Abstract

This paper is motivated by the assumption that 'terrorism' is a loaded and politically significant term, the use of which exudes and produces power relations. It acknowledges this, and also argues that not everyone has an equal right to use the term. This leads to an examination into the kind of power that is manifested in the use of the term, by putting the social constructivist framework to work and placing the semantic field of terrorism within that framework. It identifies a kind of power attached to the enunciation of the term 'terrorism' and argues that it is unequally distributed between perceived potential victims of terrorism and perceived potential perpetrators of terrorism. Drawing on Nietzsche's genealogical analysis of morality, I argue that it is counterproductive to deny potential perpetrators the power of enunciation around the term 'terrorism' on the basis that this leads to a kind of slave revolt in terrorism. Redistributing the power of enunciation around the term 'terrorism' might remove the line that separates potential victims from potential perpetrators of terrorism and work towards reducing the threat of terrorism itself by allowing those potential perpetrators to exercise this capability within mainstream society, as opposed to seeking alternative communities to do so outside of it.

<u>Contents page</u>

Introduction

The term 'terrorism' today is so commonly used in public discourse that a discussion of it may seem inane. If its meaning was not established, how could it be so popularly used after all? Its demotic quality, however, does not imply that it has a univocal meaning, or that its meaning is fairly constructed. Indeed, it is terms like this that seem to be archived within the public lexicon that are most in need of philosophical scrutiny, because of the power exercised in and as a result of using them. This paper seeks to grapple with this politically significant term by placing it within the social constructivist framework inherited from Friedrisch Nietzsche, Michel Foucault, and more recently Judith Butler, Lynne Tirrell et al. In it, I argue that the kind of power exercised in legitimately using the term 'terrorism' can be identified as a capability. I call it the *enunciative capability*. Its title as a capability is borrowed from and justified according to Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum's capabilities-based approach to human development and wellbeing. It is explained in due course. Identifying the enunciative capability allows me to argue that the enunciative capability regarding 'terrorism' is unfairly distributed and this is counterproductive to the aim of reducing terrorism.

In chapter one, I identify the enunciative capability. I do so by showing that when we place the semantic field of terrorism within the social constructivist framework, we observe a functioning of the right to speak legitimately about it, and this is what engenders the mainstream understanding of it. Next, I claim that the enunciative capability is unfairly distributed between those who can and those who cannot legitimately use the term and that the line that separates these two groups is the same as the line that separates potential victims and potential perpetrators of terrorism in the West. I justify this second claim in chapter two, by drawing an analogy between Nietzsche's warrior and slave morality and the capability of potential victims and potential perpetrators to enunciate 'terrorism' respectively. I show that the line that separates potential perpetrators from potential victims is the same as the line that separates those with the function of the enunciative capability with regard to the term 'terrorism' and those without. I show that maintaining this separation is otiose since it encourages a parallel 'slave revolt in morality' in the topic of terrorism, where the group denied the conditions to exercise the enunciative capability will seek it elsewhere. Thus, creating or adhering to alternative or counter linguistic communities, in which its members are afforded the capability. Finally, I draw a third analogy between Nietzsche's priest and those agents who radicalise today, to emphasise just how counterproductive to reducing the threat of terrorism it is to deny certain social groups this capability. The following claim appears in chapter three: by redistributing the

enunciative capability, so that it can be exercised by all, perhaps we can also reduce the threat of terrorism. By providing this power to speak to those who lack it, maybe they will be less likely to seek alternative linguistic communities in which they can speak legitimately. Thus, they would remain within and engage in the mainstream linguistic sphere, and be less vulnerable to the manipulation of the priest-like figure who operates *outside* of the mainstream linguistic community, too. This claim is defended as an extension to the second claim. In the end, I suggest two ways that we may go about redistributing this capability. First, the implementation of critical pedagogical schemes that offer citizens the capacity to scrutinise the external power norms around them. Second, placing limits on the length of time that a single individual is able to hold a post that affords them an almost intrinsic right to legitimately speak of terrorism. Such posts include political commentating. This can be seen as an addition to the core thesis, the aim of which is to identify the enunciative capability, to show that it is unequally distributed in the specific example of terrorism and to argue that redistributing it would be more productive to reducing the threat of terrorism.

<u>Chapter One: Is our understanding of terrorism socially constructed?</u>

The purpose of this chapter is to show how the social constructivist thesis, that words and phenomena gain meaning in the way that we use them, works. Specifically, it seeks to apply this thesis to the term 'terrorism' in order to show that our understanding of it is socially constructed. This will allow for a better account of *how* this operates with regard to terrorism in chapter two. According to this view, whatever terrorism is, it is because of the discursive regularities that surround it and govern the use of it. Our linguistic practices around the term frame it and give it meaning. In showing that our understanding of terrorism is socially constructed, this chapter identifies legitimate enunciation as a kind of power that contributes to the social construction of meaning. Whilst the conclusion of this chapter will be modest, what it adds to the wider argument is important. First, it situates terrorism within the social constructivist framework so that we can analyse it as such in the following chapter; and, second it identifies the kind of power to legitimately use the term so as to contribute to the construction of its meaning and the general understanding of it. First, I will sketch the predominantly Nietzschean-Foucauldian view of power and social construction, placing the naming of women within it. Second, I will place the semantic field of terrorism within it and try to unveil what is responsible for the codification of mainstream terrorism discourse. The answer will be the enunciative capability.

<u>1.1 Power and social construction</u>

In the *On Genealogy of Morality* (GM), Nietzsche shows morality to be an expression of subjective experience by members of the noble caste, on the one hand, and members of the slavish caste, on the other. This underlines the contingency of linguistic practices. In this case, the contingency is dependent upon one's class in society, and given this, to what extent one is able to assert one's instinct for freedom or will to power. Foucault's work on power develops this. In contrast to previous theories of power, excluding Nietzsche's, Foucault explicitly breaks with the idea of 'having' power by rejecting the claim that there is a single location from which power stems, and focusing instead on a never-ending circuit of social practices through which power is *exercised*. It is what we do and how we do it that sets power into motion; our practices allow us to exercise power and power allows us to act. 'The exercise of power'[1], for Foucault,

---

[1] Foucault, M. 1982. 'The Subject and Power' in *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 8, No. 4. pp.777-795. p.788.

is not simply a relationship between partners, individual or collective; it is a way in which certain actions modify others…[it] exists only when it is put into action.[2]

Power does not act on others directly, but indirectly acts on their actions[3]. Power is a relation: 'every relation between forces is a 'power relation''[4].

Power is exercised through discourse, and the verbal part of discourse is language. Power is prior to language, to the extent that it manifests itself through language. It is transferred through linguistic and discursive practices. For these practices systematically categorise the external phenomena that we experience. Discursive practices are norm-bestowing insofar as they work with other practices to engender structures that 'establish norms that govern what can and cannot be said, and with that what can and cannot *be*'[5]. So too can linguistic practices be norm-bestowing, since their normalisation produces and reinforces semantic norms. E.g., 'girls are weak' might be a discursive norm, whilst pointing to a physical phenomenon, such as a knife-attack at a metro station, and saying 'terrorism' might be considered a linguistic or semantic norm. For it categorises visual phenomena as something called 'terrorism'. It creates a code for the use of language in a specific speech community. In both cases, the power manifested produces knowledge.

By using language we follow certain rules every day and agree to judge as those around us: 'language casts sheaves of reality upon the social body, stamping it and violently shaping it'[6]. In line with Ludwig Wittgenstein's conception of the production of meaning, we can say that we do not learn how to use words by appealing to rigid definitions to which they refer, but by actually incorporating them in our daily lives. As he puts it, 'Children do not learn that books exist, that armchairs exist, etc., etc., - they learn to fetch books, sit in armchairs, etc., etc.'[7]. We do not create meaning through individual consideration, but rather through the communal use of shared language, thus creating and maintaining linguistic *communities* in which certain words gain meaning and legitimacy. It is the exercise of power and continual production of power relations that facilitate this normalisation of language and construction of meaning and understanding in linguistic communities.

---

[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid. p.789.
[4] Deleuze, G. 2012. *Foucault*. London, New York: Continuum. p.59.
[5] Tirrell, L. 1998. 'Language and Power' in *Companion to Feminist Philosophy* edited by Jaggar, A and Young, I. Blackwell. pp.139-151. p.141.
[6] Tirrell, L. 1998. Op cit. p.139.
[7] Wittgenstein, L. 1975. *On Certainty*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. §476.

A key distinction between a constructivist account and a descriptivist account under which such philosophers of language as the early Wittgenstein, Bertrand Russell and Gottlob Frege, may be categorised, is that constructivists see language as inherently normative. A descriptivist account says that there are pre-existing entities or qualities that only need to be given a name, so that we can discuss them and use them in our day-to-day lives. When we describe these entities or qualities, we do not alter them in any way. The constructivist, in contrast, places what we say and how we say it in a constitutive position, so that the entities and qualities that we see are seen because they matter to us in some way or another. That is to say, hands don't exist as hands until we see them as hands and normalise their name as that. In short:

> The descriptivist would say that we see human bodies and simply describe what we see – heads, eyes, hands, arms, legs, feet, etc. The constructivist would urge that we see hands because hands matter to us, and that hands matter to us because we have projects to which they are useful. [8]

On the one hand, this normative aspect of constructivism makes the role of power a positive phenomenon. As Foucault puts it,

> Power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production.[9]

That is to say, power produces discourse, and discourse is what makes reality as we experience it. It is facilitative, as the force constitutive of reality, by providing the means of establishing more sophisticated societies, by transforming knowledge, through discourse, into power. Language is the tool used to do this, for it determines how we categorise external phenomena and experience the world outside of us. Power is what is required to integrate the outside forces and turn them into knowledge. When power is exercised in conjunction with this rule following, it 'breeds an animal that is entitled to make promises.[10]' That is to say, an animal that can exercise the freedom and self-restraint to do so. Just as the painter who has learned how to apply rules of rhythm and composition becomes more free than the painter who has not, because her options in painting open up to her once she has agreed to see and practice those rules of rhythm and composition. So too, does agreement in language and rule-following afford those members of societies this freedom in opening up new options

---

[8] Tirrell, L. 1998. Op cit. p.142.
[9] Foucault, M. 1975. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books. p.194.
[10] Nietzsche, F. 2007. *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. §2.1.

– in reality. Possessing the means to discuss such phenomena as rhythm and composition in painting provides the painting student with a language through which to understand them. In the absence of that language, she may not be able to go beyond a visceral, primal, intuitive understanding. Shared language, rules and agreement propel her thinking forward and thereby expand her options for *doing* in the world. In order for this process to be successful and for painters to be able to count themselves as possessing knowledge of what a dynamic composition looks like, the rules have to be codified. When rules are codified, knowledge can be formalised – painting technique is an example of knowledge.

On the other hand, power can be negative. In some cases, language can be encoded in such a way that it makes some people worse off than others. An obvious example is women and people of colour. It is argued that those with the authority and privilege to encode language tend to be white, cisgender men; known or unbeknownst to them, they encode language with their own ends in mind (Cameron (1985), Spender (1983), Rich (1979)). To be crude about it, they encode language so as to maintain their own privilege. E.g., the act of sex and its culmination or definition by way of the male orgasm[11]. Dale Spender writes that in their hegemony of language and the monopoly they possess over naming, men stifle women's 'struggle for self-determination'[12]. Little surprise, then, that Judith Butler states:

> It is not enough to inquire into how women might become more fully represented in language and politics. Feminist critique ought also to understand how the category of "women," the subject of feminism, is produced and restrained by the very structures of power through which emancipation is sought.[13]

That she places women in speech marks hints at the political point: this term is assumed to designate a common identity whilst it cannot, for one's identity is not wholly consisted by one's gender[14]. Butler's point is that representational feminist discourse exudes the paradoxical quality in seeking to regulate the female identity and create spheres of inclusivity and exclusivity within it. This serves to underscore the idea that power is both positive and negative, and discourse can serve power as much as they can obstruct its flow. As Foucault

---

[11] Saul, J and Diaz-Leon, E. 2017. 'Feminist Philosophy of Language' in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* edited by Zalta, E.N., forthcoming. << *https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/feminism-language/>>*
[12] Spender, D. 1983. *Man-made Language*. London: Routledge. p.53.
[13] Butler, J. 1999. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge. p.5.
[14] Ibid. p.6.

puts it, 'discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are'[15].

Spender et al. are determined to show, however, that the patriarchal linguistic structures are responsible for producing discriminatory rules that hinder women in the use of language itself. Butler takes this principle further in her own critique of feminist discourse, placing the object of the discourse on its head. In any case, the point remains, that men possess an authority and legitimacy over language that women lack in the mainstream discourse, and in some cases may try to reproduce in seeking to create regularity in the feminist discourse. The power exercised by men - and women within the feminist discourse - is a special kind of power that relates to the enunciation of such seemingly rudimentary terms as 'woman'. It is a kind of power related to naming, normalising and naturalising so as to almost seamlessly form knowledge – purposely or by chance. I would like to claim that in the first instance this boils down to a power in enunciation: pointing and saying with credibility. E.g., pointing to a bound wad of paper and uttering 'book', so that the term 'book' is normalised and enters into the public discourse as if this object had always existed as and been referred to as a 'book'. Or, pointing to an individual uttering 'woman', so that the term 'woman' is normalised and then naturalised, so that it seems that women *qua* women have always existed[16].

The oppressive aspect of the process mentioned is that 'men say 'women''[17] as a way to *mark* women. This shows women to be abnormal. The woman is exposed in her difference from being normal by being a woman in having her femaleness underscored as being female, whereas being a man in not remaining unmarked is naturalised as simply being. By marking woman, they identify the 'woman' as a phenomenon and object of discourse, whilst oppressing her by *them* identifying *her* as an *object* of – their - discourse. It is the one who possesses the authority to name and speak who is the subject of discourse and who can occupy the positive space. The other is merely an object within the wider *episteme* created by the subject himself. That is to say men are able to *mark* and *erase*[18], whilst women, lacking the same authority, can only be *marked* and *erased*. The woman's place is in the passive tense. When women refer to themselves using the same language as men, perhaps for practical reasons, they reinforce their status as an object of discourse. This is reinforced by establishing women in such roles where they are made object and not subject:

[15] Foucault, M. *The History of Sexuality Vol. I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books. pp.100-101.
[16] Tirrell, L. 1998. Op cit. p.141.
[17] De Beauvoir, S. 1959. 'Woman as Other' in *The Second Sex*.
<<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/introduction.htm>>
[18] Tirrell, L. 1998. Op cit. p.143.

> Discursive practices set women up as outsiders, as objects in texts, but not straightforwardly as speaking subjects. The speaker or writer of a text claims an authority that women are generally presumed to lack.[19]

By being so embedded it seems to be an organic way of dividing sex and gender differences within society. The point here however, is that it may not so organic. After all, for language to be codified, the words must be chosen and enunciated by *subjects* of enunciation. The identity and social standing of those subjects is important and contributes to the outcome of the codification of language and therefore reality. Formed matter is both the soul that merges the outside with the internal, and the content arising through this process. The forms that produce knowledge are as important as the content that arises. The skeleton that carries the flesh contributes to the body, too. The power of enunciation acts as the skeleton propping the flesh up so that it can contribute to the holistic functioning of the body.

In the example of the objectification and subjection of women, we can say that the special kind of power exercised is the *enunciative capability*. For the categorisation of thoughts are dictated by men; how we can interpret forces outside of us is determined by those categories we apply to thinking, knowing *that* and knowing ourselves, since 'to know is to interpret'[20]. This power to enunciate one's interpretation, which may simply be an utterance of symbols, is the enunciative capability. We can say that men have the function of the enunciative capability because they can occupy spaces of enunciative modality where women cannot. That is to say, a woman might be able to utter but her utterance will not be considered valid. Animals and babies can utter, too, but neither they, nor the woman, as described in the literature above, can be considered to exercise the enunciative capability. For to exercise it is to be able to contribute to the systematic linguistic categorisation of phenomena and thereby co-produce truth. This truth is 'the truth within which we are caught'[21], i.e., the paradigm of knowledge in Kuhnian terms which is considered true at a certain time and space within the history of thought and not some holy epistemic good. Women, as described above, could only reinforce the 'regime of truth'[22] produced by men, or create their own within an alternative linguistic community, e.g., their feminist discourse.

---

[19] Ibid.
[20] Foucault, M. 1994. Op cit.p.32.
[21] Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books. p.232.
[22] Foucault, M. 2008. 'The Birth of Biopolitics' in *Lectures at the Collège de France*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan. p.19.

1.2 Terrorism as a social construction

Can we unveil a similar operation in the normalisation of the term 'terrorism'? On changing the word 'hands' in Tirrell's description quoted above, to the word 'terrorism' we find that,

> The constructivist would urge that we see terrorism because terrorism matters to us, and that terrorism matters to us because we have projects to which it is useful.

This suggests that it may not be that terrorism *qua* political tactic is what matters to us, as much as being able to label events and perpetrators as 'terrorism' and 'terrorists', respectively. We care to label hands 'hands' for practical purposes, so that we can talk about these fascinating body parts that allow us to write, build, and eat, in a colloquial or scientific setting. There seems to be an identifiable place in reality to which the semantic field of body parts – in which the label 'hands' falls - corresponds. I.e., we can grasp, perhaps retrospectively, why the term 'hands' matters to us and to which projects it is useful. Can we try to do the same with respect to 'terrorism'? To be sure, the question, in light of social constructivism, is not whether or not x amount of lives was lost in what is labelled at as an 'act of terrorism', since we can all agree that x amount of people ceased to exist. Rather, the question is why these physical events were labelled 'acts of terrorism' as opposed to something else, e.g. criminal activities or acts of violence. The constructivist account does not deny the destruction of matter. Instead it acknowledges that labelling these incidents 'acts of terrorism' produces different modalities of action than labelling them something else. This is due to the application of language. So, we ought to ask why this term and not another is used and what purpose this serves.

Three recent events labelled 'acts of terrorism': Berlin Market Attack 2016; Reina Club Shooting 2017; London Borough Market Attack 2017. Chancellor Angela Merkel, President Recep Erdoğan, and Prime Minister Theresa May all referred to these incidents as 'acts of terrorism'. We might say that they did this because its use serves the practical purpose of categorising such specific violence. The three incidents share the fact that Daesh claimed responsibility for them. It is a politically motivated non-state group willing to engage in violence against non-combatants to achieve its aims, which comes close to most dictionary definitions of terrorism, as well as political ones[23]. It may matter to the speakers and their interlocutors to be able to discuss this kind of event effectively. It is convenient to the project of 'countering terrorism' or discussing this form of violence and keeping citizens updated.

---

[23] See, for example, government definitions of terrorism.

That said, the culture of employing this term to such attacks has a clear beginning within the literature and global politics.

Like the term 'woman' mentioned above, the term 'terrorism' is selected, normalised and then naturalised. Again, like the term 'woman', subjects must do the enunciative work. In the example of woman, these subjects are men until women begin to accept and reinforce the own matter of being as being named by men. So when it comes to terrorism, there must be a power in the right to legitimately use this term so that it produces some sustainable meaning. The aftermath of 9/11 remains the most striking example of just how powerful this term is when used by the "right" people, i.e. those with the enunciative capability. If we can call the United States of America an agent, and for argument's sake, I suggest we do, then we can say that when the Bush administration decided that such an attack would be considered an act of terrorism, so it was. Because like men, in the example offered in the previous sub-section, the USA had the authority to encode language.

No other country qua agent could compete or seek to construct a counter narrative in 2001. Intellectuals and thought leaders did not even have the time to wonder whether or not it was a wise move to proceed in this direction. 9/11 thus became a global marker in the history of world politics and academic writing in terrorism studies[24]. A 9/11 narrative was born that said that it was not possible to negotiate or reason with terrorists and that there was no provocation to what they did. Looking for such a provocation or asking 'how we got there'[25] became problematic. This is not because considering such questions is wrong *per se*, but because the construction of meaning by the USA about this event made it so. Granted, the attack is highly lamentable, but questions help to unearth the potential reasons behind it. However, America's capability to fill the then 'void of meaning'[26] was not available to others. Thus, it was able to maintain a hegemony of the semantic field of terrorism that was produced as a result. Such American allied state-actors as the United Kingdom and others were ready to reinforce America's enunciation by repeating the words the Bush administration used and thereby legitimising this interpretation of the event.

Not that this is new information, but it wasn't purely about the actions of those terrorists. For logically speaking, the Taliban already operated in Afghanistan at this point with Muslim "jihadists" flying in from such countries as Saudi Arabia, Pakistan and the United Arab

---

[24] Toros, H. 2017. '"9/11 is alive and well" or how critical terrorism studies has sustained the 9/11 narrative' in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. Vol. 10 – Issue.2. pp.203-129.
[25] Zeyfuss, M. 2003. 'Forget September 11' in *Third World* Quarterly. Vol. 24 – No.3. pp.513-528. p.520.
[26] Jackson, R. 2005. Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-terrorism. Manchester: Manchester University Press. p.31.

Emirates to fight with the Mujahideen. Hundreds of thousands of Afghanis tried to escape and thousands more were killed or maimed at the hands of the Taliban. By the time the USA invaded Afghanistan, there were already 3.5 million displaced Afghanis[27], not to mention the massacres committed at the hands of the Taliban between 1994 and 2001. The freedom of Afghanis was stripped away from them anew, but it was only when America experienced terrorism that the war on terror began, and the world legitimised this by paying attention and repeating the sentiments expressed by the USA.

The point of mentioning this is to show that the meaning of 'terrorism' and our understanding of it are as socially constructed as the labelling of women. It is contingent upon previous power relations that either afford or do not afford various subjects the power to enunciate the word to such a degree that it matters in mainstream discourse. This social construction can be arrived at unfairly, if we consider an unequal distribution of the power to construct it to be unfair. A recent paper by James Hopkins analyses the special issue in the journal 'Terrorism and Political Violence' in which critical academics were termed 'psychologically disturbed and on the side of the terrorists'[28] as part of a two-point process to make illegitimate their comments on the topic. It can also come about through an exercise of power that seeks to reach ulterior ends. Just consider the actions that have been justified by Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Bahrain and Jordan's officials' use of the term with regard to Qatar on account of Qatar funding terrorism[29] or Erdoğan's overuse of the term.

This is at one and the same time productive and repressive. For it produces discourse, it produces norms, it produces an understanding. At the same time, it is repressive because it quashes other attempts at making meaning. Importantly, being able to modify future actions supposedly legitimately on the basis of using this term requires the enunciative capability: the capability to use the word legitimately. Like the codification of language to the disadvantage of women discussed above, the codification of terrorism discourse is not necessarily fairly shared. Not everyone possesses the authority or privilege to house a lived phenomenon. Like the example of women being marked as 'girls', marking perpetrators and potential perpetrators as terrorists, rests on a codification of language. That is to say, creating a standardised way of talking about these phenomena. As in the case of the marking and erasing of women, the group that exercises the enunciative capability to encode language tends to exercise a capability that the marked and erased lacks, by

---

[27] Ruiz, H and Emery, M. 2001. 'Afghanistan's Refugee Crisis' in *Middle East Research and Information Project*. <http://www.merip.org/mero/mero092401>

[28] Hopkins, J. 2014. 'Psychologically disturbed and on the side of the terrorists: the delegitimisation of critical intellectuals in Terrorism and Political Violence. 7:2. pp.297-312. p.297.

[29] Keatinge, T. 'Why Qatar is the focus of terrorism claims' in *BBC News*. << http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-40246734>>

enacting their subjectivity whilst erasing that of the other. We will discuss this in the following chapter. For now, suffice it to say that we have identified the particular kind of power responsible for the construction of the mainstream meaning of terrorism: the enunciative capability.

So far we have simply applied the term terrorism to the social constructivist framework in order to show that the meaning and understanding of it, as a phenomenon, is also socially constructed. In doing so, we touched upon the enunciative capability as the kind of power required to contribute to constructing the meaning of the term and phenomenon. We have also briefly revised the technical framework in which the rest of this paper will be situated.

Chapter Two: How is the capability to enunciate terrorism distributed?

In this chapter, I show *how* our understanding of terrorism is both socially constructed by the distribution of the enunciative capability. The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate that this kind of power is unfairly distributed. To start with, I will justify the decision behind naming this kind of power the enunciative capability. Next, I will show how this capability of 'terrorism' is unfairly distributed between potential victims and potential perpetrators of terrorism using the discrepancy in its distribution regarding morality between Nietzsche's noble and slave castes. I argue that we can consider the noble caste as primarily being able to exercise the enunciative capability whilst the slavish caste is not. The slave revolt in morality is the slavish caste's strive for the functioning of the enunciative capability. I suggest that if the slavish caste were afforded the capability, then perhaps the revolt would not have been necessary. Using recent findings from within terrorism studies, I argue that we can see a similar phenomenon in the British Muslim youth. To emphasise the implications of this with respect to new terrorism, I draw a third analogy between Nietzsche's priest and modern extremist Muslim activists. I use this to show that lacking the enunciative capability makes the slave more susceptible to accepting this form of alternative knowledge, by placing them outside of the mainstream discursive sphere, if s/he wishes to exercise the enunciative capability. This argument demonstrates that potential perpetrators and potential victims are separated by a line that is reflected in the separation between those with and those without the enunciative capability. Extrapolating to the logical end of this, it seems plausible that if this is the case, then redistributing the enunciative capability may remove the line that separates these two groups, and as a result, also reduce the threat of this kind of terrorism, at least.

2.1 Why capability?

Nussbaum and Sen's capabilities-based approach to human development and wellbeing asks, 'what is a person able to do and be?'[30]. 'Capabilities' here means:

> not just abilities residing inside a person but also the freedoms or opportunities created by a combination of personal abilities and the political, social, and economic environment.[31]

Therefore, having a capability means having the freedom and opportunity to use it. Imagine Roxanne is a writer. She can only put her artistic capability to work if she has become an adequate enough writer through practice and exposure, and *also* if writers are not persecuted for writing, women are allowed to be writers and her economic environment allows her to do so. Nussbaum refers to the 'internal capability plus the social/political/economic condition'[32] as a 'combined capability'[33]. This distinguishes the capabilities approach to development from others, say, equality of resources. The capabilities approach is interested in what one can *actually do* and *be* given one's capabilities, as

---

[30] Nussbaum, M. 2013. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. p.20.
[31] Nussbaum, M. Ibid.
[32] Ibid. p.22.
[33] Ibid.

opposed to, say, what basket of goods one can purchase given gross national income per capita. It is to be preferred because it avoids the kind of harmful distortions that non-pluralist metrics lead to by oversimplifying the varied capabilities that an individual needs in order to live a good life worthy of human dignity[34]. Through its inherently pluralist structure, we can identify the interrelatedness of an individual's various capabilities. E.g., an individual's being raped may affect that individual's educational capabilities. Different approaches, due to their non-holistic, non-pluralist approach may miss this.

Nussbaum, for her part, offers ten central capabilities. It is incumbent upon us to show that the enunciative capability is not properly contained in any one of them. There are three capabilities mentioned in her list that stand in similarity with the so-called enunciative capability. They are: (1) Senses, Imagination, and Thought; (2) Practical Reason; and (3) Control Over One's Environment – political[35]. (1) is concerned with 'being able to use the senses; being able to imagine, to think, to reason...'[36]. It seems to be a broad central capability in which Nussbaum includes 'literacy and basic mathematical and scientific training,'[37] as well as, 'being able to use one's mind in ways protected by guarantees of freedom of expression with regard to both political and artistic speech and freedom of religious exercise...'[38]. It seems to refer more to proper schooling and external, societal values, as opposed to a more precise form of power. Granted, a good education helps to shape a more internally capable mind, but it does not change the place in society in which one finds oneself. I.e., what Foucault denotes, 'the various enunciative modalities in [the subject's] dispersion'[39]. This capability does not touch upon this; it does not guarantee one or aim for the power of enunciation. Therefore, the enunciative capability is not properly contained here.

Next, (2) may seem similar if it were not directed towards a more precise qualitative end, namely the formation of a 'conception of the good life'[40] and the capability 'to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's life'[41]. Being able to envision and enact one's conception of the good life is not the same as being able to exercise the power to use certain terms legitimately within a linguistic community. Nussbaum continues to add, 'this entails protection for the liberty of conscience and religious observation'[42]. This is relevant since being able to use certain terms legitimately within a linguistic community may require certain protections, including liberty of conscience and religious sympathy if not observation. As we will see below, for the slave in Nietzsche's *GM* to be able to exercise the enunciative capability, s/he will need the physical guarantee that the warrior will not strike him/her for doing so. However, the protection that is required for the exercise of the enunciative capability is not so qualitatively specific as 'protection for the liberty of conscience and

---

[34] Nussbaum, M. 2013. Op cit. p.18 & p.29.
[35] Please note: Nussbaum's numbering in the referenced paper is different to my numbering.
[36] Nussbaum, M. 1997. 'Capabilities and Human Rights' in *Fordham Law Review* Vol. 66, Issue 2. pp.273-300. p.287.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Foucault, M. 1972. Op cit. p.54.
[40] Nussbaum, M. 2001. 'Political Objectivity' in *New Literary History*. Issue 32. pp.883-906. p.889.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

religious observation'[43]. Additionally, enunciation is not in any necessary way related to forming a conception of the good life. Therefore, it seems fair to reject the similarity between the two capabilities as insufficient.

Finally, we can eliminate (3) as a contender because it is predominantly concerned with *participation*. That is: 'being able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one's life; having the right of political participation, protections of free speech and association'[44]. Again, this is certainly related to the enunciative capability, and arguably to a greater degree than (2). For, the specificity of 'free speech' comes closer to the point of enunciative opportunity and capability. Yet, the enunciative capability is the ability to legitimately participate in *verbal* discourse. It is the lack of focus on the 'verbal' part that is missing and warrants the enunciative capability the status of a capability on its own. Participation is important and certainly may be an end arising from the enunciative capability in practice. Nonetheless, it is the enunciative capability in itself that is arguably important and influential. This capability fails to recognise the power in speech in itself. Thus it seems justifiable that the enunciative capability be warranted the status of a capability in its own right.

It is worth noting that the enunciative capability is a combined capability insofar as for it to be exercised, the individual must have the internal capability to perform it and chose it whilst also being in an environment that allows her to do so. E.g., we can say that highly trained dissident political scientists in Syria do not have the enunciative capability, because the political environment there does not allow them to exercise it, by speaking of, say, terrorism there, without grave risk to their safety and that of their family. Therefore, they do not have the function of this capability. At the same time, if the social/political/economic conditions exist but the individual does not receive the proper opportunity to cultivate the internal capability, then they cannot exercise this capability either. E.g., if an individual is too poor to cultivate his or her critical thinking skills but lives in a place where critical thought is encouraged, lacking the internal capability means lacking the combined capability. The enunciative capability is about being able to legitimately say and speak of certain topics; to have the capability to do so, not just nominally[45]. In what follows, we will assume that all have the internal capability. In case the individual lacks the enunciative capability, this is because the external conditions for the individual to exercise the internal capability to speak is lacking. I.e., the surrounding social, political or economic conditions do not allow the individual to exercise this power.

2.1 The enunciative capability in Nietzsche's *Genealogy*

Having clarified and justified the decision to proceed with the term 'enunciative capability', let us first consider its role in Nietzsche's *GM* and if it is fair to claim that the warrior caste possesses the function of this capability whilst the slavish caste does not. Nietzsche's noble value equation reads:

---

[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid. p.288.
[45] At the outset, we might note that Nussbaum claims that her list is constantly under revision and rightly so, thus adding to it should not be seen as a criticism of it or as an exclamation of its shortcoming, but simply an observation that stands in need of consideration.

'good = noble = powerful = beautiful = happy = blessed'[46]. The aristocracy are not "blessed" because they are "good" but because they discursively reason from their

> powerful physicality, a rich, burgeoning, even overflowing health, as well as all those things which help to preserve it – war, adventure, hunting, dancing, competitive games, and everything which involves strong, free, high-spirited activity.[47]

It is these experiences that lift the human spirit and accord it the pleasure that lead the noble subject to reason that it is good and blessed and powerful. Importantly, this group is self-reliant in this project insofar as it does not need to react to any "other" to view itself as good. Their judgement that they are "good" arises out of the gratification and greatness that members of this group enjoy in their daily lives. In crude terms, we might say that the nobles are able to properly express their will to power. As Nietzsche puts it,

> the judgement 'good' does *not* emanate from those to whom goodness is shown! Instead it has been 'the good' themselves, meaning the noble, the mighty, the high-placed and the high-minded, who saw and judged themselves and their actions as good, I mean first-rate, in contrast to everything lowly, low-minded, common and plebeian.[48]

I.e., it is subjective: "good" as a moral value amongst the warriors does not arise out of needing to label and categorise so-called "good" deeds. It is brought about by a kind of organic and spontaneous, self-affirming growth experienced by the noble, 'seeking out its opposite only so that it can say 'yes' to itself even more thankfully and exultantly'[49]. The nobles can exercise the capability not only to *do* various activities given their wealth, strength and status, but also to *be* various characteristics exuding and crucially deciding various values, given the right afforded to themselves to make these judgements.

In trying to integrate external power relations, or digest stories about them integrated by others, we come upon Foucault's 'regimes of truth'[50] again – those sets of practices that co-perform alongside the regime that determines truth and falsehood and forms knowledge – and power – that are normalised in an *episteme* and taken to be accurate. The point of Foucault's

> investigations concerning madness, disease, delinquency, sexuality...is to show how the coupling of a set of practices and a regime of truth form an apparatus (*dispositif*) of knowledge-power that effectively marks out in reality that which does not exist and legitimately submits to the division between true and false.[51]

---

[46] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.7.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.2.
[49] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.10.
[50] Foucault, M. 2008. Op cit. p.19.
[51] Ibid.

For our purposes, the point is not that these regimes are inaccurate, but that they reveal the process through which the linguistic categorisation of terrorism comes about. With regard to the noble caste in Nietzsche's *GM,* the regime of truth to which they adhere is constructed by them for them through their life-affirming and pleasurable day-to-day activities.

In relation to this, lies the slave value system, that seeks to overturn the warrior's equation of 'good and bad'. It is essentially reactive, drawn out of and in response to the noble caste. Reacting, in its pitiful, miserable, feeble state to the state of self-affirmation of the warriors, it says, "'No' on principle to everything that is 'outside', 'other', 'non-self''[52]. The slaves apply, in thought, the concept of 'evil' to the warrior caste and reason, as a result, that they, the slaves, the weak and good, in opposition to the evil of the noble caste – that which the slaves reject on principle. The slave caste seeks to justify its feelings of hatred, envy and vengefulness towards its masters by appealing to the concept of justice[53]. From the pits of misery and lowliness, it manipulates the concept, 'as though justice were fundamentally simply a further development of the feeling of having been wronged'[54]. The feeling of 'having been wronged', of course, ties in with the inability to discharge the inherent human, all-too-human, violence and aggression outwardly. And so, the slave caste aspires 'belatedly to legitimize with revenge emotional *reactions,* one and all'[55]. Whilst the warriors acts out their strength, aggression, violence, the slaves internalises their *ressentiment* towards the noble caste, unable, as slaves to release the sentiment outwardly – 'All instincts which are not discharged outwardly *turn inwards* – this is what I call the *internalization* of man'[56]. This spirit in the slaves is engendered by *ressentiment* without release. Reactive emotions such as 'hatred, envy, resentment, suspicion, *rancune* and revenge'[57] that are engendered as a reaction to the active, strong, healthy warrior outside of him, cannot be discharged by the slaves.

It seems fair to say, if the slaves had the capacity to direct those poisonous feelings outwardly – towards their masters – then perhaps they would not fester inside of the souls of the slaves and create their 'bad conscience'[58]. That is, the obstruction of man's instincts and the turning of man '*against man himself*'[59]. This refers to the slaves' rejection of warrior's expression of the will to power, by transforming 'impotence which doesn't retaliate'[60] into '"goodness"'[61], and 'submission to people one hates'[62] into '"obedience" (actually towards someone who, they say, orders this submission – they call him God)'[63]. So, the slaves find their own way of coming out on top, in a distinct discourse than the warriors'. For, the interpretation and meanings attached to the same words come out as different. This

---

[52] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.10.
[53] Ibid. §2.11.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid.
[56] Ibid. §2.16.
[57] Ibid. §2.11.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid. §2.16.
[60] Ibid. §1.14.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.

occurs because the slaves cannot express themselves externally and directly towards their masters. Thus, the slaves *qua* slaves are unable to legitimately and powerfully say 'no' to that which is outside of them.

It seems that what the slaves lack and the warriors possess, until the slave revolt, is the function of the enunciative capability. Because the slaves are miserable in this existence, they seek to destroy the joy and pleasure of the warriors. But they lack the capability to hurt the warriors in any 'real' way[64]. Therefore, the slaves reorient their *ressentiment* internally until it results in the slave revolt in morality and that is the rearrangement and revaluation of the equation of 'good and bad' into 'evil and good'. In the latter, the slaves look outward and see the warriors as evil. The slaves, then, via process of elimination become good. This revaluation occurs in a separate discursive space to that of the mainstream episteme because the social and political conditions do not allow the slaves to exercise the enunciation of morality within the mainstream. The warriors organise the value system of the mainstream episteme where they claim 'the right to create values and give these values names'[65]. Perhaps, if the slaves had the function of enunciation in the mainstream, then they would not internalise their *ressentiment*.

The warrior caste has 'the seigneurial privilege of giving names'[66] which 'even allows us to conceive of the origin of language itself as a manifestation of the power of the rulers they say 'this *is* so and so,''[67]. I.e., the warriors, in their spontaneous self-affirmation, health and happiness also afford themselves the authority and privilege over language that dominant social groups enjoy[68]. This allows them to dictate the discursive norms within a community, and to use them, known or unbeknownst to them, to their advantage. This may not be because they seek to dominate the other group, but simply because they are able to play out their instinct to freedom, to health, to strength, to courage, to aggression, and so on. This happens to detriment the lives of the others – the slaves. For, in claiming the power to enunciate or the enunciative capability – having the internal capability to do so and the external social conditions that permit them to do so – the warrior caste can 'set their seal on everything and every occurrence with a sound and thereby take possession of it, as it were'[69]. They gain a hegemony over the mainstream linguistic community and a barrier to entry arises that prevents the slaves from entering legitimately, to the extent that they could affect the mainstream episteme constructed by the warriors.

---

[64] For a discussion of Nietzsche's forms of power - 'real, symbolic and imaginary' – see 'Forces and Powers in Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*' by Martin Saar, in Roodt, V, and Siemens, H, *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. Berlin/Boston, DE: De Gruyter. pp.454-466.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.2.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Tirrell, L. 1993. 'Definition and Power: Toward Authority without Privilege' in *Hypatia*. Vol. 8- Issue 4. pp.1-34.
[69] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §1.2.

The slave revolt in morality comes about in the slaves seeking the enunciative capability, this precise form of power, that they are unable to exercise as long as they are in the primary sphere of valuation, that is the warrior's. On a Deleuzian reading of Foucault, we might flesh this out as follows. There is a 'field of sayability'[70] that consists in enunciative regularities, where statements and words are normalised and even taken to be natural. These regularities are consistently decided upon by the noble caste. Out of the enunciative regularities, a regime of truth emerges: those sets of practices that co-perform alongside the regime that determines truth and falsehood and forms knowledge – and power – that are normalised in an episteme and taken to be accurate. If the noble caste is responsible for those enunciative regularities, then it effectively decides what is true and what is false, what exists and what doesn't, what can be and what cannot. Members of the noble caste, then, have the function of this capability, because they have the internal capability to name, *and* the external conditions to do so legitimately and without social, political or economic risk to themselves. There is no social, political or economic restraint that could be placed on a member of the warrior caste in this respect. The slaves are not so lucky. The enunciative capability is claimed by the noble caste and enjoyed by them, whilst the slavish caste lacks it and yet is expected, and does, indeed, abide by it. That this is the case shows that within the external linguistic community in which the warriors possess the hegemony over language, the slaves do not possess a right to speak in the same way. As Tirrell puts it,

> the power of naming is not just about finding or inventing words for what we want to say; it is also about having contexts and communities in which such saying matters.[71]

The slavish caste lacks the 'contexts and communities in which such saying matters'[72], until they create one through their revolt.

2.3 The enunciative capability to use the term 'terrorism'

Reorienting our discussion back to terrorism, it seems that an analogy can be drawn between the warriors and their functioning of the enunciative capability and modern, potential victims of terrorism residing in the West. That is to say, potential victims of terrorism – by this I mean Westerners – seem to be able to exercise the capability to talk about terrorism without posing a serious risk to themselves or their lives, whereas immigrants and refugees, especially of Muslim descent, do not[73]. Within the warrior class we can place potential victims of terrorism that happen to be non-Muslim or even Muslim/Asian looking Westerners in Britain[74]. A white, male youth is less likely to be held under terrorism laws as a potential suspect than a Muslim, male youth[75]. Just like Nietzsche's noble, this group of individuals rarely realises that they have the function of the privilege to exercise the

[70] Deleuze, G. 2012. Op cit. p.41.
[71] Tirrel, L. 1998. Op cit. p.148.
[72] Ibid.
[73] See: Lean, 2012, Franz, 2007, Mamdani, 2004, Marusek, 2017, Said, 1997 et al.
[74] Brown, K.E. and Saeed, T. 2015. 'Radicalization and counter-radicalization at British universities: Muslim encounters and alternatives' in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol.38-Issue 11. pp.1952-1968.
[75] Lynch, O. 2013. 'British Muslim youth: radicalisation, terrorism and the construction of the "other" in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. Vol.6- Issue 2. pp.241-261. p.242.

enunciative capability around terrorism. Members of this group are able to say this word and make claims about it, because they will not face social, political or economic disadvantages for doing so. Laymen and public figures can both exercise this capability, although the layman will do so with less reach and scalability than, say, a politician. Still, both reinforce the normative semantic valuations about terrorism in talking about it and judging it as a phenomenon from the vantage point of victims. Like the warrior caste, they create the primary value system, in being able to freely exercise this capability. The important point for our argument here is that whilst they are capable of doing this, other co-citizens are not afforded the conditions to exercise this capability to an equal capacity.

Within terrorism studies, it is acknowledged that terrorism is increasingly associated with the 'male Muslim youth in the West'[76]. Since former President George W. Bush's speech declaring the 'war on terror' after the 11 September attacks, the treatment of Muslims as a potential security threat to the Western world has increased. As Sarah Marusek puts it,

> After 9/11 the Muslim-as-terrorist typology entered public discourse, helping the state to make terrorism knowable in a way that "ensures the demonization of a range of groups now regarded as potential terrorists, not least of these Muslims, Arabs and asylum seekers".[77]

In normalising this image of Muslims through speeches addressed to the public, news outlets and academic research into this topic, Muslim citizens' own functioning of the enunciative capability has gradually dwindled. Today, it is risky for a visible Muslim to exercise this internal capability, if s/he wishes to stay out of trouble with the police and counter-terrorist state organisations[78]. Muslims report that they feel less able to talk about politically significant topics, including terrorism, because when they do, they are automatically treated with suspicion[79]. E.g., in 2008 the now lecturer of criminology, Dr Rizwaan Sabir was arrested for downloading Al Qaeda literature from the US government's website whilst writing his MA thesis, on Islamic terrorism[80]. He and the administrator who printed the literature for him were detained for six days and later released. Katherine Brown and Tania Saeed rightly point out that 'the material that was downloaded was widely available to the public, yet it was the 'Muslim' identity of the student that made them radical'[81]. Sabir was arrested, not because he printed out such material, but because he printed out such material *and* he had a Muslim-sounding name. The latter variable vilifies this social group and makes them potential perpetrators of terrorism. A string of similar cases could be cited to support the claim made by Brown

---

[76] Ibid.
See also: Aistrope, T. 2016. 'The Muslim paranoia narrative in counter-radicalisation policy' in *Critical Studies on Terrorism* Vol.9 – Issue 2. pp.182-204.
[77] Marusek, S. 2017. 'Inventing Terrorists: the nexus of intelligence and Islamophobia' in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. p.7.
[78] Ibid. p.10.
[79] Mamdani, M. 2002. 'Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism' in *American Anthropologist* Vo. 104 – No. 3. pp.766-775. p.768.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.

and Saeed[82]. A twenty-five-year-old Pakistani male interviewed for a qualitative research paper by Orla Lynch laments the decreasing scope of enunciation available to Muslims:

> The [Home Office's] new legislation is going to make it worse because you cannot speak out about the Palestinians and so on and Universities are going to clamp down on Muslims, so again they can't speak out in the universities.[83]

When it comes to terrorism, British Muslims are considered guilty until proven innocent and this assumption places a strain on their being able to exercise the enunciative capability. The British Muslim identity is appropriated and distorted by the value system of the mainstream, Western discourse, e.g., members of government and institutions in the press. The hegemony over the legitimacy to use the term 'terrorism' in the mainstream public sphere has turned the Muslim identity into a public commodity, making it all the more difficult for this enunciatively marginalised group to opt *in* to the mainstream discourse, *ceteris paribus*. Unlike ordinary, non-Muslim citizens, they can try to *earn* the enunciative capability to contribute to the mainstream linguistic community.

Like the slaves in the warriors' primary value equation in *GM*, Muslims today are made "bad" in virtue of their being Muslim or seemingly Muslim. Muslims and especially the male, Muslim youth are silenced, having their right to speak on such topics removed. The outpour of calls for the British Muslim population to assert their affinity and loyalty to British values over the values of their immigrant families arises after each extremist attack[84]. In spite of their being born and raised in the UK, these youths are treated as if there was something inherently wrong with them, that they needed to eliminate or prove otherwise, in order to be afforded the same capability as a peer to enunciate terrorism. Just like Nietzsche's slaves, they see themselves already as defendants, as 'having been wronged'[85], as seeking justice.

As the nobles constitute themselves as blessed through affirming themselves through the life enhancing activities with which they are busy, the slaves constitute themselves as blessed by rejecting the other through making the other's power and worldly blessedness a sin that will indirectly afford the slaves' salvation and joy in the hereafter. This becomes self-knowledge, the internalisation of which produces new discourses, power relations, and knowledge and subjectivity. Now, the slaves can reason that because they are miserable, their actions in this world only contribute to their life in paradise in the hereafter. And if they are happy within this new community due to their ability to properly discharge the violence and verbal aggression within them, all the better for them, on a psychological level. That is to say, that in an alternative episteme or value system, the, enunciative capability can be distributed to potential perpetrators, because they are not seen as potential perpetrators in this community.

---

[82] See, for example, Marusek, S. 2017. Op cit. pp.7-14.
[83] Lynch, O. 2013. Op cit. p.250.
[84] Ibid. p.254.
[85] Nietzsche, F. 2007. Op cit. §2.11.

2.4 Assisting the priest

There is a final analogy that can be drawn between Nietzsche's priest and thought leaders assisting terrorist groups that shows why pushing citizens into an alternative *episteme*, outside of the mainstream is undesirable. So-called 'Abu Haleema' is an incarcerated British hate-preacher thought to be affiliated with Daesh, documented by the filmmaker Jamie Roberts. In spite of his own list of litanies against his treatment in the UK, Haleema does not moralize like Nietzsche's slave. Instead, he is like the priest because he finds a way, which he may believe in, to offer hopeless, hapless individuals a meaning and a justification for the shortcomings and disappointment they face throughout their existence. Like the priest, he arrives ready to transform the bubbling *ressentiment* of the slaves into something that suits him. The priest, in Nietzsche, offers the slave a way out through perpetuating the suffering in this life by envisioning a glorious hereafter. Islamist hate preachers offer this glorious hereafter, but at the same time, they offer actionable measures as a short-cut to get there. They serve the same purpose for the slaves who suffer: explaining their suffering as useful to something else, something otherworldly. The preacher and the priest both offer the vulnerable a reason for their suffering. Recall:

> What actually arouses one's indignation against suffering is not suffering intrinsically, but the senseless of suffering.[86]

Human beings can and will suffer, but we seek to know why we do it – just consider the self-lacerating jealousy of the lover. Like the priest, the preacher emerges in the lives of the slaves to eradicate the senselessness of their suffering, transforming it into an active practice of the ascetic ideal. Both respective slave groups have the *ressentiment* that they harbour reinterpreted and given meaning through the intellectual ingenuity of the priest or priest-like figure. The *ressentiment* of Muslim youths can be transformed into an endorsement of an alternative *episteme*. As the 'ascetic ideal provides an existential form for subjects that secures their existence'[87], so we can say that the extremist religious ideology offered by such a figure as Haleema and others like him does the same. Importantly, this is not in virtue of its being extreme *per se*, but because within the linguistic community in which it is produced, members who are denied the conditions to exercise the enunciative capability in the mainstream sphere are either able to do so in the alternative one, or are able to see people with whom they identify doing so and this placates them. The point here is that the denial of the conditions to exercise the enunciative capability within the mainstream makes these individuals more susceptible to the manipulation of such a priest-like figure. Therefore, it is not only a matter of social justice to afford these groups the functioning to exercise the enunciative capability, but also a pragmatic move, in line with the aim of preventing terrorism and radicalisation.

---

[86] Nietzsche, F.2007. Op cit. §2.7

[87] Saar, M. 2008. 'Forces and Powers in Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*' in Roodt, V, and Siemens, H, *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. Berlin/Boston, DE: De Gruyter. pp.454-466. p.462.

We should note that whilst the treatment of perceived potential perpetrators may encourage and assist radicalisation, we are not able to generalise from this claim. There are countless examples of Western, Muslim converts fleeing their country of origin and Western lifestyle, in which they are afforded the enunciative capability, to fight with Daesh or Al Nusra group in Syria[88]. What leads them to do so is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is safe to say that it would contradict the argument here if what encouraged this behaviour was the absence of the enunciative capability given their belonging within the warrior caste, according to the argument here. They may lack other capabilities, and more research should be accorded to this topic. Therefore, we should stay clear of trying to account for *all* cases of radicalisation and keep our focus on Muslims in mind.

The point of drawing these analogies was to export the argument about the enunciative capability from Nietzsche's *GM* to these groups. I hope to have shown that non-Muslim Westerners tend to have the capability, to varying degrees; whereas, Muslims or Muslim-looking citizens tend to lack it, or they are expected to earn it, at best[89]. The latter group are perceived as potential perpetrators of terrorism, whilst the former group are perceived as potential victims. The distribution of the enunciative capability is not equal between potential victims and potential perpetrators of terrorism. The example of the priest emphasises how counterproductive to the project of preventing terrorism this is, because like it sends the marginalised group in search of an alternative linguistic community, where it can engage with its own slave revolt in terrorism. The preacher's value system lurks outside of the mainstream, too. Redistributing the enunciative capability to avoid the revolt should surely a preferred option to fostering and contributing to a state of affairs that encourages the formation of a revolt. In the following chapter I will recommend this and provide two practical recommendations for accomplishing it. This is not to say that this flat out solves the problem of terrorism and radicalisation, but it might go some way in reducing it. To conclude, then, in this chapter we have seen how the kind of power called the enunciative capability is unfairly distributed between potential victims of terrorism and potential perpetrators. Potential victims are provided with the conditions to apply it, whilst potential perpetrators are denied those conditions, and consequently the capability to use this capability, too.

---

[88] See, for example, Julia Loffle and Emily Kassie's report, 'Mothers of ISIS' in *The Huffington Post* << http://highline.huffingtonpost.com/articles/en/mothers-of-isis/ >>

[89] Marusek, S. 2017. Op cit.

Chapter Three: What steps can be taken to redistribute the enunciative capability more fairly?

In chapter one, we identified the enunciative capability. In chapter two, we recognised how it is unfairly distributed between potential victims and potential perpetrators of terrorism. The latter group is unable to exercise this capability in mainstream, public discourse. In this chapter, I suggest that by redistributing this capability more fairly we may be able to reduce the threat of terrorism by discouraging those who seek alternative linguistic communities from doing so by affording them this capability within the mainstream discursive field. I offer two suggestions to redistribute the enunciative capability more fairly. First, the implementation of citizen-wide critical teaching programmes; and, second, institutional checks and balances to maintain a limit on the enunciative capability that can be exercised by individuals in certain jobs. Of course, these suggestions are not exhaustive. They can be seen as an extension to the main body of the thesis.

3.1 Why redistribute the enunciative capability?

Redistributing the enunciative capability means increasing the number of agents that can use a term legitimately within a network of agents. This means multiplying the nodes of enunciation that exist in a network. Since the enunciative capability is a kind of power, we can say that it is exercised upon a network of circling power relations. To be able to exercise the enunciative capability is to be able to exercise a kind of power; it is to possess the function to do so. We agreed in chapter two that we would assume that people possess the internal capability to exercise the enunciative capability and when they are unable to exercise it, this is due to the external social, political or economic conditions not allowing them to do so. We will maintain this assumption going forward.

Commenting on Foucault's strategies of power, Gilles Deleuze writes, 'the power to be affected is like a *matter* of force, and the power to affect is like a *function* of force'[90]. As long as there are individuals constructing their lives upon the circuit of power relations mentioned above, but lacking the ability to affect the circuit by exercising power themselves, then they are merely subjected by the forces by which they are affected, as opposed to coming into contact with those forces and affecting them as well as being affected by them. One may be affected by a conversation without needing to participate in it, but sooner or later, if one is unable to participate and observe one's impact on the conversation, one may feel alienated or dispossessed, turn one's need for self-expression inwards and ultimately feel

---

[90] Deleuze, G. 2012. Op cit. p.60.

resentment towards those affecting the conversation. In contrast, if one is able to exercise power within this network and change something in the flow of forces, one will have expressed oneself therein. I.e., one's will to power may be quenched in the second instance, but not in the first.

To be sure, one can exercise power at a nano-level without the scope for enunciation. E.g., I pick up the book beside me, remove it from the pile, and place it beside the pile on the desk. By doing so, I exercise power at a nano-level, modifying the actions of no one to any noticeable degree, not even their act of thinking. In order to exercise power at a *micro*-level, and this is the level that we are interested in, the statements comprising the relevant, surrounding discourse must be accessible and open to reformulation. This is not to say that knowledge is necessarily transformed, but that it has the *potential* to be. If I ask a toddler to provide me with the rules of playing chess, whatever s/he says does not have the potential to move my local knowledge of the topic, because at the outset, I dismiss the toddler's capability to properly enunciate the rules of chess. Whatever she utters around this topic, I perceive as illegitimate. If it happens to be true, I regard this as an exception. Whereas if an older, more experienced chess player informed me of, say, the castling rule – that you are not allowed to castle your king if this passes the king through the gaze of the opponent's piece – I'd be more likely to take this utterance as legitimate and informative. Whilst 'to know is to interpret'[91], it is at the same time to have that interpretation accepted. If I were to interpret Foucault as being a linguistic descriptivist, I would not be recognised as knowing what kind of philosopher of language Foucault is – if any. The toddler's contribution may have value in other areas, and may indeed contribute to producing knowledge to something else, but s/he is not considered capable of affecting knowledge with regard to the rules of chess, at least not by me. For the child lacks the social conditions that afford the seasoned chess player the enunciative capability in this example.

It seems understandable that this should be an adult's attitude to a toddler's capacity to contribute to the rules of chess amongst other topics. However, applying this kind of dismissiveness at the outset to a social group, precludes their capacity to contribute in the same way to a society's paradigmatic knowledge as those possessing the enunciative capability. As we have seen, when forces are integrated by the human mind and that integration is normalised or formalised by being interpreted at the outset by an authority, it is considered valid within an *episteme*. We have also seen that the mode of existence of an individual derives from his or her normative framework of behaviour that in turn derives

---

[91] Foucault, M. 1994. Op cit. p.32.

from forms of knowledge, that at the beginning, derive from thoughts[92]. Being unable to engage with this sequence save for at the latter two parts that concern action, is being paralysed at the moment of discussing and deciding upon the rules for action. I.e. the rules of language games are decided upon by groups, but those groups do not include all members of society, yet they are expected to continually participate in them. This is because, like the toddler they are not recognised as possessing the capability to properly enunciate; what they say and think is not given the same weight as others. Still, they are expected, more or less, to accept what others say. Justice, as the capabilities approach tells us, requires that individuals be able to exercise certain important capabilities, and the enunciative capability, here is one of them. Moreover, given the perceived threat of terrorism, and the line that seems to lie separating the capability for enunciation and the lack thereof, granting the enunciative capability may reduce this threat by affording the potential perpetrators a place for enunciation in the mainstream.

One objects: suppose that we redistribute this enunciative capability, what is to say that the priest-like figures we identified in chapter two will not continue seeking to radically proselytize, given how 'bent on [their] own brand of dominion'[93] they are? Of course, there is no guarantee. The solution is not geared towards redirecting the efforts of the priest, as much as it is at affording the priest's potential followers, i.e. potential terrorists, a better chance to reject the priest by offering better alternatives. The current environment pushes individuals outside of the mainstream, not necessarily into terrorism, but definitely into an alternative sphere of valuation. As Lynch states,

> As part of an effort to escape the, at times, xenophobic and discriminatory debates on integration, the youths in this study have come to situate their identity *outside* of these debates.[94] (Own emphasis.)

If, on the other hand, potential perpetrators are afforded the enunciative capability in the mainstream discursive sphere, then their enunciation of terrorism may gain some credibility. It would encourage them to remain within the mainstream by offering them more to lose if they leave it. This means that they would not be forced to succumb to an alternative mode of valuation and being in seeking to exercise this capability. Suppose are happy in your job, you receive good remuneration, work hours are not too long, you feel intellectually challenged

[92] Foucault, M. 2010. Foucault, M. 2010. 'The Government of the Self and Others' *Lectures at the Collège de France*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.p.3.
[93] Ridley, A. 1998. Nietzsche's Conscience: Six Character Studies from the "Genealogy". New York: Cornell University Press. p.47.
[94] Lynch, O. 2013. Op cit. p.255.

and motivated, you get along with your colleagues and they respect and value you, and there is scope for career progression. If you are scouted by a head-hunter, you have no reason to accept or even entertain their proposal, because all of your needs and many of your desires are being met in your current workplace. I.e., you are able to exercise multiple work-related capabilities. Redistributing the enunciative capability to those currently perceived to be potential perpetrators of terrorism would afford them a capability hitherto missing, the lack of which seems to encourage them to reject the mainstream. Outside of the mainstream, lies the priest and his desire for manipulation. Thus, by redistributing the enunciative capability within the mainstream, the need to seek it outside is reduced and with it the chances for success belonging to the priest. Still, to be sure, the priest or priest-like figure may still have the opportunity to attempt to radically proselytize all the same. However, if there is no demand for this alternative knowledge, the supply of it will eventually lessen. The priests receive their own legitimacy from their willing interlocutors, after all. That is, even if such individuals as hate-preachers were afforded the external conditions to be able to speak, they may fail to establish a necessary symbiotic relationship with listeners so that their hate-speech would be seen as lacking in credibility within the mainstream. As the situation currently is, on the other hand, we find that willing interlocutors do exist, but within their *own* linguistic communities.

The redistribution of the enunciative capability, then, may not act as a deterrent to those well-entrenched within an alternative *episteme*, but may act as a preventative mechanism to others. Furthermore, in order for the enunciative capability to work, the conditions must allow it. Accepting that language, in its enunciative primacy, plays as significant a role as the contents of it do, then if we want to reduce the negative interaction between words and phenomena, we need to ensure that this warehouse of enunciative energy is not limited to just a few members of society. Redistributing the enunciative capability means expanding the space in the warehouse of enunciation so that more members of society can access and affect the existence of statements within a society and thereby actively participate in it.

3.2 Critical pedagogy

Now that we have motivated the redistribution of the enunciative capability, let us consider how we can go about redistributing it more fairly. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paul Freire argues for critical pedagogy, which he sometimes calls 'problem-posing education'[95]. Problem-posing education involves dialogue and critical thinking – no surprise there. The

---

[95] Freire, P. 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, London: Continuum. p.84.

ability to think critically and to also be considered an individual capable of having and sharing critical, valuable thoughts, divides the conditions for the functioning of the enunciative capability between members of the classroom. A by-product of the method behind this dialogical, critical education is teaching students and thus future citizens to treat language critically. E.g. why is the term terrorism used here and not there? What projects does this serve, if any? For, if discourse is all that there is, and language is the verbal part of discourse, then treating language critically falls under thinking critically. Reason and critical reflection are required to disentangle strategies of power in language. We have seen that naming events 'acts of terrorism' is a product of linguistic normalisation. Critical minds should be able to identify this, by becoming 'more sensitive to the muted testimonies of language and the plumb layers of experience preserved in it'[96].

Citizens with the capacity to reflect critically on the practice of naming and marking are better equipped to notice when there are attempts to smuggle power in. In fact, they are well-placed to prevent this at the outset. For, it is much more difficult to impose meaning onto someone with a critical mind than it is onto someone who acts as a depository of information from authority. Applying a critical distance to discourse allows the individual to better analyse that very discourse, providing him or her with more autonomy regarding it, and importantly, more power in being able to *choose* how to treat it. Being made of aware of the arbitrariness and the lack of power that language *has* per se, and yet its almost paradoxical quality of carrying the thoughts of an age, when people do radical things with language, critical listeners should be able to identify this.

Constituting subjectivities free of resentment and adept to participate in a democracy must be related to their having critical thinking skills, so that they can understand how the social reality in which they are caught and by which they are constituted functions. By deterring individuals from accepting the authority of every individual claiming to be an authority and providing individuals with the tools to see that those structures are arbitrary and express themselves in logical argumentation, critical pedagogy could help prevent radicalisation from gaining traction. By accepting a norm, one reinforces an aspect of one's identity, which, in turn, reinforces a kind of knowledge and power. By rejecting it, one will eventually, notably alter an *episteme*. Providing citizens with critical reasoning skills allows them to take a critical distance from discourse so that one can consider it more critically. To quote Horkheimer, 'to liberate themselves from the circumstances that enslave them'[97], with belief

---

96 Horkheimer, M. 1947. *Eclipse of Reason*. New York: Oxford University Press. p.165.
97 Horkheimer, M. 2002. *Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum. p.244.

through normalisation or the 'tyranny of the majority'[98] being one of those circumstances. As Donaldo Macedo writes:

> [Freire's] problem-posing education...offered to me – and all those who experience subordination through an imposed assimilation policy – a path through which we come to understand what it means to come to cultural voice. It is a process that always involved pain and hope; a process through which, as forced cultural jugglers, we can come to subjectivity, transcending our object position in a society that hosts us yet is alien.[99]

Freire's model could be applied to instilling these skills into citizens through education centres in which citizens are required to attend one or two classes every month, during their work day, for which they are paid. This approach could be married with trying harder to harbour a culture of critical pedagogy in all schools, and not just private ones. This is not to say that reason triumphs over all, but this 'over all' should be chosen by the individual according to his or her will. In order to be able to do this, she must be able to separate her will, by being able to autonomously exercise power. I.e. s/he should not be coerced into it. 'Education ought not to be aimed at telling individuals *what* to think. Education ought to teach students *how* to think'[100]. Trying to breed docile citizens is counterproductive to ensuring a secure democracy. Breeding docile minds is a waiting game, where the vulnerable mind awaits the more compellingly presented dogma, presented at the time when the individual is weakest.

One might object that an element of docility is required in order to implement such critical pedagogy schemes at the outset. This is not a fatuous concern. However, it is known that all organised society is built upon a kind of legitimate coercion, for better or for worse. In this case, we assume that it is for better and defend this inescapably paternalistic aim as legitimate to the end of living in a more harmonious society, less threatened by terrorism.

An objection emerges from within the literature that marries critical pedagogy with critical attack. Roughly, it says the critical pedagogy is a *means* that does not teach one about anything in particular, but makes one quite adept at poking holes in unfinished thoughts or attitudes[101]. In normalising an educational culture of critical attack, David Hayes argues, people will be reluctant to try new and unfinished thoughts out when 'what they can expect

---

[98] Mill, J.S. 2001. *On Liberty*. Kitchener: Batoche Books. p.9.

[99] Freire, P. 2005. Op cit. p.10

[100] Sawaya, V.C. 2012. 'The Truth of the Matter: A Defense of Critical Thinking as the Principle Aim of Education' in *Stance* Vol 5. pp.75-84. p.79.

[101] Hayes, D. 2015. 'Against critical thinking pedagogy' in *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education 2015*. Vol 14 – Issue 4. pp.318 – 328.p.321.

as a reward is a critical attack'[102]. Of course, this objection is directed to critical pedagogy as a final end of education, whereas our approach to critical pedagogy here views it as *instrumental* to maintaining fairer societies more secure from the threat of terrorism. Therefore, it is not compulsory upon us to resolve this objection. Although as a side note, critical pedagogy does not imply a lack of courtesy or openness in the classroom or outside of it. If it seems that critical thinkers tend to be brusquer and more brash, then this may not be a result of their critical thinking skills, but rather a different reason that is subjective to each individual. There is nothing to say that a critical case for good manners and polite conversational skills cannot be made on its merit to the individual and the community.

3.3 Institutional reform

The second suggestion to redistribute the enunciative capability seeks to place limits on the amount of time that a single individual can hold a post that affords the post holder the conditions to continually exercise the enunciative capability. We currently place legal limits on such politically influential positions as those of the president, prime minister, mayor etc. within a democracy, in order to ensure that power is balanced. Political pundits and commentators often remain in the same post for decades[103]. This is not to say that these are not talented people doing fine work, however, other talented people could also be doing fine work whilst receiving the opportunity to exercise the enunciative capability. Since the substantive nature of this work is to convince others of their points of view, writing and talking about issues of public concern within the public domain, diversifying the individuals who can hold these posts would create the social conditions that would diversify the public exercise of the capability. The principle extends to think-tanks, because the research that they produce can be driven by a monopolised vision. Instead of arguing that only power should be decentralised to enhance democracy, this recommendation suggests the actual way to do so is by altering the conditions that for now limit the amount of people who can exercise the enunciative capability in this capacity. Such institutional changes expand the enunciative warehouse, making it more accessible to others in society and according them a capability heretofore lacking. By making such institutional changes, positions offering the external capability open up to those who lack the external conditions to exercise the capability. If at the library, I am not allowed to sit at the same computer and desk more than five times in one month, then other students receive the capacity to do so. In doing so, they exercise some power, whereas, if I am always permitted to sit at the same desk, this opportunity ceases to exist for them. Additionally, studies have shown that shared leadership

---

[102] Ibid.
[103] E.g. Nick Robinson of the BBC, Adam Boulton of Sky News, Polly Toynbee of the Guardian et al. have all held onto their posts for over a decade.

can 'maximise talent'[104]. So too could sharing such posts that offer thought leadership. Research should be afforded to assessing to what extent a post is conducive to knowledge production and whether or not it would be worth applying legal limitations to people's ability to remain within it.

Some may object that this is rather draconian. How can we live in a democracy if people aren't able to pursue their notions of the good life? Yet, strata of citizens are currently unable to pursue their notions of the good life, by having the conditions to exercise this enunciative capability denied. Therefore, institutional change may help to disseminate this pursuit of the good life within a single evaluative sphere, subverting the need to develop alternative communities of valuation. By marrying the discovery of this capability with Nussbaum's capabilities approach, we can claim that a just society would provide its citizens with the enunciative capability or the right to use politically significant terms legitimately and in a contributory way within that society. This may not make the recommendation any less "draconian", but it should show that it is not intrinsically undemocratic. Affording the enunciative capability to citizens who do not contribute to the mainstream *episteme* and thus society allows them to contribute to the mainstream society instead of a parallel one. If this is the case, then surely this does not limit democracy, but aids it, by allowing more citizens to actively participate and shape the country's *episteme*.

A different objection, however, raises the point that perhaps those from marginalised groups do not hold such posts because of their qualifications and expertise, or lack thereof. Even if we accepted such institutional reforms, the kind of social groups that I am suggesting to fill those roles, would not be able to do so. Suppose this were the case, then this would allude to an underlying issue in society that would warrant further research. Moreover, a quick look at the 'terrorism experts' in the USA shows us that you do not need to be real expert to be able to exercise the enunciative capability[105]. It seems more important to have the opportunity to be in the right place, at the right time, amongst the right people, who are willing to afford you credibility.

In conclusion, I hope to have shown that it is not out of the question to redistribute the enunciative capability and importantly to have argued convincingly in favour of doing so. Namely, that by redistributing the enunciative capability within mainstream discourse, the need for those who lack of the function of it to seek it outside, is reduced. This, in turn, decreases the chance of them being manipulated by a priest-like figure lurking in the alternative linguistic communities. The suggestions I proposed should not be considered

---

[104] Goldsmith, M. 2010. 'Sharing Leadership to Maximise Talent' in *Harvard Business Review*. << https://hbr.org/2010/05/sharing-leadership-to-maximize>>
[105] Marusek, S. 2017. Op cit. p.3

exhaustive. More research into the proposed solutions and others would be required in order to achieve them. Nonetheless, I hope I have at least sparked an interest in these two proposals and to have persuaded the reader of the benefits of redistributing the enunciative capability.

Conclusion

We began with the aim of demonstrating that there is a kind of power that is related to the right to use certain terms legitimately and that it is unfairly distributed with respect to terrorism. We called this power the enunciative capability. In chapter one, we identified the capability in showing that terrorism is socially constructed as an object of discourse. In chapter two, we first justified the decision to use the name 'enunciative capability' and distinguished it from three seemingly similar capabilities offered by Nussbaum. We agreed that the enunciative capability would be regarded as a combined capability: to exercise it one would have to possess the internal capability to do so and the external social, political and economic conditions to allow one to do so. After this, in line with the wider aim of the chapter of explaining how the enunciative capability works and is distributed, we sketched Nietzsche's warrior and slave moralities and argued that the warriors possess the functioning of the enunciative capability in mainstream society whilst the slaves do not. The slave revolt in morality is a way to seek and gain the functioning of the capability albeit in a different linguistic community. We drew an analogy between the warriors and potential victims of terrorism, and the slaves and potential perpetrators, so that we could argue that in a parallel fashion, potential victims are able to exercise the enunciative capability with regard to terrorism, whilst potential perpetrators are not. Drawing on the literature within terrorism studies, we showed that potential perpetrators are predominantly young, Muslim males in the West, whilst perceived potential victims are "native" Westerners. We then indicated that it is counterproductive to deny potential perpetrators the conditions to exercise this capability because it leads them to form or seek alternative linguistic communities. Once they are outside of the mainstream sphere, we showed, they become more susceptible to radicalisation, because this is where such figures as radical hate-preachers, akin to Nietzsche's priest, operate. This served as the basis for the argument that redistributing the enunciative capability may reduce the threat of terrorism, since the line that separates potential victims and potential perpetrators seems to be the possession of functioning of the enunciative capability and its absence. Chapter three asserted in more direct terms the argument in favour of redistributing the enunciative capability, spelling out the lack of warrant in denying it to adult members of a society. Then, it acted as an extension to the main body of the thesis insofar as it offered two recommendations for redistributing the enunciative capability. First, the dissemination of critical pedagogical schemes. Second, institutional changes that would create the conditions for more marginalised groups – insofar as the enunciative capability is concerned – to exercise this capability. E.g., I suggested that political commentators should have a limited amount of time to fulfil this role.

The recommendations that I offered should be regarded as a starting point, in need of further research. To be sure, there is already work being done to try to reduce the threat of terrorism by seeking to prevent radicalisation. E.g., in the UK, the Muslim Council of Britain has set up grass-roots initiatives to deter young people by teaching them that violence can never be used[106]. However, such organisations remain outside of the mainstream discursive sphere and go no way in trying to make those youths' enunciation credible within the mainstream. Reasons for this vary, but this could be an important angle for research. Still, this paper has shown that it is important that we treat citizens fairly and ensure that they can exercise their capabilities. Not doing so is not only socially unjust, but actually strategically counterproductive. Whilst the aim here was specifically directed towards enunciation with respect to terrorism, it may be useful to focus on other politically significant terms and to see what kind of role the enunciative capability plays there. E.g., with regard to racism, how is the enunciative capability distributed? It may be insightful to analyse in more depth what social configurations afford the conditions of the capability with regard to each term. A different project might seek to situate the role of the enunciative capability in the classroom, amongst children in their formative years and whether or not their being able to exercise this capability affects them in the long-term.

Ultimately, I hope to have ignited an awareness of a specific kind of power, the enunciative capability and to have contributed to the literature on terrorism by showing how perceived potential perpetrators of terrorism are denied this special kind of power. I hope I showed that the current treatment of perceived potential perpetrators of terrorism as counterproductive to the end of reducing the threat of terrorism. At the same time, I hope the paper was encouraging in hinting that in trying to create a more homogeneous, inclusive society, we may reduce the threat of terrorism as it currently stands in the West.

---

[106] Dodd, V. 2016. 'Muslim Council of Britain to set up alternative counter-terror scheme' in *The Guardian*. << https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/oct/19/muslim-council-britain-set-up-alternative-counter-terror-scheme>>

Bibliography

Aistrope, T. 2016. 'The Muslim paranoia narrative in counter-radicalisation policy' in *Critical Studies on Terrorism* Vol.9 – Issue 2. pp.182-204.

De Beauvoir, S. 1959. 'Woman as Other' in *The Second Sex*. <<https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/2nd-sex/introduction.htm>>

Brown, K.E. and Saeed, T. 2015. 'Radicalization and counter-radicalization at British universities: Muslim encounters and alternatives' in *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol.38-Issue 11. pp.1952-1968.

Butler, J. 1999. *Gender Trouble*. London: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. 2012. *Foucault*. London, New York: Continuum.

Dodd, V. 2016. 'Muslim Council of Britain to set up alternative counter-terror scheme' in *The Guardian*. << https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/oct/19/muslim-council-britain-set-up-alternative-counter-terror-scheme>>

Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse of Language*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. 2008. 'The Birth of Biopolitics' in *Lectures at the Collège de France*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. 1975. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. 2010. 'The Government of the Self and Others' *Lectures at the Collège de France*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. *The History of Sexuality Vol. I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. 1982. 'The Subject and Power' in *Critical Inquiry* Vol. 8, No. 4. pp.777-795.

Freire, P. 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York, London: Continuum.

Hayes, D. 2015. 'Against critical thinking pedagogy' in *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education 2015*. Vol 14 – Issue 4. pp.318 – 328.

Hopkins, J. 2014. 'Psychologically disturbed and on the side of the terrorists: the delegitimisation of critical intellectuals in *Terrorism and Political Violence*. Vol.7-Issue 2. pp.297-312.

Horkheimer, M. 2002. *Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.

Horkheimer, M. 1947. *Eclipse of Reason*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R. 2005. Writing the War on Terrorism: Language, Politics and Counter-terrorism. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Keatinge, T. 'Why Qatar is the focus of terrorism claims' in *BBC News*. << http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-40246734>>

Kearns, E, M., Betus, A and Lemieux, A. 2017. Why Do Some Terrorist Attacks Receive More Media Attention Than Others? <<https://ssrn.com/abstract=2928138>>

Lynch, O. 2013. 'British Muslim youth: radicalisation, terrorism and the construction of the "other" in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. Vol.6- Issue 2. pp.241-261.

Mamdani, M. 2002. 'Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism' in *American Anthropologist* Vo. 104 – No. 3. pp.766-775

Mill, J.S. 2001. *On Liberty*. Kitchener: Batoche Books.

Nelson, A. 2017. 'EU declared Monsanto weedkiller safe after intervention from controversial US official' in *The Guardian*. << https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/may/24/eu-declared-monsanto-weedkiller-safe-after-intervention-from-controversial-us-official>>

New Statesman, 2016. 'Thomas Mair found guilty of murdering Jo Cox MP' in *New Statesman* << http://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2016/11/thomas-mair-found-guilty-murdering-jo-cox-mp>>

Nietzsche, F. 2002. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nietzsche, F. 2007. *On the Genealogy of Morality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, M. 1997. 'Capabilities and Human Rights' in *Fordham Law Review* Vol. 66, Issue 2. pp.273-300.

Nussbaum, M. 2013. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. 2001. 'Political Objectivity' in *New Literary History*. Vol. 32 – Issue 4. pp.883-906.

Ridley, A. 1998. *Nietzsche's Conscience: Six Character Studies from the "Genealogy"*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Ruiz, H and Emery, M. 2001. 'Afghanistan's Refugee Crisis' in *Middle East Research and Information Project*. <http://www.merip.org/mero/mero092401>

Saar, M. 2008. 'Forces and Powers in Nietzsche's *Genealogy of Morals*' in Roodt, V, and Siemens, H, *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. Berlin/Boston, DE: De Gruyter. pp.454-466.

Saul, J and Diaz-Leon, E. 2017. 'Feminist Philosophy of Language' in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* edited by Zalta, E.N., forthcoming. << *https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/feminism-language/*>>

Sawaya, V.C. 2012. 'The Truth of the Matter: A Defense of Critical Thinking as the Principle Aim of Education' in *Stance* Vol 5. pp.75-84.

Spender, D. 1983. *Man-made Language*. London: Routledge

Tirrell, L. 1993. 'Definition and Power: Toward Authority without Privilege' in *Hypatia*. Vol. 8- Issue 4. pp.1-34.

Tirrell, L. 1998. 'Language and Power' in *Companion to Feminist Philosophy* edited by Jaggar, A and Young, I. Blackwell. pp.139-151.

Toros, H. 2017. '"9/11 is alive and well" or how critical terrorism studies has sustained the 9/11 narrative' in *Critical Studies on Terrorism*. pp.203-129.

Travis, A. 2016. 'Snooper's charter' bill becomes law, extending UK state surveillance' in *the Guardian* <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/29/snoopers-charter-bill-becomes-law-extending-uk-state-surveillance>>

Wittgenstein, L. 1975. *On Certainty*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Zeyfuss, M. 2003. 'Forget September 11' in *Third World* Quarterly. Vol. 24 – No.3. pp.513-528.