

---

consumption is accordingly looked at in some detail, but the use of reports as a more significant part of the hearing than matters put in mitigation by children's solicitors highlights a system under which legal representation is to assist a child present his/her case, as distinct from that pertaining in New South Wales where advocacy is generally little different from that in adult courts. Nevertheless the way in which solicitors also adapt the information in reports to the best advantage of their clients when addressing the court is treated in some depth. The dynamics of families and the reactions of the justices to differing social situations — 'Is mother on the booze?' — receive a concentration of effort, as do views that school attendance is necessarily part of containment and control of children.

This book is not about new ways of dealing with young offenders, nor does it focus on whether the system accords due process or how well the justices acquit themselves in deciding questions of law. It is about the social dimensions of jurisdiction and how magistrates treat information with which they are presented — and how the providers of that information in their turn formulate it with a view to the magistrates' consumption. With so many direct comments quoted (from magistrates and other participants) one can find both attitudes to be criticised and thoughts to be commended; the author has provided a valuable insight for those outside the jurisdiction to study and for those within to ponder upon.

RODNEY BLACKMORE\*

---

*Violence, Terrorism and Justice*, by R G Frey and C W Morris, Cambridge University Press, USA, 1991.

### TERRORISM FROM THE BOWLING GREEN

This is a collection of essays on the moral dimensions of "terrorism", taken from papers given at a 1988 conference at the placidly named Bowling Green University, Ohio. The authors are mainly academic philosophers who apply their minds to the questions of principle surrounding political violence.

Surprisingly, there is little in-depth analysis of the political origins and utility of the term "terrorism". The editors raise the definitional problem, then dispose of it by the end of page one: "terrorism" is to be considered simply "a type of violence", the boundaries of which can be interpreted at will or according to cultural need.

Editors Frey and Morris, convenors of the conference, go on to describe terrorism as a type of violence that creates terror, is characterised by its "random" use and targets non-combatants. With these assumptions they look at the possible justifications of terrorism, discussing consequentialist perspectives and those from Lockian and Kantian theory. More original contributions come from Claudia Card, who attempts to define rape

---

\* Senior Children's Magistrate, Children's Court of New South Wales.

as a “terrorist institution”, and Jonathan Glover, who describes “state terrorism” as “dwarfing” the individual variety and being “morally worse”. Gregory Kavka also develops the idea of state terrorism in his chapter on “nuclear hostages”, but concludes contrary to Glover that the moral case against nuclear hostage taking (by the state) is less strong than that against other forms of terrorism. Card’s argument on rape as terrorism has two elements: that rape is an institution, in the sense of an entrenched social practice, and that rape is terrorism: the systematic intimidation and manipulation of an entire section of society. She cites Susan Rae Petersen’s essay “Coercion and Rape: The State as a Male Protection Racket”,<sup>1</sup> and incorporates the argument of pornography as propaganda for this terrorist cause. It is also useful to note in this context that Amnesty International considers rape by the military, or by police of women in custody, as “an act of torture for which the state bears responsibility”.

One has to question, though, to what extent linguistic elements of the dominant political culture, constructed for quite specific purposes and repeated almost daily by the mass media, can be co-opted in this way. Can such powerfully normative language be stolen? Thomas and Standley have described “terrorism” as a “crude pejorative calculated to instil hostility and fear”, noting that commentators “may perhaps recognise a question of value-neutrality, but nevertheless find it impossible to escape from positions profoundly influenced by their political and cultural environments”.<sup>2</sup>

So it is with the view of terrorism from the Bowling Green. The imagery of Middle America intrudes heavily into the papers of its philosophers. Glover’s attempt apart, few other moves are made to conceive of terrorist violence as a state phenomenon; at least not one of western governments. Alan Ryan does suggest the distinction between “red terror” (for justice) and “white terror” (for order) is forced, and makes a parallel between “total war” and non-negotiable terrorism. But this concession remains on safe political ground: he comfortably accepts the official US “terrorist state” status given to Syria but suggests the status of (state sponsored) Salvadoran and Guatemalan deaths squads are “veiled in obscurity”.

Perhaps more importantly, no real attempt is made to distinguish the application of the central term to such diverse social phenomena as national liberation movements, state sponsored proxy armies, revolutionary communist movements, militant sectarian groups and adventurist bands. The editors, for example, first discuss terrorist groups through depictions of the Irish Republican Army and the Japanese Red Army, two quite different groups, the first being a regionally based liberation movement with substantial civilian support, the second an ideologically based internationalist group, with little support. Equivalent moral issues can be discussed in either case, but much of the meaning, it seems to me, is lost.

Thomas Schelling ponders “international terrorism” as characterised by the political violence of leftist groups and Arab nationalists, wondering why such groups, if their aim

1 In Vetterling-Braggin, M, et al (eds), *Feminism and Philosophy* (1978), at 360-1.

2 Thomas, P A and Standley, T, “Redefining Terrorism” (1987), 4 *Aust J of Law and Soc*, 61-84; a briefer version of this paper appears in Koechler, H (ed), *Terrorism and National Liberation* (1988) at 67-79.