

# The liberating effects of violence

## Comparing revolutionary ideas

Name: Friso Doelman

Student number: s2203197

Date: 1 June 2018

Supervisor: Prof. T.H. Weir

Second assessor: Dr. J. Tarusarira

Word count (excl. bibliography): 19611

# Table of Contents

Introduction	3
The need for an intellectual historic approach	4
Outline of this research	6
Background	7
Frantz Fanon	7
Rudi Dutschke	9
Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO)	9
Red Army Faction (RAF)	10
Chapter One: comparing Frantz Fanon and Rudi Dutschke	12
Frantz Fanon	12
The colonial situation	12
Psychological effects of othering	13
Economic gain as justification	14
Legitimizing the use of violence	15
Who is allowed to use violence?	16
Spontaneous violence as the only option	17
The international context	20
Rudi Dutschke	23
Structural violence in the German context	23
Connecting the First and Third World	25
The options for resistance in the First World	27
Dutschke's personal views on the use of violence	30
Connecting Fanon and Dutschke	31
Chapter Two: the PLO and the RAF	34
Palestinian Liberation Organization	34
The creation of society and its structural violence	35
Psychological effects of violence	36
The use of guerrilla warfare	38
The international context	40
Red Army Faction	41
Structural violence according to the RAF	41
Psychological suffering because of the system	43
Legitimization of the use of violence	44

The success of igniting class struggle	45
International context	47
Conclusion	48
Analysis of the oppressor's violence	48
Overcoming violence	49
The legacy of Frantz Fanon's ideas on violence	50
Bibliography	51

## Introduction

In the first decades after the Second World War, the world went through a lot of change, uprooting the system of colonization. Across the globe, wars of liberation were fought out against colonizer who had held some colonies for centuries. In other countries, dictators were overthrown as result of a revolution. In China, the Marxist revolutionary Mao Zedong rose to power. Another Marxist revolutionary, Ernesto Che Guevara was one of the leaders of the revolutionary forces in Cuba. Moreover, in Algeria Frantz Fanon was one of the influential theoreticians of the Algerian war of independence, which led to the retreat of the French colonizers. One commonality between these three revolutionaries was their ideas on the oppressive characteristics of capitalism. All three argued in favor of socialism as the best way to rule a country or people. Their description of oppressive systems gave rise to what Johan Galtung later called ‘structural violence.’ Galtung, one of the most influential academics on the topic of peace research, used this term for the first time in his article ‘Violence, Peace and Peace Research’, which he wrote in 1969. Violence, he argued, meant “the cause of the difference between the potential and the actual” making it structural violence when it “is not committed by an actor (...) and shows up as unequal power and consequently as unequal life chances.”<sup>1</sup>

For Galtung, structural violence is especially visible as the uneven distribution of resources, such as a lack of literacy, income inequality and lack of medical services compared to other areas. He argues: “the potential level of realization is that which is possible with a given level of insight and resources. If insight and/or resources are monopolized by a group or class or are used for other purposes, then the actual level falls below the potential level, and violence is present in the system.” But above all, “it is the power to decide over these resources that is unevenly distributed.”<sup>2</sup> Paul Farmer understood Galtung’s concept of structural violence as:

“‘sinful’ social structures characterized by poverty and steep grades of social inequality, including racism and gender inequality. Structural violence is violence exerted systematically—that is, indirectly— by everyone who belongs to a certain social order: hence the discomfort these ideas provoke in a moral economy still geared to pinning praise or blame on individual actors. In short, the concept of structural violence is intended to inform the study of the social machinery of oppression.”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 168, 170-171

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, 169-171

<sup>3</sup> Paul Farmer, “An Anthropology of Structural Violence,” *Current Anthropology* 45, no. 3 (2004): 307

However, Galtung's definition is problematic for several reasons. First, "the difference between the actual and the potential" is such a wide definition that almost any societal process in which people have to follow rules can be defined as structural violence. If anything is violent, than nothing is violent.<sup>4</sup> Second, what counts for Galtung is that "if people are starving when this is objectively avoidable, then violence is committed, regardless of whether there is a clear subject-action-object relation or no such clear relation."<sup>5</sup> The implication that violence can be measured objectively is problematic. After all, what person A can feel as being violent, might not be the same for person B. Similarly, when person A feels being oppressed or discriminated by person B, person B might not even recognize it because he or she did not oppress or discriminate on purpose. The examples above show that violence is foremost a matter of perception.

To understand perceptions, Jürgen Habermas argues that one should start by researching the cause of structural violence, which is the end of a spiral of disrupted communication. Negative consequences that are a part of globalization, such as the disparities in economic development between regions and continents, only further the spiraling movement of communicative violence. This has resulted in a collapse of dialogue.<sup>6</sup> One way to restart the dialogue, is by studying the *experience* of people who live in poverty or are marginalized by racism or affected by other forms of structural violence, as Paul Farmer argues.<sup>7</sup>

### The need for an intellectual historic approach

Thus, in order to understand the roots of structural violence, we must, as Paul Farmer argued, study the experience of people during the era of decolonization and anti-capitalist sentiment. The aim of this paper is to study this period and to research how violence in the system was understood in the time Galtung first used his term 'structural violence. Second, this thesis concerns itself with how structural violence can be overcome. This is done by researching different theorists and revolutionary movements during the 1960's and 1970's by using an intellectual historic approach.

---

<sup>4</sup> Hans Achterhuis (b), *Met Alle Geweld: Een Filosofische Zoektocht* (Rotterdam, Lemniscaat: 2008), 77

<sup>5</sup> Galtung, 171

<sup>6</sup> Edward Demenchonok, Richard Peterson, "Globalization and Violence: The Challenge to Ethics," *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 68, no. 1 (2009): 69-70

<sup>7</sup> Farmer, 308

According to Quentin Skinner, there are two problems with the research of intellectual history. First, intellectual historians focus too much on the economic, social or political context when explaining ideas. For him, context should merely serve as support in unraveling ideas. Focus on context is thus not entirely wrong, however too much focus on context “could never enable a scholar to understand the meaning of the text in question.” The second problem with current research for Skinner is an approach that focusses only on the text. Skinner argues that some scholars view the text itself as the key to its meaning, and that when one reads and re-reads text, eventually scholars develop a habit to search for ‘universal ideas’ that have ‘dateless wisdom’. This leads, he argues, to “historical absurdity” in which scholars ascribe ideas and arguments to others that they could not possibly have held: ideas that are used in the present are traced back to previous times in which these ideas did not exist.<sup>8</sup>

The extreme focus on text only leads to three different mythologies, Skinner argues. First, ‘the mythology of doctrines’, meaning that new ideas are linked to historical texts which are thought to be related to the new idea. However, ancient authors could never have supported these contemporary ideas since these ideas did not exist at that time. Second is the mythology of prolepsis, which is more or less the opposite of the mythology of doctrines. Mythology of prolepsis means that the original meaning of an idea as written down by an ancient writer gets a contemporary meaning that could have never been envisioned as such by the ancient writer. For Skinner, this is a flawed mode of reasoning as “the action has to await the future to await its meaning.” The last mythology is that of coherence. Skinner argues that historians sometimes assume that the text they read is a coherent text and if the coherence is not found after reading the text once, one should look harder. Scholars can have the illusion of completeness, while this might not be intended by the writer in the first place.<sup>9</sup>

For Skinner, the right way of conducting research on intellectual history is that one should seek to understand the experiences of people in the past, by recognizing that “experiences generated particular ideas, that might then play their part in shaping lived experience and what followed from it.”<sup>10</sup> Intellectual historians try to understand the meaning of texts and ideas by identifying the intentions of an author. Here the social, economic and political context can help in unraveling. Ultimately, the goal of the intellectual historian

---

<sup>8</sup> Richard Whatmore, “Quentin Skinner and the Relevance of Intellectual History,” in: *A Companion to Intellectual History*, ed. Richard Whatmore and B.W. Young (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016), 97-101

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, 101-102

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 97-98

becomes to reveal what an author ‘was doing’, by constantly keeping in mind what “the author intended to do and had succeeded in doing as interpreted by the responses of other authors.”<sup>11</sup>

## Outline of this research

One of the most influential writers during the 1950s and 1960s was the French/Martinique psychologist Frantz Fanon. His most famous book, ‘The Wretched of the Earth’, which he wrote in 1961, will serve as the basis for this research. The title ‘The Wretched of the Earth’ immediately shows Fanon’s socialist orientation, as this title is the first line in the left-wing anthem ‘The Internationale’, written in the 1870’s.<sup>12</sup>

After Fanon’s theory on violence is discussed, the influence of Fanon on a German socialist theorist and leader of the German student movement, Rudi Dutschke, is analyzed in order to assess how Fanon’s ideas, which were developed in the context of the Third World, were interpreted in the First World. Subsequently, the influence of Fanon on revolutionary movements is analyzed. This paper chose for the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) and the Red Army Faction (RAF). The PLO was very much influenced by Fanon, because of the proximity of Algeria and Palestine, but also because the Algerian War of Liberation, in the mind of young Palestinians, resembled the war they fought in Palestine.<sup>13</sup> In the case of the RAF, they saw themselves as the ‘representatives of Fanon in the First World.’<sup>14</sup> The RAF also claimed affinity to Dutschke by arguing that the RAF “does not deny its roots in the history of the student movement.”<sup>15</sup> Close ties existed between also the PLO and RAF, which was evidenced by their joined military training camp in Jordan in the summer of 1970.<sup>16</sup> The question that remains here is how similar the rhetoric actually was: how similar was Fanon’s theory to the theories of Dutschke, the PLO and RAF?

In short, the objective of this research is thus to examine theories of structural violence and to explore how these theories influenced revolutionary movements of the 60’s and 70’s.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, 99

<sup>12</sup> The original title of the book was ‘Les Damnés de la Terre’. In the first line of ‘The Internationale’ it says: “Debout, les damnés de la terre”, translated ‘Stand up, damned/wretched of the earth’ It is still played, for instance at Chinese Communist Party Congresses, highlighting the continued relevance of the song.

<sup>13</sup> Paul Chamberlin, “The Struggle Against Oppression Everywhere: The Global Politics of Palestinian Liberation,” *Middle Eastern Studies* 47 no. 1 (2011): 31

<sup>14</sup> Sabine Kebir, “Gewalt und Demokratie bei Fanon, Sartre und der RAF,” in: *Die RAF und der linke Terrorismus*, ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar (Hamburg: Hamburg Edition, 2006), 270

<sup>15</sup> J. Smith and André Moncourt (a), *The Red Army Faction: A Documentary History: Volume 1, Projectiles for the People* (Montreal, Quebec: Kersplebedeb, 2009), 171 Note: all communiqués issued by the RAF are translated to English in this book.

<sup>16</sup> Martin Jander, “German Leftist Terrorism and Israel: Ethno-Nationalist, Religious-Fundamentalist, or Social-Revolutionary?,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 38, no. 6 (2015): 462

And, since violence is a matter of perception, this research will largely deal with the rhetoric imbued in these theories and movements.

As said, Fanon's 'The Wretched of the Earth' is the basis of this paper. In the first chapter, 'On Violence', Fanon covers two related topics. The first part describes the violence of the colonizer and how it manifests itself, while the second part concerns itself with how this situation can be overcome by the colonized. This paper will follow the same division by first discussing the violence as perceived by Dutschke, the PLO and the RAF and afterwards analyzing how they argued this could be overcome. Transformed into a research question, this paper asks: *What was Frantz Fanon's theory of violence and how was this theory interpreted by Rudi Dutschke and revolutionary movements during the 1960's and 1970's?*

In short, the argument of this paper is that Dutschke, the PLO and the RAF analyze their respective situations on the same grounds as Fanon, by highlighting similar social, economic and psychological effects of oppression. The argumentation on how the violence of oppression can be overcome, however, differs considerably between the four. Fanon is interpreted more loosely and the different contexts in which the actors operate become more important.

To better understand the argumentations given by the theorists and revolutionary group, a brief background of all actors is given first.

## Background

### Frantz Fanon

Frantz Fanon was born in Fort-de-France, Martinique on 20 July 1925. Fanon's family, originally descendants of slaves from Africa, belonged to the Black bourgeoisie on the island. At age 19, he joined the allied forces to fight in the Second World War. After the war, he obtained a scholarship to study medicine in Lyon, France. After completing his studies, Fanon shortly worked at a French clinic before he accepted a position to work as a psychiatrist at the most important psychiatric hospital in Algeria, called Blida-Joinville psychiatric clinic. Fanon worked there for little more than three years, between 1953-1957. During his work at Blida-Joinville, he treated many injured soldiers from both sides. Increasingly, he became aware of the Algerian liberation struggle and began to collaborate with the Algerian Liberation Front (French: 'Front de Liberation Nationale, FLN'). The personal experiences with wounded fighters in the psychiatric clinic caused the increasingly radicalization of Fanon's political ideas. Because of his growing involvement in the liberation struggle, the French expelled him



from Algeria. Fanon ultimately settled in Tunisia. Here, Fanon started working for the FLN's newspaper 'El-Moujahid', where he shaped the political orientation of the FLN both domestically and internationally. In his role as official diplomatic representative of Algeria, he attended multiple Pan-African Congresses, where he tried to unite the liberation struggle in Algeria to the liberation struggles elsewhere in Africa. During this time, Fanon also wrote multiple books, most importantly 'Black Skins, White Masks' (1952), detailing the impossibility of black people to be seen as equals to white people due solely to their skin color, and 'A Dying Colonialism' (1959, in French titled 'L'An V de la Révolution Algérienne'), in which Fanon argued how Algerians changed socially and culturally throughout the War for Independence. Fanon wrote his most important book, 'The Wretched of the Earth,' in April 1961, while heavily suffering from leukemia. Fanon received the first copy of his book at the end of November 1961, a little over a week before he passed away.<sup>17</sup>

Fanon's book 'The Wretched of the Earth' consists of five chapters. The first chapter, on which the focus largely is in this study, deals with the system that is set up by the settler and the psychological effects the system has on the native. Fanon argues that by violently decolonizing the country, these psychological effects can change. The second chapter, titled 'Spontaneity: its strength and weakness' deals with the political organizations that are formed during the revolutionary struggle. However, Fanon argues that these organizations tend to forget the majority of the colonized population. Similarly, in the next chapter Fanon argues that the colonial system is recreated instead of overthrown by the wealthy native businessmen and landowners. Fanon therefore calls to educate the people in order for a national debate about the future of the country to take shape. After the first three descriptive chapters, Fanon deals with culture and the importance of culture in the fight for nationalism. Fanon here sees an important role for the intellectual, who, by putting their work in the context of history, helps to create a national consciousness. The last chapter deals with the psychological effects of colonialism. According to Fanon, psychoses like depression and anxiety disorders are all rooted in the teachings of the settler. Only getting rid of the colonizer will help to heal the psychological wounds of the native.

---

<sup>17</sup> Renate Zahar, *Frantz Fanon: Colonialism and Alienation: Concerning Frantz Fanon's Political Theory*, trans. Willfried F. Feuser (New York: Montly Review Press, 1974), vii – xx

## Rudi Dutschke

Rudi Dutschke was born in March 1940 in Schönefeld, what after the Second World War would become East-Germany. There he attended, and later graduated, from high school. As all East-Germans, he had to join the army after graduation, but he refused and moved to West-Berlin in 1961, shortly before the Berlin wall was built. In Berlin, he studied sociology at the Free University (German: Freien Universität) in Berlin. He signed up as a member of the university's student movement in 1965 and became its leader soon after. He was known for his Marxist views and advocated fiercely for the liberation of Third World countries, organizing demonstrations mainly to protest against the war in Vietnam. While violence was very obvious in Vietnam, Dutschke argued that violence was also present in Germany. Dutschke argued that the difference between Vietnam and Germany was that in Germany the manipulation from the elite in the country was so pervasive that physical violence did not need to be present in everyday life anymore.<sup>18</sup> Dutschke was in favor of more autonomy, which had to be realized in all aspects of life. For instance, he advocated for direct democracy and argued that education should first and foremost be an 'education to disobey', so that future generations remained critical of the state.<sup>19</sup>

Dutschke survived an assassination attempt in 1968, but was forced to recuperate from his injuries in the years after. He decided to leave Germany and to live in the United Kingdom and later Denmark. Although Dutschke still wrote texts on political matters, he was not as politically active as before the assassination attempt. More than 10 years later Dutschke would pass away as a result of the injuries caused by the assassination attempt.

## Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO)

In 1959, Yasser Arafat, along with two university friends who also worked in Kuwait, founded the group Fatah, meaning 'conquest' in Arabic. The group based itself on the revolutionary doctrines developed by revolutionaries in Algeria, China, Cuba and Vietnam: guerrilla warfare was the best way to gain support and to liberate Palestine.<sup>20</sup> The Palestinian people however, inspired by Gamal Abdel Nasser, president of Egypt, whose doctrine of Pan-Arabism was very popular in the Arab world, still put their faith in the neighboring Arab states to successfully liberate Palestine through conventional warfare. The June 1967 war, resulting

---

<sup>18</sup> Jan-Werner Müller, "1968 as event, milieu and ideology," *Journal of Political Ideologies* 7, no. 1 (2002): 29

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, 28

<sup>20</sup> Barry M. Rubin, *Revolution until Victory?: The Politics and History of the PLO*. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 6-7

in a massive defeat for the Arab armies and the Israeli control over the whole city of Jerusalem, left the Palestinians disillusioned.<sup>21</sup>

For Fatah, the defeat of the Arab armies proved them that guerrilla warfare was the way forward. They started attacking Israel more often and quickly gained support of the disillusioned Palestinians. Arafat's fame rose and in 1968, he took over control over the PLO. Under the umbrella of the PLO, Arafat loosely organized all the liberation organizations in Palestine, of which Fatah and the Marxist-Leninist Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) became the most important groups. Because Fatah was the most important group within the PLO, evidenced by Arafat's leadership over both groups, and because the PLO was not very successful before Arafat took over, this paper will focus on the rhetoric of Fatah until its incorporation in the PLO in 1968 and after 1968 on the rhetoric of both Fatah and the PLO under Arafat's leadership.

Within the PLO, the PFLP and Fatah differed in their approach to liberate Palestine. The PFLP considered the West an equal enemy to Israel. Therefore, they mostly concentrated on international terrorism, for instance by hijacking airplanes. Fatah, except for a brief period from 1971 to 1974, argued that international terrorism diverted attention away from the main priority, defeating Israel. Fatah prioritized direct attacks on Israeli occupied territory. Because of these different approaches, this paper will, whenever possible, refer directly to Fatah or the PFLP when it acted on its own.

## Red Army Faction (RAF)

The Red Army Faction began operating in May 1970, when Andreas Baader was broken out of prison, in which he served a three-year sentence for setting a store on fire to protest against the war in Vietnam. Among the rescuers of Baader were Gudrun Ensslin, who was also Baader's partner, and Ulrike Meinhof, a left-wing journalist. Together, they formed the core of the RAF. Shortly after, they left Germany with other RAF-members to join a military training camp organized by the PLO in Jordan. When the group returned to Germany, they started to carry out attacks. In May 1972, the RAF bombed police stations and American army personnel based in Germany. The German police responded to the attacks by intensifying their search for RAF-members and a few weeks later, the five most prominent members, the three mentioned above, together with Holger Meins and Jan-Carl Raspe, were captured. During their

---

<sup>21</sup> William L. Cleveland, Martin Bunton, *A history of the modern middle east*, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Westview Press, 2009), 359-361

captivity, the RAF managed to stay relevant from prison through, among other action, hunger strikes. Hunger strikes were their way to create attention for the conditions of their imprisonment as well as for their anti-imperialist struggle. The death of Holger Meins as a result of his hunger strikes, sparked renewed outrage in Germany, and created a new stream of recruits for the RAF, creating what came to be known as ‘the second generation’. The second generation RAF-members continued the violent struggle by, among other acts, seizing the German embassy in Stockholm. The alleged suicide of Meinhof, which is to this day doubted, once again sparked renewed outrage at the German state. It was also the beginning of the ‘German autumn’, in which the assassinations of Hanns Martin Schleyer, the president of the Federation of German Industries at the time and Siegfried Buback, at the time Attorney General of Germany took place.<sup>22</sup> After the German Autumn, a third generation came into being. This generation was less active than previous generation, and ultimately in 14 May 1998, the RAF declared that “today we end this project. (...) it is now history.”<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> J. Smith and André Moncourt (b), *Daring to Struggle, Failing to Win: The Red Army Faction's 1977 Campaign of Desperation* (Oakland, California: PM Press, 2008), 12-26

<sup>23</sup> Red Army Faction, *RAF-Auflösungserklärung*, March 1998, last seen 14-3-2018, link: <http://www.rafinfo.de/archiv/raf/raf-20-4-98.php>

## Chapter One: comparing Frantz Fanon and Rudi Dutschke

### Frantz Fanon

#### The colonial situation

According to Fanon, the settler brought the native into existence by arriving at the native's land with a forceful display of bayonets and cannons. The violence that marked the first encounter between native and settler also gave rise to the relationship between the native and the settler, as there cannot be a native without a settler and the other way around.<sup>24</sup> The society that is created by the settler is a society that is cut in two halves. Dividing these two halves are the police stations and army barracks. These government officials only speak the language of force, "and advise the native by means of rifle butts and napalm."<sup>25</sup> The act of oppression and domination by these officials is not hidden, and their presence is justified as being 'the upholder of peace'.<sup>26</sup>

Behind these barracks and police stations there are two vastly different worlds, which Fanon describes as being Manichean.<sup>27</sup> The settler's town is built with stone and steel. The streets are well lit, and covered with asphalt. It is a town for white people. The native's town is an infamous town, where diseases spread easily. The native is always hungry, starving for food and materials. It is a town "for niggers and dirty Arabs."<sup>28</sup> The settler describes the native society as a society without values, even declaring the native "insensible to ethics", representing the negation of values. Furthermore, Fanon argues that the insensibility to ethics allows the settler to describe the native in zoological terms, thereby dehumanizing the native, turning him into an animal.<sup>29</sup>

For the native, non-white man, it is impossible to become a part of the white town. Fanon had described this impossibility to 'become white' in detail in his book 'Black Skins, White Masks'. Similar to the settler who created the native, Fanon contends, it is also the racist who created the inferior.<sup>30</sup> White, European people saw black people as mere objects, ascribing

---

<sup>24</sup> Frantz Fanon (a), *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 36

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 38

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, 38

<sup>27</sup> Manichaen means things are either good or evil.

<sup>28</sup> Fanon (a), 39

<sup>29</sup> Ibid, 41-42

<sup>30</sup> Zahar, 30

black people only negative qualities.<sup>31</sup> This process of othering ultimately results in blacks seeing themselves as inferior, as 'black', not realizing that it is the white man's need to justify his domination over blacks that is the cause of this othering. Being black is foremost a social construct.<sup>32</sup> Fanon shows the result of othering by white people through an analysis of two novels regarding love between black and white people, both situated in the European context.<sup>33</sup>

### Psychological effects of othering

The two novels go as follows: a black woman, Mayotte, is in love with a white man. She loves him because he has money and social status, which she will never have or achieve because she is black. But she also hates that she loves him because of money and social status. Fanon concludes that Mayotte's feeling of racial inferiority is therefore primarily a result of economic circumstances. Mayotte starts to hate herself, but remains with the white man to try to become something that she is not and never will be: white. But remaining with the white man also makes Mayotte constantly realize that she is black and not white. A vicious cycle occurs.<sup>34</sup> Just like the black person who wants to be white, the native always wants to be in the place of the settler. And like Mayotte, the native envies the settler for his prosperity but at the same time also hates the settler for the same reason.<sup>35</sup>

The second novel tells the story of a black man, Jean, who loves a white woman. But because of his feeling of racial inferiority, he is never sure of her love for him. How can a white woman love him, a black man? Jean continuously seeks affirmation of her love, but no matter how much and how often she tells him that she loves him, it is never enough.<sup>36</sup> The two novels show that the inability to enter into a structure based on mutual recognition creates a weakened sense of self in the black person. It also causes the black person to put more effort into regaining that sense of self. Fanon argues that this vicious cycle ultimately ends in an inferiority complex.<sup>37</sup> However, unlike Jean, the native is never convinced of his inferiority. He is overpowered, but never in his mind.<sup>38</sup> The native is also not convinced of the European culture, which Fanon describes with the example of the French offensive against the veil in Algeria.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, 30

<sup>32</sup> Peter Hudis, *Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades. Revolutionary Lives* (London: Pluto Press, 2015), 31

<sup>33</sup> Frantz Fanon (b), *Black Skins, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967)

<sup>34</sup> Hudis, 38

<sup>35</sup> Fanon (a), 52

<sup>36</sup> Hudis, 39

<sup>37</sup> Ibid, 33

<sup>38</sup> Fanon (a), 53

Fanon analyzed the French offensive as an attempt to destroy the native culture, in this case the Algerian culture. The Algerians responded to the offensive by encouraging women to wear a veil. This counteroffensive by the Algerians highlights for Fanon how previously insignificant parts of a culture gain in prominence after the settler tries to abolish a cultural feature. For the native, maintaining cultural features is important.<sup>39</sup>

### Economic gain as justification

As stated above, Fanon argued that in Europe the racial inferiority is a result of the white man's need to justify his domination over the black man, and that this domination in turn is caused by economic circumstances. For Fanon, the economic circumstances were even more important in the colonial context than in the European context. So just like the native, non-white man is unable to become a part of the white town, it is also impossible for the white man to 'slide down' and become part of the non-white town, as "you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. The cause is the consequence."<sup>40</sup>

In the beginning of the era of colonialism, small armies were able to occupy a vast amount of territory. The main reason for this ability was that within that vast amount of territory, only small parts were really important. In these small parts, raw materials were found that needed to be dug up and sent to Europe. Tight control throughout the territory was not important. Fanon argued that after a long period of accumulation of raw materials, capitalism had changed its ways. Instead of Europe as the market for companies, the colonies and the ability of the colonial population to buy goods became the main focus. The European population now expected from their government to implement policies that helped preserve economic interests in the colonies, instead of a government "whose policy is solely that of the sword."<sup>41</sup>

With regards to the importance of the economic structure, Fanon agreed with most of Karl Marx's ideas. However, while Karl Marx thought of society as being divided by the bourgeoisie on one side and the proletariat on the other side. Fanon extended this division of society by also pointing out that race was also an important factor. The rich are always white and the poor are always Arab or black. Furthermore, in Fanon's description of the colonial society, the racial division was another reason why the colonial situation could not change in its current form, as only whites could become rich. The white man's need to justify his domination, causes the inability of the native and the settler to reconcile, because the prosperity

---

<sup>39</sup> Zahar, 88-89

<sup>40</sup> Fanon (a), 40

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, 65

of the settler rests on the misery of the native.<sup>42</sup> Because exploitation must continue, the colonial society is set up as a very static society, kept static by race and economic reasons. And, if the violence embedded in the structure is insufficient, physical violence is used to enforce colonial rule by a superior armed force.

### Legitimizing the use of violence

The ensuing part analyzes why Fanon saw violence as necessary to overcome the colonial situation, and why a solution without violence was not possible. After, this paper deals with whom is authorized in Fanon's view to carry out violence and what effects violence has. Lastly, Fanon's views on the results of violence are discussed. It is important to note that Fanon wrote 'The Wretched of the Earth' when the Algerian war for independence was nearing its end and Algeria was in the process of becoming an independent country. This chronology is important as Fanon explains his views on nonviolence, social justice and other issues that are mentioned below while violence was already occurring. One could argue that it is because Fanon knows that the outcome of the war for independence was almost won, that Fanon was in favor of the use of violence, as it had worked during the war. However, this paper argues that this is not the case and that for Fanon violence is a fundamental part in being liberated psychologically from the settler.

In order to decolonize, there needs to be "a complete calling into question of the colonial situation".<sup>43</sup> After violence has broken out, the first to appeal to the reason of the native is the settler. The settler argues that the native does not need to use violence in order to decolonize, arguing that the native should use reason and intellectual qualities. But for the native, decolonization is not a rational confrontation: "The violence with which the supremacy of white values is affirmed and the aggressiveness which has permeated the victory of these values over the ways of life and of thought of the native mean that, in revenge, the native laughs in mockery when Western values are mentioned in front of him."<sup>44</sup>

The native does not see the Western values how settlers see these values. For the native, Western values mean most of all oppression and exploitation. Meaning that for the native, Fanon argues, 'morality' is defined as breaking and stopping the settler's violence.<sup>45</sup> After the settler has tried to appeal to the native's reason, the intellectuals in the settler's home country

---

<sup>42</sup> Hussein Abdilahi Bulhan, "Frantz Fanon," *Race & Class* 21, no. 3 (2016): 263

<sup>43</sup> Fanon (a), 37

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 43

<sup>45</sup> Ibid, 44



attempt the same as the colonial settler. But what the intellectual does not realize is that in his quest for a more harmonious relationship between native and settler, the intellectual forgets that it is not in the settler's interest. The settler's interest is the domination of the native. For Fanon, "decolonization unifies that (native) people by the radical decision to remove from it its heterogeneity, and by unifying it on a national, sometimes a racial, basis."<sup>46</sup> For Fanon, negotiating in a truthful manner will never be possible. For the settler and for the native, "the good is quite simply that which is evil for 'them'". This means for the native that truth implies "the property of the national cause. (...) Truth is that which hurries on the break-up of the colonialist regime."<sup>47</sup>

### Who is allowed to use violence?

Similar to the distinctions Fanon makes in the settler's imperial society between the colonial government and the intellectuals, Fanon also divides the native society in different classes. This marks the first time that Fanon differentiates between different parts of the colonial society instead of just referring to 'the native'. The first to realize the exploitation in a colonialist society, is the starving, rural peasant. The rural peasant is the true revolutionary because they "have nothing to lose and everything to gain."<sup>48</sup> They are the only class that is not interested in a deal with the settlers. Moreover, the rural peasantry has largely been left alone by the settler, and because of that their communal traditions have remained intact. It ensures the cohesiveness of the rural peasantry. They also have fought the settler when he first arrived, and will want to continue to make their presence felt. Therefore, they are the force behind the independence struggle as well as the catalyst to continue the revolution after the settler has been defeated.<sup>49</sup>

Fanon continues his break-down of the colonial society with the young nationalist bourgeoisie. Just like the settler, the nationalist bourgeoisie is afraid of the peasantry, because the peasantry is not interested in maintaining the status quo. Afraid of losing their comfortable position in society, the nationalist bourgeoisie claims to control the peasantry and starts to negotiate with the settler. For Fanon, the problem with the nationalist bourgeoisie is that they are not convinced that violence will work because they think the settler's power is far superior in comparison to the power of the native. Fanon argues that the bourgeoisie does not recognize the power of guerrilla warfare as displayed elsewhere in the world, for instance during the

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, 45

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, 50

<sup>48</sup> Ibid, 61

<sup>49</sup> Hudis, 122

American war of independence. Because of this mindset, the nationalist bourgeoisie is “beaten from the start.”<sup>50</sup> Nationalist parties are also afraid of the violence of the masses, and are quickly asked to enter in negotiations with the settler, resulting in a compromise which is in the interest of both the nationalist party and the settler. The only violence the nationalist party will use is through stoppages of work, boycotts and peaceful demonstrations.<sup>51</sup>

The lumpenproletariat, consisting of the urban peasants, is the fourth category described by Fanon. These are the peasants who rushed to the towns when the colonial rule had established itself. As a consequence to its misery and disintegration, this is the group that is the most responsive to the call for revolution. On the other hand, due to their political unawareness, the lumpenproletariat is also the group that is the most easily seduced by the colonizer to fight in the colonial army.<sup>52</sup>

For Fanon, it can only be the rural peasantry who will be able to completely call into question the colonial situation, as decolonization is the process in which “the destruction of the colonial world is no more and no less the abolition of one zone, its burial in the depths of the earth or its expulsion from the country.”<sup>53</sup> Through engaging with the views of different classes within the colonial society, Fanon also argues that non-violence will never lead to complete decolonization. Except for the rural peasantry, all groups in favor of negotiations want a colonial society in which the settler and native live more harmoniously. However, the rural peasantry is not concerned with the settler’s position, “they demand the settler’s farm.”<sup>54</sup>

## Spontaneous violence as the only option

As has been analyzed in the previous part, Fanon thought of colonial society as very static which was the result of capitalism and race. For Fanon, a more harmonious relation was not possible, as the primary reason for the presence of the settler was the exploitation of the native. Non-violence would have never stopped this exploitation. True liberation of, and freedom for, the native can therefore only come through the use of violence, initiated by the native peasantry. For Fanon, colonialism is violence in its natural state, and the only way to beat this violence is through greater violence.<sup>55</sup> However, stating that violence to end colonialism does work because non-violence does not work, is not necessarily true. So what

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid, 62-63

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 66

<sup>52</sup> Zahar, 99

<sup>53</sup> Fanon (a), 41

<sup>54</sup> Ibid, 60

<sup>55</sup> Ibid, 61

does Fanon say about the results of the use of violence? The static, colonial society was mainly divided among two lines: possession of capital and the inferiority/superiority of race. The type of violence used by the native, guerrilla warfare, deeply impacts the economic structure implemented by the settler. The settler had come to the colony to extract resources. Later, the settler had to control the colony in order to make it a marketplace for companies from the settler's home country. In reaction to the violence of the native, the settler cannot be as violent as the native as that is not in the interest of the settler's companies.<sup>56</sup>

With regards to race, the native had always been described as inferior to the settler, ultimately believing that that is indeed true. But that changes once the native turns to violence. When the native fights the settler, race becomes irrelevant, because the fight means it is one man against another. Not only has the native realized through violence that he is now equal to the settler, the native's violence also acts as a cleansing force: "It (violence) frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect."<sup>57</sup>

Through violence, the native shows that he no longer dreams of being white, or accepts being exploited. He is now a liberated man ready to serve his own struggle for freedom. The native immediately starts to build a community, different from the individualistic ideals of the settler. The importance of individualism of the settler is immediately replaced by the importance of community, as "everyone will be saved, or everyone will be massacred."<sup>58</sup> Violence is also nationally liberating:

"The mobilization of the masses, when it arises out of the war of liberation, introduces into each man's consciousness the ideas of a common cause, of a national destiny, and of a collective history. In the same way the second phase, that of the building-up of the nation, is helped on by the existence of this cement which has been mixed with blood and anger."<sup>59</sup>

Next to blood and anger, spontaneity plays a very important role in first part of the struggle for liberation. Fanon argues that the native is spontaneous in his actions, but at the same time remains disciplined and altruistic.<sup>60</sup> Especially when the police force is at its most

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid, 63-66

<sup>57</sup> Ibid, 94

<sup>58</sup> Ibid, 47

<sup>59</sup> Ibid, 93

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, 112

violent, it is the spontaneity of the peasantry in their actions that frightens the colonizer, who either chooses to continue the war or starts negotiations. The national parties in their turn leave it to the rural peasantry to continue its spontaneous action and do not attempt to organize the rebellion.<sup>61</sup> For Fanon, “the so-called revolutionary doctrine in fact rests on the retrograde, emotional, and spontaneous nature of the country districts.”<sup>62</sup> And especially in the beginning, when the forces of repression are the strongest, Fanon observes “a veritable triumph for the cult of spontaneity”, and argues that “spontaneity is king.”<sup>63</sup> It is mostly in this phase that violence liberates the native psychologically. The aim in the second phase is to change the capitalist colonial structure.<sup>64</sup> It becomes important to change the peasant revolt into a revolutionary war. It is from this point forward that leadership becomes important. The task of the leaders of the revolt is to set objectives and most importantly, to raise the consciousness of its fighters in order to transform the struggle and ultimately win the struggle for liberation.<sup>65</sup>

It is not until after the beginning stages of the struggle that the native will realize that the Manichaeism that was implemented by the settler should not be adopted by the native. According to Fanon, the native will realize “that it sometimes happens that you get Blacks who are whiter than the Whites (...) and the hope of an independent nation does not always tempt certain strata of the population to give up their interests or privileges.”<sup>66</sup> Conversely, Fanon argues, “many members of the mass of colonialists reveal themselves to be much, much nearer to the national struggle than certain sons of the nations.”<sup>67</sup> Discrimination on the basis of race disappears and racial treason makes way for social treason: “the people find out that the iniquitous fact of exploitation can wear a black face, or an Arab one.”<sup>68</sup> And at the same time, “the prototypes of this division of the species (settlers) go over to the enemy, become Negroes or Arabs, and accept suffering, torture, and death.”<sup>69</sup> True, mutual recognition between the black and white, native and settler, only now becomes possible, giving rise to the beginning of a new humanity.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, 116

<sup>62</sup> Ibid, 120

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, 131

<sup>64</sup> Zahar, 80-81

<sup>65</sup> Fanon (a), 136

<sup>66</sup> Ibid, 144

<sup>67</sup> Ibid, 146

<sup>68</sup> Ibid, 145

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, 145

<sup>70</sup> Hans Achterhuis (b), *Filosofen van de derde Wereld* (Baarna: Ambo bv, 1975), 44-45

## The international context

According to Fanon, it also becomes important for the native to understand his violence in the international context, as it provides a lot more problems for the settler, because the settler does not want to fight in multiple wars for independence. A victory by one people over the settler is no longer just their victory, it is a victory for all colonized people.<sup>71</sup> The native must realize the Third World<sup>72</sup> is in the middle of international affairs.<sup>73</sup> Fanon argues that when the native realizes that he is in the middle of international affairs, he must refrain from both the doctrines of the United States as well as the Soviet Union, as the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union between is fought out in Third World countries. The reconstruction of the nation is therefore a balancing act between socialist and capitalist ideas, where the most local issues in different parts of the world can be linked and given a universal dimension.<sup>74</sup> The only way the native will not become part of the struggle between socialism and capitalism, is to maintain neutral.<sup>75</sup> Fanon argues that it is only through the bond between recently decolonized nations that colonialism can be defeated. It is in the context of the Cold War that the native understands the struggles for independence elsewhere. The native knows the atmosphere in which the settler operates and uses violence. It has made the peasant a “political animal” in the broadest sense of the word, and it is this understanding of the atmosphere that makes it possible to form a bond between different people engaged in a war of liberation.<sup>76</sup> While the native had always been described in zoological terms by the settler, for Fanon the international system shows that it is truly the imperial powers who have lowered humanity to an animal level.<sup>77</sup>

This bond between newly independent countries is also important because the colonial power reacts to the independence of their former colony by setting up a system of economic pressure. Since the colonial power had control over all the means of production, it withdraws all its capital and human resources, naming it ‘the curse of independence.’ This causes widespread poverty and misery in the newly independent state, thereby trying to persuade other colonies not to start a war for independence. The other option for a newly independent state is to accept to become economically dependent on the former settler, thereby agreeing to still be

---

<sup>71</sup> Fanon (a), 70

<sup>72</sup> The ‘Third World’, according to Zahar, must be understood as a mix between the socialist planned economy and the capitalist market economy in a developing country. In: Zahar, 111

<sup>73</sup> Fanon (a), 76

<sup>74</sup> Ibid, 75

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, 80

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, 81

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, 78-79, 99-100

controlled.<sup>78</sup> For Fanon, the latter option is not unacceptable: Third World countries must develop their own values instead of their values still being defined by the settler's country, and find methods and practices that fit the new nation.<sup>79</sup>

But that does not mean the young independent country is free from day one: it has to use the economic channels that were created by the settler. These channels must be maintained or "catastrophe will happen".<sup>80</sup> Fanon argues that in this light, the newly independent country must re-examine everything, whether it is the soil, the mineral resources and even the sun. The situation to which the Western powers want to condemn the new nation must simply be refused.<sup>81</sup> According to Fanon, colonialism and imperialism "have not paid their score when they withdraw their flags and their police forces from our territories:"<sup>82</sup>

"So when we hear a head of a European state declare with his hand on his heart that the must come to the aid of the poor underdeveloped peoples, we do not tremble with gratitude. Quite the contrary; we say to ourselves: "It's just reparation which will be paid to us." Nor we acquiesce in the help for underdeveloped countries being a program of "sisters of charity.""<sup>83</sup>

According to Fanon, the First World needs the overseas markets and therefore will find out soon enough that it is also in their best interest to give aid to underdeveloped countries. Fanon stresses that this must be "unstinted aid with not too many conditions."<sup>84</sup> Third World nations require and ask for large-scale investments and technical aid, which must be given, for "the fate of the world depends on the answer given to this question."<sup>85</sup> Although the money should come from Europe, Fanon argued that Third World countries must prevent to become like Europe for the sake of humanity:

"We today can do everything, so long as we do not imitate Europe, so long as we are not obsessed by the desire to catch up with Europe. (...) So, comrades, let us not pay tribute to Europe by creating states, institutions, and societies which draw their

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, 97

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, 99

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, 100

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, 100-101

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, 101

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, 102-103

<sup>84</sup> Ibid, 105

<sup>85</sup> Ibid, 105

inspiration from her. (...) If we want to turn Africa into a new Europe, and America into a new Europe, then let us leave the destiny of our countries to Europeans. They will know how to do it better than the most gifted among us. But if we want humanity to advance a step further, if we want to bring it up to a different level than that which Europe has shown it, then we must invent and we must make discoveries.”<sup>86</sup>

Critiquing the First World and its actions in the Third World was not only done by people from the Third World. Throughout Europe and the United States, the call to end the war in Vietnam grew louder and louder. Fanon’s book was also avidly read by Europeans who wanted to change global affairs. One of them was Rudi Dutschke, who became one of the most well-known Germans that supported the liberation struggles in the Third World. According to Dutschke, some descriptions of violence by Fanon were also present in Germany, motivating him to try to bring about a revolution in the First World as well. But given the differences between the Third World and First World, how was Dutschke able to transfer Fanon’s ideas?

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid, 312-315

# Rudi Dutschke

## Structural violence in the German context

Dutschke's understanding of structural violence starts with the claim that there exists a violent global system that prevents "introducing those conditions in which men can live creative lives without war, hunger and repressive work."<sup>87</sup> The uncreative life coupled with repressive work is exemplified by Dutschke's understanding of a normal worker's life: he gets up at 6 A.M., drinks some coffee, goes to work before 7 A.M., comes home in the evening, eats, watches a bit of television, goes to bed and repeats this schedule the next day. Dutschke argues that this miserable routine is fully decided by the socio-economic structure of society, in which latent violence is already present, for instance in the ownership and power structures.<sup>88</sup> In turn, the latent socio-economic violence is connected to political forms of violence.<sup>89</sup> According to Dutschke, this includes the violence of people who think they are exercising power legally and of the many illegal activities of the organizations that legally have the power in their hands. This is clearly visible, Dutschke argues, in the shooting of Benno Ohnesorg during the demonstration of the visit of the Iranian Shah. The demonstration was legal, was announced in advance and any action that was required was done beforehand, but suddenly the police started to hit the demonstrators.<sup>90</sup>

For Dutschke, this system increasingly shows that it is losing its impartiality in favor of the ruling class.<sup>91</sup> According to Dutschke, the problematic features of the socio-economic structure will present itself when the rebuilding of the West-German economy is finished. During the development phase after the Second World War, it was easy for the state to hand out subsidies to the elite because the state could argue it was still trying to reconstruct its economy. At that time, subsidies were given out regularly by the state to help grow the economy. However, when the reconstruction period ends, and the economy does not have any untapped manpower left, capitalism needs other ways to accumulate more money. The solution for this problem of capitalism is to unload the cost on the wage-dependent masses. It therefore

---

<sup>87</sup> Rudi Dutschke (a), "On anti-authoritarianism," trans. Salvator Attanasio," in: *The New Left Reader*, ed. Carl Oglesby (USA: Grove Press, 1969), 244

<sup>88</sup> 3Sat, "Retro spezial 1968 Jahr des Aufstands," published on YouTube 5 January, 2011 (originally 13 June 1978), last visited 15 March 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8v3bcJLaG6I&t=4196s>, beginning at 1:06:40.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, 1:06:40

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 1:06:40

<sup>91</sup> Dutschke (a), 246



becomes important for the elite to maintain the masses as politically immature, so that they will not revolt.<sup>92</sup> The ruling class consists of, among others, the liberal bourgeoisie and representatives of monopolies, who also control the press. Dutschke described their goal as follows:

“Together they (the ruling class) form an ‘anonymous joint stock company’ to impose the usually subtle but, when necessary, the *manifest* terrorism of the class rule of late capitalism whose historical task is to transform the masses into a collective which reacts functionally in the interest of the rulers, to keep the masses utilizable and available at all times for military and civil purposes.”<sup>93</sup>

According to Dutschke, transforming the masses into a collective is done by what Marcuse named ‘repressive tolerance’. Marcuse argued that tolerance, the word itself deriving from *telos*, meaning truth, is based on the proposition that individuals can hear, see and feel for themselves in order to develop their own thoughts, interests, rights and capabilities.<sup>94</sup> Affluent democracies, Marcuse continues, are tolerant to a large extent. Their tolerance is justified by the idea that “nobody, neither group nor individual, is in possession of the truth and capable of defining what is right and wrong, good and bad.”<sup>95</sup>

However, in order for people to develop their own thoughts and interests, access to authentic information is a must. This, according to Marcuse, is not possible in democracies where the economic and political power is concentrated and effective dissent is blocked: The media – according to Marcuse themselves instruments of economic and political power – does not only give information but also gives meaning to that information, thereby predefining what is right and wrong, true and false, thereby making true tolerance impossible and creating a repressive tolerance instead.<sup>96</sup>

Dutschke argued that through this repressive tolerance, the ruling class has completed the repressive socialization of capital, and now dominates all other groups through a system in which the norms and ideas of the bourgeois capitalistic society have been internalized.<sup>97</sup> In this

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, 246-247

<sup>93</sup> Ibid, 248

<sup>94</sup> Robert Paul Wolff, Barrington Moore, and Herbet Marcuse, *A critique of Pure Tolerance* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 90

<sup>95</sup> Ibid, 94

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, 95

<sup>97</sup> Rudi Dutschke (a), 248

system, Dutschke argued, the manipulation from the state was so pervasive that open state violence to control the masses was not necessary anymore.<sup>98</sup>

In conclusion, Dutschke thus argued that the structural violence is at its core economic violence, which is kept in place through political violence. The most visible example for him was the police force, that acts on behalf of the elite and is thus not impartial. This description of society is similar to Fanon, notwithstanding the fact that they both solely analyzed their own situations: Fanon argued that the French were foremost economic settlers, who put in place a political system that benefitted themselves. This was visible in the role of the police, who, Fanon argued, always presumed the native as guilty.<sup>99</sup>

### Connecting the First and Third World

According to Dutschke, the latent violence used by the West-German government in Germany becomes visible in its support for American actions in the Third World, which Dutschke defined as “the totality of peoples suffering under the terror of the world market system of the giant corporations.”<sup>100</sup> The American violence was especially visible in Vietnam. For Dutschke, it became a struggle of “the revolution of people against all forms of domination and exploitation.” Moreover, the United States has taken over the role of world police, to destroy the fight against oppression and hunger. It has become the symbol of unfreedom.<sup>101</sup> According to Dutschke, the question is now: “When, ladies and gentlemen, will we finally take a closer look at the factories in Frankfurt, Munich, Hamburg, or West Berlin that directly or indirectly supply the American army in Vietnam with chemical and electronic installations?” In this question, Dutschke resembles the critique put forward by Fanon in ‘The Wretched of the Earth’, who was highly critical of the role of the European working class in enabling the sustained violence in the Third World:

“This colossal task, which consists of reintroducing man into the world, man in his totality, will be achieved with the crucial help of the European masses who would do well to confess that they have often rallied behind the position of our common masters on colonial issues. In order to do this, the European masses must first of all decide to

---

<sup>98</sup> Müller, 29

<sup>99</sup> Fanon (a), 16

<sup>100</sup> Dutschke (a), 244

<sup>101</sup> Gretchen Dutschke-Klotz, *Wir Hatten Ein Barbarisches, Schönes Leben: Rudi Dutschke: Eine Biographie*. (Cologne: Kiepenheuer&Witsch, 1996), 95

wake up, put on their thinking caps and stop playing the irresponsible game of Sleeping Beauty.”<sup>102</sup>

Not only do Fanon and Dutschke agree that the European working class plays an important role in the continuation of Western imperialism, they also agree that the working class is not realizing what they are doing. Fanon talks about waking up and putting on their thinking caps and for Dutschke it was clear that the West-German ruling class has succeeded in keeping the working class politically immature through their system of ‘repressive tolerance’. It also made clear to Dutschke that Third World oppression and exploitation is the basis of prosperity in the First World.<sup>103</sup>

Nonetheless, and although the First World and the Third World are closely connected in Dutschke’s approach, they remain different and must be kept separated. The violence done by the imperialist forces in the African colonies and Latin-American countries is so visible and obvious, that a violent confrontation is possible. Guerrilla warfare is not only possible there, but perhaps necessary.<sup>104</sup> Personally, Dutschke also was not against picking up the weapons in the Third World. He also said that he thought pacifism could be counterrevolutionary, as a full identification with the need of revolutionary terrorism and struggle in the Third World was a necessary condition in the struggle of people in the Third World and the development of forms of resistance in the First World.<sup>105</sup> However, contrary to the violence in the Third World, Dutschke argued that the First World needed a different approach:

“To call for violence, murder, and killing in the cities of highly developed industrial countries – I think that would be wrong and virtually counterrevolutionary. Because in the metropolises there is basically no one to hate. The government leaders at the top – a Kiesinger, Strauss, or whoever – are bureaucratic character masks. (...) In the Third World: the people hate the form of direct oppression that is represented by puppets, so they fight against them. Here: assassinating members of our government would be

---

<sup>102</sup> Fanon (a), 62

<sup>103</sup> Quinn Slobodian, *Foreign Front: Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012), 59

<sup>104</sup> Wolfgang Kraushaar, Karin Wieland, and Jan Philipp Reemtsma, *Rudi Dutschke, Andreas Baader und die RAF*. (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2005), 43

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid*, 43

absolute madness. Because who does not understand that here the people at the top are interchangeable?”<sup>106</sup>

Violence would thus not lead to the abolishment of structural violence by the West-German state, according to Dutschke, but merely to a change of who is leading the government. However, this did not mean that nothing could be done against the government.

### The options for resistance in the First World

For Dutschke, developing forms of resistance in the First World was in the beginning a task for university students, as they have the ability of critical reasoning, which is systematically denied to mass society. This meant that it was also up to the students to start the process of political emancipation by organizing demonstrations.<sup>107</sup> These demonstrations were rather simple, for instance when they tried to block a department store: protesters collectively entered the store, distributed flyers and tried to disrupt the sales routines of workers in order to, at least temporarily, stop profit maximization. Dutschke argued that these workers were generally sympathetic to the protesters and that these demonstrations were a success, showing a “tactical victory” by a radical small minority over the more powerful forces of the state.<sup>108</sup>

Dutschke’s emphasis in these demonstrations was mostly on its subjective aspects: individual and collective acts had to weaken the psychological control of the consumer ideology that was dominant in the First World. After that had succeeded, Dutschke argued, people in the First World would be able to carry over the struggle from the Third World into the First World.<sup>109</sup> For Dutschke personally, Fanon’s writings on the struggles in the Third World became more important through the collaborative protests in Germany with students from the Third World, especially after the demonstration against the Congolese president Tshombe in December 1964. The cooperation between foreign and German students made Dutschke feel that “the Third World came alive for the first time.”<sup>110</sup> The foreign students were living examples of the “native as a political animal” for Dutschke. That understanding, Fanon had argued, made it possible to form bonds between peoples who are active in different struggles

---

<sup>106</sup> Rudi Dutschke(b), “Wir fordern die Enteignung Axel Springers” [“We Demand the Expropriation of Axel Springer”] (*Der Spiegel*, July 10, 1967), 5 last seen 15 March 2018, [http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub\\_document.cfm?document\\_id=893](http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=893)

<sup>107</sup>Ibid, 2

<sup>108</sup>Alexander Sedlmaier, *Consumption and Violence: Radical Protest in Cold-War West Germany* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2014), 37

<sup>109</sup> Slobodian, 59

<sup>110</sup> Ibid, 61

for liberation around the world.<sup>111</sup> This was exemplified by Rudi Dutschke in a speech at the height of the opposition against the Vietnam War in West-Germany, where he quoted Fanon's experience in Algeria to talk metaphorically about Vietnam, by saying that 'leaving the old behind required a change of one's way', 'darkness is followed by light and the night of colonialism by the dawn of the revolutionary new beginning.'<sup>112</sup>

Besides weakening the psychological control of the consumer ideology in the First World, the demonstrations had two other main functions. First, the demonstrations became, through this physical experience for protestors, an "instrument of struggle for creating consciousness."<sup>113</sup> Second, demonstrations served to make the latent violence of the system visible. According to Dutschke, these 'Direkte Aktionen' had to disrupt the capitalist order, which would cause the latent violence of the state to become manifest and lead to the unmasking of the system as a dictatorship of violence and ultimately force the 'democracy' to openly show its dominating character. These demonstrations should be near the 'Nervpunkte' of society, for instance buildings from the pro-government press, army bases and police stations.<sup>114</sup>

However, Dutschke argues, ultimately it is not up to the students to do more than demonstrating in order to raise political awareness in society. Students can work together with representatives of unions, but ultimately, autonomous work councils, shop stewards and union members are the groups that represent the interests of the workers and they are the ones that can legitimately start a strike. Students cannot persuade workers by going into the factories, but what they can do is help the factory workers with their strike by organizing the right conditions, from organizing fundraisers to setting up daycare for the workers' children.<sup>115</sup>

Although these demonstrations gained in size and gathered more and more attention, Dutschke acknowledged that it is an almost impossible task to raise public awareness, especially when it is only done through illegal demonstrations and actions. Along with these actions, Dutschke argued for the need of 'a long march through the institutions'. This had to start at the weakest link of society. For Dutschke this was the university, as it is the furthest removed from the state apparatus and offered the possibility for true critical reasoning. First the university had to be politicized, then the vocational schools, and so on until finally the whole West-German society was politicized and the evolutionary movement had a solid basis within society. This process was called the 'Focus Theory': focusing on politicizing a small part of society, and then

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 61

<sup>112</sup> **Kalter, discovery of the third world, chap. 5, p. 237**

<sup>113</sup> Ibid, 59

<sup>114</sup> Kraushaar, 39

<sup>115</sup> Dutschke (b), 2-3

continuing to another small part until the whole society has become politicized.<sup>116</sup> This ‘long march through the institutions’ would be supported by a revolutionary uprising of the German ‘counter milieu’, who, according to Dutschke, were the legitimate counterpart of the people in the slums and ghettos of the Third World. The counter milieu was the basis for the ‘Stadt Guerilla’ (city guerrilla), aimed at destroying the ‘system of oppression.’ The idea of a city guerrilla was originally invented by the Tupamaros in Uruguay through their analysis of the Cuban revolution in the 1950’s and through the gradual process of politicizing society, Dutschke argued that the city guerrilla could also take place in West-Germany.<sup>117</sup>

In an article written by Dutschke in 1969, he argued that the revolution in West-Germany was starting to take shape, based on the increasingly negative reaction from the ‘system’: because of the political activity and mass actions, the “‘left-liberal critics’ of the System, from the Spiegel to Zeit (two German newspapers) are clearly beginning to turn against us politically.”<sup>118</sup> In order for this development to continue, Dutschke argued, it was of vital importance to remain “successful in arousing the spontaneity of the wage-dependent masses.”<sup>119</sup>

The spontaneous resistance, Dutschke argued, was beginning to develop all over West-Germany, from Frankfurt to Berlin: “Everywhere “self-appointed vanguards” are being formed which have taken up the struggle against the manipulation and repression of man’s creative capabilities, and they have not been organized by a central authority or otherwise manipulated.”<sup>120</sup> This spontaneity is the strength of the movement according to Dutschke: “the practical awareness of one’s own needs in the making, of one’s own interests and sufferings, prevents the monopolization of the historical interests of individuals in a membership party “representing” the masses.”<sup>121</sup>

For both Fanon and Dutschke spontaneity was of vital importance in the beginning of the struggle: the revolutionary struggle could only begin with unorganized and spontaneous action. Dutschke argued that it was precisely the self-appointing and lack of organization that was the strength of the movement. Fanon even went a step further in his support for spontaneity, arguing that in the beginning of the revolution, ‘spontaneity is king’. The trust both Fanon and Dutschke had in the masses in igniting the revolution shows once more the role they saw for

---

<sup>116</sup>Gerd Langguth, “Rudi Dutschke und das Konzept Stadtguerilla.” In: *40 Jahre 1968. Alte und Neue Mythen*, ed. Bernhard Vogel et al. (Freiburg: Herder, 2008), 51-54

<sup>117</sup> Ibid, 48-49, 53-54

<sup>118</sup> dutschke (a), 249

<sup>119</sup> Ibid, 249

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, 249-250

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, 250

themselves in the struggle and thereby highlights the primacy of action taken by the masses in the first phase of the revolutionary process.

### Dutschke's personal views on the use of violence

Although Dutschke was against the killing of people, he was in favor of attacks against objects. He considered an attack on the means of production of the Springer press agency, if it could be done without killing or injuring a person, an “act of emancipation”.<sup>122</sup> However, this distinction was not always valid. For instance, Dutschke criticized the fact that the Shah of Iran was able to complete his state visit to Germany without being harmed: “In the First World, we do not fight against people, as in my opinion that is counter revolutionary. The system would use that opportunity to crack down on us. However, not seizing the opportunity to injure a despotic ruler, is a sign of a lack of quality in our struggle.”<sup>123</sup> Just like the distinction between the struggles in First World and Third World, Dutschke thus also disconnects action that may be taken against leaders in the First World and Third World.

With regards to Marxist-Leninist groups in Germany, Dutschke associated himself with the pro-violence Red Army Faction when he showed up at the funeral of RAF-member Holger Meins, who died in prison due to a week-long hunger strike. At the funeral, Dutschke raised his fist and shouted “Holger, der kampf geht weiter” (Holger, the struggle continues). Dutschke thought of his death as a ‘half-murder’, and believed “the pigs” (the West-German police) were happy with his death.<sup>124</sup> However, although Dutschke and the RAF had the same enemy, they remained opposed. This was evidenced by Dutschke’s reaction on the killing of Günter von Drenkmann, the president of the German Superior Court of Justice, at the hands of the 2-June-movement, a group allied to the RAF, in the reaction to the death of Holger Meins: “The killing of von Drenkmann is understandable in the German context, as the German class struggle is a political learning process. However, terrorism hampers the learning process of the oppressed and insulted.”<sup>125</sup> Similarly, Dutschke argued that “individual terror will culminate in individual despotism, not socialism. We all know the despotism of capitalism, and do not wish to replace it with another form of despotism.”<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Kraushaar, 44

<sup>123</sup> Kraushaar, 45

<sup>124</sup> Dutschke-Klotz, 346

<sup>125</sup> Kraushaar, 16-17

<sup>126</sup>Rudi Dutschke (c), “Toward Clarifying Criticism of Terrorism”, trans. Jeffrey Herf, *New German Critique* 12 (Autumn 1977): 3

Additionally, Dutschke and the RAF were also opposed on the right of existence for Israel. While the RAF organized a training camp with the PLO in 1970, Dutschke saw the founding of Israel as the “political emancipation of Judaism” and argued that reconciliation between Israel and the Arab masses would also mean human emancipation, and for that goal of human emancipation, Israel must continue to exist under all circumstances.<sup>127</sup>

With regards to international politics, Dutschke was very critical of the Soviet Union. Dutschke was born in East-Germany, but fled to West-Germany in 1961 after he refused to join the East-German army. He later wrote an article under a pseudonym, in which he analyzed that in Stalinist Soviet Union, the Marxist dialectics, concerning the detection and subsequent elimination of contradictions within society, has been absent in the interest of the bureaucrats and technocrats in power.<sup>128</sup> Like Dutschke, Fanon was also critical of the Soviet Union. But their critique differed: Fanon argued that one must refrain from the Soviet Union because it causes the newly independent nation to become part of the Cold War struggle, while the only way to survive is by remaining neutral and finding a way between capitalism and socialism. Implicitly Fanon stated that the Soviet Union ‘is’ socialism, while Dutschke’s argument was a critique on the internal socialist system of the Soviet Union.

## Connecting Fanon and Dutschke

Both Fanon’s and Dutschke’s efforts were mostly concentrated on their own struggle, while the focus in other struggles in the Third World was on the implications it had on the struggle they were both fighting. But despite their different foci, Fanon and Dutschke had a lot in common. As mentioned previously, Fanon and Dutschke shared their critique on the First World’s working class, Dutschke saw what Fanon meant with the native as a ‘political animal’ and both had critique on the Soviet Union, even though they differed on what they critiqued.

And, although Dutschke argued that the First and Third World must remain separated, there are many other similarities to be found. With regards to what structural violence is, Fanon and Dutschke highlight that the core of structural violence is economic exploitation: Fanon argues that the settler’s main purpose for his settlement is economic gain, while Dutschke starts his argument with the worker that is being exploited. The second step for both is the need for the elite to use political violence in order to maintain the economic exploitation, meaning that the social gap between exploiter and exploited must be preserved. For Fanon, an important

---

<sup>127</sup> Kraushaar, 48

<sup>128</sup> Langguth, 50



manner to preserve that gap is through race relations by making it impossible for the exploited black person to become an exploiter, as the power to exploit is only for whites. Dutschke argues that the gap between exploiter and exploited is kept through repressive tolerance, a system that makes it very difficult for the exploited to realize they are being exploited. For both, the police favors the elite and represses the exploited if necessary.

The most important effect of this system of structural violence for both was psychologically. For Fanon, the loss of dignity and self-respect was the worst effect of the oppression. Dutschke critiqued mostly the psychological effect on the state level. For him, the German masses were totally unaware of what was happening, giving the elite the freedom they needed to solely pursue their own interests at the expense of the masses.

The most important reason for the native to use violence, Fanon argued, was that only through violence he loses his feeling of inferiority while gaining back his dignity and self-respect. Also nationally the native becomes liberated, introducing into the native a sense of nationalism and a common ideal. Dutschke saw the violence not yet as an option, but argued that through the 'long march through the institutions' and the 'Direkte Aktionen' the masses would become aware of their psychological oppression. The aim of these actions was to show that the true character of the state is that of a 'dictatorship of violence'. These actions were therefore a first step in order to liberate the masses from this oppression.

However, Fanon and Dutschke agreed on three necessities for the use of violence. First, the violence used by the exploiter must be manifest. For Fanon, this was clear from the outset in Algeria. For Dutschke, the non-violent process had started in order to make the violence of the German elite manifest.

Second, violence is only legitimized when there is a closed society without social mobility. Here Fanon argues about the importance of race. However, this paper argues that behind the issue of race, it is more about the preservation of a gap between two parts of a population rather than race in itself. For instance, as Hans Achterhuis argues, Fanon is also relevant to feminists. Achterhuis compares between Fanon's white man who brought the black man into being and how in modern-day language the 'man brought the woman into being', for instance in the word 'mankind' and not 'humankind'. This shows the superiority of the man over the woman. Just as the black man can never become white, the woman can never become a man. Through his writing, Achterhuis argues, Fanon had made himself an interpreter for all 'wretched of the earth'.<sup>129</sup> By focusing on their race, gender or other physical particularities, a

---

<sup>129</sup> Hans Achterhuis (b), 46

group in power can maintain a certain favorable system. Because of the black man's inability to change this system non-violently, violence becomes legitimized. This closed system is not present in West-Germany. Dutschke argues that it is still possible to change society peacefully, causing him to focus more on the 'march through the institutions.'

The third necessity is on who is allowed to use violence. Both Fanon and Dutschke argued that it should be the ones who are hit the hardest. For Fanon this meant the rural peasantry, which consisted of the majority of the people in Algeria. They were poor and had nothing to gain from a deal with the settler. For Dutschke, the most affected by the violence from the ruling class was the working class. This also meant that both Fanon and Dutschke, because they were not a part of these classes, did not see themselves as legitimate to start with violence. For both, the revolution's first phase consists of spontaneous and unorganized action from the masses. Through these actions, they argue, the revolution will start to take shape. Demonstrations had to weaken the elite's control over the working class, while spontaneous action would eventually cause the government to use manifest violence.

For some, the process of waiting for spontaneous action from the masses took too long. The PLO and the RAF argued that the masses were not spontaneous enough, and argued that the masses can be convinced of using violence by using violence themselves. In their attempt to legitimize their struggles, The PLO used Fanon's writings on violence as an inspiration and legitimization for their own struggle. Next to using Fanon, the RAF also saw its organization as a successor to the German student movement, of which Dutschke had been the leader. The next chapter will research the PLO's and RAF's use of Fanon in their analysis of oppressive violence and how to overcome that situation.

## Chapter Two: the PLO and the RAF

### Palestinian Liberation Organization

From the start of the 1960's, the PLO tried to legitimize its struggle against Israel by connecting it to other Third World struggles. In 1964, Fatah leader Yasser Arafat visited China as part of an Algerian delegation. This visit was a success, as in the years to follow many Palestinians travelled to China for guerrilla training. Moreover, China shipped weapons to Palestine in order to equip more and more Palestinian fighters. Via China, Arafat also visited North Vietnam in 1970 to learn how the Vietnamese had set up their military logistics by visiting factories and army bases.<sup>130</sup> But perhaps the most important trip Arafat took was to Algeria 8 years earlier, in 1962, where Arafat became convinced that the Algerian struggle for independence was similar to the struggle of the Palestinians.<sup>131</sup> Because the Palestinians thought they fought the same sort of struggle as the Algerians, they began to read the books of Frantz Fanon. His influence is visible in many texts produced by Fatah, for instance in the 1967 pamphlet 'Revolution and Violence: the Path to Victory' and 'Revolution Until Victory', which was published around 1970. Especially in 'Revolution and Violence: The Path to Victory' Fanon is quoted frequently. An important part of this pamphlet is the focus on the purifying aspects of violence, for instance in the subtitles "Violence will heal the people of their diseases"<sup>132</sup> and "Violence strengthens the entity of the nation."<sup>133</sup> Likewise, in 'Revolution Until Victory' is written in capital letters "Decolonization is always a violent phenomenon."<sup>134</sup>

The frequent use of quotations begs the question how similar Fanon's writings and the context of the Palestinian struggle and actions of Fatah really were, as Fanon's book consisted not only on violence but also on the Algerian society and instructions on whom is allowed to use violence and how the militants should operate in the context of the Cold War and other Third World liberation struggles.

---

<sup>130</sup> Chamberlin, 25, 30

<sup>131</sup> Daniel Byman, *A High Price: The Triumphs and Failures of Israeli Counterterrorism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 32

<sup>132</sup> Fatah (a), "*El-thawra wa el-3unf: el-tariq ila el-nasr*" [Revolution and Violence: the road to victory] in: *Revolutionary Studies and Experiences*, no. 3 (Beirut: 1967), 24, access via Institute for Palestine Studies.

<sup>133</sup> Ibid, 28

<sup>134</sup> Fatah (b), *Revolution until Victory*. (Circa 1970), (the pamphlet does not have page numbers.)

## The creation of society and its structural violence

The beginning of Fanon's book detailed how the native and settler both came into being by force. Similarly to the native who was unable to stop the settler, Fatah argued that the creation of Israel was "unjust and unwanted."<sup>135</sup> Fatah argued that the creation of Israel was based on "Zionist political myths that, through constant repetition, have acquired the status of facts."<sup>136</sup> Internationally the establishment of Israel was also unwanted, and was only accepted by the United Nations because of "personal partisan pressure of the President of the United States."<sup>137</sup> The partisanship of the United Nations proved to Palestinians that justice was not achievable through Arab or international power politics and that the Palestinians should not put their faith in "a political casino like the United Nations."<sup>138</sup>

In Fanon's theory, the force of the settler was used to set up a society that was characterized by segregation along economic and racial lines. The French justified their colonial rule by economic gain. The French settler needed the Algerians for production and later during the colonial occupation as a consumer. The racial perspective ensured that the settler was rich because he was white, and that he was white because he was rich. Moreover, for his legitimization of violence, it was important for Fanon that the settler had created a static society, in which the native was unable to change his situation. To explain the relationship between the Israelis and Palestinians, Fatah compared it to the Algerian case: "French colonialism in Algeria is an instance of that settler-colonialism, and an even uglier example is the Zionist occupation of part of Palestine, the usurpation of that territory, and the expulsion of its inhabitants."<sup>139</sup> Furthermore, Fatah argued that "colonialism arrived by means of violence and oppression and it will only leave and be eradicated violently as well. Colonialism takes the logic of profit and loss as the measure of its interests. As such, whenever these interests are threatened, it tends to confront the threat by all violent means available, until it finally accepts the need for leaving the colonized country after securing the highest percentage of profit possible."<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Ibid

<sup>136</sup> Ibid

<sup>137</sup> Ibid

<sup>138</sup> Ibid

<sup>139</sup> Fatah (c), *The Liberation of Occupied Countries and the Method of Struggle Against Direct Colonialism*, trans. 'The Palestinian Revolution' in: *Revolutionary Studies and Experiences* no. 8 (1967), last seen 15 March 2018, <http://learnpalestine.politics.ox.ac.uk/uploads/sources/588c768baf7ba.pdf>, page 1

<sup>140</sup> Ibid, 7

## Psychological effects of violence

The 1948 war between Israel and the Palestinians, Fatah argued, had resulted in the “political, economic, social and moral annihilation for the Palestinians.”<sup>141</sup> This annihilation was felt at different levels of society. On a personal level, Fatah argued, the Palestinian suffered not only from the agony of defeat, his refugee status and the contempt of the Arab world, but most importantly lost his dignity because he lost his land and property, two traditionally prestigious goods.<sup>142</sup> As a society, Fatah argued that the Palestinians were “reduced from the status of self-respecting human beings to that of paupers living on international charity or to that of second class citizens living under the yoke of occupation.”<sup>143</sup> And, from a regional perspective, the establishment of Israel had an effect on the relations between Arab nations but also within them. According to Fatah, the disunity, restiveness and lack of national consciousness that plagues the Arab nations was a direct effect of the existence of Israel: “the chief direct cause for all these happenings and facts in Arab life is the existence of Zionist occupation and what it entails in arousing complexes, fears and irrational anxiety among Arabs.”<sup>144</sup> However, in contrast to Fanon, who argued that the native was a victim and suffered from a sense of inferiority, Fatah refused to be represented as a victim. Instead of feeling victimized, Fatah argued for the immediate begin of an armed struggle for liberation.<sup>145</sup>

Revolutionary violence, Fatah argued, would cure the psychological effects caused by the annihilation of the Palestinians. On a personal level, violence increased the self-respect and compensated for the past failings and inadequacies of Palestinians. This message was especially important for the younger generation, who saw themselves as “the generation of revenge.”<sup>146</sup> Fatah argued that violence will cure people from their shortcomings and anxieties, and give them courage and fearlessness when possibly facing death.<sup>147</sup> This was also reiterated in the PLO Charter of 1970, which stated that “the liberation of Palestine, from a human view-point, will restore to the Palestinian his dignity, glory and freedom.”<sup>148</sup>

On a regional level, Fatah argued that countries needed to change their viewpoint with regards to the liberation of Palestine. The phrase “Arab unity as a method for the liberation of

---

<sup>141</sup> Fatah (b)

<sup>142</sup> Yehoshafat Harkabi, *Fedayeen Action and Arab Strategy. Adelphi Papers no. 58*. (London: Institute for Strategic Studies, 1968), 14

<sup>143</sup> Fatah (b)

<sup>144</sup> Harkabi, 8

<sup>145</sup> Ido Zelkovitz, “Militancy and religiosity in the service of national aspiration: Fatah’s formative years,” *Israel Affairs* 21, no. 4 (2015): 672-673

<sup>146</sup> Harkabi, 14

<sup>147</sup> Harkabi, 14

<sup>148</sup> PLO, “The Palestinian National Covenant,” *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 7, no. 4 (1976): 361

Palestine”, which was popular in Arab countries, needed to be reversed to “the liberation of Palestine as a way towards Arab unity.”<sup>149</sup> The reason why this reversal was so important, Fatah argued, was that:

“every revolutionary motto, such as that of unity, when it is carried out, ineluctably creates a new situation, differing qualitatively from the previous situation (...) In order that the motto of unity will materialize there is an inevitable need for introducing a historic change and a fundamental transformation in the shape of Arab society, in short, causing a revolution in the life of this society. Such historic changes are usually achieved by wars, calamities and uncontrollable economic fluctuations. The nearest means of producing such a convulsion and a great historic change (...) is by creating an appropriate environment for a decisive fateful battle between the Arabs and the Zionist enemy.”<sup>150</sup>

The battle against the Zionist enemy was thus the ‘historic change’ needed by the Arab society in order to become unified. Additionally, Fatah argued that the victory over the Zionist enemy will also lead to a unification on a national level: violence ultimately leads to “the establishment of a unitary, democratic and non-sectarian Palestine State in which Christians, Jews and Muslims will have equal rights and obligations, irrespective to race, color or creed.”<sup>151</sup> An important prerequisite to this ideal according to Fatah is the winning over all Jews across the world and most importantly in the occupied homeland, by showing that Fatah is not against Jews, but against Zionism as a “political, racial and colonial movement.”<sup>152</sup> In order for this to be accomplished, “a progressive national liberation movement cannot be motivated by revenge and should not suffer from the racial exclusiveness that characterizes the very enemy it is striving to conquer.”<sup>153</sup> From other texts however, it remains difficult to assess whether Fatah truly saw a difference between Jews and Zionists. In 1967, Fatah argued that:

“the process of liberation is not only to eliminate a colonial base but, more importantly, to eradicate a society. Armed violence must take many forms besides destroying the military forces of the Zionist occupation state, that is, to direct itself towards destroying

---

<sup>149</sup> Zelkovitz, 673-674

<sup>150</sup> Harkabi, 9-10

<sup>151</sup> Fatah (b)

<sup>152</sup> Fatah (b)

<sup>153</sup> Ibid

the existential basis of Zionist society in all its industrial, agricultural, and financial aspects. Armed violence must aim to destroy all the military, political, economic, financial, and intellectual institutions of the Zionist occupation state until it is impossible for a new Zionist society to arise (again).”<sup>154</sup>

The broad definition of what contains Zionist elements in Fatah’s view coupled with their ideal to win over all Jews across the world seems contradictory. The balancing between two, according to Fatah, different groups was not present in Fanon’s work. For Fanon, anything colonial was a target. On a psychological level, Fatah and Fanon agreed on the results of violence. Fanon argued that violence would help the native to regain his dignity, and on a national level, help to unify the country. Fatah adds a regional perspective, arguing that the battle with Israel unifies the whole Arab region.

### The use of guerrilla warfare

To accomplish victory, Fanon argued that the best strategy was to conduct guerrilla warfare. As noted in the previous chapter, guerrilla warfare had to target the economic structure of the settler, as the colonial occupation was an economic project. The idea behind that was that a lack of economic gain in the colony would ensure the retreat of the settler.

In the case of Fatah and the PFLP, warfare went through two different stages. In the first phase, roughly between the end of the June 1967 war and the beginning of 1968, guerrilla warfare mostly targeted the Israeli army. Not harming citizens was justified by Fatah by arguing that the Israeli army did not attack Palestinian citizens as well.<sup>155</sup> Due to the ineffectiveness of this plan, as the limited confrontations did not yield enough results for the Palestinians, a recasting of who the enemy was, was needed. In the second phase, Fatah argued that it had to show the Israelis that they were able to carry out similar actions. The target of Fatah’s attack now was on weakening of the Israeli economy, by deterring tourism and prevent Jewish immigration, which ultimately had to make “the Zionists feel that life in Israel is impossible.”<sup>156</sup>

This rationale was given an international dimension by the PFLP, who hijacked an Israeli flight from Rome to Tel Aviv on 23 July 1968. The PFLP justified international terrorism by insisting that attacking aviation and maritime routes should not be seen as attacks on

---

<sup>154</sup> Yazid Sayigh, *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement, 1949-1993* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 212

<sup>155</sup> Ibid, 211-212

<sup>156</sup> Ibid, 211

civilians, due to the highly militarized nature of Israeli society. After all, the PFLP argued, El Al-pilots were military personnel dressed in civilian clothing.<sup>157</sup> The use of international terrorism complicates the previously mentioned claim by Fatah that it only targeted Zionist society and not Jews. And even if that claim was to be true, it is highly doubtful that it would have been convincing for ‘non-Zionist Jews’ in Israel.

The last important part of the legitimization of violence by Fanon concerned the question of whom is allowed to use violence. In contrast to Fanon, Fatah’s view on class and class struggle was rather vague. On the one hand, Fatah rejected the idea of a class struggle, because it was hurtful for the unity between Palestinians.<sup>158</sup> The closest Fatah came to a division of society in classes was that Fatah was the “class of the refugees” which meant that there was “no difference between workers, peasants and rich people.”<sup>159</sup> On the other hand, in one of Fatah’s pamphlets from 1967, titled ‘The liberation of occupied countries and the method of struggle against direct colonialism’, Fatah elaborates how they see the class struggle in light of the conflict. In this pamphlet, the influence of Fanon is clearly visible, yet at the same time very different. Fatah stressed that “the starting point for the liberation of occupied countries is dependence on the masses as a revolutionary power”, but also that the individuals belonging to the national bourgeoisie had a big role in the struggle against colonialism.<sup>160</sup> Although the masses are the starting point of the revolution, they can become an instrument of sabotage. Moreover, their actions must not take place in a spontaneous manner. Therefore, Fatah argues, a revolutionary vanguard is needed that leads the armed struggle towards the defeat of colonialism. This armed struggle is also a necessity, as “political work alone is not sufficient to move the masses in a constant manner.”<sup>161</sup>

Fanon’s theory on who was allowed to use violence was adapted by Fatah on multiple points. Fanon argued against a role for the national bourgeoisie in the first stages of the liberation struggle, arguing that they are afraid to lose their comfortable lives and are thus willing to negotiate with the settler. Second, Fanon never argued that the masses can become an instrument of sabotage. For Fanon, the majority of the population, the rural masses had nothing to gain from a deal with the settler. The urban masses however, due to their misery and political unawareness, could be seduced by either side. Lastly, Fanon was very much in favor of spontaneous actions from the rural masses. The revolutionary vanguard was thus not needed.

---

<sup>157</sup> Ibid, 214

<sup>158</sup> Rubin, 33

<sup>159</sup> Sayigh, 199

<sup>160</sup> Fatah (c), 2-3

<sup>161</sup> Idem, 4-5



## The international context

Fanon was convinced that the Algerian struggle must not be influenced by the Cold War. It was necessary to refrain from joining either the Soviet Union or the United States. Fanon argued that it was important as the battle between the two global powers is fought out in Third World countries. Refraining from both would ensure a peaceful future. Especially in the beginning, Fatah followed this line of reasoning by establishing relations with China, Vietnam and Algeria.<sup>162</sup> Over time, the relations between Fatah and the Soviet Union developed. Between 1970 and 1972 Arafat visited Moscow three times and the Soviet Union started to give limited military aid. The cooperation increased again because of the rapprochement between Egypt and the USA, causing Fatah to believe that the Soviet Union had a major role in neutralizing 'a new American plot'. The PLO even opened an office in Moscow in 1974.<sup>163</sup> But while Fanon thought of the bond between Third World struggles as a way to divide the military of the imperial powers over multiple places, the PLO formed a more practical bond with other liberation organizations. The contacts with Moscow also led to visits by Arafat to East Germany between 1970 and 1973 and led to the opening of a PLO office in East Germany. Moreover, through these contacts ties between the PLO and West-German terrorist organizations like the Red Army Faction were established.<sup>164</sup> This culminated in the visit of the RAF to Jordan to train with the PFLP and Fatah.

---

<sup>162</sup> Chamberlin, 30

<sup>163</sup> Eli Karmon, *Coalitions between Terrorist Organizations: Revolutionaries, Nationalists, and Islamists* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2005), 254, 257

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid*, 256

## Red Army Faction

The establishment of the Red Army Faction was rooted in the International Vietnam Congress in February 1968, which was organized in West-Berlin by the German Student Movement (Sozialistischer Deutsche Studentenbund, SDS). During the congress, it was discussed how German revolutionaries could help the struggle of different peoples in the Third World. The most important question in that discussion was whether revolutionaries in the First World could use violence in order to create “two, three, many Vietnams.”<sup>165</sup> At the end of the Congress, the answer to this question was left rather open: “In this situation, the opposition movement in the capitalist countries must take its fight to a new level, expand its actions, sharpen and concretize. The opposition movement is facing the transition from protest to political resistance.” This vague answer led to a crisis between pacifistic and more violent members within the SDS, which reached its highest point after the shooting of Rudi Dutschke later in 1968. The group that came to the most radical interpretation of the call for support of the Third World liberation struggles, was the Red Army Faction.<sup>166</sup>

### Structural violence according to the RAF

The RAF first became prominent when Andreas Baader was convicted for the setting on fire of two department stores in Frankfurt am Main, together with Gudrun Ensslin and two others, Thorwald Proll and Horst Söhnlein. Shortly after, the RAF issued their first communique, titled ‘Build the Red Army!’, directing its attention mainly to the poorest people in society, as the RAF argued that they are the ones who will understand them: “those who receive no compensation for the exploitation they must suffer. Not in their standard of living, not in their consumption, not in the form of mortgages, not in the form of even limited credit, not in the form of midsize cars. Those who cannot even hope for these baubles, who are not seduced by all of that.”<sup>167</sup> The RAF thereby claims to act on behalf of the most exploited people of society, who are also those who die “in the service of the exploiter”:

“20,000 die every year because the stockholders of the automobile industry only care about profit and, therefore, don’t stop to consider technical safety issues for automobiles

---

<sup>165</sup> Christopher Daase, “Die RAF und der internationale Terrorismus. Zur transnationalen Kooperation klandestiner Organisationen,” in: *Die RAF und der linke Terrorismus*, ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2006), 914

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 914

<sup>167</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 154

or road construction. 5,000 people die every year at their workplace or on their way to or from it, because the owners of the means of production only consider their profits and don't care about an increase or a decline in the number of accidental deaths. 12,000 commit suicide every year, because they don't want to die in the service of capital; they'd rather just get it over with themselves. 1,000 children are murdered every year, as a result of living in low quality housing, the only purpose of which is to allow the landlord to pocket a large sum.”<sup>168</sup>

According to the RAF, these deaths are considered “normal”, while on the other hand, the actions of people who cope with these conditions “are perceived as crimes.” This perspective of ‘normal’ and ‘not normal’ is necessary for the ruling class, because without it, they “could not maintain their rule.”<sup>169</sup> The police is instrumental in maintaining this perspective in society: “With this comes the way that the pigs (the police) use censorship, layoffs, dismissals, along with bailiff’s seals and billy clubs. Obviously, they reach for their service revolvers, their teargas, their grenades, and their semi-automatic weapons; obviously, they escalate, if nothing else does the trick.”<sup>170</sup>

The RAF’s claim of division between exploited and exploiter also becomes clear in the closing statement of Proll at his trial for setting fire to the two department stores, during which he argued what was wrong with the West-German justice system by highlighting two main aspects. First, according to Proll, “justice is the justice of the ruling class”, which he substantiated by the claims that “the justice system says it represents the people, but means it represents the ruling class” and that “the ruling morality is bourgeois morality, and bourgeois morality is immoral.”<sup>171</sup> The second aspect is related to the fascist past of Germany. Proll claimed that the justice system is still fascist in its nature, because the justice system charged “anyone that swore the oath to Hitler, an act the entire justice system quite willingly engaged in itself in 1933” and that the justice system “prosecutes the minor murderers of Jews and lets the major murderers of Jews run around free.”<sup>172</sup>

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid, 214

<sup>169</sup> Ibid, 214

<sup>170</sup> Ibid, 155-156

<sup>171</sup> Ibid, 136-138

<sup>172</sup> Ibid, 136-137

## Psychological suffering because of the system

Charging the imperialist system, consisting of the USA, Japan and Western Europe under the leadership of West-Germany<sup>173</sup>, with 'being fascist' was done repeatedly by the RAF in connection to the Third World. For instance, the RAF claimed that what happened in Vietnam was similar to the genocide of Jews in Auschwitz. At the Stammheim trial in 1973, Ensslin's lawyer connected Vietnam to Auschwitz by pointing to the famous image of a Vietnamese child, burned by napalm, walking towards a photographer, and asking how this image is different from a Jewish child in a ghetto that walks towards SS-men with his hands raised.<sup>174</sup> Likewise, in a communique sent after the attack on the U.S. military headquarters in Heidelberg, the RAF referred to the American bombing of Vietnam as: "This is genocide, the slaughter of a people; this is "the final solution"; this is Auschwitz."<sup>175</sup> They also labeled Israel's policies in the Middle East as "Israeli Nazi fascism" in their statement regarding the Black September attack at the 1972 Munich Olympics.<sup>176</sup> By connecting Nazi Germany with imperialism, the RAF battled both the past and the present, as there was still a major psychological burden on Germany's postwar generation as to how Hitler's rule could have happened. Because of the feeling of guilt, this question was left largely unanswered in German society.<sup>177</sup>

In addition to this, the poor also suffered psychologically from their exploitation. The RAF argued this becomes visible in their aggression: "They (the poor) generally direct their aggression against themselves rather than against their oppressors. The objects of their aggression are usually other poor people, not those who benefit from their poverty. Not the real estate companies, the banks, the insurance companies, the corporations and the city planners, but rather other victims."<sup>178</sup>

Aggression within the lowest class of society as a result of psychological suffering is also present in Fanon's book, in his description of the behavior of the black man: "the colonized subject will first train this aggressiveness sedimented in his muscles against his own people. This is the period when black turns on black, and police officers and magistrates don't know which way to turn when faced with the surprising surge of North African criminality."<sup>179</sup> But while Fanon argues that it is also these people who are the most spontaneous and revolutionary,

---

<sup>173</sup> Ibid, 329

<sup>174</sup> Klimke and Mausbach, 624

<sup>175</sup> Smith and Moncourt, 292

<sup>176</sup> Ibid, 339

<sup>177</sup> Jeremy Varon, *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 189

<sup>178</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 247

<sup>179</sup> Fanon (a), 15-16

and ultimately understand that only violence pays<sup>180</sup>, the RAF argues otherwise, stating that “the poor are not spontaneous and of their own accord revolutionary.”<sup>181</sup>

In conclusion, the RAF, like Fanon and Dutschke, sees structural violence as economic violence that is maintained through political violence. The exploited is, in Fanon’s terms, always guilty because the justice system only represents the ruling class. The police is the most visible part of the entire system through their use of violence. A key difference between Dutschke and the RAF is their use of Germany’s fascist past. In Dutschke’s analysis of structural violence, the link with fascism is never made, while the RAF makes frequent use of the, in its view, apparent similarity. The reason for this difference is that the RAF needed the charge of fascism to legitimize the need for greater militancy, while Dutschke was not in favor of violence.<sup>182</sup> Fanon’s critique of the European working class, which needed to realize they had an influence on the exploitation in the Third World, is similar to both Dutschke and the RAF. Difference is that for Fanon, the exploited people in the Third World eventually figured out themselves that violence was necessary, while in the West-Germany, Dutschke and the RAF argued that the exploited people needed to be helped before they realized their situation.

### Legitimization of the use of violence

In the same manner as the comparison between the actions of Nazi Germany and the American bombings in Vietnam, the RAF argues that there is no difference between the situation in the First and Third World. A common critique put forward by critics of the RAF, according to the RAF itself, is that “to use counter violence (the Latin American urban guerilla model) which is meant to be used against a terrorist capitalist ruling class, in a country where one can discuss workers’ participation, is to make a mockery of the wretched of the earth.”<sup>183</sup> This type of argument is, the RAF argues, often “advanced by people who speak about current affairs from a perspective in which their monthly income is secure, and who speak in a way which keeps it secure; it is an example of human coldness and intellectual arrogance in the face of the problems of people here.”<sup>184</sup> Because following the logic of a difference between the First and Third World, “to bomb BASF (a German multinational chemical company) in

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid, 23

<sup>181</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 247

<sup>182</sup> Varon, 189

<sup>183</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 242

<sup>184</sup> Ibid, 243

Ludwigshafen would be to mock the people who bombed BASF in Brazil. The Latin American comrades feel differently. BASF does as well.”<sup>185</sup>

The attempt to delegitimize the opponents of the RAF was continued by Meinhof after the failed assassination attempt of Rudi Dutschke. According to her, critics of the nonviolent student protests often labeled it ‘terrorism’. Opposing this label, she argued that the students’ violence, mostly comprised of throwing stones, smashing windows and demolishing offices, was justified as a means of resistance against the terror of the state. Those who argued that it was terrorism, she argued, failed to assess the bombs on Vietnam, the terror of the state in Persia and the Apartheid-regime in South Africa along the same lines. Moreover, the opponents of the student movement did not have the moral legitimization to argue against the students’ action as they were the representatives of the violent system.<sup>186</sup>

One of the most important targets to delegitimize for the students was Springer press. The RAF had never liked the manner in which journalism functioned within a capitalist society: “Journalism is about one thing: sales—news a commodity; information a consumer product. Whatever isn’t suitable for consumption is bound to make them sick.”<sup>187</sup> This was coupled with what Dutschke and the RAF argued was the censorship of the press in favor of the elite by upholding a monopoly on information services. Consumers of Springer’s news were victims of manipulation and puppets in maintaining the power structures within the state. Especially Springer’s support of the ‘economic miracle’ of West Germany was called into question by the protesters.<sup>188</sup>

### The success of igniting class struggle

According to the RAF, there are two main reasons why guerilla warfare is best suited to win the struggle: first, it unites the national and international struggle and makes it possible to understand the imperialist rule and second, guerilla warfare is best suited when the struggle is waged from an overall position of weakness. Also, without guerilla warfare, an advance in the class struggle cannot be made.<sup>189</sup> The effect of this type of warfare is that the ruling class is “obliged to violate their own system, and in so doing they show their true colors as enemies of the people.” Furthermore, the RAF argued the response to the violence of the RAF by the ruling

---

<sup>185</sup> Ibid, 243

<sup>186</sup> Sedlmaier, 55-56

<sup>187</sup> Ibid, 168

<sup>188</sup> Ibid, 169

<sup>189</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 221

class is not aimed at the RAF, but at the overall development of the class struggle.<sup>190</sup> One form of action was to attack representatives of capitalism, as a way to attack capitalism as a whole.<sup>191</sup> This reasoning is contrary to Dutschke's argument that personal attacks "only lead to despotism, and not socialism."

Regarding the RAF's logic that there is no difference between the First and Third World is followed, the RAF's actions are similar to actions that were legitimate according to Fanon, as Fanon argued that the exploiter is always the target. However, this logic was not shared by Fanon, as he placed his writings firmly in the context of anti-colonial struggles and never argued that the struggle in Algeria was transferable to the First World.<sup>192</sup>

The call to militancy is needed for two reasons according to the RAF. First, without militant struggle the political system would not change: "If the red army is not simultaneously built, then all conflict, all the political work carried out in the factories and in Wedding and in the Märkisch neighborhood and at Plötze (three districts in Berlin) and in the courtrooms is reduced to reformism; which is to say, you end up with improved discipline, improved intimidation, and improved exploitation. That destroys the people, rather than destroying what destroys the people!"<sup>193</sup> The second reason was that without militant struggle "it is not possible to create a unifying strategy for the working class with the current conditions in the West-Germany: "without a revolutionary initiative, without the practical revolutionary intervention of the socialist workers and intellectuals, and without concrete anti-imperialist struggle, there will be no unifying process. (...) Unity can only be created through the common struggle of the conscious section of the working class and the intellectuals, one which they do not stage-manage, but which they model, or else it will not happen at all."<sup>194</sup>

That violence caused a unifying effect was also present in Fanon's writing, as he argued that violence would cause the native to abandon the individualism of the settler and focus on his community. On the other hand, The RAF differed from Fanon with their theory that they had to start the violent struggle, which would convince the working class that they were right and mark the beginning of the revolution. The struggle thus became highly structured, highlighted by the planned attacks, instead of advocating for spontaneous action from the workers. For Fanon, the 'revolutionary initiative' was the spontaneous action from the masses,

---

<sup>190</sup> Ibid, 240

<sup>191</sup> Varon, 190

<sup>192</sup> Sabine Kebir, *Revolutionäre Subjekte bei Frantz Fanon*, last seen 19-2-2018, <http://www.bpb.de/apuz/31323/revolutionaere-subjekte-bei-frantz-fanon>

<sup>193</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 156

<sup>194</sup> Ibid, 173

who would ultimately be transformed into a revolutionary war. Its success, according to Fanon, was its unpredictability and thereby making it difficult for the oppressor to know who should be arrested.

### International context

The RAF often pointed to the role of the United States in the Third World liberation struggles. The Soviet Union on the other hand was barely mentioned in RAF communiqués. In all communiqués issued by the RAF between their founding and their statement regarding the Munich Olympics attack, the RAF mentioned the term ‘Soviet Union’ only once, in their argument that the United States needs their ‘alliance’ with the Soviet Union “in order to have a free hand for its wars of aggression in the Third World.”<sup>195</sup> But while the first generation RAF-members had little contact with East-Germany and the Soviet Union, the second generation, active from 1972 until 1982, made frequent use of East-Germany and the Soviet Union in their operations. The Stasi, the East-German secret police, had actively trained RAF-members in the use of weapons, including RPG’s, while also providing a safe haven for RAF-members who wanted to quit.<sup>196</sup>

In the legitimization of their attacks, the RAF often pointed to events around the world, for instance the communiqué called ‘For the Victory of the People of Vietnam’ which was issued by the RAF after their bombing of the Frankfurt headquarters of the US army. Similarly, they also approved terrorist attacks of foreign groups on West-German soil, evidenced by the statement regarding the Black September action at the Munich Olympics was praised in a 68-page document. The relations between the PLO and the RAF had been established during their training camp in Jordan in 1970 and would also lead to combined action, for instance the hijacking of Lufthansa flight 181 in 1977.

On both the role of the Soviet Union as on the rightfulness of the existence of Israel the RAF and Dutschke differed. Dutschke had been critical on the Soviet Union for its lack of socialist values while the RAF never critiqued them, even accepting help on different occasions. Moreover, while Dutschke and the RAF agreed on Algeria, Cuba and Vietnam, they differed on who was fighting for freedom in Israel. Dutschke saw Israel as a political and humane emancipation of the Jews, while the RAF justified the horror attacks by the PLO, who fought for the abolishment of Israel.

---

<sup>195</sup> Smith and Moncourt (a), 165

<sup>196</sup> Assaf Moghadam, “Failure and Disengagement in the Red Army Faction,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 35, no. 2 (2012): 168



## Conclusion

The objective of this research was to examine theories of structural violence and to explore how these theories influenced revolutionary movements of the 60's and 70's, by using an intellectual historic approach. As set out in the introduction, intellectual historians seek to understand the experiences of people in the past, as experiences generate particular ideas that might play a part in shaping lived experiences and what followed from it. They try to understand the meaning of texts and ideas mainly by identifying the intentions of an author. The goal is to display what the author 'was doing' by keeping in mind what the author intended to do and had succeeded in doing as interpreted by the responses of other authors. Bearing this in mind, the research question was: *What was Frantz Fanon's theory of violence and how was this theory interpreted by Rudi Dutschke and revolutionary movements during the 1960's and 1970's?*

### Analysis of the oppressor's violence

In comparing Fanon's analysis of the oppressor's system with the ideas of Dutschke, the PLO and the RAF, there are three main similarities found: the goal of the oppressor's system is economic, which is enabled by a political and judicial system that works in the interests of the oppressor. On the lower classes of society, this system leads to psychological suffering.

For Fanon, the cause of the colonizer's violence had an economic reason. To ensure the maximization of profit in the colonized lands, a system had to be created that worked in favor of the colonizer. That also meant a political and judicial system was created in which the oppressor was always right. The police functioned on behalf of the oppressor. The most important effect of this way of governing for Fanon was that it created psychological suffering for the native, most notably in his feeling of inferiority.

The maximization of profit is also what Dutschke described as the main goal of the West German elite. He also argued that the police and judicial system were losing their impartiality, evidenced by the police's role in suddenly stopping demonstrations. Additionally, through the media, the economic elite had created a system of repressive tolerance that blocked dissent and had internalized the ideas and norms of the capitalist bourgeoisie. This ensured that the lower classes of society functioned in the interest of the ruling class.

The PLO argued that the invasion of Palestine by the Zionists was a next step in the process of colonization, by the expulsion of the native. The oppressor will leave only when the highest percentage of profit possible has been achieved. Justice via the international system was not achievable for the Palestinians, because of the pressure of the United States on the United Nations. The Zionist invasion, the PLO argued, caused psychological effects on a personal,

societal and regional level. For the Palestinian, this was mostly a loss of dignity and self-respect, while on a regional level, the existence of Israel caused disunity and restiveness.

The RAF claimed to struggle on behalf of the most exploited people within West-German society. They are the ones who die at the hands of the exploiter, with their deaths considered normal. The RAF argues that the police acts on behalf of the exploiter, who by their actions maintain this system. The result of this system, the RAF continued, is that poor people are hurt psychologically, aiming their anger at other poor people instead of at the cause of their psychological suffering, the exploiter.

The lack of equality between men and the lack of a just system prompted all four to follow a revolutionary path, by promoting a sort of utopia in which all men are equal and the psychological effects of oppression are eradicated. While they had similar views about the need for this utopia, the manner in which this had to be achieved, differed between the four actors.

### Overcoming violence

Fanon advocated for the use of violence as the only way of getting rid of the psychological feeling of inferiority. Non-violence is not an option, as a just system is not in the interest of the colonizer as the colonizer needs an unjust system for its profit maximization. For Fanon, only the rural peasantry is allowed to use violence, as they are the ones who are hit the hardest by the colonization. Spontaneity in their attacks on the colonizer is the best way to defeat the opponent, as they will then not be able to use their superiority of force. Last important point for Fanon is to remain independent from both the United States and Soviet Union, and only reinforce ties with other revolutionary movements and Third World countries.

Dutschke, living in the First World, argues that a non-violent revolution is still possible in West Germany. The students are tasked with starting the process of political emancipation to break through the media's repressive tolerance. However, only the most exploited people, which for Dutschke are the masses, are allowed to start strikes and force a change in the system. Like Fanon, Dutschke argues for the primacy of spontaneity, arguing that spontaneity prevents the masses from being neutralized by a membership party that says they "represent" the masses and thereby prevents a revolution from taking place. Dutschke was also very critical of both the United States as well as the Soviet Union.

Unlike Dutschke, who did not deviate from Fanon on most points, the PLO and the RAF interpreted Fanon's argumentation on how to overcome the violent oppressor more loosely. Fanon's claim that violence would liberate the masses psychologically is also argued by the PLO and the RAF and both groups had resorted to guerrilla warfare. However, they disagreed

with Fanon in that they both argued that the masses were not spontaneous in their nature. While Fanon argued for the importance of spontaneous action, the PLO and the RAF argued that the oppressed needed to be convinced to start the struggle. And, as for both political action was not enough, it was their task to start the revolutionary struggle. Fanon's idea that it could only be the masses who start the struggle, was thus also not adopted by both groups. With regards to the international context, Fanon's emphasis to refrain from either the Soviet Union or the United States. While both fiercely opposed the United States, both did start to cooperate with the Soviet Union. The PLO received weapons, while the RAF made increasingly use of the Soviet Union for weapons and training.

### The legacy of Frantz Fanon's ideas on violence

As is clear from the pages above, utilizing Fanon's views by other theorists and revolutionary groups in the 1960's and 1970's was mainly done in relation to how the oppressor's system is set up and what the psychological implications of that system were. This also shows in the use of quoting Fanon when Dutschke, the PLO and the RAF made a statement: they used Fanon more frequently when trying to describe the system of oppression than to describe why counter violence is necessary. For Dutschke, the PLO and the RAF, overcoming violence depended more on context than on Fanon's theory. Therefore, we should view Fanon's contribution to our understanding of colonialism by his analysis of the oppression imbued in colonization, rather than his championing of violence as a means to overcome oppression.

## Bibliography

- 3Sat, “Retro spezial 1968 Jahr des Aufstands,“ published on YouTube 5 January, 2011, last visited 15 March 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8v3bcJLaG6I&t=4196s>
- Achterhuis, Hans (a). *Filosofen van de derde Wereld*. Baarn: Ambo bv, 1975.
- Achterhuis, Hans (b). *Met Alle Geweld: Een Filosofische Zoektocht*. Rotterdam, Lemniscaat: 2008.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata B. “Voices of the governed: towards a theory of the translocal,” *Organization* 18, no. 3 (2011): 323-344
- Bulhan, Hussein Abdilahi. “Frantz Fanon.” *Race & Class* 21, no. 3 (2016): 251-272.
- Byman, Daniel. *A High Price: The Triumphs and Failures of Israeli Counterterrorism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Chamberlin, Paul. “The Struggle Against Oppression Everywhere: The Global Politics of Palestinian Liberation.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 47 no. 1 (2011): 25-41.
- Cleveland, William L. and Martin Bunton. *A history of the modern middle east*, 4th ed. Philadelphia: Westview Press, 2009.
- Daase, Christopher. “Die RAF und der internationale Terrorismus. Zur transnationalen Kooperation klandestiner Organisationen,” in: *Die RAF und der linke Terrorismus*, ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar, 905-931. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2006.
- Demenchonok, Edward, and Richard Peterson. “Globalization and Violence: The Challenge to Ethics,” *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 68, no. 1 (2009): 51-76
- Dutschke, Rudi (a), “On anti-authoritarianism,” trans. Salvator Attanasio,” in: *The New Left Reader*, ed. Carl Oglesby. USA: Grove Press, 1969.
- Dutschke, Rudi (b), “Wir fordern die Enteignung Axel Springers” [“We Demand the Expropriation of Axel Springer”] (*Der Spiegel*, July 10, 1967), 5 last seen 15 March 2018, [http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub\\_document.cfm?document\\_id=893](http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=893).
- Dutschke, Rudi (c). “Toward Clarifying Criticism of Terrorism.” trans. Jeffrey Herf, *New German Critique* 12 (Autumn 1977): 9-10.
- Dutschke-Klotz, Gretchen. *Wir Hatten Ein Barbarisches, Schönes Leben: Rudi Dutschke: Eine Biographie*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer&Witsch, 1996.
- Fanon, Frantz (a). *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
- Fanon, Frantz (b). *Black Skins, White Masks*. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

- Fatah (a). “*El-thawra wa el-3unf: el-tariq ila el-nasr*” [Revolution and Violence: the road to victory] in: *Revolutionary Studies and Experiences*, no. 3 (Beirut: 1967): 1-31 access via Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Fatah (b). *Revolution until Victory*. Circa 1970: no page numbers.
- Fatah (c). *The Liberation of Occupied Countries and the Method of Struggle Against Direct Colonialism*,” trans. ‘The Palestinian Revolution’ in: *Revolutionary Studies and Experiences* no. 8 (Beirut: 1967), last seen 15 March 2018, <http://learnpalestine.politics.ox.ac.uk/uploads/sources/588c768baf7ba.pdf>.
- Farmer, Paul. “An Anthropology of Structural Violence.” *Current Anthropology* 45, no. 3 (2004): 305-325.
- Galtung, Johan. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 167-191.
- Harkabi, Yehoshafat. *Fedayeen Action and Arab Strategy. Adelphi Papers no. 58*. London: Institute for Strategic Studies, 1968..
- Hudis, Peter. *Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades. Revolutionary Lives*. London: Pluto Press, 2015.
- Jander, Martin. “German Leftist Terrorism and Israel: Ethno-Nationalist, Religious-Fundamentalist, or Social-Revolutionary?” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 38, no. 6 (2015): 456-477.
- Karmon, Eli. *Coalitions between Terrorist Organizations: Revolutionaries, Nationalists, and Islamists*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2005.
- Kebir, Sabine. “Gewalt und Demokratie bei Fanon, Sartre und der RAF,” in: *Die RAF und der linke Terrorismus*, ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar, 262-279. Hamburg: Hamburg Edition, 2006.
- Kebir, Sabine. *Revolutionäre Subjekte bei Frantz Fanon*, last seen 19-2-2018, <http://www.bpb.de/apuz/31323/revolutionaere-subjekte-bei-frantz-fanon>.
- Klimke, Martin, and Wilfried Mausbach. “Auf der äußeren Linie der Befreiungskriege. Die RAF und der Vietnamkonflikt,” in: *Die RAF und der linke Terrorismus*, ed. Wolfgang Kraushaar, 620-643. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2006.
- Kraushaar, Wolfgang, Karin Wieland, and Jan Philipp Reemtsma. *Rudi Dutschke, Andreas Baader und die RAF*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2005.
- Langguth, Gerd. “Rudi Dutschke und das Konzept Stadtguerilla.” In: *40 Jahre 1968. Alte und Neue Mythen*, ed. Bernhard Vogel et al. Freiburg: Herder, 2008.

- Meyer, John W. "Globalization: Theory and Trends," *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 48, no. 4 (2007): 261-273
- Moghadam, Assaf. "Failure and Disengagement in the Red Army Faction" *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 35, no. 2 (2012): 156-181.
- Müller, Jan-Werner. "1968 as event, milieu and ideology." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 7, no. 1 (2002): 15-37.
- PLO. "The Palestinian National Covenant." *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 7, no. 4 (1976): 360-362.
- Red Army Faction, *RAF-Auflösungserklärung*, March 1998, last seen 14-3-2018, link: <http://www.rafinfo.de/archiv/raf/raf-20-4-98.php>.
- Rubin, Barry M. *Revolution until Victory?: The Politics and History of the PLO*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Sayigh, Yazid. *Armed Struggle and the Search for State: The Palestinian National Movement, 1949-1993*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Sedlmaier, Alexander. *Consumption and Violence: Radical Protest in Cold-War West Germany*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2014
- Slobodian, Quinn. *Foreign Front: Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2012.
- Smith, J. and André Moncourt (a). *The Red Army Faction: A Documentary History: Volume 1, Projectiles for the People*. Montreal, Quebec: Kersplebedeb, 2009.
- Smith, J. and André Moncourt (b). *Daring to Struggle, Failing to Win: The Red Army Faction's 1977 Campaign of Desperation*. Oakland, California: PM Press, 2008.
- Varon, Jeremy. *Bringing the War Home: The Weather Underground, the Red Army Faction, and Revolutionary Violence in the Sixties and Seventies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Whatmore, Richard. "Quentin Skinner and the Relevance of Intellectual History," in: *A Companion to Intellectual History*, ed. Richard Whatmore and B.W. Young, 97-112. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.
- Wolff, Robert Paul, Barrington Moore, and Herbert Marcuse. *A critique of Pure Tolerance*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- Zahar, Renate. *Frantz Fanon: Colonialism and Alienation: Concerning Frantz Fanon's Political Theory*, trans. Willfried F. Feuser. New York: Montly Review Press, 1974.

- Zerkovitz, Ido. "Militancy and religiosity in the service of national aspiration: Fatah's formative years." *Israel Affairs* 21, no. 4 (2015): 668-690.