

Anti-Choice Leaderless Resistance

A Study on the Fight of Lone Wolves

Elżbieta Pośluszna

Logos Verlag Berlin



Reviewers:
Prof. Daniel Kucharek
Prof. Mariusz Kubiak

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de> .

© Copyright Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH 2019
All rights reserved.

ISBN 978-3-8325-4815-5

Logos Verlag Berlin GmbH
Comeniushof, Gubener Str. 47,
D-10243 Berlin
Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)30 / 42 85 10 90
Fax: +49 (0)30 / 42 85 10 92
<http://www.logos-verlag.com>

1 Introduction

A radical objection movement against abortion constituted in the second half of the 20th century. The countries where the movement was the strongest were the United States of America and Canada. It took the most extreme form in those countries, as well. Although it is true that many moralists tried before to vigorously oppose the procedure of fetus removal, due to the lack of the public's interest of that problem and the fact that before 1973 the procedure had not been legally sanctioned at the state level, the protest was neither dynamic enough, nor it had enough causative force. It does not mean, of course, that the issue of abortion did not generate strong emotions.

In the 18th and the first half of the 19th century the admissibility of abortion in the United States was regulated by the British customary law, according to which abortion was acceptable until the first movements of the fetus were noticed (i.e., approximately till around the fifth month of pregnancy). This law was not controversial, as it was widely believed at that time that the fetus in "immovable state" was inanimate matter and as such was not fully a human being. In fact, the first US law regulating this issue (modeled, in part, on the customary English law) was adopted in the State Connecticut in 1821. The Act was neither "specifically restrictive," nor "really morally engaged on the side of the fetus." It introduced, admittedly, the ban on abortion in the relatively late phase of fetal development (after the first movements in the uterus), but such was a common trend that reflected the English legislation, not the liberal attitude of the Americans. The Act also included an article protecting the health and life of a woman and prohibiting the use of any dangerous poisons during the abortion procedure. Soon, similar laws were adopted in Missouri, Illinois, and New York. In the last of these states, the law (enacted in

1 Introduction

1828) allowed for termination of pregnancy even after the fetal movements were ascertained, but only when the pregnancy could become the cause of the woman's death. In such a case, the consultation and consent of at least two doctors were required. Until 1860, other twenty states legally regulated the issue of abortion in a similar manner as the 1821 Act did.

In the second half of the 19th century, there was a significant change in the motivation behind the legislative efforts. Later on, next to the pragmatic demands for women's health and life, demands of moral nature that called for the necessity of introducing legal protection of the fetus began to appear more and more. The first such a postulate was put forward in 1859 by the American Medical Association (AMA), which not only recognized abortion as "unjustifiable destruction of human life," but organized an active lobbying campaign in the state legislatures to enact new, much more radical restrictions on termination of pregnancy. The doctors who opposed abortion were soon joined by "professional moralists." In 1869, Bishop Spaulding of Baltimore stated that "the murder of the infant before its birth is (. . .) as great a crime, as would be the killing of a child after birth."¹ In 1867, a popular congregational clergyman condemned abortion in an article entitled "Fashionable Murder." Also, Congregational Church recognized abortion as something much worse than slavery or war. The press supported the moralists. In 1871 the New York Times published an article entitled "The Evil of the Age" which author deplored the fact that "thousands of human beings are (. . .) murdered before they have seen the light of this world."² In a similar tone it was presented on the pages of the New York Tribune, calling murderers everyone who kill their children "either before or after birth."³ This "moral campaign" influenced the legislative ac-

¹Quoted after: "Safety Valve Closed: The Removal of Nonviolent Outlets for Dissent and the Onset of Anti-Abortion Violence," *Harvard Law Review*, 2000, Vol. 113, No. 5, p. 1214.

²"The Evil of the Age," *New York Times*, 23 August 1971; quoted after: "Safety Valve Closed: The Removal of Nonviolent Outlets for Dissent and the Onset of Anti-Abortion Violence," *op. cit.*, pp. 1213-1214.

³*New York Tribune*, 27 January 1868; quoted after: "Safety Valve Closed: The

tion. In 1872 Congress passed the so-called "Comstock Law"⁴, which forbade the use of mail for transporting literature and obscene articles, medicines and equipment dedicated for abortion and contraception, as well as their manufacturing and selling in the Federal District of Columbia and other territories under the jurisdiction of the federal authorities.

Until 1890 each state had its more or less restrictive "abortion law" (in Connecticut and Massachusetts, where Catholics were prevalent, abortion was forbidden entirely). Differences in abortion law between the various States remained until the second half of the 20th century. It is worth noting that although in many states abortion was a crime, and there were a lot of illegal procedures carried out, there were few indictments and convictions for the removal of pregnancy. For example, in Minnesota in 1911-1930 there were only 100 of them, of which only 31 ended up with convictions; in Michigan in 1893-1932 – there were 156 indictments, of which only 40 ended with the convictions.⁵ During this period, the majority of abortion opponents argued that it was a threat to the traditional gender division. In the 1871 Report of the American Medical Association it was stated that a woman requesting an abortion forgets about the fate set down for her by the Providence; therefore, she is "selfish" and "immoral." Such a woman succumbs to pleasure and defends herself from the troubles and responsibility of motherhood, so the husband of such a woman should not be enchanted by the fact that he gained her love. For, she cannot appreciate the respect of the righteous husband.⁶ Such views were reflected in the then legislation – at the end of the 19th century, 40 anti-abortion acts were issued. This legislation, i.a., abolished the division between the animated and

Removal of Nonviolent Outlets for Dissent and the Onset of Anti-Abortion Violence," *op. cit.*, p. 1214.

⁴The name of the law comes from the surname of a puritan Anthony Comstock, who fervently fought with "sin and crime," which, he believed, were pornography, sexual freedom, and abortion.

⁵See: Kristin Luker, *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, p. 53.

⁶Quoted after: Laurence H. Tribe, *Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992, p. 41.

1 Introduction

unanimous and allowed abortion only in cases where it was necessary to save a woman's life.

Up to 1973 in particular states of the U.S.A., there were more or less restrictive regulations in force from different periods.⁷ The oldest of the state codes prohibited abortion at any stage unless the treatment was necessary to save a woman's life. The acts issued in the 1960s in several states allowed abortion (in accordance with the exemplary Model Penal Code of the American Institute of Law – American Law Institute (ALI) in three cases: when a pregnancy threatens the life or health (physical or mental) of the woman, when there is a danger that the child may be born severely handicapped, and also when the pregnancy is the result of a crime. Such a diverse "abortion policy" led to the emergence of a "miscarriage migration" phenomenon⁸ (conducting the procedures in states with liberal legal solutions, or where there could be a more lenient stance on this issue by the law enforcement), which resulted in circumventing the laws of their own state. It is no wonder that there were more and more voices that demanded the unification of the legislation in the whole country – a unifying that should end the total depenalization of abortion.⁹

As it is widely believed, the emergence of this "climate of legislative change" contributed to the immeasurable transformation of the customs of the late 1960s. At that time the social movements that demanded free access to abortion developed. These demands occurred mainly due to the emancipation process of women and

⁷At the beginning of the 1970s in the states of Alaska, Hawaii and New York the law allowed termination of pregnancy at the request of a woman. In the states of Connecticut and Florida, the law on abortion was based on the "indications" model, but abortion due to social indications was not allowed.

⁸See: Eleonora Zielińska, *Oceny prawnokarne przerywania ciąży – studium porównawcze*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1986, p. 157.

⁹Sociologists and criminologists were particularly active in this field. They expressed the view that the fact that the ban on abortion was an act of discrimination of the poor, which was a violation of the constitutional principle of equality before the law. See: Eleonora Zielińska, *Oceny prawnokarne przerywania ciąży – studium porównawcze*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1986, p. 157.

the increasingly broader dissatisfaction caused by the inefficiency of the propagated methods of birth control. A significant impact on subsequent legislative changes was also ongoing public debate over the demographic perspectives of the United States that took place in the 1960s and early 1970s. More and more often economists argued that the key to material prosperity is a low natural growth. This argument was also used on a global scale, to which a great contribution was undoubtedly the famous publication of the biologist Paul Erlich entitled "The Population Bomb" (1968). In the book, the author drew attention to the problem of the steady growth of the population, especially in the Third World countries. Ehrlich was arguing that if there were no necessary birth regulations adopted in the 1970s and 1980s, hundreds of millions of people would face famine. The attempt to prevent it with the use of technology would not only deliver any results, but would rather worsen the situation because the intensification of food production would destroy the soil, which would, according to Ehrlich, lead to even greater hunger, natural disasters, and nuclear warfare.¹⁰ Summing up this demographic debate, a special Congress Committee concluded that no benefit should be expected from the further development of the population. The contacts with the developing countries seemed to strengthen that view. Dynamic social development and the fact that more and more women were working professionally or studying in the post-II World War era were other factors that contributed to creating a climate for legislative changes regarding abortion. According to Laurence Tribe, in the 1950s-1970s the percent of married white women working outside the home almost doubled, and among black women the increase was 112%. Moreover, many of these women searched for work in the areas traditionally reserved for men. This change was accompanied by a decrease in fertility of women (from the average of 3.7 in the mid-1950s to 2.4 in 1970

¹⁰Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1968. In his essay "Tragedy of the Commons" (1968), ecologist Garrett Hardin, who was convinced that worldwide destruction was inevitable, believed that the survival of the humankind was possible only if it agrees to "mutual constraint," especially in the case of the birth control.

1 Introduction

and 1.8 in 1975), and the increasing number of women who delayed marriage and having children, which, of course, must be linked with the emergence of new contraceptives (intrauterine spiral and contraceptive pill).¹¹

There is no doubt that two tragic phenomena that shook the public have strongly influenced the change of approach to abortion. The first was a scandal related to an unauthorized sale of a sedative called Thalidomide in the United States (but sold in Europe). This medicine caused serious fetal damage, and in effect, the birth of severely deformed children. In 1962, an American, mother of four, Sherri Finkbine learned in the fifth month of pregnancy that the fetus was severely deformed as a result of using that medicine. To warn other women, she described her story in a newspaper, which caused many controversies and led to the hospital's refusal to perform the procedure. None of the doctors wanted to issue a certificate that the patient's health is at risk. (Eventually, Sherri Finkbine went to Sweden to have her pregnancy terminated). This case sparked a discussion in the medical world about a possible range of exceptions from the laws banning abortion. Another tragic event that had an impact on the approach to abortion was the rubella epidemic that erupted in the United States in 1962 (and prevailed till 1965). Due to the epidemic 15,000 children were born with various congenital disabilities. Doctors (and other influential groups moved by this tragedy) began increasingly to proclaim the need to alleviate the existing abortion law.¹² In 1967, the American Medical Association issued a statement that was favorable to a liberalization of the regulations on abortion, and in 1970 it declared abortion admissible (limited only by the doctor's opinion). In the aftermath of the rubella epidemic, the United States of California and Colorado have issued bills that liberalized the law, which, later on, the California Governor Ronald Reagan was forced to sign. But the right climate for legislative changes was not created merely by dramatic events.

¹¹Laurence H. Tribe, *Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992, pp. 47-48.

¹²During the epidemic there were cases of private doctors (and sometimes even hospitals) carrying out abortion procedures without proper authorization.

The daily practice was of the most vital importance. At the end of the 1960s, there were about 1,200,000 illegal abortions, which translated into roughly one procedure per minute. The termination of pregnancy was not, of course, free, and the price depended on to the use of advanced medical equipment (from \$100 to \$1000).¹³

It is worth noting that the change of approach to abortion was also advocated by many clergy representatives and numerous religious organizations. As early as May 1967, 21 clerics declared that they would be directing women to doctors known to perform safe and legal abortions (i.a., in Puerto Rico, the UK, and the US). The organization they created – The Pastoral Guidance – has quickly covered the whole country. In Michigan, such activity was carried out by hundreds of clergymen, including several Catholic priests.¹⁴ In the same year, the support for abortion was declared by the Episcopal Church, the United Church of Christ, the United Methodist Church, the United Presbyterian Church, Church Women United, and the Young Women's Christian Association. Hence, many religious organizations supported the right to abortion.

The pressure from various groups and the impact of "new movements" on social awareness created a conviction, increasingly more and more popular in the early 1970s, that only the decision of the Supreme Court can bring to an end the diversity of less or more strict state legal regulations. Two cases, *Roe v. Wade* and *Doe v. Bolton*, contributed to reaching such a settlement. The first case was related to a woman from Dallas, who, after getting pregnant, sought permission for discontinuation of pregnancy. The permission was not given because the condition (required by the State of Texas) that the pregnancy was a threat to her life was not met. Recognizing that the lack of consent to abortion violates the right of the woman to privacy, the lawyer Jane Roe challenged the Act of the state of Texas in the Federal Court. The case was then

¹³After: Laurence H. Tribe, *Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992, p. 50.

¹⁴See: Laurence H. Tribe, *Abortion: The Clash of Absolutes*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992, pp. 49-50.

1 Introduction

transferred to the Supreme Courts of the United States. However, the settlement procedure continued for so long that the petitioner gave birth to the child. In the meantime, the case *Doe v. Bolton* was sent to the Supreme Court. In spite of the difficult circumstances of her life, the plaintiff did not obtain consent to abortion by the authorities of the State of Georgia. In 1973 the Supreme Court assessed the cases, and by the majority of seven to two votes it issues a ruling, which ultimately regulated the issue in favor of the proponents of the right to abortion. That judgment was that the right of a woman to decide on abortion stemmed from the woman's right to privacy, and as such, it cannot be restricted by state authorities, at least until the time when the fetus was able to live outside the mother's body.¹⁵

The decision of the Supreme Court, so longed for by the followers of the liberal abortion policy, caused activation and criticism from both sides – its proponents (the pro-choice movement) and the opponents (the pro-life movement). The former ones stood against giving state authorities the right to introduce limitations to abortion in the last months of pregnancy, while the latter undermined the substantive and moral validity of the decision. They were also others who argued that the Supreme Court exceeded its competence because that kind of issues should be regulated by state authorities. The ruling has become a strong impulse for the development of the anti-abortion movement. Of course, in the beginning, the movement was of a peaceful nature. Quickly, however, a radical wing emerged, which was later responsible for a series of acts of violence, both, indirect (sabotage), and direct (attacks on people). The two terms that are most often used when talking about the actions of that radical wing are anti-abortion

¹⁵Moreover, in the *Doe v. Bolton* case, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional the state laws, in which the admissibility of abortion depends on whether the validity of that decision was confirmed by two doctors and the hospital committee, as well as those, which limit the availability to the procedure in terms of place (selected establishments) and people (residing in a particular state). See: Eleonora Zielińska, *Oceny prawnokarne przerywania ciąży – studium porównawcze*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1986, p. 160.

extremism and anti-abortion terrorism. The first of them has a slightly broader scope. Extremism as a socio-political concept refers to such views and actions that lie at the borders of a broad political spectrum, with a "balanced" center as a reference point. Political extremism as such can be both, a feature of views (ideologies and beliefs), and a trait of behavior. In the first case, it means to profess certain extreme worldviews or set of beliefs – in our case the ones concerning abortion (mainly the moral status of the fetus and methods of combating abortion), in the second – the use of extreme (generally unacceptable) methods of action.¹⁶ The term terrorism (including anti-abortion terrorism) refers to the ideologically motivated performed by small groups or individuals illegal actions seen by the public as breaking the accepted norms. In the subject matter literature the authors are most likely to use the definition formulated in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), whereby terrorism is defined as "the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives."¹⁷ Similarly, the U.S. Department of Defense defines terrorism as "the unlawful use of violence or threat of violence, often motivated by religious, political, or other ideological beliefs, to instill fear and coerce governments or societies in pursuit of goals that are usually political."¹⁸

¹⁶See: Roman Tokarczyk, „Teoretyczna a praktyczna istota współczesnego ekstremizmu politycznego,” and Roman Bäcker, „Typologia doktryn i ruchów współczesnego ekstremizmu politycznego,” in: Edward Olszewski (ed.), *Doktryny i ruchy współczesnego ekstremizmu politycznego*, Lublin Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 2004, p. 25, pp. 79-80; *Ekstremizm polityczny. Studium psychologiczne*, Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, 2005, p. 12.; see also: Ryszard Herbut, „Ekstremizm polityczny,” in: Andrzej Antoszewski, Ryszard Herbut (eds.), *Leksykon politologii*, Wrocław: Alta 2, 2002, p. 86.

¹⁷U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Terrorism 2002-2005*, p. iv (28 C.F.R. Section 0.85), <https://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/terrorism-2002-2005> (03.05.2018).

¹⁸Department of Defense, *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms (As Amended Through 15 February 2015)*, p. 241, https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jp1_02.pdf (03.05.2018).

On different types of terrorism definitions one may read in: Danny Gold-

1 Introduction

Recognizing these definitions as exemplary (i.e., manifesting some social intuitions), we can assume that attacks on people and sabotage acts motivated by the objection to the legality of abortion should be accounted as anti-abortion terrorism.

The anti-abortion violence is neither a homogeneous, nor a constant (unchanging over time) phenomenon. As it is the case with other types of political violence, there are many diverse, changing in time forms and manifestations of anti-abortion violence. It should be noted, however, that there is a growing radicalization within the movement that is reflected by the number of victims and the instances of material property damage. Of course, a closing of such a complex phenomenon as anti-abortion motivated violence in the rigid framework of simplistic description is always a risky procedure. However, on the other hand, it is, to some extent, necessary because it allows capturing the most essential features of the phenomenon, which in the longer term can bring forth increasingly more effective methods of combating it. What does then characterize the anti-abortion violence, and what does distinguish it from other forms of ideologically motivated violence?

There are, I believe, four notable characteristics (features) that define it. Firstly, it is violence that belongs to the "single issue" category; secondly, it is religiously motivated; thirdly, the strategy it activates upon is based on the leaderless resistance model; fourthly, it is of universalistic nature. Let us briefly explain the meaning of these qualifiers.

The first one is that it belongs to the single issue category. The term single issue is usually used to define violence actions of an individual or a group, which aim not to induce deeper (revolutionary) social or political changes, but rather to solve a single problem

stick, "Defining 'Terrorism,'" or H.H.A. Cooper, "Terrorism: The Problem of Definition Revisited," in: Harvey W. Kushner (ed.), *Political Terrorism: Analyses of Problems and Prospects for the 21st Century*, New York: Richard Altschuler & Associates, 2002; Gus Martin, *Understanding Terrorism. Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2003, pp. 31-45; Alex P. Schmidt, *Political Terrorism. A Research Guide to Concepts, Theories, Data Bases and Literature*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1984, pp. 5-11.

(a "settlement" of one specific issue). Of course, the separation of such a single problem in the activity of specific groups (including the radical anti-abortion groups) is extremely difficult. It is so due to at least three reasons – firstly, these groups are often part of wider social movements, such as those fighting for moral renewal or a new socio-political order, which hinders their ideological determination; secondly, in case of many groups the "purity" of their ideological intentions is nowadays very blurry, due to the fact that they are extremely seldom subject to hierarchical, organizational control (which, in turn, results from the rejection of the classical organizational structure and turning to leaderless resistance); and thirdly, it happens very rarely that a group fights for just one thing. Much more often there are two or even three issues, which (after closer scrutiny) significantly change the socio-political order. In the case of anti-abortion violence, it has to be said, the situation is not that complicated. In the tangle of individual and group goals, one may distinguish one that is given the priority (i.e., is put at the first place and its realization does not entail other objectives). This goal is to introduce a complete ban on abortion. Therefore, in my opinion, one can say that the groups or individuals that reach for anti-abortion violence, despite the numerous ideological entanglements, fight, in fact, for a single issue.

Another element (feature) of anti-abortion violence is a strong religious motivation. In fact, for the anti-abortion groups (both radical and non-violent), it is a potent stimulus to support and even build their rhetoric. As there is no paragraph both in the Old and New Testament that refers directly to termination of pregnancy, this motivation only indirectly is based on the biblical message. Usually, at its core, there is the conviction that every act of destroying life (even if this life is only a potential one) is an act of misappropriating God's will, and as such, it is sinful and immoral. Such arguments have been raised by Christian thinkers for ages. However, it was never perceived (or the act to which it pertained) as part of a religious strategy. Everything changed in the second half of the 20th century through the movement of a new Christian right. Among its many "moral" and "religiously well-established" demands (such as the struggle against secular

1 Introduction

humanism, secularization, the moral downfall and degeneration of humanity) there is a ban on abortion. These postulates caused a rather robust social response in the US, and became the basis for the development of Christian Fundamentalism and later also Christian terrorism in its numerous manifestations.

Another feature that characterizes anti-abortion violence is leaderless resistance. This strategy implies the abandonment of any hierarchical organizational structures, which should be replaced by a loose configuration of small autonomous cells, individuals or smaller groups that are not controlled by any decision center that specializes in managing hierarchical organizational structures. Leaderless resistance is defined as a type of operation of lone wolves, in which an individual or a very small but internally coherent group, engages in violent actions against authorities or society, regardless of the movement, leaders or support networks. This kind of violence can take the form of attacks against state institutions or their employees, but also of attacks on random targets, chosen because of their vulnerability or symbolic importance.¹⁹ The essence of this new form of organization, fully adopted by the radical anti-abortionists, is to reject any formal or informal structure, as well as extreme individualism in achieving specific goals. In other words, the bounds that have always joined together the individual links of the network have lost their significance. Only the shared ideology counts and the deeds and actions complying with it. What is important, in leaderless resistance there are no links between the cells. There are only sources that emit ideas (these sources may be of ephemeral nature), and those who are inclined to bring these ideas into life. This is the reason why leaderless resistance and the violence it causes are so difficult to destroy or even invigilate.

The next characteristic of anti-abortion violence is its universal nature. It is the fact that in its ideological (motivational) layer it refers not to a particular interest (of a group or individual) but to the necessity of realizing the universal and fundamental moral

¹⁹See: Jeffrey Kaplan, "Leaderless Resistance," in: David C. Rapoport (ed.), *Terrorism Critical Concept in Political Science*, Taylor&Francis, 2006, p. 242.

truths. These truths should be of paramount importance not only to their advocates but to the whole world, as well. Therefore, abandoning them becomes a disaster of unimaginable scale. What is important, this catastrophe has a metaphysical dimension – it does not solely refer to those, who, by their deeds, can realize or deny these truths, although they are most involved. The catastrophe, as believed by the anti-abortion fundamentalists, if realized, will undermine the whole metaphysical order, and thereby will push the human being (a creature intrinsically sinful, and understood by them as a set of permanent, axiologically desirable traits) in the snare of Satan (understood, in turn, as the personification of all evil). Universalism in the sphere of values obliges to make every effort to restore the axiological order, placed quite vaguely in the past or in biblical (prehistoric) reality, and in consequence, to open the path to salvation. Of course, it will not be for everyone. In accordance with the fundamentalist maxim that bad things happen only because bad people want them to happen, it is the intentional engagement (on the value side) that decides whether someone will follow that path or not.

The list of traits, which has been attributed here to the anti-abortion violence, is, of course, incomplete. The ones mentioned above characterize it quite generally (which does not mean of course that they are irrelevant). It should be remembered, however, that the term anti-abortion violence is an abstract denomination. If we go down to the level of particular features, i.e., to the level of particular organizations or individuals, the issue of anti-abortion violence may look a little different. It may, for example, turn out that a number of anti-abortion organizations are not of the single issue type but rather transformational groups (aiming at a broad social change), e.g., to create a global theocratic state. Moreover, the changes that have been happening for last twenty years have brought forth the "organizational blur" and "the permeation of ideas," which means that more and more we deal with not "pure" single issue organizations but with a mosaic (or network) lacking a clear structure of loosely connected individuals and groups operating on the basis of several (influencing one another) ideologies, and often only ad hoc created goals. It

1 Introduction

is now impossible to precisely establish the organizational framework of a terrorist group, their current goals, and motivations. It is also difficult to determine to what extent the religious motivation (listed as a feature) is the leading factor or just a theoretical justification (a kind of prosthesis) for the elements ideologically more crucial, and perhaps the only ones (e.g., the belief that it is forbidden to take away life from a potential human being). The least changeable category in this breakdown is axiological universalism. Indeed, it is hard to imagine (unless at a very high level of abstraction) that any anti-abortion group or individual would work in order to realize their own particular but ideological interests. In fact, it must be assumed that we deal here with altruistic (on the motivational level) conviction of the necessity of fulfilling the only true moral principles.

The above-described state of affairs makes the study of anti-abortion violence a challenging task and thinking about it in essential categories is at least anachronistic. It is probably high time to abandon them for more flexible thinking, perhaps a bit more fluid, but which much better reflects the nature (not the essence) of the phenomenon. This postulate refers to the Wittgensteinian thinking in categories of "family resemblances." To think in these categories is to be convinced that concepts do not always relate to the universal features. It happens that the scope of the concepts is a collection of designates that do not share common characteristics, and yet are similar. (The concepts of this type, according to Wittgenstein, are like a rope made of many twisted fibers, none of which run through the entire rope.) In the context of our considerations, it should be remembered that all types of typologies are, first of all, tools for organizing and explaining reality. They simultaneously model and simplify – they are ideal models that explain and at the same time falsify the image of reality by often arbitrary assimilation of various but in some respect close to each other phenomena. The task of the researcher is to avoid, as much as possible, a simplistic analysis and to draw attention to the multi-faceted nature of the described phenomena, as well as to "mixed phenomena" that do not completely fit into the ideal model. For many phenomena it is of fundamental importance.