic Perspective:** Terrorism could be seen as a logical extension of the failure in political administration. People may resort to violence when they seek to redress their grievances through the government but fail to win the government's attention to their challenges. From this viewpoint, terrorism is the effect of a logical analysis of a group's goals and objectives and their estimate of the likelihood of gaining victory (United States Institute of Peace, Program 202, p11).

Nevertheless, Primoratz believed that if we consider that terrorism is the deliberate use of often deadly violence against innocent people to intimidate and coerce other people. Alternatively, if we peruse a detailed report on particular terrorism, we may feel that such violence ought to be extremely difficult to justify Primoratz (2013p.174).

Looking at how our present society is going, especially in Nigeria, one cannot admit that terrorism is not what one needs to reckon with. The recent Boko Haram and Fulani

Herdsmen attacks have drawn international attention making it one of the first three indexes.

Primoratz looked at terrorism from the philosophical and dynamic spectrum. Philosophically, he considers terrorism to be morally repugnant. Emotively because it triggers apprehension or outright fear, these feelings make terrorism morally provocative and disgusting as a vivacious example of moral atrocity. This could be seen in the Nigerian life in I.D.P(internally People) who struggle now to survive where it seems all hope is lost in life and the farmers who suffer the destructive invasion of the Fulani Herdsmen into their farms.

Having said this, the value system in which terrorism is embedded is not universally accepted within the larger society from which it emanates. Hence, it is not unreasonable to conclude that terrorism is wrong.

REFERENCES

Ackoff, L, and Strumfer, P et al. (2003). Terrorism: A Systemic view", system Research and Behavioral Sciences, Wiley Inter-Science,

Advanced English Dictionary, Retrieved from HTTP;/wordnet. Princeton. Edu

Alcorn G, (2002). News of Afghan Dead is Buried, *The Age*, January 12

Arthur K, (1968). Darkness at Noon, trans. by D. Hardy, ed by H. Broenw, London: Longmans.

Ashmore R.B (1997). State Terrorism and Its Sponsors," in T. Kapitan (ed.) Philosophy perspectives on the Israeli-Palestinian *conflict*, Armonk, NY: M.E Sharpe,

Braith Waite A, (2013). The Logic of Public Fear in Terrorism and Counter-Terrorism", J police Crim Psych, Springer Online Publishers, June 07.

Cigar N, (1995). Genocide in Bosnia: The Political of Ethnic Cleansing, college station, Texas: Texas A&M University Press, \Fisher, R. and Subba D, (2016), Philosophy of Fearism: East and West Dialogue, Australia, Xlibris publishers..

Cletus U. (2017). Nigeria remains third most Terrorised country as Boko Haram killing reduce 80%. Retrieved from http;//www.premiumtimtimesng.com/news/headlines/200369-special-report-inside-agatu-killing-field-blood-on-the-streets-charred-bodies-everywhere.html,

Clifford N. (2017). F.G. Explains why it labeled IPOB a Terrorist Group. Retrieved from http://www.vanguardngr.com/2016/02/bloody-farmersfulani-herdsmens-clashes-in-benue-40-killed-socre-injured-2000-displaced/

Dworkin R (2002). The Trouble with the Tribunals, New York the New York Review of Books, April 25,

Dworkin R, (2002). The Threat to Patriotism, New York: Review Books, February 28, 2002

Friedrich CJ, Brzezinski Z. k. (1965). Totalitarian dictatorship and democracy, 2nd ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University press

Gross, L.M. (2013). Terrorism: A philosophical investigation. Igor Primoratz, *Australian Journal of philosophy*, the University of Haifa.

Held V, (1991). The Morality of Terrorism - Penn Law. Retrieved from https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/5184-primoratzthe-morality-of-terrorismpdf

Hinman, M (2013). Terrorism: A philosophical investigation, Igor Primoratz, Notre Dame Philosophical Review, an electronic journal, university of San Diego.

Hornby A.S, (2015). oxford advance learner's dictionary, international student's edition (8th ed. T. Janna et al.), Oxford University press

Igor P. (1997). Ethical Approaches to Terrorism : A Very Short Introduction. Retrieved from https://www.thestandnews.com/international/ethical-approaches-to-terrorism-a-very-short-introduction/

Igor P. (2002), State Terrorism. In Tony Coady and Michel O'Keefe (eds), *Terrorism and Justice: Moral Argument in Threatened world*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Igor P. (2006). Primorac Igor 2006 Terrorism in the Israeli Palestinian. Retrieved from https://www.coursehero.com/file/p1bsarq7/Primorac-Igor-2006-Terrorism-in-the-Israeli-Palestinian-Conflict-A-Case-Study/

Igor P. (2008). Das Bombardement deutscher state. In Zweiten Weltkreig: Eine Moralische Frage, Deutsche Zeitschrifit fur Philosophie No. 56, pp.585-98, Berlin: Akademie verlag GmbH,

Igor P. (2011). Civilians Immunity, Supreme Emergency, and Moral Disaster. *Journal of Applied Ethics* No. 15, pp.371-86, Springer Science and Business Media B.V.

Igor P. (2013), Ethical Approaches to Terrorism : A Very Short Introduction. Retrieved from https://www.thestandnews.com/international/ethical-approaches-to-terrorism-a-very-short-introduction/

Igor P. (n.d). The Morality of Terrorism. Penn Law. Retrieved from https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/5184-primoratzthe-morality-of-terrorismpdf,

Institution for Economics and Peace, (2018). Retrieved from http://static.visionfhumanity,org/sites/default/files/2015%20Global%20Terrorism%20index%20Report2.pdf.

Jonne R, (2017) Terrorism: A philosophical investigation, Igor Primoratz, Amazon Review.

Nigeria Legal Alert January 2012 Terrorism (prevention) Act, Abuja National Assembly press,

Onikepo B, (2017). How much of a terrorist Group is IPOB?" THISDAY, September 26, 2017

Sparks C, (2003). Liberalism, Terrorism and the politics of fear, politics: 2003, vol. 23(3). 200-206, Garlington Road, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Sullivan, M.I, (2015). Terrorism: A Philosophical Investigation, Igor Primoratz, Philosophy East and West Vol 6, (1). pp.369. 370.

United States Institute of peace. *Teaching Guide on International Terrorism: Definitions, Causes, Response, Education,* Program (202) 429-33854.

Wesis L, (2015), On Fear and Nuclear Terrorism, Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, vol. 71 (2) 2015, Sage Publication.

Wilks, Yorick. (2017). Will There Be Superintelligence and Would It Hate Us? A.I. Magazine, vol. 38, no. 4, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence.