THE FOG OF TERRORISM

A Philosophical Analysis into the Veracity of the Terrorism Lexicon

James Warren Shufelt

A thesis

In

The Department

Of

Philosophy

Presented in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts (Philosophy) at

Concordia University

Montréal, Quebec, Canada

2007

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-34779-9
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-34779-9

ABSTRACT

The Fog of Terrorism:
A Philosophical Analysis into the Veracity of the Terrorism Lexicon

James Warren Shufelt
Concordia University, 2007

The word 'terrorism' describes a lexicon but has little utility as a politically relevant and beneficial concept. The implacable nature of the terrorism lexicon is such that our current usages lack significant veracity and hence, utility. The word 'terrorism' is an extremely contested word for which there is no ideological consensus. Unfortunately the American government's conception and characterisation of 'terrorism' and 'terrorists' is dangerous, hypocritical, and violent and leaves no possibility of finding a lasting resolution to the problem of "terrorism". Also, if 'terrorism' does not conform to fact it is not accurate and thus misleading so it cannot be useful in our political and media discourses especially when its usage has very dangerous consequences. The word 'terrorism' is used to instil fear, dehumanize, to remove civil liberties and freedoms and is used to justify a new, violent international norm. Moreover, because our current usage is defective and equivocal it can actually further the "terrorist" cause. The American government has helped create our befuddled understanding of the word and created a climate of fear and divisiveness through their calculated employment of persuasive definitions of 'terrorism' and in their greater and enduring use of 'the war on terror'. In light of the principle of universality and the historical record, American state violence makes them the largest global terrorist. Thus, 'terrorism' has lost all its veracity and utility and its usages are dangerously evolving and mutating to justify the otherwise unjustifiable. It is with haste that we should abandon the word altogether.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to all victims of violence whatever its name

&

to everyone who patiently supported and believed in me.

When our nation is at war with any other, we detest them under the character of cruel, perfidious, unjust, and violent: But always esteem ourselves and allies equitable, moderate, and merciful. If the general of our enemies be successful, 'tis with difficulty we allow him the figure and character of a man. He is a sorcerer: He has a communication with daemons (...) He is bloody-minded, and takes a pleasure in death and destruction. But if the success be on our side, our commander has all the opposite good qualities, and is a pattern of virtue, as well as of courage and conduct. His treachery we call policy: His cruelty is an evil inseparable from war. In short, every one of his faults we either endeavour to extenuate, or dignify it with the name of that virtue, which approaches it. It is evident the same method of thinking runs thro' common life.

David Hume
A Treatise on Human Nature, 1740

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER THREE

CHAPTER FOUR

CHAPTER ONE

"In a world of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act"
George Orwell

Introduction

Contrary to our discourse, our politicians and most media sources there is something inherently difficult in defining 'terrorism' as it will necessarily lead one to either a subjective, persuasive and/or an incomplete definition rendering attempts at a definition which could enjoy wide consensus deeply problematic. This is why many have considered the difficulties associated with defining 'terrorism' as the semantic struggle of the 21st century. Any attempt at defining 'terrorism' ultimately depends upon one's agenda, one's objectives and one's cultural biases. There are a plethora of actions, circumstances, motivations, and means which belong to the concept of 'terrorism'. The word describes a lexicon but has little utility as a politically relevant and beneficial concept. As will be seen, Lexical sources will offer a wide variety of definitions and definitional elements. Also, any academic work will define and contextualize the usage in its introduction specific to the aims of the discussion and the objectives of the writer. Thus, there is no ideological consensus on a definition of 'terrorism' as the definition of 'terrorism' as defined in academic works is limited, referring to the outlined definition in the specific work itself.

Troublingly, media reporting and broadcasts of 'terrorism', speeches of the American president and congressional bills do not always define what they mean by 'terrorism' [1] and when they do offer characterisations, they are polemical and

[1] Even the Canadian immigration bill lacked a terrorism definition. The CBC reported in 2001 that the bill granted officials the power "to throw anyone out of the country who is connected to

duplicitous. The implacable nature of the terrorism lexicon is such that our current usages lack significant veracity and hence, they lack utility. If our usage of the word 'terrorism' does not conform to fact it is not accurate, thus misleading and cannot be useful in our political and media discourses.

'The fog of war' is a well known expression which characterises the ambiguity of knowledge held by those who are engaged in military operations during war. It is an expression of the clouded haze which engulfs the ability to know both the intent and the capabilities of one's enemy; hence the title of my thesis. The fog surrounding our current political use of the word 'terrorism' is obfuscating and befuddling both our ability to understand the enemy and their capabilities. The American public (and Western) conception of 'terrorism' is greatly influenced by the American government. Unfortunately, this conception and characterisation of terrorism and terrorists lacks veracity and is dangerous, hypocritical, and violent and does not leave any possibility of finding a lasting resolution to the problem of "terrorism".

Even though no concise definition is possible for this word (like many words) without rendering it problematic, many will still argue that a general understanding of 'terrorism' is possible. There is good reason to reject this notion as (among other reasons) any understanding will reinforce the speaker's belief system whether one is the "terrorist" or fighting the "terrorist". This is so, because attempts at defining terrorism, even if one does not have a political agenda, contain an inherent cultural bias. Joris Luyendijk, a reporter for *Le Monde diplomatique*, writing about the inability of Western correspondents to accurately or objectively represent the Arab world says "even if

---

terrorism without defining terrorism". "Immigration bill lacks terrorism definition," CBC News 3 Oct. 2001: online at: http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2001/10/03/immigration011003.html

correspondents obey all the rules, they still contain a fundamentally biased and skewed picture of the Middle East".[2] And I believe this is true of our usage of 'terrorism'. There is no ideological consensus in academia, the media, lexical sources, or among governments and international institutions.

Even more importantly, because the word 'terrorism' can be used to instil fear, dehumanize, and strip one of one's rights and freedoms and because it has been used to justify a new violent international norm the word is very dangerous and we should question our use of it with urgency and clarity. Moreover, because our current usage is defective and equivocal it can actually further the "terrorist" cause. Presidential campaigns are, at least in part, decided by each candidate's stance on national defence against "terrorism" and the broader "war on terror", thus it is alarming that candidates don't articulate exactly what they mean when they speak of "terrorism". It is even more alarming when they characterise the "terrorist" as evil and propose eradication as the only solution.

Because one man's "terrorist" can be another man's "freedom fighter" the word 'terrorist' is and remains a contestable term often used by the strong to marginalize the weak. The American government has created a climate of fear and divisiveness through their calculated employment of a variety of persuasive definitions of 'terrorism' and in their greater and enduring use of "the war on terror". We have been sold the idea that one is either for or against the war on "terrorism", that all "terrorists" are evil and depraved individuals without any creditable or valid position; terrorism is considered the "ultimate evil". Alarmingly, the word 'terrorist' is evermore being used to define states, groups and

---

[2] Joris Luyendijk, "Agreement on terms," Le Monde diplomatique Mar. 2007: 16.

individuals who do not support state policies. The word 'terrorism' has lost its utility and its usages are dangerously evolving and mutating to justify the otherwise unjustifiable.

Deconstructing the Lexicon

My thesis is a work of disambiguation concerning the political use of the word 'terrorism'. Using a multidisciplinary and multimedia approach to address the issue of terrorism, I employ political philosophy and philosophy of language while also covering political science, history, and law. I rely on texts, textbooks, dictionaries, periodicals, journals, newspapers, government documents, legal documents, international treaties and conventions, documentaries, television news programmes, interviews and online government, academic, news, and historical resources. I will argue that the nature of the word 'terrorism' is inherently problematic and our current conception is significantly incomplete thus the terrorism lexicon lacks determinate veracity and utility. The word 'terrorism' is deeply pejorative and I argue it is too ambitious, ambiguous and too broadly defined a term easily manipulated to suit one's agenda to be useful in public discourse. Moreover, the current American political and public conception of "terrorism" is hypocritical, dangerous, and justifies overtly violent actions. The American government manufactures consent for a new violent international norm by befuddling our understanding of the enemy by using a calculated persuasive, thus illegitimate, conception. The government has furthermore polarized the debate thus allowing for the bifurcation of the enemy. This has the consequence of eliminating the possibility of finding a peaceful solution and normalises brutal human rights violations.

'Terrorism' is an extremely contested word which does not conform to any universal ideological consensus. Its normative importance should be questionable but its

meaning is not currently debated within the realm of the public sphere. What is first, most important, to understand are the terms of the debate, "framing" our employment of 'terrorism'. We require a clear understanding of what we are talking about, fighting against, and bombing. There is no clear definition of the enemy and thus, the need to correctly understand the "terrorist" threat and the enemy themselves is vitally important in moving towards a long term solution. But our usage of the label 'terrorist' does not help us understand "terrorism" or "terrorists" and it impedes our search for long-term, humane solutions.

The effort to understand the terrorism lexicon takes precedence over the debate of whether or not "terrorism", or some forms of it, can be justified. The issue of justification or reprehensibility of some forms of "terrorism" and the necessary conditions for these qualifications are irrelevant when speaking of the terrorism lexicon because the conditions for justification are relative to the specific act itself and/or definition used. Defining 'terrorism' is ultimately mere subjective interpretation conditioned by one's political, and in many cases religious beliefs, and by the social environment in which one lives. Thus, it is of utmost importance to deconstruct, in the Derrida sense[3], the current publicly determinate use of 'terrorism' and show that it lacks veracity.

Distorted Communication

I hope to add greater clarity and rigour to our current use of the word 'terrorism' and shed light on its problematic nature, its persuasive uses, and the human rights abuses committed in the fight against "terrorism". I attempt this in order to show our urgent need to remove the word 'terrorism' from our discourse. Words have tremendous significance,

[3] By deconstruction I mean revealing the means by which language is deployed to maintain power and the examining of our public discourse prejudices.

thus we must establish the criteria of our discussions because failing to contextualise the usage means we fail in communicating. But the implacable nature of the terrorism lexicon prevents us from communicating about "terrorism" and "terrorists" effectively. Thus eliminating the word removes the distorted communication of the terrorism lexicon. The American government has also deliberately obfuscated our understanding of "terrorism" and the historical record for mass manipulation. If the definition of 'terrorism' as used in political rhetoric is not impartially descriptive but subjective, then it is a persuasive definition, one not based on unbiased facts but one used emotively often instilling fear and self righteousness.[4] Persuasive definitions are normally illegitimate because they are based on emotive reasoning with the intent to influence or sway another's belief. The American usages of 'terrorism' reflect a skewed rendition, which does little more than distort our understanding of world events and of the "terrorists".

Any attempt at solving the "terrorist" threat requires considered and reflective thought. As John Dewey said, the nature of reflective thought requires "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends".[5] Active, careful and persistent thought is needed to understand the terrorism lexicon. This issue is not only important for academic study, but it is also important in determining who will be bombed. It affects international relations, foreign policy, domestic law enforcement and public debate. The government manufactures consent through its calculated use of the word 'terrorism' and hence acts without any "real" democratic legitimacy. The current use of 'terrorism' in the "global war on terror" is taken as a universal referent with an inherent

[4] For a good discussion of persuasive definitions see: Charles Leslie Stevenson, "Persuasive Definitions," Mind 47.187 (July, 1938): 331-350.
[5] J. Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1933) 9.

moral condemnation. The public has not had a say in the political use of the word which shapes the American population and the greater global community.

Dissent

There is no clear, nonbiased, non-relative, non-persuasive, definition of 'terrorism'. Thus, there is a need for greater understanding when employing this word. It is ever more important to question everything called "terrorism". This is why the U.S. Vice President's wife Lynne Cheney's comments followed by a report from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (for which she is chairwoman emeritus) condemning academe for dissent and for the promotion of Islamic courses post September 11th are so disturbing.[6] As Angelic Nuzzo says, "inquiry or search for the grounds, any attempt to explain 9/11 (...) is in principle forbidden and reduced to a meaningless enterprise".[7] This makes the American and Western usages of 'terrorism' nothing more than hegemonic political discourse.[8] Steven Best writes, "dissent of any kind (can) now branded as 'terrorist,' and thus is stigmatized and criminalized".[9]

Those who speak out or ask questions are viciously and swiftly dealt with using threats, ridicule and violence. The most public example of this retaliation and silencing is

---

[6] Lynne Cheney: "To say that it is more important now [to study Islam] implies that the events of Sept. 11 were our fault, that it was our failure... that led to so many deaths and so much destruction [...students need to] know the ideas and ideals on which our nation has been built..." 5 Oct. 2001. For the full report see: Jerry Martin, and Anne Neal, Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America And What Can Be Done About It (American Council of Trustees and Alumni, Feb. 2002).

[7] Angelic Nuzzo, "Reasons for Conflict: Political implications of a definition of terrorism," Metaphilosophy 35.3 (2004): 337.

[8] A hegemonic political discourse is "one where the public debate uses mainly the language, terms, ideas and 'knowledge' of the dominant discourse and where alternative words and meanings are rarely found and dissenting voices are almost never heard". Richard Jackson, Writing the War on Terrorism: Language Politics and Counter-Terrorism (New York: Manchester University Press, 2005) 19.

[9] Steven Best, "The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act: New, Improved, and ACLU Approved," Journal for Critical Animal Studies V.1 (2007): 2.

the Libby case. Lewis Libby, the former Chief of staff to Vice-President Dick Cheney, was found guilty "of offences linked to the White house's attempts to undermine the credibility of critics of the Iraq war". [10] A good example of using ridicule to discredit critics is President Bush's comments on Washington Post reporter Bob Woodward's book *State of Denial*. President Bush said, "for some time our nation has been looking for a cheap, plentiful alternative to Middle Eastern oil (...) I have personally burned one hundred copies of Bob Woodward's book and I can tell you that it burns cleanly and efficiently".[11] But as Jürgen Habermas explains, the ability to critique improves "the production of consensus based on free and undistorted discussion among speakers. Critique thus becomes the examination of the conceptual and practical procedures allowing the formation of rational consensus".[12] But this is far from the current reality as critiquing the Iraq occupation is unpatriotically questioning America's "right" to defend her national security. [13]

---

[10] Toby Harnden, "Libby guilty verdict bad news for Bush," The National Post 7 Mar. 2007: front page.

[11] Andy Browitz, "Bush urges using Woodward's book as alternative fuel source: burning book could wean U.S. from Middle-eastern oil, President says," YubaNet.com 3 Oct. 2006: online at: http://www.yubanet.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi/10/43176

[12] Borradori on Habermas in Giovanna Borradori, ed., Philosophy In a Time of Terror (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003) 68.

[13] American journalist and public commentator Bill Moyers insightfully commented in 1987, "This remains for me the heart of the matter. The men who wrote our Constitution, our basic book of rules, were concerned that power be held accountable. No party of government and no person in government, not even the President, was to pick or choose among the laws to be obeyed. But how does one branch of government blow the whistle on another? Or how do the people cry foul when their liberties are imperilled, if public officials can break the rules, lie to us about it, and then wave the wand of national security to silence us? (...) Can it happen again? You bet it can. The apparatus of secret power remains intact in a huge White House staff operating in the sanctuary of presidential privilege (...) And a lot of people in Washington are calling for more secrecy, not less, including more covert actions. This is a system easily corrupted as the public grows indifferent again, and the press is seduced or distracted. So one day, sadly, we are likely to discover once again that while freedom does have enemies in the world it can also be undermined here at home, in the dark, by those posing as its friends". The Secret Government:

State Terrorism

The terrorism lexicon is without veracity in another significant way. Acknowledging state terrorism and the correct historical record of the American government reveals that our usage of the word 'terrorism' does not reflect reality. This is so because to achieve any kind of understanding of the word 'terrorism' and the origins of today's global "terrorist" threat and to achieve fairness in debate, one needs to acknowledge the reality of state terrorism. If we compare American covert operations, wars, and foreign policy with their own definitions of 'terrorism' we would easily see that the American government is the most violent global terrorist. American political rhetoric is used to create a binary system which allows for both the advancement of a violent hegemonic agenda and which reinforces polarized opinion. Human rights violations become normalized and tolerated when our concepts and language reflect a clear "us" versus "them" ideology. Our Western ideological uses of the word 'terrorism' have rationalized unjust acts of aggression against Iraq and have actually increased "terrorism".

The American government welcomed, though deceptively, the new "terrorist" threat created by September 11th and they used it for an illegal pretext for war. The new international norm of preventative war against the "terrorist" threat is among the most worrisome consequences of our befuddled understanding of 'terrorism' and its implacable nature. Although America is not the only state guilty of committing acts of violent state terrorism and state sponsored terrorism, they are the only global superpower and the most egregious perpetrator of state terrorism. America is also leading the charge in the new

---

The Constitution in Crisis, with host Bill Moyers, PBS documentary, Public Broadcasting Service, 1987: transcript online at: http://www.wanttoknow.info/050423secretgovernment

"global war on terrorism" and directly responsible for our befuddled understanding and for creating a new, dangerous international norm. Unchecked power is a dangerous thing which leads to human rights abuses and which inhibits the development of humane and productive solutions. The president's speeches clearly show that a long-term "generational struggle" or global war in the name of "terrorism" is being waged in which no state can be ambivalent.[14] His famous statement "You're either with us or against us in the fight against terror"[15] leaves no room for understanding and polarizes what should be an extremely nuanced debate.

The History of 'terrorism'

I will now give a brief historical overview of the origins of the word 'terrorism'. Throughout history there have been many violent acts which can fall within the lexicon of 'terrorism' perpetrated by either states or individuals.[16] Until the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) there were no single dominant political authorities, no modern nation-states which thus precluded the use of terrorism as an effective method of inducing political change. The first appearance of the word 'terrorism' was during the French *regime de la terreur*, or the Reign of Terror (June 1793 to July 1794), Edmund Burke introduced this term to characterize the movement which fought those elements which sought to destroy the new French republic.[17] Thus, initially when the term was first coined, it was not seen as an evil or morally deplorable tactic. It was rather a legitimate course of action, although

---

[14] Bush: "...we will need to wage this broad war on terrorism for years to come" Remarks by the president on the USS Enterprise on Pearl Harbour day, 7 Dec. 2001.
[15] "Bush says it is time for action," CNN.com 6 Nov. 2001: online at: http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/ret.bush.coalition/index.html
[16] A good example of state terrorism in antiquity is the Roman Empire's merciless campaigns of conquest and terror.
[17] Gus Martin, Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues (California: Sage Publications, 2003) 5.

brutal,[18] to fight against the enemies of the new revolutionary republic. For the revolutionists, terrorism was critical in fighting and deterring their enemies, the French royalty, the French clergy and other European countries which had a stake in ensuring that the revolutionary government was defeated and the Former French royalty reinstated. In fact, the French Jacobin leader, Maximilien Robespierre, declared "Terror is nothing other than justice, prompt, severe, inflexible; it is therefore an emanation of virtue; it is not so much a special principle as it is a consequence of the general principle of democracy applied to our country's most urgent needs".[19]

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the Party of Socialist-Revolutionaries used terrorism as means to "radicalize the toilers, popularize the revolutionary cause and (...) to protect the revolutionary movement and to bring fear and disorganization into the ranks of the government". [20] The ideology behind the terror was to deter the repressive government measures against their movement thus justifying the use and threat of terrorism as a "means of self defense, (and) as a necessary weapon of protection (...)" which included the many assassinations of prominent Tsarist representatives in an effort to force the government to make concessions.[21] Thus, the historical conception of 'terrorism' was first one which viewed the use of terrorism as a legitimate tactic to combat repressive regimes and to further the cause of revolutionary change.

The word 'terrorism' has increasingly evolved to refer to oppressive measures by different totalitarian regimes. This became most apparent during the Second World War and the fight against Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. However, even though Nazi

---

[18] According to some estimates, up to 40,000 individuals were executed by guillotine.
[19] Maximilien Robespierre, speech given at the French National Convention, 1794.
[20] Anna Geifman, Thou shalt kill: Terrorism in Russia 1894-1917 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993) 47.
[21] Geifman 47.

Germany was heavily engaged in violent and brutal acts of violence against its population, imprisoning and murdering political opponents and those individuals who did not support the Third Reich, Hitler used the term to label his enemies. He labelled the subversives "terrorists" and vowed to end the wave of terrorism if he was granted extraordinary political powers. The Nazis even labelled the allies of World War Two as terrorists. They fought what they considered partisan resistance, "which often was, in fact terrorism in the technical sense".[22] Post World War Two, the evolution of 'terrorism' continued to now include groups and organizations like the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Basque ETA, and the Provisional Irish Republican Army. Increasingly, 'terrorism' referrers to states who sponsor terrorism like Iran, Iraq, Libya and Syria. However, in the West, this conception of state sponsors of terrorism does not include some of the most notorious state sponsors of terrorism; most notably the American government.

During the latter half of the twentieth century, the word 'terrorism' evolved to include the conception of the lone bomber like the 1995 Oklahoma bombing by McVeigh and the numerous Palestinian suicide bombers. During this period, the evolution of the word 'terrorism' began to include religion in its diverse assortment of motivations.[23] Today, the most common image of 'terrorism' is that it is carried out by small and secretive cells with global reach. Thus, from its initial characteristics of identifiable movements using conventional weapons and selecting specific targets, this new clandestine, cellular organization is characterized by loose cell-based networks, the threat

[22] Noam Chomsky, "The United States is a leading terrorist State," Monthly Review 53.6 Nov. 2001: 10-19.
[23] The 1995 attack on the Tokyo subway by the Aum Shinrikyo religious sect is a good example.

of acquiring weapons of mass destruction, politically vague motivations and "asymmetrical" methods.[24]

The word 'terrorism' is not a neutral description of an external reality, but rather it is a social construct. Our current concept of 'terrorism' has evolved due to the specific attacks of September 11th. Our current conception, created predominantly by the American government, is of the dangerous al Qaeda network and the Axis of evil counties (Iraq, Iran and North Korea) all hell bent on destroying the freedoms that Western societies enjoy. These circumstances governed the way we, in most Western counties, defined the term and continue to govern it as its meaning and usage evolve in our political discourses. One of the most alarming consequences of this evolution of the meaning of 'terrorism' is how its current meaning is becoming evermore diluted and ambiguous. The second US PATRIOT Act legislation, passed in America, has now broadened its scope to include animal rights activists as possible "domestic terrorists".[25]

---

[24] Martin 5.

[25] According to the Bill of Rights Defense Committee, provision USAPA §802 "creates a new crime, 'domestic terrorism,' which it defines as 'acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the Unites States or of any state' and that 'appear to be intended...to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion.'" According to the Defense Committee, this broad definition can be used to imprison any activist who exercises their right to assemble and to dissent. Nancy Talanian, A guide to Provisions of the USA PATRIOT ACT and Federal Executive Order that threaten civil liberties (MA: Bill of Rights Defense Committee, 2002) 2.

CHAPTER TWO

"He who has a thousand friends has not a friend to spare
and he who has one enemy will meet him everywhere"
Ali Ibn Abu Talib.

The Ineffable and Indefinable

The "war on terrorism" and for that matter the greater "global war on terror" leaves one with the impression that there is a single, homogeneous concept of 'terrorism' which represents an enemy which must be destroyed. We have been conditioned through the American President's speeches and the media to believe that there is an immanent global threat of "terrorism" predominantly led by al Qaeda focused on a religious jihad which seeks to destroy Western culture and its freedoms. Increasingly, new neologisms are being created to incorporate more classifications and types of 'terrorism' or 'terrorist' activities. They are incorporated under the banner of 'terrorism' and are thus subject to all the consequences this implies. However, treating 'terrorism' as a broad and general term eviscerates the action from its context. This amalgamation of 'terrorism' into one public conception further undermines the possibility of understanding and addressing the causes of terrorism or even the possible justification of some forms of "terrorism". It allows for the promotion of the ideology that there is agreement on the types or classifications of 'terrorism' and that these categories conform to fact and are representative of "terrorism". The following are currently the most popular classifications of 'terrorism'.

Conventional terrorism: 'Conventional terrorism' is a broad and controversial category which may refer to an attack by non-state individuals or organizations with either a political or religious motivation with the intent to cause fear in a population and thereby to influence society or governments. Its general focus is on the methods used

such as suicide bombings, planted bombs, car bombs, guns, and the hijacking of airplanes. However, in today's post September 11th world, the threat of conventional terrorism is being overshadowed by new perceived threats of biological and chemical weapons, dirty bombs and WMD's. Moreover, this understanding is misleading as, it will be seen, there is little consensus on the basic elements or motivations of terrorism let alone what constitutes a conventional weapon. Prior to September 11th, the general belief that airplanes could be used as weapons to destroy office towers was not widely held.

Bioterrorism: Bioterrorism is essentially the use of biological agents and can be further defined as the illegal release of biological agents or toxins with the intent to intimidate or coerce a government or civilian population to further political or social objectives. The American Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention defines 'bioterrorism' as "the deliberate release of viruses, bacteria, or other germs (agents) used to cause illness or death in people, animals, or plants (...) spread through the air, through water, or in food."[26] According to this definition and according to the American Biological Weapons Anti-Terrorism Act and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, signed by America and 143 UN member states, there are no conditions under which one could legally release biological agents or toxins which are not intended for prophylactic purposes[27]. Moreover, the development, stockpiling or acquisition of any such weapons is illegal under both above mentioned acts. However, the American Navy and the Air Force are both pursuing the development

---

[26] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Emergency Preparedness and Response, Bioterrorism Overview (Atlanta: Department of Health and Human Services) online at: http://www.bt.cdc.gov/bioterrorism/overview.asp

[27] "US Armed Forces Push for Offensive Biological Weapons Development," The Sunshine Project News release 8 May 2002: online at: http://www.sunshine-project.org/publications/pr/pr080502.html

of offensive biological weapons according to the Sunshine Project which gained access to classified information through the Freedom of Information Act in 2002.[28] This directly violates both American federal and international law.

Bioterrorism agents are further divided into three categories of highest risk, second highest risk, and emerging threats for disease. One important difference between 'conventional terrorism' and 'bioterrorism' is the length of time it takes for victims and effects to manifest from the time of the initial attack. Conventional terrorism is considered immediate whereas bioterrorism may take days to manifest its effects. Interestingly, Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and response act of 2002 does not provide a definition of "bioterrorism".[29] 'Argoterrorism' is an important subcategory of 'bioterrorism'. It is not a new concept as, according to Jim Monke, throughout history attacks against the agriculture industry have occurred by both nation-states and substate organizations. He defines the term as "the deliberate introduction of an animal or plant disease with the goal of generating fear, causing economic losses, and/or undermining stability."[30]

Narcoterrorism: The label 'Narcoterrorism' was first used by the Peruvian President in 1983 to label "terrorist" attacks against his anti-narcotics police. Ronald Reagan also used the term when he referred to the perceived links between international

---

[28] According to the Naval Research Laboratory, "It is the purpose of the proposed research to capitalize on the degradative potential of... naturally occurring microorganisms, and to engineer additional, focused degradative capabilities into [genetically modified microorganisms], to produce systems that will degrade the war fighting capabilities of potential adversaries." The Air Force proposes "genetically engineered catalysts made by bacteria that destroy... Catalysts can be engineered to destroy whatever war material is desired." Sunshine Project.

[29] United States of America, Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (Washington, DC: Public Law 107-188 107th Congress, 2002) online at: http://www.fda.gov/oc/bioterrorism/PL107-188.html

[30] Jim Monke, Agroterrorism: Threats and Preparedness (The Library of Congress: CRS Report for Congress, 13 Aug. 2004) 2.

drug trafficking and terrorism between the Soviets and their allies. The term generally means the attempt of narcotics traffickers to influence the policies of government through violence and intimidation. Narcoterrosim is carried out by groups, according to the Drug Enforcement Administration, "directly or indirectly involved in cultivating, manufacturing, transporting or distributing illicit drugs". [31] However, the 'narcoterrorist' label is not always applied.

Should Pablo Escobar, an infamous and brutally ruthless, ambitious and powerful Colombian drug warlord, be classified as a criminal, Mafioso, a terrorist or all three? According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, among others, he is certainly a narcoterrroist. Not only did he manufacture and distribute illicit drugs, he also assassinated presidential candidates, half the judges on the Colombian Supreme Court, and bombed a security building and the Aviance flight 203. However, he is rarely, if at all, referred to as a terrorist but rather a criminal drug lord and his bombing of flight 203 is referred to as a "criminal attack". One of the problems this raises concerns the debate as to whether 'narcoterroism' is a proper category of 'terrorism' or better defined as a criminal law enforcement problem. Although the terms 'criminal' and 'terrorist' are not mutually exclusive, labelling the illegal act as a crime and not an act of 'terrorism' has significant legal ramifications.

Sexual terrorism or gender terrorism: 'Sexual terrorism' commonly considers acts of sexual and gender-based violence against women and children. However, it can also be directed against gay men and transsexuals. Perpetrators range from abusive men, to homophobic individuals, to the church. The intense shame and guilt, concerning deviant

[31] Pierre-Arnaud Chouvy, "Narco-Terrorism in Afghanistan," Terrorism Monitor II 6, 25 Mar. 2004: 7.

sexual behaviour, instilled by religious doctrine and church authorities can fall within this classification of sexual terrorism. UNICEF's Executive Director Carol Bellamy announced on December 19, 2001 that "the commercial sexual exploitation and abuse of children is nothing less than a form of terrorism".[32] However, this classification is not widely accepted as UNICEF is alone among the international institutions and states in considering sexual terrorism as a category of 'terrorism'.

Cyberterrorism: 'Cyberterrorism' is the latest neologism today and means, "the intentional use or threat of use, without legally recognized authority, of violence, disruption, or interference against cyber systems, when it is likely that such use would result in death or injury of a person or persons, substantial damage to physical property, civil disorder, or significant economic harm."[33] An American ambassador and the American coordinator for counterterrorism Michael Sheehan said, "terrorists looking for a bigger impact will increasingly turn to weapons of mass destruction and cyberterrorism".[34] The veracity of this classification is called into question as the definition is increasingly used to describe basic defacing of websites and servers or the disruption of non-critical computer systems.[35] Moreover, it is questionable whether 'cyberterrorism' is best defined as 'terrorism' or is better classified as 'hacking' or 'information warfare'. It is also unlikely that 'cyberterrorism' can create fear within a

---

[32]"U.N.: Child sex trade 'a form of terrorism'," CNN.com 17 Dec. 2001: online at: http://archives.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/east/12/17/childsex.conference/index.html

[33] Abraham D. Sofaer and Seymour E. Goodman, A Proposal for an International Convention on Cyber Crime and Terrorism Article 1.2 (The Center for International Security and Cooperation, Aug. 2000) 32. Online at: http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/11912/sofaergoodman.pdf

[34] US Department of State International Information Programs, Post-Millennium Terrorism Review Speech by Ambassador Michael A. Sheehan, Coordinator for Counterterrorism (Washington File: Brookings Institution, 10 Feb. 2000) online at: http://cryptome.org/mas021000.htm

[35] Kevin Poulsen, "Hackers face life imprisonment under 'Anti-Terrorism' Act," SecurityFocus 24 Sept. 2001: online at: http://www.securityfocus.com/news/257

population or even cause significant harm or death. Jacques Derrida believes that the destructive power of computer technologies is real but that "in fact, (these computer technologies) have no name, neither war nor terrorism".[36]

Ecoterrorism: The FBI defines 'ecoterrorism' as "the use or threatened use of violence of a criminal nature against innocent victims or property by an environmentally-oriented, sub-national group for environmental-political reasons, or aimed at an audience beyond the target, often of a symbolic nature."[37] The issue of 'ecoterrorism' is no less a controversial one as it can be used to describe legal forms of non-violent demonstration and protest. This is most clearly manifested in the 2002, Criminal Justice Task Force of the American Legislative Exchange Council's proposed *Animal and Ecological Terrorism Act*. According to this Act, "two or more persons with the primary or incidental purpose of supporting any politically motivated activity (...) intended to obstruct, impede or deter any person from participating in a lawful animal activity" (or forestry and resource mining) can be considered an animal or ecological terrorist.[38] Furthermore, some American state officials tried to define 'ecoterrorism' as "virtually anything that harms business interests".[39] This classification is alarming to many advocacy groups as it could include mainstream non-violent, environmental activists. This raises the question of whether or not actions which are destructive to property constitute acts of 'terrorism' when no individuals are harmed or intended to be. Moreover, advocacy groups insist that

---

[36] Borradori 110.
[37] James F. Jarboe, The Threat of Eco-Terrorism, Testimony of Domestic Terrorism Section Chief (Counterterrorism Division FBI, the House Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, 12 Feb. 2002, online at: http://www.fbi.gov/congress/congress02/jarboe021202.htm
[38] State Environmental Resource Center (SERC), Alec's Animal and Ecological Terrorism Act (Wisconsin, Dec. 2002). Online at: http://www.serconline.org/alec/alec21.html
[39] Philip Herbst, Talking Terrorism: A Dictionary of the Loaded Language of Political Violence (Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2003) 164.

corporations and governments which engage in environmental pollution and destruction should also then, be subject to this classification.

Animal enterprise terrorism: This classification suffers some of the same problems as ecoterrorism. According to the 1992 Animal Enterprise Act (AEPA), peaceful protest which would be better described as 'criminal' activity can be considered "terrorism". The AEPA was passed by congress, due in large part to the efforts of the National Association for Biomedical Research, and it applies to any individual who "causes an economic loss of any kind" to an animal enterprise and this can include (among other possibilities), "research facilities, pet stores, breeders, zoos, rodeos, circuses, furriers, (and) animal shelters".[40] Thus, as Steven Best writes, "the actions of two or more people can be labelled as "terrorist" if they leaflet a circus, protest an experimental lab, block a road to protect a forest, do a tree-sit, block the doors of a fur store, or even organize an effective boycott".[41]

Religious terrorism: 'Religious terrorism', also referred to as 'theoterrorism', is considered 'terrorism' carried out by individuals or groups motivated by religious ideologies with the interest of changing government policies or actions. 'Religious terrorism' can be characterized by a deep-seated belief in the righteousness of one's cause and the motivation that the violence is condoned or even commanded by one's god for the benefit of the faith. Islamic religious "terrorism" is commonly perceived as the most prevalent; however, there are Jewish, Christian, Sikh and Hindu "terrorist" organizations as well. There is no unified terrorist ideology or cause as the varying religious groups each have their own specific agenda. The obfuscation and confusion surrounding 'Islamic

[40] Best 4.
[41] Best 4.

religious terrorism', provided by the government and most mainstream medias, attempts to simplify the complexity of the issue and reduce it to al Qaeda.

There are blatant omissions by the American government which do not list some American Christian right-winged "terrorist" organizations. The Defense department and the Center for Defense Information do not include the Army of God on their lists of "terrorist" organizations. The Army of God is an anti-abortion organization which has sent out over 200 letters containing anthrax threats in which white powder was placed inside the envelopes[42] and they have been responsible for a multitude of abortion clinic bombings[43] in their effort to end abortion in America. But they are also responsible for the bombing of gay night clubs and the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta and yet, for some reason, they are not included on the list.

Moreover, religious terrorism, according to Mark Juergensmeyer, is marked by the promotion of divine struggle and use of religious images in the name of political battles and serves as "evocations of a much larger spiritual confrontation."[44] Similarities to Bush's rhetoric can clearly be drawn with regards to his declaration of terrorism as the "battle between good and evil", his initial remarks post September 11th, declaring "this crusade is a war on terrorism" and the naming of the operation "*infinite justice*" in response to September 11th. Moreover, as Howard Zinn said, "God is brought into the picture when the government is doing great violence...It takes advantage of the fact that a

---

[42] "Army Of God Anthrax Threats," CBS News 9 Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/11/09/national/main317573.shtml

[43] Interestingly, I was unable to find any reference to the total number of abortion clinic bombings by the Army of God.

[44] Mark Juergensmeyer, Terror in the Mind of God: the Global Rise of Religious Violence (California: University of California Press, 2000) 146.

lot of people in (America)...think of God as a moral force".[45] Thus, the violence carried out in the name of the "war on terrorism" is connected to the moral worthiness that having god on your side brings. The violence carried out in the name of 'counter terrorism' is far in excess of the "terrorism" it is supposed to be countering.

Political terrorism: 'Political terrorism' is "terrorism" carried out by individuals or groups motivated by political ideologies with the interest of changing government polices or actions. 'Political terrorism' is also intermingled with 'religious terrorism' in some cases as the "al Qaeda" example demonstrates. Al Qaeda has both religious and political objectives as they are fighting a global jihad in the name of "Islam" and seek to rid the Arab nations of "infidel" occupiers and the "infidel" culture which support corrupt and repressive Arab regimes.

State terrorism: 'State terrorism' or "terror from above" is among the most controversial classifications of 'terrorism' as there is wide disagreement concerning it; i.e. what counts as 'state terrorism', whether or not actions by a state during a war can be considered 'terrorism', and whether such a notion is even warranted. Generally, state terrorism can refer to violence perpetrated by a state government against its own population and/or its own infrastructure or that of another state or individuals. 'State terrorism' is often the most organized and most brutal form of 'terrorism' as the resources of a state far exceed those of conventional terrorist organizations. Other classifications which can fall within the category of 'state terrorism' are 'state-sponsored genocide violence', 'assassinations' or 'homicidal state violence', 'torture' and 'warfare' or 'war terrorism'.[46] Michael Walzer considers 'war terrorism' to be a separate category of 'state

[45] Herbst 79.
[46] Martin 84.

terrorism' as, according to him, 'state terrorism' targets its own civilians and 'war terrorism' targets the civilian populations of other countries.[47] Moreover, the disagreement on 'state terrorism' is amplified by the fact that some government and academic definitions "make state terrorism impossible *a priori*".[48]

State-sponsored terrorism: 'State-sponsored terrorism' is nearly identical to 'state terrorism' but differs as it is most often a secretive and covert operation whereby the state sponsors the terrorism either by participation in or encouragement of the terrorism by use of proxies or financing terrorism which allows, in some cases, for the plausible deniability of involvement. State-sponsored terrorism can be carried out by the state's own official forces or army or by support of foreign organizations or groups. State-sponsored terrorism can "be applied in service to political agendas in opposition to the accused state rather than as a result of objective analysis of the state's policies".[49] State-sponsored terrorism as foreign policy comprises the following possible categories of support, ideological support, financial support, military support, operational support, or by initiating terrorist activities or by direct involvement in the terrorist activities themselves.[50] The most commonly referred to terrorist states and/or state sponsors of terrorism are the former soviet block, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Cuba, Sudan, Syria, and North Korea. However, many feel this conventional classification neglects many Western governments, notably Israeli and American involvement in both 'state terrorism' and 'state-sponsored terrorism'.

---

[47] Michael Walzer, "Five Questions About Terrorism," Dissent Winter 2002: 5.
[48] C.A.J. Coady, "Defining terrorism in Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues," (2004): 3-14, in Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues, by Igor Primoratz ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) 8.
[49] Herbst 168.
[50] Martin 91.

Counter terrorism: 'Counter terrorism', also referred to as 'low intensity conflict', can refer to the policies, practices, techniques and strategies that states, corporations, police, emergency agencies, special forces and NGO's use to combat, eliminate and prevent terrorism. Many actions, both legitimate and illegitimate, have been and are carried out in the name of 'counter terrorism'. However, the usual objective of 'counter terrorism' is to prevent or decrease the number and frequency of terrorist attacks and save lives. This category is also a contentious one as, for example, some analysts believe the American government has come to define 'terrorism' and 'counter-terrorism' in the minds of Americans in a manner suitable to its own self-serving political agenda[51] (this will be discussed in chapter four). The debate continues as many consider 'counter terrorism' to be analogous with 'terrorism' and it has been viewed as "often, terrorism supported as distinct from terrorism deplored".[52]

Other terrorisms: Other forms of 'terrorism' may include: 'species terrorism' which is the slaughter and torture of innocent animals by animal exploitation industries, 'radiological terrorism' which involves the use of dirty bombs, 'nuclear terrorism' which involves nuclear reactions and nuclear weapons, and 'chemical terrorism' which involves the use of cyanide agents, nerve agents, pulmonary agents, and vesicants/bli agents.[53]

What is important to note is that there is no commonalty or wide acceptance among all these categories of 'terrorism'. There is no common trait or set of traits which unifies them. Their acceptance depends upon the ideological perspective of the individual

---

[51] Noam Chomsky believes that states (most notably the United States) often justify their violent actions as counter terrorism. Chomsky in Herbst 41.
[52] Herbst 41.
[53] The Institute for Bio Security, Bioterrorism - Quick Reference Material (Missouri: Saint-Louis University School of Public Health) linked from the U.S. food and drug administration website on counter terrorism, online at: http://www.bioterrorism.slu.edu/bt/quick.htm

or the state; as many states do not consider 'state terrorism' a valid category or do not include their own violent actions as terrorism. Some categories are better defined as 'criminal acts' rather than 'terrorism' such as 'narcoterrorism', 'sexual terrorism' and 'cyberterrorism'. There are no common targets, means, or objectives as some forms of 'terrorism' use bombs, computers, or children. Violence is not even common to all these categories as there is nothing violent about 'cyberterrorism'. Some governments ignore the ban on the development of biological weapons while condemning other states for developing them. The disturbing fact is, "the more crimes become 'terrorism' the more people you can label as terrorists".[54] These broad categories group together various ideologies which are very different; such as the important distinctions within 'religious terrorism'. Many of these categories allow for the classification of actions which lack the veracity necessary for them to be meaningful. As Walter Laqueur, speaking about the differences in motives, function and effect between 'state terrorism', 'religious terrorism' and 'political terrorism' stated, "to equate them, to obliterate the differences, is to spread confusion".[55] Even more disturbing are those accused of, say 'cyberterrorism', who will be subject to the terrorism laws and the heavy penalties this implies.

Subjective Impression

'Terrorism' is an ambiguous word and due to this characteristic, it can be employed in different ways to suit different objectives. Hence the expression, "one man's terrorist is another's freedom fighter". Yet Igor Primoratz states, "Those who claim that who is a terrorist, and who a freedom fighter, depends on who is wearing the uniform, or

---

[54] Steve Watson, "Endemic: The move To Label All Civil Disobedience "terrorism": Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act makes protesters terrorists," Inforwars.net 1 Dec. 2006: online at: Infowars.net

[55] Walter Laqueur, "Reflections on Terrorism," Foreign Affairs 65.1 Fall 1986: 89.

what its color is, are not promising partners for a serious discussion anyway." [56] However, Primoratz misses an important point: who is defining the "terrorist" and what their objectives or motivations are will ultimately influence the definition they provide. Who is defining the word is as important as who is wearing the uniform.

There seems to be an inherent difficulty with forming one universal definition which would enjoy wide ideological consensus. Walter Laqueur believes "it would be unrealistic to expect unanimity on (a definition of 'terrorism') so close to us in time," but he continues, "the absence of an exact definition does not mean that we do not know in a general way what 'terrorism' is; it has been said that it resembles pornography, difficult to describe, but easy to recognize when one sees it"[57] But this is not the case as it depends just as much on who is recognizing the event. Many violent acts may appear to be 'terrorism' but are not and vice versa. If Laqueur is correct, then "we have only (a) subjective impression as the means of identifying terrorism".[58] If our means of identifying an act of violence as an act of 'terrorism' are subjective, then the means with which we identify "terrorisms" (our perceptions) are neither veracious nor reliable.

The word 'terrorist' is a relative term which can be applied to individuals who actually engage in other forms of resistance (such as civil disobedience and guerrilla warfare), but it is argued this doesn't mean that the term does not represent actual and potentially definable acts worthy of universal condemnation. 'Genocide' is also another morally charged term which has been misused to describe 'segregation' and 'birth control'. Consequently, it is then argued, suicide bombings are no less a terrorist attack

---

[56] Igor Primoratz, "What is Terrorism in Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues," (2004): 15-30, in Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues, by Igor Primoratz ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) 25.
[57] Laqueur, "Reflections" 88-89.
[58] Herbst 164.

even if the term 'terrorist' is indefinable or misused. But it is because the word 'terrorism' is indefinable in essentialist terms and because there is no ideological consensus that it ought not be used to describe some violent acts because of the many significant consequences which result from naming something 'terrorism' or someone a 'terrorist'. Moreover, there are very real and important consequences to using this word because it is misused (more on this in chapter five). As will be shown, there is no academic, governmental, international, lexical, or media definition of 'terrorism' which is widely accepted.

Dictionary Definitions

The following are a sample of the vast variety of dictionary definitions. This broad variety reveals the unreliability of 'terrorism' definitions. So many creditable and notable lexical sources are unable to agree on a definition and the definitions they do provide are most often vague and ambiguous.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines 'terrorism' as, "1. Government by intimidation as directed and carried out by the party in power in France during the Revolution of 1789-94; the system of the 'Terror' (1793-4). 2. *gen.* A policy intended to strike with terror those against whom it is adopted; the employment of methods of intimidation; the fact of terrorizing or condition of being terrorized".[59]

The Webster's New International Dictionary defines 'terrorism' as, "1: the systematic use of terror as a means of coercion. 2: an atmosphere of threat or violence".[60]

---

[59] "Terrorism," Oxford English Dictionary Second edition, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, (1989) online at: http://0-dictionary.oed.com.mercury.concordia.ca/cgi/entry/50249598?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=terrorism&first=1&max_to_show=10

[60] "Terrorism," Webster's New International Dictionary ProQuest Information and Learning Company, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, (1996-2003) online at: http://0-

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines 'terrorism' as, "the unlawful use or threatened use of force or violence by a person or an organized group against people or property with the intention of intimidating or coercing societies or governments, often for ideological or political reasons".[61]

The Online Etymology Dictionary states that 'terrorism' is the "general sense of "systematic use of terror as a policy."[62]

Dictionary.com states that 'terrorism' is, "1: The use of violence and threats to intimidate or coerce, esp. for political purposes. 2: The state of fear and submission produced by terrorism or terrorization. 3: A terroristic method of governing or of resisting a government."[63]

The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy states that 'terrorism' involves...

> Acts of violence committed by groups that view themselves as victimized by some notable historical wrong. Although these groups have no formal connection with governments, they usually have the financial and moral backing of sympathetic governments. Typically, they stage unexpected attacks on civilian targets, including embassies and airliners, with the aim of sowing fear and confusion. Israel has been a frequent target of terrorism, but the United States has increasingly become its main target.[64]

---

collections.chadwyck.com.mercury.concordia.ca/mwd/htxview?template=basic.htx&content=frameset.htx

[61] "Terrorism," The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Bartleby, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, (2000) online at: http://www.bartleby.com/61/26/T0122600.html

[62] Terrorism," Online Etymology Dictionary, Douglas Harper, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, (Nov. 2001) online at: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php

[63] "Terrorism," Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1), Random House, Inc. online at: <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/terrorism>

[64] "Terrorism," The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, Third Edition (Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005) online at: <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/terrorism>

There is an obvious cultural bias present in this rendition of 'terrorism'. It clearly defines state terrorism out of the definition and insinuates the illegitimacy of the "terrorists". The bias is pro-Israeli and American.

The Dictionary of Terrorism states, "it is easier to identify that which is not terror than attempt to label exactly that which is terror".[65] There is no attempt by the author to define 'terrorism' himself, rather he lists 90 different definitions from 90 different sources all of which focus solely on terrorism's "ultimate objectives rather than in terms of ideology and manner of action".[66] It is quite revealing that a work dedicated to the definition of 'terrorism' opts to list 90 different definitions rather than to establish one of its own. However, there is a clear bias in this work which does not include 'state terrorism' in its understanding. Moreover, the author states that the ideologies and philosophies of terrorists...

> "are a frontal attack on liberal values and principles. Terrorism is an instrument or political weapon developed by revolutionaries. They believe that because states commit acts of terror and violence, it is permissible for terrorists to do the same".[67] They group all terrorists under the same banner saying "terrorists face just as many problems as the democratic society which they are hoping to destroy"[68]

However, this is clearly not the case of all terrorists as classical Marxist revolutionaries were against terrorism for they thought it was counter-productive to revolutions. This is a fallacious grouping of all terrorists under the same ideology and motives which has no relevance to actual events and furthermore ignores the origin of the word itself. Not all "terrorists" are out to destroy democratic societies.

---

[65] John Richard Thackrah, Dictionary of Terrorism, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2004) 66.
[66] Thackrah 66.
[67] Thackrah 156.
[68] Thackrah 156.

The Historical Dictionary of Terrorism states that 'terrorism' *can* be defined as, "a purposeful human activity directed toward the creation of a general climate of fear designed to influence in a way desired by the protagonists, other human beings, and through them some course of events".[69] This definition is vague in that it does not define, among other things, who the potential protagonists can be, who the targeted human beings are, and what the aims of the events or results sought are; and these answers are bound to be culturally driven. The authors go on to describe three categories of 'terrorism', 'Revolutionary terrorism', 'Sub-Revolutionary terrorism', and 'Establishment terrorism' but admit that these categories "may be culturally bound", which they indeed are.[70]

Finally, the *Urban dictionary*, is an online public dictionary wherein the public can formulate their own definition and then others can vote on its acceptability, relevance or lack thereof. The definition of 'terrorism' which received the most positive votes states that 'terrorism' is "George W. Bush's excuse to dominate the world".[71]

American Government Definitions

American government definitions: There is no more likelihood of finding harmony among the many American state department definitions either. Almost every department has its own definition suited to its department's objectives.

---

[69] Sean K. Anderson and Stephen Sloan ed., Historical Dictionary of Terrorism, 2nd ed. (London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2002) 2.
[70] Anderson & Sloan 4.
[71] (245 in favor and 107 against). "Terrorism," Urban Dictionary.com (1997-2007) online at: http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=terrorism

The US Dept of Defense defines 'terrorism' as, "the calculated use of unlawful violence to inculcate fear, intended to coerce or to intimidate governments or societies in the pursuit of goals that are generally political, religious, or ideological".[72]

The US State Department defines 'terrorism' as, "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against non-combatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents, usually intended to influence an audience." And it further states, "For purposes of this definition, the term 'non-combatant' is interpreted to include, in addition to civilians, military personnel who at the time of the incident are unarmed and/or not on duty".[73] Chomsky writes, "an enemy combatant (or "terrorist") can be anyone that the US chooses to attack, with no credible evidence, as Washington concedes".[74]

The FBI divides the terrorist threat facing the United States into two broad categories, 'international' and 'domestic terrorism'. 'Domestic 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." 'International terrorism' is defined as...

> violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or any state, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the United States or any state. These acts appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion, or affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping. International terrorist acts occur outside the United States or transcend national boundaries in terms of the means

---

[72] United States Department of Defense, Office of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Publication 1-02: Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms (Washington, DC: United States Department of Defense, Apr. 12, 2001 – As amended through June 5, 2003): 531, online at: http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf

[73] Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Patterns of Global Terrorism 2002: US Department of State Publication 11038 (Washington, DC: State Department, Apr. 2003): 13, online at: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/20177.pdf

[74] Noam Chomsky, Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance (New York: Owl Book, 2003) 189.

by which they are accomplished, the persons they appear intended to coerce or intimidate, or the locale in which the perpetrators operate or seek asylum. [75]

The US Code defines 'terrorism' as, "premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by subnational groups or clandestine agents".[76] And the current United States National Security Strategy defines 'terrorism' as simply "premeditated, politically motivated violence against innocents."[77]

Part of the problem with the American government definitions, aside from the fact that there are many, begs the question of who is innocent and how we are to determine their innocence. Most of the above definitions do not include the threat of violence to the state which is confusing as the justification for the war in Iraq was based on the perceived threat of violence to the American state and not the actual use of it. Moreover, according to these definitions the Boston Tea Party, the Civil War and the Warsaw uprising were all forms of 'terrorism'. Another part of the problem is that these definitions exclude state terrorism or define 'terrorism' such that 'state terrorism' is not possible by definition. But definitions which do not allow for 'state terrorism', as I discuss in chapter four, do not represent what is actually the case in the world today. Moreover, if the American government definitions were applied to their own actions, their terrorism would far exceed that of any "terrorist".

---

[75] Federal Bureau of Investigation, Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit, National Security Division, Terrorism in the United States 1999: 30 Years of Terrorism – A Special Retrospective Edition (Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, 1999): i, online at: http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terror99.pdf

[76] U.S. Code, Title 22, Chapter 38, § 2656f § 2656f. Cornel University Law School, Annual country reports on terrorism (New York: Legal Information Institute): online at: http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/usc_sec_22_00002656---f000-.html

[77] George W. Bush, The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (Washington, DC: The White House, Sept. 2002) 11. Online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf

A further part of the problem concerns the ability of governments "to quash dissent and deprive citizens of civil liberties" due to vague and broad government definitions.[78] [79] This has been clearly seen with regards to the American US PATRIOT Act. These definitions lack veracity as American 'state terrorism' (when using their own definitions) is the most prevalent form of global violence. As Chomsky points out, referring to the many government definitions, "it follows from them that the US is a leading terrorist state".[80] Thus, according to Nuzzo, "terrorism is construed by the official definitions of the Bush administration as a phenomenon lying outside and beyond any law – civil law as well as normal law, international law, the law of peace, as well as the law of war".[81]

United Nations Lack of a Definition

United Nations definition: The Untied Nations has no member agreed or accepted definition. The utility of a legal definition of 'terrorism' was questioned by former International Court of Justice Judge Richard Baxter when he said, "we have cause to regret that a legal concept of 'terrorism' was ever inflicted upon us. The term is imprecise; it is ambiguous; and, above all, it serves no operative legal purpose".[82] Ben Golder and George Willams describe the international law approach to dealing with 'terrorism' as "the *specific* approach".[83] This approach, whose utility is also questioned,

---

[78] Herbst 168.
[79] In August 2006, then British Prime Minister Tony Blair said, "global terrorism means traditional civil liberty arguments are *not so much wrong* as just made for another age", emphasis added.
[80] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 189.
[81] Judge Richard Baxter (1974) in Nuzzo 338.
[82] Richard R Baxter, "A Skeptical Look at the Concept of Terrorism," Akron Law Review 7.3 (1974): 380.
[83] Ben Golder and George Willams, "What is 'Terrorism'? Problems of legal definition," UNSW Law Journal 27.2 (2004): 274.

focuses on the prevalent types of "terrorism" popular at any given time and Golder and Willams insist this is an attempt "to sidestep the political sensitivity of the broader definitional question".[84] It is because of this approach that there exist dozens of international resolutions on 'terrorism'.

The United Nations began to address the question of 'terrorism' in the 1990's developing two general resolutions on terrorism (1368 and 1373). The two UN attempts at resolutions, despite compelling states to act against acts of terrorism, leave the description and classification of 'terrorism' acts in the hands of each member state.[85] Both responses by the Security Council omitted any attempt to define 'terrorism'. To this day, there is no consensus on the definition of 'terrorism'. Jane Boulden and Thomas Weiss write,

> ...there is not even the sense that an attempt need be made. Both resolutions 1368 and 1373 refer simply to terrorism and terrorist acts as if they were self-explanatory, as if none of the drafters was aware of the problems associated with decades of frustrated efforts to establish a definition, (... both resolutions) allow wide latitude for interpretation (such that...) both the response (self-defence) and the subject of the response (terrorism) remain undefined and, by extension, unlimited.[86]

Leaving the definition of 'terrorism' open to interpretation or to be taken as a self-evident truth allows it to be subject to, according to Derrida, "opportunistic appropriation".[87] And the American government has done just this, Derrida states, "thus, after very hasty decisions, without any philosophical debate on the subject of "international terrorism" and its condemnation, (...) the UN authorized the United Sates to use any means deemed necessary and appropriate by the American administration to

---

[84] Golder & Willams 273.
[85] Golder & Willams 275.
[86] Jane Boulden & Thomas G. Weiss, ed., Terrorism and the UN: Before and After September 11 (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press 2004) 12.
[87] Derrida in Borradori 103-104.

protect itself against this so-called 'international terrorism'".[88] The UN authorized any means necessary in the face of two of their emphasized principles which declare the duty of all states not to organize, instigate, sponsor, or practice terrorism against other states and not to use terrorism to justify threats or force against other states. The UN, in their passed resolution on the *Inadmissibility of the Policy of State Terrorism and any Action by States Aimed at Undermining the Socio-Political System in other Sovereign states,* demands that all states:

> take no actions aimed at military intervention and occupation, forcible change in or undermining of the socio-political system of States, destabilization and overthrow of their Governments and, in particular, initiate no military action to that end under any pretext whatsoever and cease forthwith any such action already in progress.[89]

The war in Iraq is clearly in violation of this resolution in every way possible. Furthermore, due to the inability of the UN to define terrorism in the seventy years it has debated the issue, the International Criminal Court when created in 1998, "had to exclude international terrorism from its jurisdiction, although it was tasked with prosecuting a wide range of other crimes, including genocide".[90]

Media Definitions

Media definitions: There is no wide consensus or usage in a definition of 'terrorism' in the media. There are numerous variations and mutations of 'terrorism' used to characterize a multitude of people and organizations reflecting clear biases of the reporters. According to reporter Eric Rouleau, the Western media has "confused Islam,

---

[88] Derrida in Borradori 104.
[89] Dietrich Rauschning, Katja Wiesbrock and Martin Lailach ed., Key Resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly 1946-1996 (United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 459.
[90] Eric Rouleau, "Terrorism: the chosen tool of the weak against the mighty: does 'global war on terror' mask a new imperialism?" Le Monde diplomatique June 2007: 14

Islamism, fundamentalism, jihadism and terrorism".[91] To avoid these problems, and in an attempt to accurately report the news, some media sources either avoid the term or abandon it altogether. The BBC, writes Michael Bhatia, is "decidedly reluctant to use the term 'terrorist', referring only to terrorist attacks and instead labelling these perpetrators as 'militants' or 'rebels'".[92] And Reuters avoids the term 'terrorist' as well "because of its emotional freight and in an attempt to avoid characterizing the subjects of the news rather than reporting their actions or background".[93] Amnesty International does not use the word 'terrorism' at all stating, "in our view it is simply not an acceptable term of use given that there is no internationally agreed definition of what the term means".[94] Luyendijk, from *Le Monde diplomatique*, writes, "I see no way out of this morass, except more openness about the inescapable biases and filters in reporting, and an end to misleading slogans".[95] A very good example of how different media sources will use different labels to describe the same actors in the same event is given by Gus Martin concerning the 1973 bombing of Rome Pan Am 110:

> One *New York Times* leading article...(described) it as "bloody" and "mindless" and (used) the words "terrorists" and "terrorism" interchangeably with "guerrillas " and "extremists." ... The *Christian Science Monitor* reports of the Rome Pan Am attack ...avoided "terrorist" and "terrorism" in favour of "guerrillas" and "extremists"; an Associated Press story in the next day's *Los Angeles Times* also stuck with "guerrillas," while the two *Washington Post* articles on the same incident opted for the terms "commandos" and "guerrillas".[96]

---

[91] Rouleau, "Terrorism."
[92] Michael V. Bhatia, "Fighting words: naming terrorist, bandits, rebels and other violent actors," Third World Quarterly 26.1 2005: 11.
[93] Herbst 166.
[94] Kate Gilmore, Amnesty International Executive Director Secretary General at the European Social Forum, The war against terrorism: a human rights perspective: speech by Kate Gilmore (Florence: Amnesty International, 2002) online at: http://web.amnesty.org/pages/ec_briefings_fora_terror
[95] Luyendijk 16.
[96] Martin 287.

Academic Definitions

Academic definitions: Alex P. Schmid concluded in 1984, that there is no universally accepted definition of 'terrorism' after dedicating over a hundred pages to its definition.[97] However, in 1988 he presented the following definition:

> Terrorism is an anxiety-inspiring method of repeated violent action, employed by (semi-) clandestine individual, group or state actors, for idiosyncratic, criminal or political reasons, whereby - in contrast to assassination - the direct targets of violence are not the main targets. The immediate human victims of violence are generally chosen randomly (targets of opportunity) or selectively (representative or symbolic targets) from a target population, and serve as message generators. Threat- and violence-based communication processes between terrorist (organization), (...) victims, and main targets are used to manipulate the main target (audience(s)), turning it into a target of terror, a target of demands, or a target of attention, depending on whether intimidation, coercion, or propaganda is primarily sought.[98]

His definition requires the repeated use of violent action, but not all terrorist actions are repeated. The Oklahoma bombing was a onetime event classified as 'terrorism'. His definition lacks reference to religious reasons for terrorism and does not include acts of assassination. Furthermore, what if the "terrorists" seek not to "manipulate the main target" but rather only to inflict senseless violence? In a 1992 report to the UN Crime Branch he proposed a definition based on what constitutes a war crime. If war crimes are extended to peacetime, a simplistic definition would be 'terrorism' is the "peacetime equivalents of war crimes".[99] However, this is not helpful as a definition for one would then have to describe what would constitute a 'war crime'. The blanket bombing of Dresden and the two nuclear bombings of Japan during the Second World

---

[97] Alex P. Schmid, Political Terrorism: A Research Guide (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1984).
[98] Alex P. Schmid, quoted in United Nations, Definitions of terrorism (United Nations: United Nations Office on Drug and Crime, 2006) online at: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html
[99] "Definitions of terrorism."

War are not widely held as war crimes although they indiscriminately targeted large populations of innocent civilians by mean of extraordinary and unnecessary destructive force.[100]

Habermas believes, from a political point of view, that "there is no excuse for terrorist acts regardless of the motive or the situation under which they are carried out".[101] However, he believes that political terror can attain certain legitimacy retrospectively if say, the terrorists seize power by overthrowing an unjust regime and henceforth become "well-regarded representatives of their country".[102] This is so because, for Habermas, political content is granted to 'terrorism' if its objectives are politically realistic.[103] If the political objectives of terrorism are not realistic then the terrorism is "on par with ordinary criminal activity".[104] This is how Habermas arrives at the conclusion that 'terrorism' is a retrospective designation because "only the future can judge whether the goals of terrorism have been accomplished".[105] However, this begs the question, whether the goals of terrorism, successful or not, could still be considered terrorist acts?

Habermas links the political objectives of terrorism with its success of accomplishment to offer the possibility of distinguishing between three forms of 'terrorism'; 'indiscriminate guerrilla warfare', 'paramilitary guerrilla warfare', and 'global terrorism'.[106] 'Indiscriminate guerrilla warfare' is representative of the lone

---

[100] However, there are some who believe the nuclear bombing of Japan was an unnecessary war crime; Kai Nielsen for example.
[101] Habermas in Borradori 34.
[102] Habermas in Borradori 34.
[103] Habermas in Borradori 56.
[104] Habermas in Borradori 56.
[105] Habermas in Borradori 56.
[106] Habermas in Borradori 56.

suicide bomber and 'paramilitary guerrilla warfare' is representative of national liberation movements and these movements can gain retrospective legitimacy if they are successful in forming a state. But couldn't a national liberation movement fail and still coherently be considered legitimate? Could Nelson Mandela's ANC national liberation movement still be coherently considered legitimate if it had failed to topple the apartheid government in South Africa? [107] For Habermas, lone suicide bombers are not a part of 'guerrilla warfare' although they can be used by armies as the Taliban demonstrate. Habermas believes 'guerrilla warfare' is conducted by groups composed of soldiers who fight in a guerrilla army. According to Habermas, it is the third form, 'global terrorism', which does not have any politically realistic goals other than "exploiting the vulnerability of complex systems".[108] 'Global terrorism's' primary focus is in the delegitimation of democratic governments.

Habermas' perspective contains a certain inconsistency, that is, if there is no excuse for terrorism, regardless of its motive or situation, then why would it then become legitimate if the terrorists seize power? In this case, there would be justification to use terrorism if the group using it does so to overthrow a violent and corrupt government to form their own. Moreover, if a violent and brutal group of terrorists overthrow a democratic and just government to replace one of their own which would be violent, corrupt and pernicious, how could one then state that this new government has gained legitimacy? 'Terrorism' attains political content only if its objectives are realistic, but how does one determine the realistic nature of the political aims and is an objective judgement on what constitutes realistic goals even possible? The objectives of the

[107] Discussions with Kai Nielsen.
[108] Habermas in Borradori 56.

"terrorism" can be viewed as having been realistic only as an after thought. But this is not helpful in determining the legitimacy of current "terrorist" acts nor does it help in defining what 'terrorism' is. Abu Musub Al Zarqawi in 2003 bombed the U.N. headquarters in Baghdad killing the U.N. envoy to Iraq successfully getting the U.N. out of Iraq. One of his political objectives was realized, does this then make the U.N. killing retrospectively justified? Moreover, would the terrorist designation of Hezbollah change if they were successful in causing Israel to withdraw from southern Lebanon? Lastly, Habermas groups together many different "terrorist" organizations in his 'global terrorist' category which have very different tactics and objectives. This amalgamation of many groups into one broad category with the objective of exploiting and destabilizing complex systems is to commit a hasty generalization and to group them all in too broad a category to understand the complexities of the various groups this category is supposed to represent.

Audrey Kurth Cronin admits that "terrorism is intended to be a matter of perception and is thus seen differently by different observers" but asserts, that even though many disagree over what actions may constitute 'terrorism', "there are certain aspects of the concept that are fundamental".[109] She believes that 'terrorism' always contains a political objective for it "involves the commission of outrageous acts designed to precipitate political change". [110] She does not believe that states can be terrorists by definition even though she admits they can terrorize or support terrorists through military, political, economic or other means.[111] Another fundamental concept of 'terrorism' is that

[109] Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism," International Security 27.3 (Winder 2002-03): 32.
[110] Cronin 33.
[111] Cronin 33.

it deliberately targets innocents and for her, this "also distinguishes it from state uses of force that inadvertently kill innocent bystanders".[112] The final fundamental concept of 'terrorism' for Cronin is that "terrorists" are unpredictable and do not follow international laws or norms as opposed to state use of force which is subject to international law and conventions.

Thus, her admittedly imperfect definition of 'terrorism' is, "the threat or use of seemingly random violence against innocents for political ends by a nonstate actor".[113] But this definition ignores the historical record of state terrorism. Moreover, if states can terrorize or support terrorists why then should states be defined out of the definition of 'terrorism'? As will be shown, states not only deliberately kill innocent bystanders but also, as in the American war in Iraq demonstrates, can and do ignore international law and conventions. Finally, a political objective is not always present in classified acts of 'terrorism' and to limit 'terrorism' to political objectives is to limit the scope of the definition.

Walter Laqueur stated in 1977, with regards to the problem in finding a comprehensive definition of 'terrorism', that "such a definition does not exist nor will it be found in the foreseeable future". [114] He believes that the word 'terrorism', as well as 'guerrilla', is used in a variety of ways such that their conceptions are "almost meaningless".[115] However, we are still able to study 'terrorism'. The following, he believes, are the "main" features of 'terrorism' and he believes, their main features are in widespread acceptance today; terrorism is a new phenomenon, it is one of utmost

---

[112] Cronin 33.
[113] Cronin 33.
[114] Walter Laqueur, Terrorism (Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977) 5.
[115] Laqueur, "Terrorism" 6.

importance and the most dangerous problem facing humanity today. Terrorism is a response to injustice ("if there were political and social justice, there would be no terrorism"), thus the only way to reduce terrorism is to reduce the "grievances, stresses and frustration underlying it".[116] Terrorists are "fanatical believers driven to despair by intolerable conditions" and lastly terrorism can at any point, occur anywhere.[117]Laqueur's position on terrorism does not remain the same, as in 1986, as already noted, he moves away from the idea that terrorism is a response to injustice and says that by addressing the grievances, stresses and frustrations underlying terrorism one can eradicate it. He now views terrorism as increasing because the state's response to it has been "weak and uncoordinated".[118]

In answering the question of how to eradicate "terrorism", Laqueur equates his former position to that of the moralist and in response to removing the underlying injustices he states "although this may be true as an abstract general proposition, it seldom applies in the real world". [119] He suggests, further on, that because the number of potential terrorists is limited in every country that "terrorism can be stamped out with great ease (...) the power of the state is infinitely greater than that of terrorists, and it will always prevail, provided there is the determination or the ruthlessness to do so".[120] From the idea that terrorists are driven to despair by intolerable conditions, he now equates them with children saying they "resemble in many respects children trying to find out by

[116] Laqueur, "Terrorism" 5.
[117] Laqueur, "Terrorism" 5.
[118] Laqueur, "Reflections" 89.
[119] Laqueur, "Reflections" 91.
[120] Laqueur, "Reflections" 94.

trial and error how far they can go in provoking the adults until punishment will be meted out to them".[121]

Laqueur now believes that if "terrorism" becomes a more prominent threat than it currently was in 1986, a "one-time, limited application of military force may be sufficient to drive the lesson home".[122] However, the failed success of the "war on terror" in both Afghanistan and Iraq clearly shows the misguided understanding of "terrorism" and "terrorists" in his assessment. Concerning 'state terrorism', he believes that only dictators use state-sponsored terrorism. In 1999, he identifies the main players in 'state-sponsored terrorism' as the Soviet bloc, Libya, Iran, and Iraq. This disregard for the historical record of American and Israeli state terrorism is obvious. He has also reconsidered the legitimacy of terrorism, stating in 1977 that "terrorism cannot be unconditionally rejected except on the basis of a total commitment to nonviolence and nonresistance to evil"[123] but in 1999 he states that "terrorists are willing to kill a great many children (... and then asks) can there be any kind of 'just terrorism' under these circumstances?"[124] Laqueur's position regarding terrorism does not remain consistent and it is incomplete. However, it is the significant shift in this thought between 1977 and 1999 which is remarkable. If he can so radically change his perspective then how can he be so certain that stamping out terrorism is the only answer?

---

[121] Laqueur, "Reflections" 98.
[122] Laqueur, "Reflections" 99.
[123] Laqueur, "Terrorism" 4.
[124] Laqueur, "New Terrorism" 6-7.

Some authors are open about their ideological usage of the word 'terrorism' admitting that their definitions are either too narrow or too broad.[125] Others, like Kai Nielsen will offer a sample of definitions from other sources in an attempt to provide as neutral and accurate a description of 'terrorism', for their purposes, as possible. Nielsen makes reference to six different definitions and sources to establish what he calls "a reasonable initial understanding for our purposes of what we are talking about in speaking of terrorism".[126] Nielsen believes that there are a number of definitions out there that when taken together "are sufficiently determinate (...) to deliver us from the fog of Bushian blabber about the 'war on terror'".[127] However, this may be sufficient for his particular purposes but it is not sufficient for political or media discourses as it is not one which enjoys ideological consensus. Moreover, the various definitions appealed to are a matter of subjective selection and do not address the problematic and implacable nature of the terrorism lexicon.

Hopelessly Muddled

There are many contentious political words which suffer similar definitional problems as 'terrorism'.[128] However, none approach the numerous possible definitions of 'terrorism' and none are as crucial in shaping our global community as 'terrorism' currently is. There is a lack of unanimity in government agencies, private agencies, the media, the international community and among academic experts. This is troubling because there is no conformity to fact or truth possible to establish a definition which

---

[125] Frederick Gareau admits that his definition of terrorism he provides in the introduction of his book is broad. Frederick H. Gareau, State Terrorism and the United States: From Counterinsurgency to the War on Terrorism (Atlanta: Clarity Press, 2004) 15.
[126] Kai Nielsen, "Commentary on the Moral Justifiability of Terrorism (State and Otherwise)," Osgoode Hall Law Journal 41.2 & .3 (Summer-Fall 2003): 429-430.
[127] Nielsen, "State and Otherwise" 429.
[128] Examples of other contentious political words: 'genocide', 'democracy', and 'war'.

would enjoy wide acceptance. In addition, sound government policy in dealing with "terrorism" requires a clear definition of the enemy and there currently is none. The American "global war on terror" is in fact, a declaration of "war" against all "terrorists", "terrorist organizations" and "terrorist states".

Every academic study of terrorism begins with a definition. How this definition is "set-up", contextualized or employed in the outline or in the introduction establishes the lexical assumptions and normative principles to follow. Many authors state that no definition of 'terrorism' is possible but then go on to define the word, in order to talk about it, and affirm that their definition is characteristic of a basic understanding of 'terrorism' which could enjoy wide consensus. But this ignores the point first made; there is no wide consensus on the definition of 'terrorism' nor is there a rendition of it which could enjoy such favour, now or in the foreseeable future. The terrorism lexicon, admitted by many, is not known for its veracity.

Defining 'terrorism' means restricting any ensuing narrative to the author's outlined definition. The nature of any definition of 'terrorism' is provisional at best, that is, its veracity or lack thereof is dependant upon the outlined definition given and the inherent cultural bias. Thus, resting upon the characterization of 'terrorism' in any specific work is the entire value or illegitimacy and importantly its acceptability. The political language games, in which terrorism has meaning, vary as much as the variations in its definition. The array of definitions, with particular regard to the U.N. definition, allow for unlimited flexibility and demonstrate that there is no wide acceptance and no unassailable definition and that the veracity of the definition of 'terrorism' is dependant upon the perspective of the individual.

As Chomsky states, "we are left with no sensible definition of 'terrorism' – unless we decide to break ranks and use the official definitions that have been abandoned because of their unacceptable consequences".[129] He adds, "whether attacking 'soft target' is right or wrong, terrorism or a noble cause, depends on who is the agent".[130] Primoratz does not think that a paper on the definition of 'terrorism' is the right context for establishing the status of the innocence of individuals nor do I think that a paper on the definition of 'terrorism' is the right context for establishing a definition of 'terrorism' which could be said to represent the different categories of 'terrorism', enjoy wide consensus, or conform to all the facts. There is a clear Western bias in the majority of definitions; especially in the government definitions. Thus, any definition which could ideally be agreed upon in the West would reflect a Western bias; even the idea of a Western consensus on 'terrorism' is itself an ideological fantasy. The polemical and implacable nature of 'terrorism' demonstrates that these matters are "hopelessly muddled".[131]

[129] Chomsky 189.
[130] Chomsky 193.
[131] Discussions with Kai Nielsen.

CHAPTER THREE

"Among the calamities of war may be jointly numbered the diminution of the love of truth, by the falsehoods which interest dictates and credulity encourages."
Samuel Johnson (from The Idler, 1758)

Lost In the Fog

In chapter two the veracity of the terrorism lexicon was questioned as there is no wide acceptance on a definition of 'terrorism'. Some definitions try to account for as many traits of 'terrorism' as possible and other definitions attempt to identify one principal defining characteristic. Some institutions recognize the problematic nature of the word 'terrorism' and thus choose to abandon the word altogether. But is there a single kernel of 'terrorism', a trait which can be held as a distinguishing characteristic of 'terrorism'? Are there some common traits or fundamental components of 'terrorism' which if combined could be agreed upon and accepted and allow us to identify paradigm cases of 'terrorism'?

David Whittaker believes that the scale of the definition of 'terrorism' is such that "searching for consensus about the meaning of 'terrorism' and how to counter it, finds it impossible to frame a workable definition".[132] However, precision eludes us but he believes that there is potential for reasonable meaning if we consider a number of aspects as "it is what individual terrorists do and hope to achieve that puts a kernel into meaning".[133] If we can find a consistent set of characteristics which are common to and distinctive of things designated as 'terrorism', then we would have a definition or at least a concept of 'terrorism' which could reasonably enjoy wide consensus and thus be

---

[132] David J. Whittaker, Terrorists and Terrorism: In the Contemporary world (New York: Routledge, 2004) 11.
[133] Whittaker 11-12.

meaningful. The following are the most significant and commonly held characteristics of 'terrorism' and the problems they face.[134]

Political objective: The majority of commentators will agree that what all "terrorist" attacks have in common is their commitment to or motivation for the furtherance of a political agenda or purpose. It is considered a political tactic used by those individuals or groups who have no other effective means at their disposal to combat their perceived enemy or affect the change in society or government they deem necessary. Sean K. Anderson and Stephen Sloan state that "there is basic agreement that terrorism is a form of political violence and action".[135] It has been said by "terrorists" that armed struggle is the road to freedom. If a political motive is not included then it may become hard to separate an act of 'terrorism' from a criminal or personal act. C.A.J. Tony Coady writes "the major interest of terrorism, both theoretically and morally, lies in its political orientation".[136] However, political objectives are not the sole goal of "terrorists" nor are political objects always present. Certainly, according to the American usage, as especially stipulated in the US PATRIOT Act, political objectives are not a vital component in classifying some acts as 'terrorism' (i.e. cyberterrorism which may disrupt and damage protected computer systems by young hackers can be interpreted as an act of 'terrorism').

Moreover, the government does not always accord political content to "terrorists". The Bush government denied al Qaeda political content by constructing the motivation behind the attacks as hatred for American freedoms. Richard Jackson notes that the American government's attempt to deny al Qaeda a political rationale and thus political content, "contradicts its initial efforts to demonise them as terrorists (... because he

[134] The problems here listed with these traits are not exhaustive.
[135] Anderson & Sloan 3.
[136] Coady 6.

believes), depoliticising the aim of 'terrorism' destabilizes the very term itself".[137] There are other reasons why political objectives or motivations are not always central to the notion of 'terrorism'. Is racial hatred and the desire to inflict harm on another ethnic group, solely for the purpose of causing harm a political goal? Moreover, Philip Herbst states that a political objective "is not in itself a defining element of terrorism (...as) insurgencies, war, even mob violence – also have political goals".[138] Furthermore, "terrorists" often have vague ambitions which do not reflect a political objective per se, sometimes they just want to "lash out at (the) world" due to their experienced frustrations.[139]

Religious objectives: Religious objectives are also more frequently considered an important part of our understanding of 'terrorism' as many consider religious motivations analogous to political motivations in any concept of 'terrorism'. It is clear that not all terrorist attacks are derived from religious motivations alone as the Oklahoma bombing demonstrates. However, a central problem with considering terrorist acts as either politically motivated, religiously motivated or both, is demonstrated by the example of John Allen Muhammad. Was the 2002 sniper of Washington DC, a terrorist? He had no political or religious motivations for his attacks and was declared a "cold blooded killer" by the prosecutors. However, the court in Virginia Beach convicted him on four counts of murder, conspiracy, firearms charges and terrorism. Under the new post September 11th terror legislation, as a terrorist, he was eligible for the death penalty and was effectively sentenced to death on November 17, 2003.

---

[137] Jackson 55.
[138] Herbst 169.
[139] Herbst 169.

Illegal force or illegitimacy: Many official government definitions include the principle of illegitimacy into their definitions of 'terrorism'. Violent actions can be deemed lawful and legitimate if perpetrated by governments; however most such actions by individuals and groups are regarded as illegitimate. The American government does not recognize the possibility of the legitimate use of violence by civilians against invaders in an occupied country. According to some government definitions,[140] what may be construed as legitimate resistance movements are nonetheless categorized as "terrorist" groups. This may mean any resistance movement or revolution could be classified as 'terrorism'. What is important to notice is that under this interpretation, actions which would be defined as 'terrorism' could not be if they were perpetrated by American allied governments. Thus, this conception is certainly problematic in its denial of allied state terrorism and in deciding who can be a state terrorist.

Furthermore, there is a problem with incorporating the principle of non-justifiability into any definition of 'terrorism'. Many agree that the question should be left open to consider the legitimacy of terrorist acts and not base these important issues solely on a definition.[141] The importance of leaving the question of legitimacy open allows for objectivity. That is, the definition of 'terrorism' and the moral aspect of its being justifiable or not, are two distinct issues and saying "terrorism is wrong because it involves evil doing" does not answer either question. Most government definitions include 'unlawful' or 'criminal' as part of their official definitions because it allows them to define 'terrorism' as a crime.

---

[140] Notably the FBI definition of international terrorism.

[141] For example see: Virginia Held, "Terrorism, Rights, and political goals in Justice Law and Violence," (1991): 59-79, in Justice Law and Violence, by James B. Brady and Newton Garver, ed. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991).

Unconventional actions/methods: Another common feature of 'terrorism' is held to be the use of unconventional means or actions in carrying out the particular violence. Using car bombs, dirty bombs and airplanes are popular examples. Whittaker claims that 'terrorism' has common methods and targets and he lists over twenty "common" targets and thirty "common" methods.[142] However, this is certainly not helpful or useful as a feature of describing 'terrorism' as there is a plethora of means by which to carry out terrorism (e.g. computers, fire, cardboard knife cutters, sneakers etc...). Moreover, the weapon of choice for "terrorists" is not restricted to car bombs and airplanes as AK-47s and rockets are commonly used as well. Furthermore, there is an ever increasing fear of WMDs which are principally weapons of states (in fact, no WMD has ever been used by an alleged "terrorist," "terrorist organization" or "terrorist state"). There is no veracity in the appeal to unconventional methods as a trait of 'terrorism'.

Targets: The choice of target as a fundamental definitional component of 'terrorism' is also of little use in defining 'terrorism'. Commonly, "terrorists" are often described as selecting soft and passive military targets. But this is not true in the case of the attack on the Pentagon; which was neither a soft target nor a passive military target; the same is true of the October 12, 2000 attack on the *USS Cole*. Moreover, governments too, engage in attacking soft targets; like the 1998 American bombing of a pharmaceutical factory[143] and the blanket bombing of Dresden during the Second World War. The target of the "terrorist" can range from soft targets to hard targets and can include individuals, governments, military, schools, property, and computers. Some argue that the aim (or target) of terrorism is to affect an audience. The primary target of

[142] Whittaker 75-76.
[143] The destruction of the pharmaceutical pant resulted in tens of thousands of deaths. Chomsky, "Hegemony" 206.

terrorism is not that which is attacked, but the audience on which the attack will have an influence. The desire to influence a secondary target as the primary objective is not always a definitional component of 'terrorism' either. A political assassination is an example of 'terrorism' whose primary objective is to remove the political leader and not necessarily to influence an audience.

Innocent civilians and non-combatants: It is predominately argued that the distinctive nature of 'terrorism' lies in its intentional and specific selection of civilians as targets. Coady says the emphasis on innocents "catches a central logical and moral aspect of common discourse (...) since terrorism is frequently objected to because 'the innocent' are attacked".[144] But defining who is innocent is also based on one's perspective. Certainly the September 11th attackers believed that those who worked in the "capitalistic citadels"[145] were guilty of aiding the corporate forces of American imperialism and also held the idea that all citizens are guilty in some way for supporting their "evil" government.[146] Some Palestinians view all Israelis as "corporately the foe" and some Israelis see no Palestinian innocents in what they call "a cultural war".[147] Whether one accepts these arguments or not, it is still not true in all cases that "terrorists" attack the innocent and non-combatants.

Moreover, sometimes it is argued that claims concerning the wrongness of attacking the "innocent" may be "overridden by the duty to attain a highly important and urgent military or political aim".[148] Laqueur states that the appeal to "innocence as the quintessential condition for the choice of victims, cannot be accepted as a general

---

[144] Coady 5.
[145] (to quote Habermas) Habermas in Borradori XIII.
[146] In 1894 French anarchist Emile Henri declared "there are no innocents".
[147] Juergensmeyer 175.
[148] Primoratz, "Philosophical Issues" XIX.

proposition; this would imply that there is a conscious selection process on the part of the terrorist, that they give immunity to the "guilty" and choose only the innocents".[149] Anderson and Sloan list their three essential criteria for a definition of 'terrorism', none of which includes the targeting of the innocent.[150] Moreover, most criminal activities are directly committed against the innocent; for example, rape victims, drive-by shooting victims, and school shooting victims are all innocent.

Derrida believes the distinction between military and civilian is "another distinction which has become less and less reliable"[151] Although military targets and personnel are clearly not "innocents," the American government considers attacks on its military personal acts of 'terrorism'. Moreover, military targets are not confided to bases and vehicles. In 1946, Irgun (a militant Zionist organization) attacked[152] the British government of Palestine by bombing a military base setup in the King David Hotel killing nearly 100 people, both military personnel and civilians. Jeffrie G. Murphy struggled over 23 pages with the question of whether or not attacks on innocents and non-combatants could be justified, only to conclude that he was unable to prove that "we should *never* kill non-combatants or innocents".[153]

Perpetrators: 'terrorism' is defined as violent acts carried out by individuals or loose cell-based networks. 'Terrorism' is commonly referred to as the weapon of the

---

[149] Laqueur quoted in Primoratz, "What is Terrorism" 19.
[150] The three criteria they consider are: the use or threat of violence, fear, and that terrorism is a form of communication. Anderson & Sloan 2.
[151] Borradori 100.
[152] According to Wikipedia, "The attack was initially ordered by Menachem Begin, the head of the Irgun, who would later become Prime Minister of Israel." "King David Hotel bombing," Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_David_Hotel_bombing
[153] Jeffrie G. Murphy, "The Killing of the Innocent," The Monist 57.4 (Oct. 1973): 527-550, emphasis added.

weak, but as Noam Chomsky, I believe correctly, points out if we alter our understanding of 'terrorism' and compare state actions to their own definitions of 'terrorism' we would quickly and easily see that "terror(ism) is primarily a weapon of the powerful".[154] Indeed, the origin of the word, as we have seen, was initially used to describe state terrorism.

Coercion: Carl Wellman considers coercion "the essence of terrorism".[155] He insists that coercion and terror are "inextricably linked" such that a rapist who intimidates his victim into submission by use of a weapon is a terrorist, and even an economic boycott or union strike, he suggests, can be a form of 'terrorism' if the threatened harm is great enough and the intent is one of coercion.[156] Considering coercion as the essence of 'terrorism' is, to put it mildly, problematic. Clearly, few would agree that rape, boycotts and strikes are acts of 'terrorism'. Wellman's conception is obviously too broad in its scope. Moreover, civil disobedience can be considered a form of coercion to force the government, through non-violent protest, to change its policies. If understood as Wellman proposes, a significant majority of the population of Western democratic states would be terrorists.

Unpredictability: The unpredictable nature of terrorist attacks has also been considered a common feature of 'terrorism'. However, the unpredictable nature of terrorist attacks is not restricted to 'terrorism' alone, as many military actions within the confines of war are also unpredictable. The "shock and awe" bombing campaign of the American Operation *Iraqi freedom*[157] is a prime example of this. Moreover, it has now

---

[154] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 189.
[155] Carl Wellman, "On Terrorism Itself," Journal of Value Inquiry 13 (1979): 252.
[156] Wellman 252-253.
[157] The naming of Operation Iraqi freedom is a good example of Orwellian "double speak". First named Operation *infinite justice* and latter renamed to Operation *Iraqi freedom,* there is nothing

been shown that the attacks of September 11th were fully known to the American government. Even President Bush was personally warned weeks before September 11th by the CIA of the possibility of such an attack.[158] The American government knew that there was an immanent threat from al Qaeda who sought to attack strategic targets within New York potentially using airplanes.[159] Unpredictability is common to most crimes as well and thus it is not a pertinent feature of 'terrorism'. Moreover, if the "terrorist" warns authorities that a bomb will explode in the train station, the violent act is then not unpredictable but would no doubt still be called 'terrorism' by the authorities should the bomb explode.

Threat: The American government strongly emphasised the "terrorist threat" in Afghanistan and Iraq and considers the threat of "terrorism" crucial in their definitions. The "treat' of WMD's and "terrorism" from Iraq was the rational for operation *Iraqi freedom* and the following occupation but the case for WMD's in Iraq was a bellicose apophenia of unverified claims. Coady best explains that the concept of threat should not be considered a part of the definition of 'terrorism', at least for his purposes, as he believes "the threat to do X is generally not itself an instance of doing X, and (...) the

---

which remotely resembles justice or freedom in the American military operation in Iraq; it is in reality an occupation.

[158] "CBS reporter David Martin revealed that weeks before the attacks, the CIA had warned Bush personally of Osama Bin Laden's intent to use hijacked planes as missiles. That followed the damaging exposure by The Associated Press's John Solomon of a pre-9/11 FBI memo from an officer in Phoenix warning of suspicious Middle Eastern men training at flight schools—a warning that went unheeded." Seth Ackerman, "Who Knew? The unanswered questions of 9/11," In These Times 3 Sept. 2003: online at: http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/615/who_knew/

[159] For more information on what the government knew see: David R. Ray, ed. and Peter D. Scott, ed., 9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out (Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2007).

threat to do an act of violence is not itself an act of violence, no matter how disturbing it may be".[160]

Violence: According to Held, an inherent characteristic of 'terrorism' would seem to be violence which *prima facie* seems like a good principle to accept.[161] To accept a definition of 'terrorism' which included non-violent terrorism seems to lead to ridiculous conclusions; a parent threatening their child to eat their green beans or "to bed without dessert!" could be an example of non-violent terrorism. Laqueur agrees saying, "perhaps the only characteristic generally agreed upon is that 'terrorism' always involves violence or the threat of violence".[162] However, Laqueur is not correct in assuming that violence is always the only generally accepted characteristic of 'terrorism' as there are those who reject this view. Carl Wellman includes non-violent action in his definition of 'terrorism' and further states, "violence is not essential to terrorism and, in fact, most acts of terrorism are non-violent".[163]

Although violence or the threat thereof, is an extremely effective means to create terror it is not a defining characteristic. As Wellman indicates, blackmail which threatens to expose the actions of an individual by intimidation, is an example of non-violent terrorism.[164] He goes on to confess to being a terrorist himself by engaging in non-violent terrorism when he threatens to fail any student handing in a late paper; thus demonstrating the coercive power of intimidation. However, many would disagree with Wellman. For example, Primoratz replies to Wellman's examples by stating that blackmail is indeed a form of violence if the threatened harm were great because great

---

[160] Coady 6.
[161] Held 63.
[162] Laqueur, "New Terrorism" 6.
[163] Wellman 251.
[164] Wellman 252.

harm is a natural attribute of violent action.[165] And he claims that if to fail Wellman's course is "a great and dramatically inflicted harm" then it is indeed a threat of violence but, he adds "it is not terrorism".[166] There is also wide disagreement on what would constitute violence and if violence can include various forms of mental cruelty and psychological abuse.[167]

However, violence does not make a useful definition of 'terrorism' as other violent acts, which are not considered 'terrorism' also share this definitional characteristic such as riots, war, assault and some acts of the mafia; which are all examples of extreme violence. Furthermore, property destruction is not always a violent crime but it has been incorporated within some definitions of 'terrorism', most notably those of many American State departments. Furthermore, the US PATRIOT Act also considers anyone a "terrorist" who causes the wilful destruction of property within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States.[168] The US PATRIOT Act also considers any of the following acts 'terrorism' and punishable under terrorism legislation: Arson within the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of United States, the depredation of government property or contracts, harbouring terrorists, providing material support to terrorists and terrorist organisations, and the financing of terrorism.[169]

None of these listed acts is violent in nature, but it may be argued that they support or contribute to violence and thus have a participatory role in the creation of violence. But this fails for several reasons. First, I do not see how the depredation of government property or contracts constitutes a form of violence. Secondly, if

---

[165] Primoratz, "What is Terrorism" 16.
[166] Primoratz, "What is Terrorism" 17.
[167] Anderson & Sloan 2.
[168] The US Patriot Act Title VIII 18 U.S.C. § 1363.
[169] The US Patriot Act, 18 U.S.C. § 81, § 1361, § 2339, § 2339A, and § 2339C.

participating in the violence of terrorist acts through financing is considered, then an individual who buys illegal street drugs is also, although indirectly, supporting "terrorism".[170] Violence, as it is understood as a characteristic of 'terrorism', is further circumscribed as indiscriminate violence. Indiscriminate violence is that which does not consider the moral worthiness, status, and association etc... of those who are the recipients of the violence. However, this characterisation is flawed as well. Most "terrorists" do discriminate in selecting their targets as they may select a particular group or location. Their selective process may also include targeting civilians or non-combatants; or both as in the example of September 11th. Finally, if one considered violence to be a determining factor in a definition of 'terrorism', one naturally must clearly define what is meant by violence. It is not hard to see that there would be considerable disagreement on what constitutes a violent act and how it should be measured as the vagueness in the US PATRIOT Act regulations listed above clearly shows. Disagreement also centers around the notion of whether and to what extent violent acts carried out during a struggle for national liberation, self-determination and independence should be excluded or included in a definition of 'terrorism'.

Harm: It would appear the intention to harm individuals or property would be central to a concept of 'terrorism'. Many consider "terrorism" to be acts which unquestionably intend to harm individuals. Although the inclusion of harm within a definition appears natural, it too suffers from ambiguity. One would have to clearly outline what is meant by harm because, even though direct and prolonged harm are clear enough, economic suffering and deprivation could, and should, count as well. Is mental cruelty a form of harm? Does the intention to inflict harm have to be immediate or future

[170] The American government has aired several commercials directly claiming just this.

or both? Derrida asks, "can't one terrorize without killing?[171] And how does one judge the threat of an intended harm? We can clearly see the potential for abuse here. The American government outwardly declared that the harm from WMDs in Iraq was a real and immediate danger with the potential to harm the American people with the most threatening and destructive power imaginable. The magnitude of this perceived harm was used to justify the invasion of Iraq and slaughter of thousands of Iraqis; not to mention many other devastating consequences. Unjustly, the US PATRIOT Act considers American economic suffering within its concept of 'terrorism' but not that of other states (although this too is subject to wide interpretation and acceptance). American economic sanctions caused tremendous suffering for the Iraqi people after the Gulf War and claimed millions of lives, but this does not count for the American government.

Fear: Fear is naturally considered to be a central component in any 'terrorism' definition. In fact, 'terror' in the word 'terrorism' means just that; fear. It is held that terrorists often seek maximization in the severity and length of psychological fear, such that including fear in a definition of 'terrorism' allows one to distinguish it from other forms of violence. However, some will argue that sometimes terrorism gives rise to defiance and a strengthening of resolve rather than fear. But, the reasons for group X to be defiant against terrorism act Y may be the best and only way to respond to the terrorist act. However, this hardly means that Israelis are not fearful of further terrorist attacks. Israel is defiant of the Palestinian "terrorist" attacks but one would be hard pressed to deny that they are not afraid. Moreover, a strengthening of resolve does not imply fearlessness but rather a potential means by which to deal with "terrorism" and help overcome the fear. America is defiant and has strengthened her resolve in combating

[171] Borradori 108.

"terrorism" since the September 11th attacks. However, Americans are far from living without fear of future "terrorist" attacks.

But fear may not always be the aim of the "terrorist" and thus is not always central to the notion of 'terrorism'. Cyberterrorism for example, does not always involve acts which create fear; sometimes they are designed to disrupt, coerce, or cause a nuisance to cyber systems. The US PATRIOT Act describes acts of cyberterrorism to include, among many others, acts which damage protected computers or those individuals who gain unauthorized access to a protected computer and causes either an individual or aggregate a financial loss greater than $5,000.[172] Coady too, would prefer a definition which lacks reference to the concept of fear, for he believes, that attacks on a non-combatant target can be construed such that the purpose of the attack was not to generate fear but rather, as an example, meant as "the only blow possible".[173] Also, creating fear or intimidation in a population can be included in other activities other than 'terrorism', such as war, mob violence, viral outbreaks or even criminal law enforcement which uses the fear of the death penalty as a deterrent to crime.[174] Derrida remarks, "we must be very careful using the term 'terrorism' and especially 'international terrorism'. In the first place, what is terror? What distinguishes it from fear, anxiety, and pain?"[175] Many things may terrorise us but are not terrorism, like an earthquake or a tornado.

Misnomer

There is no single kernel or set of traits which can be distinguishing characteristics of 'terrorism' or which can be agreed upon. Like most words, there is no

---

[172] The Patriot Act U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5).
[173] Coady 6.
[174] Herbst 168.
[175] Derrida in Borradori 102.

essence of 'terrorism' (anti-essentialists hold that there is no essence to anything[176]). But there is something distinctive about this word. What has been called the 'terrorism' definitional knot is one which suffers from an intractable aporia. There is no minor or moderate disagreement as to what counts as 'terrorism', but there exists a real gulf between many viewpoints. There is no wide consensus on what is or is not 'terrorism' and thus each author begins their work by characterising the web of relations they use in their discourse. It is not that nothing is 'terrorism' but that almost anything can be 'terrorism'. With a boundless and indefinable word with no ideological consensus the problem lies in that anything can belong to the "Wittgenstein" family of 'terrorism' and then be used persuasively for political purposes as is predominately the current reality. Words like 'democracy' do not suffer from the wide variety of definitions or the numerous definitional components such as is involved with understanding 'terrorism'. What are commonly considered acts of 'terrorism', are in fact, violent acts which are defined by the objectives and biases of the source from which the violent acts were called 'terrorism'.

If the terrorism lexicon is to have any veracity and utility there would need to be a consistent set of defining traits which could enjoy wide consensus. However, the terrorism lexicon is apocryphal because there is no authoritative, attested or sovereign definition or agreed upon characteristics so its various meanings are always questionable. There have been no boundaries drawn for defining or using the word 'terrorism'. President Bush is playing language games ingrained with causal fallacies, ambiguities, and polemical judgements which describe all "terrorists" as evil, irrational, and hell bent

[176] For the anti-essentialist's position see: Richard Rorty, Philosophy and Social Hope (England: Clays Ltd., 1999) 55.

on Western destruction. The anti-essentialist shows that nothing is to be known about objects other than what sentences are true of it.[177] Because there is no essence of things the anti-essentialist will rely on wide consensus about the accuracy of sentences concerning things. But there is no consensus on what sentences are true of 'terrorism'; in fact, every sentence which can be said of 'terrorism' is at some point contested by some group. This is why there is no global ideological consensus on what is 'terrorism' and no international institutional consensus.

Without a recognized set of accurate and widely accepted sentences on 'terrorism', we are hard pressed to find the utility in employing such a problematic and ominous word. I am not saying that one cannot use the word 'terrorism' without meaning or purpose. The purpose for the use will give its meaning. There are also no universal paradigm cases of 'terrorism'. There are certainly cultural, political, religious, and patriotic usages of 'terrorism' and paradigm examples. But these "paradigm" usages do not reflect anything inherent or widely agreed upon regarding 'terrorism' but are examples of what one group of observers define or consider central to 'terrorism'. To consider the September 11th attacks by al Qaeda and Palestinian suicide bombings as "paradigm" cases of 'terrorism' is to restrict one's understanding of 'terrorism' and to commit the fallacy of limiting the definitional scope of 'terrorism'. To speak of these examples as paradigm cases of 'terrorism' is a misnomer as the greatest terrorist, and thus the best "paradigm" example of "terrorism" is the American government.

Terrorists or Guerrillas?

The problematic nature of the terrorism lexicon is further highlighted by the difficulty in distinguishing between "terrorists" and "guerrillas", between resistance and

[177] Rorty 55.

terror, and in understanding the label "non-combatant". Some academics will distinguish 'terrorism' from guerrilla warfare in that terrorists target civilians and guerrilla fighters target the military; Whittaker, writing on the difference between a terrorist and a guerrilla fighter states, "if violence is used against innocent civilians then you are most certainly a terrorist".[178] But we have seen that targeting civilians is not necessarily a definitional characteristic of 'terrorism'. Perhaps, it is the guerrilla's selection of military targets which gives it its distinctive quality. But many so called "guerrillas" target both the innocent and the military. Some organizations, like The Centre for Defense Information will list some organisations as terrorist when they are known to use guerrilla warfare; like The New People's Army (NPA); a paramilitary group in the Philippines.

Some organizations will participate in both attacks on innocents and military targets, thus effectively making them both terrorists and guerrillas. Others, as Boaz Ganor points out, view 'terrorism' and guerrilla warfare as the same thing, or others will define terrorists as those whose base of operations is small and located in cities and guerrillas as those whose base of operations is located in the countryside and whose military units grow in size conducting many of the same activities as governments.[179] Still others will say that guerrilla warfare is a "small war – subject to the same rules that apply to big wars and in this it differs from terrorism", but this is far from being a rule. To distinguish between 'terrorism' and guerrilla warfare Ganor states, "if an attack deliberately targets civilians, then that attack will be considered a terrorist attack, whereas, if it targets

---

[178] Whittaker 4-5.
[179] Boaz Ganor, "Defining Terrorism: Is one man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter?" Police Practice and Research 3.4 (2002): 287-304.

military or security personnel then it will be considered a guerrilla attack. It all depends on who the intended victims are". [180]

However, what if a car bomb intended to kill a military caravan prematurely explodes and kills a bus load of school children? The intended victims were the military caravan personnel, not the school children, so would this be called a terrorist attack or an accident? How would one determine the status of a particular organization if it attacks both military and innocent targets (like al Qaeda)? Determining the status of an organization will have serious consequences for that organization and in the measures taken to deal with it. Ganor suggests that we could rely either on a quantitative principle, which would compare the number of terrorist attacks with the number of guerrilla attacks a particular organization has done or a qualitative principle, which would state that any attack on civilians makes an organization a terrorist one.[181] But neither will suffice to resolve the issues with these polemical words. Moreover, Martin believes that it is important to understand that "terrorism is not synonymous with guerrilla warfare". [182] He defines the latter as perpetrated by "a numerically larger group of armed individuals, who operate as a military unit, attack enemy military forces, and size and hold territory (...), while also exercising some form of sovereignty or control over a defined geographical area and its population".[183] Interestingly, this can be a characteristic of al Qaeda, among other organizations, even though they are perceived by the West as the most significant "terrorist" organization - "al Qaeda" has a large number of armed individuals in Iraq

[180] Ganor.
[181] Ganor.
[182] Martin 31.
[183] Martin 31.

operating as military units attacking American enemy forces and seizing and controlling geographical areas in Iraq.

Moreover, President Hafez el-Assad of Syria stated, "we have always opposed terrorism. But terrorism is one thing and a national struggle against occupation is another (...) we support the struggle against occupation waged by national liberation movements".[184] After September 11th Sheik Muhammad Sayed Tantawi, a top Egyptian religious figure, condemned the attacks on America as terrorism, but then added, "there is a very big difference between terrorists and those who defend their land. We are in solidarity with the Palestinian people because they are right".[185] This would then make terrorism against America by al Qaeda wrong and terrorism by Palestinians against the Israelis right. However, I doubt that al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden do not deny that they are right and fighting for the good of all Arabs and for the protection of their land. What is commonly accepted is that the guerrilla label implies a positive connotation as they generally attack military targets and have a political objective. And the terrorism label implies a negative connotation as it is perpetrated by "evil" individuals targeting innocents. However, it is unlikely that either label contains any distinguishing characteristics or representational qualities which are non-ideologically accurate.

The neologism 'unlawful combatant' or 'enemy combatant' is interchangeable with 'terrorist' and is used by governments to sidestep the Geneva Convention. Unlawful combatants caught during the "war on terrorism" are not subject to the Geneva Convention as it does not contain any such concept.[186] The more appropriate term for

---

[184] Ganor.
[185] Fareed Zakaria, "Why they hate us," Newsweek 15 Oct. 2001.
[186] Noam Chomsky, Imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post-911 World (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005) 36.

"terrorists" captured during the "war on terror" would be prisoners of war. But this would then oblige the American and allied governments who are conducting the "war on terror" to recognize the "special status" of prisoners of war.[187] This is the last thing they want to do. On September 29, 2006 the American government effectively dismantled *habeas corpus* for "enemy combatants" now allowing the government to detain individuals arbitrarily and indefinitely.[188]

What distinguishes a resistance movement from 'terrorism'? The strongest ever UN General Assembly denunciation of terrorism stated that "the right to self determination, freedom, and independence, as derived from the Charter of the United Nations, of people forcibly deprived of that right ... particularly peoples under colonial and racist regimes and foreign occupation" were not terrorists.[189] But as Chomsky asks, "do such actions fall under terror or resistance?"[190] What is noteworthy is that America and Israel were the only two states to vote against this declaration as "colonial and racist crimes" might refer to their current ally at that time, apartheid South Africa, and also "foreign occupation" could refer to Israeli occupation; the UN declaration was consequently ignored[191] So, is the Palestinian movement a terror or resistance movement? *The Gazette* reported on Feb. 27, 2007 that Iraqi insurgents are turning away from civilian attacks and are targeting the government.[192] Should the "al Qaeda" violence in Iraq be properly called 'terrorism,' 'insurgency,' or 'resistance'?

---

[187] Chomsky, "Ambitions" 36.
[188] Joshua Frank, "Bye, Bye Civil Liberties: Blame the Democrats," Dissident Voice 9 Oct. 2006: online at: http://www.dissidentvoice.org/Oct06/Frank09.htm
[189] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 190.
[190] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 190.
[191] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 190.
[192] Christian Berthelsen, "Bomb plot may have been inside job; Failed attempt against Iraqi VP," The Gazette 27 Feb. 2007: A17.

Inductive Fallacy and False Analogy

In grouping all "terrorists" together into one broad category, as President Bush has, in a war against all forms of "terrorism" commits an inductive fallacy. There are no similarities between the "terrorists" of Palestine and the "terrorists" of September 11th. If you take a sample of a "terrorist" organization from a government list of "terrorist" organizations, you will notice that the sample taken is unrepresentative of the general characterisation of the population as a whole. It is a hasty generalization to equate North Korea with Iran or Iraq. There is no actual 'axis of evil' here because, correctly speaking, these countries are not an interconnected group.[193] Thus, rather than a broad war on "terrorism", a war on al Qaeda would have been more appropriate (if al Qaeda is responsible for September 11th [194]). Government policies on terrorism should have concentrated on finding members of al Qaeda and not mingled them with polices which involve the Russian conflict, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and Iraq. However, a broad war on "terror" is what has been waged and includes organizations that have never expressed grievance with America and who would likely not have otherwise. As President Bush declared "We are at war not only with a group of terrorists directly responsible for the attacks but with every terrorist group of global reach and the nations that provide safe haven to terrorism".[195] But a broad "war on terror" is a distraction and turns potential allies in finding al Qaeda "terrorists" into enemies.

---

[193] Herbst 21.
[194] For information on questions surrounding al Qaeda's alleged involvement in September 11th see: David R. Ray, ed. and Peter D. Scott, ed., 9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out (Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2007).
[195] President George W. Bush, Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American people, 20 Sept. 2001.

Many argue that terrorists are inherently evil and that "their evil is the first and most undeniable fact about them"[196] Simpson believes it is the duty of peace loving countries to rid the world of the "terrorist" evil as "not to do so would be a dereliction of duty".[197] If this is the case, then we would be ridding the world of an assorted grouping of organizations which have diverse ideologies, claims, means etc. Differences in "terrorism" in the Arab world alone are great as the Taliban, the insurgents in Iraq, Hamas, Hezbollah and the Islamic Jihad Group demonstrate. Yet President Bush declares, "in the long-term, (...) peace will come only by defeating the terrorist ideology of hatred and fear".[198] He declares this knowing that there are no similarities among "terrorist" ideologies and that "terrorism" is a tactic and not an ideology. It is important to note that each "terrorist" group has a large set of diversified grievances each requiring individual examination in order to weigh each claim on its own merits and develop appropriate and responsible political action. Grouping all "terrorists" together in a false analogy fuels the ideology of a cultural clash between Islam and the West and allows for the homogenization of the enemy which would and should not happen.[199]

The conventional American understanding of "terrorism" is that 'terrorism' is one basic descriptive, universal referent with a negative moral assessment and is perpetrated by persons who are consciously depraved, devoid of morality, and lacking in justification

---

[196] Peter Simpson, "The War on Terrorism: Its Moral Justification and Limits in Peace, War and Terrorism," (2006): 9-23, in Peace, War and Terrorism, by Dennis Okerstrom ed. A Longman Topics Reader (Montreal: Person education, 2006) 10.
[197] Simpson 14.
[198] George W. Bush, "President's Radio Address, July 22, 2006," The White House, (Washington, DC, 22 July 2006) online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/07/20060722.html
[199] Tariq Ali calls this clash between the East and the West not a "clash of civilizations" but rather, a "clash of fundamentalisms". Ali Tariq, The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads, and Modernity, (London: Verso, 2002).

for their deplorable and pointless attacks.[200] Most think of terrorists as armed individuals who are irrational, violent and far removed form society. They are seen as "misfits who place their own twisted morality above mankind's.[201] Former Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu stated terrorists were "a new breed of man which takes humanity back to prehistoric times, to the times when morality was not yet born. Divested of any moral principle, he has no moral sense, no moral controls, and is therefore capable of committing any crime, like a killing machine, without shame or remorse".[202] But we should not accept the conventional American, and also Western, view of "terrorism" and "terrorists". We have turned our minds over to a hegemonic agenda through its manipulation of the concept of 'terrorism' and in its characterization of the "war on terror" into a battle of good versus evil. Condemning all "terrorists" as unconditionally evil strips them of their political context and constructs "counter-terrorism" as a righteous battle of good over evil. President Bush in his 2007 State of the Union Address said, "on one side are those who believe in freedom and moderation. On the other side are extremists who kill the innocent, and have declared their intention to destroy our way of life".[203]

---

[200] President George W. Bush has stated that terrorists "celebrate death, making a mission of murder and a sacrament of suicide." George W. Bush, "President: We're Fighting to Win - And Win We Will: Remarks by the President on the USS Enterprise on Pearl Habor Day," The White House, (Washington, DC, 7 Dec. 2001): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/01/20070123-2.html

[201] Zakaria.

[202] Primoratz, "Terrorism" 65.

[203] George W. Bush, "2007 State of the Union Policy Initiatives," The White House, (Washington, DC, 23 Jan. 2007): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/stateoftheunion/2007/initiatives/index.html

The Neo-Conservative Project

The claims about international terrorism networks made by the American government and their allies in the 'war on terrorism' have little evidence to support them. They are detaining people not in any reference to fact, but based on a series of assumptions which do not reflect reality. Our perceptions are being driven by political agendas rather than an accurate understanding of current events. Just as Edward S. Herman states "communism is an enormously serviceable tool for achieving morally dubious goals under a morally acceptable cover" so too, I affirm, is our current Western usage of 'terrorism'.[204] According to a 2004 BBC documentary[205], the current American neo-conservative project has misled the American public, and now the global community, into another pursuit of an enemy which does not exist; or is at best greatly exaggerated. The neo-conservative project, which began after the Second World War, was one designed to deal with the liberal ideology of individualism which, in the neo-conservative view, had the inherent problematic nature of promoting the interests of the individual over the masses. This ideology was one which saw America's place in the world as a warrior of good battling the forces of evil. This evil they were called to fight was the new Soviet communist "threat". America needed to wipe out and destroy the communist "threat" from the face of the earth because, it was argued, the soviets were dedicated to the destruction of America and freedom as Americans knew it. Professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago during the 1950's and 1960's and a powerful behind the scenes

---

[204] Edward S. Herman, The Real Terror Network: Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982) 34.

[205] The Power of Nightmares: The Rise of Politics of Fear, produced by Stephen Lambert and Peter Horrocks, written and produced by Adam Curtis, BBC documentary, 92004, 10 Apr. 2007: online at: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8813210048382851 77>

force in the Republican party, Leo Strauss claimed that America, in order to rescue itself from moral decay, needed to create a threat which could strike at America at any time and one which America would then need to destroy. This creation myth, he argued, of good versus evil would give both purpose and meaning to the American people. He propounded the need to create a world view which divided the globe into good and evil creating a world of moral certainties.[206]

The communist threat was born and it was a vast Soviet "terror" network which was responsible for all communist violence in a global conspiracy to dominate and control the world. This ideology created the first "war on terror", waged by Ronald Regan. In 1983, Regan changed his foreign policy to have the CIA fight secret wars to push back the perceived hidden soviet "threat" (like the ten year Afghanistan war, more on this in chapter four). It was thought that it was America's unique destiny to fight an epic battle against the forces of evil which at the time were the Soviets. In, *The New Crusade: America's War on Terrorism*, Rahul Mahajan, gives a comprehensive understanding of the underlying reason for our current global "war on terrorism". He says it is not a "war on terrorism" at all but rather a new Cold War. To fight a war one needs an enemy. At the end of the Cold War we could no longer use the godless communist evildoers as the enemy. Thus, coincidentally, the "Islamic terrorist enemy" began to emerge. If the terrorist threat of September 11th did not exist, it would have been necessary to create one.[207] Chomsky believes that September 11th "provided them with an

---

[206] For a good analysis of Leo Strauss' political ideas and the neoconservative movement see: Shadia B. Drury, Leo Strauss and the American Right (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

[207] In fact, Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz and Donald Rumsfeld, among other founding members of the organization, the Project for the New American Century, stated in a 1999 document (this document focused on increasing tax money for the technological transformation of the military; available on their website) that the transformation will "proceed very slowly - unless America

opportunity to pursue long-standing goals with even greater intensity".[208] Terrorists are the perfect enemy. They are not a threat to the empire (as the Nazis were) and you can never know if the terrorist threat is over because "how will you know when all the terrorists are gone? You never will"![209]

Jackson explains that the government will use discourse discursively linked to meta-narratives which give meaning and explanation to the population. These meta-narratives construct distinctive meanings which influence their interpretation.[210] The Cold War is one of these meta-narratives which characterize the enemy, as "totalitarians and soulless ideologues seeking to impose their 'way of life' on subject populations".[211] President Bush has wantonly made this connection stating "because the war on terror will require resolve and patience, it will also require firm moral purpose. In this way our struggle is similar to the Cold War. Now as then, our enemies are totalitarians, holding a creed of power with no place for human dignity".[212] Thus "terrorists" have replaced the conquered communist "threat" and we now require that same resolve to win the "war on terror". Jackson thinks this is a blatant "attempt to rewrite the history of the Cold War, as well as pre-write the history of the 'war on terrorism'".[213] Thus, a complex issue is turned into a simplistic fantasy of "terrorism" and the same need for perpetual war against the communist "threat" is now said to be needed for the "threat" of international "terrorism". As American Navy Admiral Gene La Rocque said,

---

suffers 'some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor'" Quoted in Ray & Scott 15.

[208] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 109.

[209] Rahul Mahajan, The New Crusade: America's War on Terrorism (New York: Monthly Review press, 2002).

[210] Jackson 40-41.

[211] Jackson 45.

[212] George W. Bush (1 June 2002), as quoted in Jackson 45.

[213] Jackson 46.

> Never have we had a National Security Council so concerned about the nation's security that we're always looking for threats and looking how to orchestrate our society to oppose those threats. National Security[214] was invented, almost, in 1947, and now it has become the prime mover of everything we do as measured against something we invented in 1947.[215]

And this is now true of the invented, or at the very least, greatly exaggerated "terrorist" menace.

The government has its new evil and faceless enemy which can attack at any time. Under these circumstances, not knowing the enemy allows the population to imagine the worst. Thus, as Herman states, "...for the less intelligent and more demagogic ideologues and propagandists, bad words like 'communist' and 'terrorist' become synonymous with anything repugnant to the demagogue".[216] To use the 'terrorist' label is to increase the level of fear and is a reflection of our political discourse and not a reflection of the "terrorist's" power or of reality. In line with this thought, Jason Burke argues that the "terrorist" network al Qaeda, the most successful to date, is not a useful label to describe Osama bin Laden, his close associates or its infrastructure post the 2002 invasion. We should no longer use the al Qaeda label as it is not useful because the operation of this network has been destroyed after the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. At the very least, the al Qaeda label no longer describes an organized network or significant threat; even though many may argue that al Qaeda was always a loose network with no central

---

[214] The National Security Act of 1947 created the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). As Moyers states, "Its chief legitimate duty was to gather foreign intelligence for America's new role as a world power. Soon it was taking on covert operations, abroad and at home." Moyers, "Secret Government."

[215] Moyers, "Secret Government."

[216] Herman 25.

base.[217] The Cold War communist "threat" was an exaggeration and unrepresentative of the Soviet reality. In this same way, "terrorism" and the threat that this implies, is not representative of the current global "terrorist" reality.

No one and Everyone is a Terrorist

The 'terrorist' label is also problematic because no one considers themselves to be a "terrorist" and there is no plausible hope likely that people will ever agree on who a "terrorist" is and who is not. Palestinian Liberation Organization Chairman Yassir Arafat declared in 1974 at a U.N. General Assembly that "whoever stands by a just cause and fights for the freedom and liberation of his land from the invaders, the settlers and colonialists cannot possibly be called a terrorist."[218] And recently, a Palestinian official called Israel a terrorist state after an artillery strike in Gaza killed 18 people.[219] Most groups called "terrorist" deny the accusation as virtually no organisation openly views themselves as "terrorist" and furthermore, those on opposing sides in a conflict will often call each other the "terrorist". Juergensmeyer noted that religious activists seldom use the term 'terrorism' preferring the term 'militant' and they also prefer 'self-chosen martyr' over 'suicide-bomber'.[220] If we labelled groups, organizations and states 'terrorist' on the basis of how their opponents perceive them we would quickly see how fast the 'terrorist' label becomes meaningless. Great Britain is considering calling Russia a "terrorist" state

---

[217] Jason Burke, "Al-Qaeda: a meaningless label," Guardian unlimited Observer Worldview Extra, Sunday 12 Jan. 2003: online at: http://observer.guardian.co.uk/waronterrorism/story/0,,872957,00.html

[218] Yasser Arafat as quoted in Ami Isseroff, "Speech of Yasser Arafat Before the UN General Assembly: November 13, 1974," Middle East Web 2005: online at: http://www.mideastweb.org/arafat_at_un.htm

[219] Riyad Mansour, "Palestinian Official Calls Israeli Artillery Strike 'State Terrorism,'" VOA News 9 Nov. 2006: online at: http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2006-11/2006-11-09-voa40.cfm?CFID=98976627&CFTOKEN=51516023

[220] Juergensmeyer 9 & 73.

for its suspected role in the London poisoning of a former KGB agent.[221] Russia doesn't include Hamas or Hezbollah on their "terrorist" list as it is only organizations which represent the greatest threat to their own security or foreign policy and neither of these groups does.[222] Shiite Interior Minister for Iraq, Jawad Al Bolani, called a leading Sunni cleric a "terrorist inciter".[223] And even Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki, called Prime Minister of Australia John Howard an "eco-terrorist" for failing to abide by the Kyoto Protocol on climate change.[224] [225] But most famously of all, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez called President Bush "a protector of terrorists" and a "terrorist".[226]

In 2004, Education secretary Rod Paige called the largest American teachers union, the National Education Association, "terrorist" for encouraging scare tactics to block the No Child Left Behind legislation.[227] And in 2003, Defense Policy Board member Richard Perle called Journalist Seymour Hersh a "terrorist" because, according to Perle, he is "widely irresponsible" and damages his reputation. [228] Incredibly, a former

---

[221] Although Russia denies the charge the case is being investigated. "Russia denies poisoning ex-spy in London," Farifax Digital 21 Nov. 2006: online at: http://www.theage.com.au/news/World/Russia-denies-poisoning-exspy-in-London/2006/11/21/1163871369747.htmlt

[222] Associated Press, "Hamas, Hizbullah not on Russia's terror list," Y Net News.com 28 July 2006: online at: http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3282840,00.html

[223] "Iraqis react to al-Dari warrant," Al Jazeera 18 Nov. 2006: online at: http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/38761D75-390E-42F5-94C6-65ABF31C25F9.htm

[224] Wendy Frew, "PM dubbed eco-terrorist," Farifax Digital 26 May 2005: online at: http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2005/05/25/1116950760760.html?oneclick=true

[225] Even Harry Belafonte called President Bush "the greatest terrorist in the world". Ian James, "Belafonte Calls Bush 'Greatest Terrorist'," The Associated Press, CommonDreams.org 9 Jan. 2006: online at: http://www.commondreams.org/headlines06/0109-06.htm

[226] Ian James, "Chavez takes case to U.N.," The Washington Times Associated Press 24 Apr. 2007: online at: http://washingtontimes.com/world/20070423-095315-1471r.htm

[227] Greg Toppo, "Education chief calls teachers union 'terrorist organization'," USA Today MSNBC.com 23 Feb. 2004: online at: http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2004-02-23-paige-remarks_x.htm?POE=NEWISVA

[228] "Showdown: Iraq," CNN Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer CNN.com transcripts, aired 9 Mar. 2003: online at: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0303/09/le.00.html

chairman on the Senate Subcommittee on Security and Terrorism declared that "youth gangs snatching purses in Philadelphia" is a case of "terrorism".[229] Not only is this pejorative word widely rejected, it does not stick. There are many cases of former "terrorists" who have since become statesmen. Nelson Mandela, leader of the ANC, formerly recognized "as one of the more notorious terrorist groups"[230] and Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO were both called "terrorists" only to have the label shamefully abandoned.[231] [232] Moreover, the Muhadjeen in Afghanistan were called "freedom fighters" by the Americans and Saddam Hussein was a friend but both views were later replaced with the view that they are "terrorists" in the worst sense.

Language Manipulation

The word 'terrorism' is a propagandistic tool used by states to manufacture consent for overtly violent actions. The creation of fear in a phantom enemy allows politicians to maintain their power. The labelling of someone or some state as "terrorist" "shuts the door to discussion about the stigmatized group or with them, while reinforcing the righteousness of the labellers, justifying their agendas and mobilizing their responses".[233] Immediately after September 11th Mayor Rudolph W. L. Giuliani III orated "those who practice terrorism, murdering or victimizing innocent civilians lose any right to have their cause understood by decent people and lawful nations (...) the terrorists lost

---

[229] As quoted in Herman 25.
[230] In fact, Chomsky says the American government called the ANC terrorist so as to bypass the congressional legislation banning aid to South Africa during the Regan administration. Chomsky, "Ambitions" 95.
[231] Chomsky, "Ambitions" 95.
[232] Another example as Philip Herbst reminds us is the Kosovo Liberation Army who were called "terrorists" by the Americans only to have the title changed to "freedom fighters" when the Americans planned to launch a strike against Serbia. Herbst 41.
[233] Herbst 163.

the right to be understood".[234] 'Terrorism' is a rhetorical device used against those who are considered enemies. But if we limit our condemnation of "terrorism" to just the actions of the powerless and not to those of the powerful, then as Theodore Seto writes, we "violate the most fundamental premise of any moral theory that moral principles be neutrally applied".[235] A very transparent example of American government propaganda and its success is the factitious link between Saddam Hussein, terrorism and September 11th. As Chomsky notes:

> The government-media propaganda assault had its effects. Within weeks, some 60 percent of Americans came to regard Saddam Hussein as 'an immediate threat to the US' (...) and by March, almost half believed that Saddam was personally involved in the 9-11 attacks and that the hijackers included Iraqis.[236]

None of this is even remotely true. Saddam Hussein was not, nor were other Iraqis, involved in September 11th. This unfounded belief is possible because the fear generated by the "threat" of the "terrorist" is so great that evidence to the contrary is largely ignored.

Observing that large-scale government violence depends upon political and social consensus Jackson noted, "consensus and knowledge require the deployment and manipulation of language".[237] This is synonymous with Plato's noble lie as he explained in *The Republic*, that a lie or myth is told by the philosophical elite to ensure the social order. Governments carefully, consciously and duplicitously select language, which is by no means unschooled, to justify their violence. The result, participation from the population or at least acquiescence in the apparent manifestation of a logical and violent

---

[234] "America's New War: Mayor Giuliani Addresses the U.N. Assembly," CNN Live Event/Special CNN.com transcripts, aired 1 Oct. 2001: online at: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0110/01/se.15.html
[235] Theodore Seto (2002) as quoted in Whittaker 110.
[236] Chomsky 18.
[237] Jackson 16.

course of action.[238] The terrorism lexicon is currently the most pervasive linguistic propaganda tool for justifying state violence. Jackson argues the analogising of communism and "terrorism" in neoconservative meta-narratives as the Bush administration has done, means that the construction of the 'terrorism' meta-narrative was purposely created to expand the bellicose neoconservative agenda.[239] The US PATRIOT Act, Bioterrorism Response Act, Financial Anti-Terrorism Act, True American Heroes Act, Terrorism Risk Protection Act, Authorization for the Use of Military Force Act, Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act, among many others, demonstrate the disturbing conclusion that the American government, among others, "considers terrorism a tool of social engineering".[240]

Abuses and Misuses

The word 'terrorism' is too easily abused and this manifests itself in numerous examples. The 1967 South African Apartheid Terrorism Act permitted the indeterminate detention of anyone "who might endanger the maintenance of law and order (... and hold them) without trial on the authority of a senior police officer".[241] Governments have created laws with standby provisions "whereby you could, in the name of stopping terrorism, apprehend, invoke the military, and arrest (individuals) and hold them in detention camps".[242] These provisions and laws sidestep every legal system allowing anyone to be stripped of their legal protection. Jackson notes:

---

[238] Jackson 24.
[239] Jackson 27.
[240] Paul David Collins, The Hidden Face of Terrorism: The Dark Side of Social Engineering, From Antiquity to September 11 (New York: 1st Books Library, 2002).
[241] "Terrorism Act No 83 of 1967," Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terrorism_Act_No_83_of_1967
[242] Collins.

> In almost every case, these new laws greatly increase the powers of the security agencies, allow for the detention of suspects without trial and widen the definition of the kinds of activities that fall under the rubric of terrorism. Some countries have adopted the language of the "war on terrorism" to describe their own fight against internal insurgents and dissidents, notably Russia, India, China, Zimbabwe, the Philippines, Columbia and Israel.[243]

Human Rights Watch recently published a list of states which have taken advantage of the new opportunities September 11th and "terrorism" have created and detailed the repression they cause in combating it. They explain that many states misuse the term for purposes that have no relation to 'terrorism'.[244] China, for example, sought international help to apprehend "terrorists" practicing non-violent resistance.[245] Kate Gilmore, Amnesty International Executive Director, has said that the "so-called war against terrorism has become a license to governments to ignore human rights and to commit a wide range of abuses, secure in the knowledge that other governments are going to turn a blind eye in the interests of a 'global coalition against terrorism".[246] Disturbingly, the American government is creating these new 'terrorism' crimes and applying them retroactively.[247] A very important issue here, as Steve Watson suggests, is why are states (most notably America) pushing to merge crimes and terrorism together?[248]

---

[243] Jackson 13.
[244] Human Rights Watch, Opportunism in the Face of Tragedy: Repression in the name of anti-terrorism (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2006) online at: http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/september11/opportunismwatch.htm
[245] David S. Cloud and Ian Johnson, "In Post-9/11 World, Chinese Dissidents Pose U.S. Dilemma," Wall Street Journal 3 Aug. 2004: online at: http://uyghuramerican.org/articles/60/1/In-Post-911-World-Chinese-Dissidents-Pose-US-Dilemma/In-Post-911-World-Chinese-Dissidents-Pose-US-Dilemma.html
[246] Gilmore, "Amnesty International speech."
[247] For example, see Agence France-Press: "U.S. charges against Australian are made up, lawyer says," in The Gazette 3 Mar. 2007: A17. The Australian's lawyer claims the Americans are "repeating history by creating a new crime after the fact and trying to apply it (...) retroactively."
[248] Watson.

There are many ridiculous and revealing examples of the misuse of this term. The FBI has a pamphlet for their patrol officers in which they describe the ways to identify potential domestic "terrorists". The pamphlet, titled *If you encounter: any of the following, call the Joint Terrorism Task Force*, labels anyone a "terrorist" who, defends the US Constitution, makes "numerous references to the US Constitution", "refuse(s) to identify themselves", "claim(s) driving is a right, not a privilege", is motivated by "Marxist/Leninist philosophy", "animal right activists", "Urban riot agitators", "cyber penetration", "Doomsday/Cult-Type Groups", "Insurgents/Rebels" and even "lone individuals".[249] The Defense Department, the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force, the Department of Homeland Security and local police forces have all gone as far as monitoring "a broad spectrum of protest groups, including anti-war activists, environmentalists, animal rights advocates and even vegetarians".[250]

The Texas Department of Public Safety created a pamphlet for the public called *Terrorism: What the public needs to know*, in which they identify some characteristics of "terrorists" as those who are "team-oriented and very disciplined", "employ a variety of vehicles and communicate predominately by cell phone, e-mail, or text-messaging services", "try to fit in and not draw attention to themselves, may appear 'normal' in their appearance and behaviour while portraying themselves as a tourist, student, or businessperson", "may be found traveling in a mixed group of men, women, and children of varying ages who are unaware of their purpose", and are "trained to avoid confrontations with law enforcement and therefore can be expected to project a 'nice-

---

[249] Arizona, If you encounter: any of the following, call the Joint Terrorism Task Force (Arizona: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Phoenix anti-terrorism task force): front page online at: http://www.keepandbeararms.com/images/FBI-MCSOTerroristFlyer-Front.jpg and back page online at: http://www.keepandbeararms.com/images/FBI-MCSOTerroristFlyer-Back.jpg

[250] Best 3.

guy' image".[251] The state of Virginia created a pamphlet titled *Terrorism & Security Awareness Orientation for State Employees*, in which they identify potential "terrorists" as individuals who show "an increased general interest in (a) facility", question facility practices and who "may have one or more of the following items in their possession when observed: a still video camera, binoculars, hand held tape recorder, maps or charts, sketch pads or notebooks, SCUBA equipment, and disguises".[252] According to just these three American state departments, any *tourist* in America can be identified as a "terrorist"!

In France, tens of thousands of textbooks were delivered to schools and universities in which the Turkish textbook refutes Darwin's theory of evolution "describing it as 'the true source of terrorism'".[253] There is even a new Terror-Free Oil Initiative in which gas stations called *Terror-Free Oil* are appearing across the American landscape. Their business strategy is to promote the idea that Middle East oil funds "terrorism" and thus one can do their part to end "terrorism" by buying their gas purchased from non-Arab countries.[254] Yes, Middle East oil does support "terrorism" but the important distinction lacking here is that it supports American and allied terrorism.

---

[251] Texas, Terrorism: What the public needs to know (Texas: Department of Public Safety Criminal Intelligence Service, 2006): online at: http://www.pvamu.edu/Include/EHS/TDPS/Terrorism.pdf

[252] Virginia, Terrorism & Security Awareness Orientation for State Employees (Virginia: The Virginia Department of Emergency Management, 2003): online at: http://www.virginianewssource.com/images/VATerrorismManual.pdf

[253] "Darwin 'source of terrorism'," The Gazette 3 Feb. 2007: A17.

[254] Interestingly, the company logo is a circle containing a pentagon with two superimposed tower like structures with pointed tops. The logo appears to resemble the twin towers evoking the trauma of that day. To learn more about the Terror-Free Oil Initiative visit: http://www.terrorfreeoil.org/endorsements.php

Performative Power

The word 'terrorism' isn't just a propaganda tool, nor is it only contentiously descriptive and/or evaluative but it is importantly - performative. To say 'terrorism' is to do something with words as language constructs and deconstructs reality by affecting our perceptions, cognitions, and emotions. Labelling someone as "terrorist" is unavoidably subjective (as was just shown) and is intended to immediately persuade others to adopt a moral viewpoint concerning the individual as the utterance has a transformative effect. The effect of naming political violence is so powerful that to "call an act of political violence terrorist is not merely to describe it but to judge it".[255] And the judgment is not a positive one because, as we saw, to be a "terrorist" is to be evil and morally depraved. The words 'terrorism' and 'terrorist' are very loosely applied and very difficult to challenge when they are being inappropriately used. Michael Bhatia says, "once assigned, the power of the name is such that the process by which the name was selected generally disappears and a series of normative associations, motives and characteristics are attached to the named subject".[256] Moreover, as Nuzzo states, "to label an enemy a terrorist is to forbid the search for the ground or reason for action". [257]

The perlocutionary[258] force of the word 'terrorism' is the most troubling because it affects others and it affects institutional states of affairs; 'terrorism' is often used to make something the case. When the American government labels a state a "terrorist state", they acquire legitimacy in taking violent action against it. Any state accused of being involved in terrorism can find itself politically isolated and economically damaged.

---

[255] R. Rubenstein as quoted in Jackson 23.
[256] Bhatia 5.
[257] Nuzzo 338.
[258] For more information on the different speech acts and how they work see: J. L Austin, How To Do Things With Words (Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2001).

The American government, through their employment of the terrorism lexicon, uses systematic and distorted communication to manipulate the population. The language of 'terrorism', as Jackson notes, "makes some strategic options seem rational and logical and others seem absurd, even taboo: (...like) engaging in any kind of dialogue with so-called terrorists".[259] This is a significant point because the current violent global response to "terrorism" could have been altered if September 11th was not referred to as 'terrorism'. If the government constructed a discourse which used words like 'criminal', 'crime of the century', 'law-enforcement campaign' and avoided words like, 'war', 'terrorist', and 'evil', Jackson argues, "a whole range of alternative counter-terrorist strategies would have become possible".[260]

Naming a group 'terrorist' can also increase their violence. A good example of this is the MILF, a Muslim separatist group in the Philippines. They said it would be a "functional escalation" of the conflict if the Philippine government labelled them 'terrorist'.[261] The non-use of the 'terrorist' label can have serious consequences as well. The American government ignored India's requests to label Pakistan a "terrorist" state and thus end the Kashmiri "terrorist" networks. The American government did not declare Pakistan to be a supporter of the Kashmiri "terrorists" in spite of the large amount of incriminating evidence; the American government did not do this as their priority was to befriend the Pakistani government.[262] Ganor even writes that if there was international adoption of his proposed definition which distinguishes between 'terrorism' and guerrilla warfare and separates 'terrorism' from political aims that this "could motivate the

---

[259] Jackson 22.
[260] Jackson 40.
[261] Bhatia 6.
[262] Gareau 13.

perpetrators to reconsider their intentions, choosing military targets over civilian targets – guerrilla warfare over terrorism – both because of its moral considerations and because of 'cost benefit'".[263] The discourse on 'terrorism' is not an objective representation of the facts and this is disturbing because the consequences of labelling (or not) someone or some state a "terrorist" are immediately relevant to those labelled, the conflict, and the ability to find solutions.

Justifying Terrorism

There are dramatic consequences for those who are labelled "terrorist", therefore acrimonious definitions and discourses which categorically *a priori* characterise 'terrorism' as morally wrong are quite alarming. But despite the truth that 'terrorism' is a relative term, some argue, we cannot abandon ourselves to moral relativism. Would it be possible for a rational individual to declare that 'terrorism', as a means, is unacceptable, even when its cause is in the name of freedom? Is it even something that a reasonable person morally speaking must do? No, as there is nothing in itself which is either moral or immoral about 'terrorism'. The morality of any act is determined by the intentions of the actors and the circumstances surrounding it; as Jack Ornstein states, "circumstances make something the case".[264] To kill someone is a morally neutral act whereas murder and rape, are not morally neutral by definition. This is so because the circumstances and intentions of the killer are what make the violence a crime, accident or self-defence. To say that 'terrorism' is *Malum in se* is incorrect as there is nothing inherently wrong with 'terrorism' as a means, tactic or ideology and there is nothing inherently evil about

[263] Ganor.
[264] Discussions with Jack Ornstein.

"terrorists"; contrary to President Bush's statement that "terrorists" "are an evil bunch of folks".[265]

It would be more appropriate to say that 'terrorism' is *malum prohibitum*, being wrong only because it is prohibited by law. We should view 'terrorism' as Nielsen writes, "like the choice of weapons in a war(,) it cannot reasonably be ruled out as something to which only morally insane beasts or fanatical madmen would resort".[266] There are cases where the justified use of terrorism as a tactic is called for. Nielsen gives us the hypothetical example of a poor and repressed black community's justified use of "terrorism" against a white middle-class state. If the democratically elected state, responds to increased outcries for law and order to quell heightened black rioting by imprisoning for long durations in concentration camps both those innocent and guilty then the black community would be justified in using "terrorism" to end this repression if it had a reasonable chance of being effective. But not only is this dependent upon the black community's belief that the violence would be effective but also on the belief that their violence would cause less harm than the state's violence against them.[267] For Nielsen, combating an "evil" with "terrorism" is not *always* wrong.

Moreover, the American government does not always think 'terrorism' is evil or unjustified either. The bombing of Dresden and the two atomic bombs dropped on Japan

---

[265] Is Bush an Idiot? MSNBC, news report: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=-1792905136727686476&q=is+Bush+an+Idiot%3F&total=1321&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=6

[266] Kai Nielsen, "Violence and Terrorism: Its Uses and Abuses in Values in Conflict: Life, Liberty and the Rule of Law," in Values in Conflict: Life, Liberty and the Rule of Law. (1981): 435-449, by Burton M. Leiser ed. (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1981): 435.

[267] Nielsen, "Violence" 438-439.

deliberately and needlessly[268] targeted and destroyed hundreds of thousands of innocent civilians, thus "the United States must believe (...) that sometimes terrorist acts are justified".[269] There are no rules to follow for determining the justifiability of violence. The justification or blameworthiness of 'terrorism' and its necessary conditions are relative to the specific act itself, its situation, and to the definition used by those to describe it. This being the case, the American paradigm of 'terrorism' prevention, imprisoning individuals perceived as possible future "threats", is very amiss. The American attorney general has justified the paradigm of prevention by stating that "we had to make a shift in the way we thought about things, so being reactive, waiting for a crime to be committed, or waiting for there to be evidence of the commission of a crime didn't seem to us to be an appropriate way to protect the American people".[270] So rather than hold people accountable for their actions, they can be imprisoned for what they may possibly do in the future! How can one counter their speculations and prove one's innocence?

As of 2005 in Britain, under their own duplicitous "terrorism" law (the Terror Act), there were 664 arrested "terrorists" since September 11th. They have been held in

---

[268] More than fifty of Japan's major cities were fire bombed and destroyed prior to the dropping of the two nuclear bombs. Japan wanted to negotiate its surrender but the Americans refused to talk and dropped the first nuclear bomb days after. As Nielsen has explained, the Americans could have easily dropped one bomb off the shore of Tokyo thus demonstrating the power of the new weapon of mass destruction without having to murder hundreds of thousands of civilians. But the American's intent was to test the bomb in combat and demonstrate to the communists the destructive power of their new weapon. Discussions with Kai Nielsen.

[269] Nielsen, "State and Otherwise" 431. Nielsen believes attempts at defending these government "terrorist" acts are mistaken because they do not satisfy the principle of the double effect. He writes "the grounds for justifying the use of what I have called state terrorism therefore do not stand up to scrutiny. They are rather flimsy rationalizations for extremely brutal acts carried out on civilian populations". Ibid., 434.

[270] Steven C. Clemons, "Extraordinary Rendition? America Outsources Torture," The Washington Note (2004): online at: http://www.thewashingtonnote.com/mt/mt-comments.cgi?entry_id=211

prison and have been stripped of all their civil liberties. Of these 664, a fifth have been charged and only seven convicted.271 On March 26, 2007, the Washington Post reported that the American "terrorist" watch list quadrupled from less than 100,000 files in 2003 to an unmanageable 435,000 files. They also reported that once on the list "it is virtually impossible to get off it". 272 According to the Red Cross, "70 to 90 percent of those being held seem to have committed no crime other than simply being in the wrong place at the wrong time, caught up in some sweep of 'suspects' - the principal justification for holding them is 'interrogation".273 Surprisingly, even American intelligence officials "estimated that 70-90% of prisoners detained in Iraq 'had been a mistake'".274 The peak of hypocrisy and injustice is to be indeterminately imprisoned (no charges laid, with no representation, no outside communication, and subject to questionable practices) by a government which is guilty of perpetrating that which it accuses those imprisoned of. Leon Trotsky said it best in 1911:

> They would like to label all the activities of the proletariat directed against the class enemy's interests as terrorism. The strike, in their eyes, is the principal method of terrorism. (...) If terrorism is understood in this way as any action inspiring fear in, or doing harm to, the enemy then of course the entire class struggle is nothing but terrorism. And the only question remaining is whether the bourgeois politicians have the right to pour out their floods of moral indignation about proletarian terrorism when their entire state apparatus with its laws, police, and army is nothing but an apparatus for capital terror![275]

---

[271] Dan McDougall, "M 15 establishing new base in Scotland -Muslims cry victim at being scrutinised as possible terror source," Militant Islam Monitor.org 6 Feb. 2005: online at: http://www.militantislammonitor.org/article/id/421

[272] Washington Post, "U.S. terrorist watch list soars to an unmanageable 435,000: up from fewer than 100,000 files in 2003," in The Gazette 26 Mar. 2007: A16.

[273] Reported in Susan Sontag, "Regarding the Torture of Others," New York Times 23 May 2004: online at: http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/23/magazine/23PRISONS.html?ex=1400644800&en=a2cb6ea6bd297c8f&ei=5007&partner=USERLAND

[274] Best 12.

[275] Leon Trotsky, Against Individual Terrorism (New York: Pathfinder Press 1974) 5.

Who is the Most Terrorist?

There is no single "kernel" to 'terrorism' or combinations of traits which can enjoy wide consensus as characteristics distinctive to acts of 'terrorism'. The fog surrounding the characteristics or definitional components of 'terrorism' is thick. We are even unable to clearly distinguish between "terrorists" and "guerrillas" or between resistance and terror, leaving us unable to determine the status of a particular organization with any determinate degree of veracity. We commit an inductive fallacy when we group all "terrorists" together into one broad category in a war against all forms of 'terrorism'. The homogenization of the "terrorist" enemy should not happen. By associating the terrorism lexicon with the communist meta-narrative, the government is pre-writing the history of the "war on terrorism". The terrorism lexicon, a complex and nuanced issue, is not representative of the current global "terrorist" reality.

The terrorism lexicon is a tool of social engineering which has performative power. Saying "terrorism" constructs reality, it makes something the case and it carries a negative denotation. Even though there is nothing inherently evil about "terrorism", "terrorists" are perceived as inherently evil. Defining 'terrorism' as morally reprehensible eliminates the possibility of justifiably using "terrorism"; *sometimes*. It is with good reason that Theodore Seto states, "condemnation of terrorism becomes merely an instrument for the preservation of existing power relationships".[276] And to this can be added, 'terrorism' is "the term of moral censure which the world *haves* employ to cover all acts of war against them by the world have *nots*".[277] If this is the case, and we accept the applicability of universal evaluative standards and acknowledge the problematic

---

[276] Theodore Seto as quoted in Whittaker 110.
[277] Danny Goldstick, "Defining Terrorism," Nature, Society and Thought 4.3 (1991): 261.

nature between the 'war' and 'terrorism' distinction then, as Borradori questions, "who is the most terrorist?"[278]

[278] Borradori 107.

CHAPTER FOUR

"In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defence of the indefensible"
George Orwell
Politics and the English language.

The Lacuna in the Lexicon

The terrorism lexicon is without veracity in another significant way as there is a consequential lacuna in our understanding. But if the fog of the terrorism lexicon is such that its nature is implacable, its definition in disaccord and it descriptiveness stretched beyond its meaningful limits subject to redefinition and interpretation, then how can I suggest that there is a logical part of the argument missing from our discourse? Quite simply, to achieve any kind of fairness in debate and understanding of the word 'terrorism' and the origins of today's global "terrorist" threat one must *acknowledge* the concept of state terrorism. Chomsky writes, "Those who are seriously interested in understanding the world will adopt the same standards whether they are evaluating their own political and intellectual elites or those of official enemies".[279]

Chomsky believes that the principle of universality is a "moral truism" as "we should apply to ourselves the same standards we apply to others – in fact, more stringent ones".[280] Only the crimes of others take place, he believes, because we exempt ourselves from this most elementary of moral truisms.[281] It was based on this principle that Nazi war criminals were absolved of their crimes if "the defence could show that their US counterparts carried out the same crimes".[282] Moreover, one cannot categorically reject or oppose "terrorism" unless one also rejects warfare which relies on weapons which do not

---

[279] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 49.
[280] Noam Chomsky, "Simple Truths, Hard Problems: Some thoughts on terror, justice, and self defence," Philosophy 8 (2005): 9.
[281] Chomsky, "Simple Truths" 16.
[282] Chomsky, "Simple Truths" 7.

discriminate or tactics which deliberately target the innocent.[283] Thus, it is this aspect of 'terrorism', 'state terrorism', which is the more important phenomenon because, according to Nielsen, "there probably would be very little substate terrorism if it were not for the pervasiveness and intensity of state terrorism".[284]

Acknowledging state terrorism and the accurate historical record of the American government reveals that our usage of 'terrorism' does not conform to reality. There are many forms of state violence such as 'war', 'repression', 'genocide', and 'terrorism'. But American state terrorism is prevalent and real; or American state violence upheld to the same definitional characteristics of all American state definitions of 'terrorism' – minus the exclusion of America and its allied states as possible actors. This is largely omitted from record and has been, and is, sold as American self-defence in the name of "freedom" - but really it is in the name of "terrorism". The American government has manufactured consent for the "war on terror" by befuddling the origins of "terrorism" against the West. America actively and purposefully engages in terrorism in fighting the "war on terror" and in numerous pre-September 11th examples. Among the most worrisome consequences of our befuddled understanding of 'terrorism' and its implacable nature is the new international norm of preventative war used to justify the advance in the fight against the "terrorist" threat.

The case for universalizing our evaluative standards concerning 'terrorism' is evident. But some still argue whether you call state violence – 'state terrorism', 'war terrorism', or 'counter terrorism', it all amounts to the same thing, but there is something which makes state violence different from 'terrorism'. This, for Audrey Kurth Cronin is

[283] Thus America, the largest keeper of nuclear weapons, cannot reject terrorism without appearing hypocritical.
[284] Nielsen, "Justifiability" 432.

because states cannot by definition be terrorists; it is, given her understanding, self-contradictory to speak of 'state terrorism'. Her view is important because I think it is a particularly good explanation for why we passively and wilfully ignore the tremendous amount of morally unacceptable state terrorism calling it "collateral damage". She does not believe that "terrorists" can have targets other than innocent civilians and so, because 'terrorism' targets the innocent (distinguishing it from state violence that "inadvertently" kills innocent people) she concludes "the fact that precision-guided missiles sometimes go astray and kill innocent civilians is a tragic use of force, but it is not terrorism."[285] So what is it then? There are significant erroneous problems with this logic. As I have made clear, 'state terrorism' cannot be ruled out by definition due to the fog which surrounds the definition of 'terrorism' itself. I have also shown the problems of incorporating the targeting of innocents into a definition. Even so, there are further grounds from which to adjudge Cronin's "fact".

States do deliberately target innocent civilians and America has done so as well (as will be shown). Moreover, her "fact" is one based on the moral theory of "double effect". The theory of "double effect" is the difference between aiming at causing an evil and creating evil as a consequence of some other acceptable end.[286] Even if one's goals are acceptable, if the evil created is aimed at, then it is not morally acceptable. However, even if the evil created is calculable beforehand, it may be morally acceptable action if the evil created is not the intended goal. But I think this can effectively be dismissed by the consequentialist view that the differences between aiming at evil and seeking no evil are morally insignificant. Danny Goldstick asks "if it is immoral specifically to aim

[285] Cronin 33.
[286] Nielsen, "Justifiability" 432.

bombs at a hospital, isn't it immoral likewise to aim bombs at an adjacent military target knowing full well that their successful detonation will destroy the hospital also?" and all inside! [287]

Moreover, there are numerous examples of "smart" bombs missing their targets, contrary to Cronin's distorted statement that they "sometimes go astray". During the first three weeks alone, the American military launched fifty "precision" strikes in Iraq in an attempt to kill Saddam Hussein and other high-ranking leaders. The laser-guided bombs levelled dozens of homes and buildings killing and wounding more than 1,500 Iraqi civilians.[288] Not one of these "precision" missiles was launched with any reliable information and not one hit an Iraqi political or military target; "buildings were deliberately targeted with scant regard for how many non-combatants would be killed or injured".[289] [290]A recent example is an American coalition bombing of a civilian, mud-brick Afghanistan home in which nine members of a family died (four being children and four women).[291] [292] Also, in November 2001, the Americans erroneously carpet-bombed the densely populated town of Kunduz, killing 150 unarmed Afghan civilians.[293] Amnesty International issued a report in 2003 concerning the intensifying use of illegal cluster bombs in Iraq and their brutal consequences on the Iraqi people. They condemned

---

[287] Goldstick 261.
[288] James Conachy, "US killed hundreds of Iraqi civilians in "precision" strikes," World Socialist Web Site 18 June 2004: online at: http://www.wsws.org/articles/2004/jun2004/iraq-j18.shtml
[289] Conachy
[290] For a report on the civilian casualties in Iraq see Human Rights Watch report, Off Target: The Conduct of the War and Civilian Casualties in Iraq (New York: Human Rights Watch, Dec. 2003): online at: http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1203/
[291] Amir Shah and Rahim Faiez, "Air strike hits Afghan house, killing 9 of family," The Gazette 6 Mar. 2007: A17.
[292] ...and this was just two days after coalition forces opened fire on a crowd killing ten pedestrians fleeing a suicide bombing.
[293] Justin Huggler, "Carpet bombing 'kills 150 civilians' in frontline town," The Independent London, 19 Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.rawa.org/s-kill2.htm

the Americans for "the use of inherently indiscriminate weapons" saying "these weapons (...) are incapable of being used in a manner that complies with the obligation to distinguish between civilians and combatants".[294]

How is it acceptable that governments are allowed to kill civilians as "collateral damage"? On July 15, 2006 Israel launched a series of air strikes into Lebanon leaving 30 civilians dead, including refugees fleeing the fighting.[295] Although the European Union and Russia both condemned the Israeli air strikes as "disproportionate", both the American and British governments defended the actions blaming Hezbollah for instigating the violence by kidnapping two Israeli soldiers. How is such disproportionate violence justified? Hezbollah kidnapped two Israeli soldiers and yet Israel took the lives of thirty Lebanese civilians in response. Even more egregious, is the Israeli army's use of Palestinian women and children as human shields in their continued occupation. Many reports are now coming out. A recent one explained how the army used an 11-year-old girl as a human shield during one of their "counter terrorism" raids; at gun point, they forced her into a building hiding behind her like a shield, believing there were armed and dangerous Palestinian militants inside![296] It is notable that "in any given year the number of Palestinian civilians killed as a result of the Israeli occupation is at least three times higher than the number of Israeli civilians killed as a result of "terrorist" attacks".[297]

---

[294] Amnesty International, "Iraq: Civilians Under fire in In The Name of Democracy: American War Crimes In Iraq and Beyond," Amnesty International (2003): 39-42, in In the Name of Democracy, by Jeremy Brecher, Jill Cutler and Brendan Smith, ed. (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005) 40.

[295] Tracy McVeigh, "Israeli attacks kill Lebanese civilians," Guardian Unlimited 15 July 2006: online at: http://observer.guardian.co.uk/world/story/0,,1821462,00.html

[296] Tim Butcher, "Group accuses Israeli soldiers of using girl, 11, as human shield," The Gazette 10 Mar. 2007: A18.

[297] Luyendijk 16.

Apologists for state terrorism still have another argument in their hat. Some statists will argue "violence by recognized states is not problematical, but the use of force by non-state actors is never okay, because they don't have a legitimate claim to use force, in that the state by definition has a monopoly on the use of force".[298] Rather than exclude state violence from the definition of 'terrorism' this attempt recognizes state violence by bestowing upon it legitimacy. Henry Kissinger declared "this can't be a universal principle available to every nation" because, Chomsky notes, only "we will use force whenever we like against anyone we regard as a potential threat".[299] But why is state terrorism a legitimate monopoly?

On Feb. 13, 1991 the Amiriyah air-raid shelter in Baghdad was destroyed by two American precision-guided bombs killing 408 civilians. The American government stated the attack was based on intelligence suggesting the bunker was used for military command; but their evidence was erroneous and dubious at best. Human Rights Watch noted in 1991, "it is now well established, through interviews with neighborhood residents, that the Amiriyah structure was plainly marked as a public shelter and was used throughout the air war by large numbers of civilians".[300] Human Rights Watch argued that the two 2 thousand pound bombs exploded inside incinerating many, while others died from boiling water as it fell on them from the shelter's water tank; of the 408 dead nearly all were women and children.[301]

---

[298] Hubert Bauch, "Terrorism? Who says?: The difficulty lies in the definition," The Gazette 9 Sept. 2001: A4.
[299] Chomsky, "Ambitions" 69.
[300] Human Rights Watch, Needless Deaths in the Gulf War: Civilian Casualties During the Air Campaign and Violations of the Laws of War (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1991) online at: http://www.hrw.org/reports/1991/gulfwar/INTRO.htm
[301] "Amiriyah shelter," Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amiriyah_shelter

What, if at all, makes this legitimate violence?[302] According to Human Rights Watch they did not have any legitimate right to use this force. They also noted that the American government's delinquency in warning before the attack was a serious violation in the laws of war. These actions, and others, violate international law and gain their 'legitimacy' through self-declaration. Most ironically, all these arguments ignore the Jacobin historical origin linking 'terrorism' to that of states.

American hypocrisy and the government's distortion of facts is nowhere more evident than in the President's speeches. President Bush has, in his remarks to the nation on September 11th 2002, stated "our deepest national conviction is that every life is precious, because every life is the gift of a Creator who intended us to live in liberty and equality. More than anything else, this separates us from the enemy we fight. We value every life; our enemies value none – not even the innocent, not even their own."[303] President Bush, in commenting on September 11th said, "...like most Americans, I just can't believe it. Because I know how good we are (...), one of the truest weapons that we have against terrorism is to show the world the true strength of character and kindness of the American people".[304]

But the American government does not act as if every life is precious nor does the world see the kindness of the American people. There is nothing separating American foreign policy from what they describe as "international terrorism". The President's speeches are duplicitously crafted to demonize the enemy and ignore the American

---

[302] For a discussion of American hypocrisy in applying different moral theories used to justify American terrorism and the terrorism of others see: C. A. J. Coady, "The Morality of Terrorism," Philosophy 60 (1985): 47-69.

[303] George W. Bush, "President's Remarks to the Nation," The White House, (New York, 11 Sept. 2002): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020911-3.html

[304] George W. Bush, 11 Oct. 2001, quoted in Jackson 77.

historical record with opprobrious eulogizing of America's global benevolence. President Bush has orated "our efforts are directed at terrorist and military targets because - unlike our enemies - we value human life. We do not target innocent people".[305] The hundreds of thousands of dead innocent civilians due to the "war on terrorism" notwithstanding, the American government has also directly targeted innocent civilians. A mostly unknown example is the 1985 CIA and British intelligence, Beirut car bombing which killed 80 civilians and wounded another 250 people.[306] The car bomb was timed to explode in front of a mosque as people were leaving, killing mostly women and children.[307] And the best "stark and explicit" call for wars crimes by the Whitehouse, Chomsky writes, is Henry Kissinger's call to carry out Presidential orders to bomb anything and anyone in the campaign against Cambodia, Kissinger ordered, "anything that flies on anything that moves".[308]

American State Terrorism

It can evidently be seen that state terrorism is a consequential foundation in understanding the terrorism lexicon even though there may be wide disagreement on which states practice terrorism. However, it will be important to note that American state terrorism is a reality and thus our usage of the terrorism lexicon is again without veracity. This is so because if our usage included acts of American state terrorism (and other allied states), we would quickly see that the 'terrorism' distinction means very little. Moreover, the American government is deeply hypocritical in its demands for other nations to

---

[305]George W. Bush, "No Nation Can Be Neutral in This Conflict: Remarks by the President To the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism," The White House, (Washington, DC, 6 Nov. 2001): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011106-2.html
[306] Chomsky, "Simple Truths" 22.
[307] Chomsky, "Simple Truths" 22.
[308] Chomsky, "Simple Truths" 6.

surrender suspected "terrorists", as they themselves refuse to respect the same requests of other nations. The American government is also supporting terrorist national security states. Briefly, I will explore some of the best examples which show American support for "terrorist" organizations and their refusal to surrender known and convicted "terrorists" from other countries, their support of "terrorist" national security states and American state terrorism before and after September 11th.

The American government is actively harbouring known and convicted "terrorists" in spite of demanding the world to hand over the "terrorists" or face their wrath. The government has declared that any state harbouring suspected "terrorists" would be regarded as committing a crime and punished; President Bush said "those who harbour the terrorists are as guilty as the terrorists themselves".[309] Consequently, says Chomsky, "much of the world, including the US, merits [instant] bombing"[310] Hypocritically, the American government demanded Afghanistan to hand over the "terrorists" of September 11th or be destroyed. Yet the American government is harbouring major terrorist criminals within its borders, ones which other countries want extradited. They want their "terrorists" handed over but the government refuses to surrender them despite the strong incriminating evidence against them. Haiti has repeated its request over many years, for the American government to extradite Emanuel Constant, head of the murderous paramilitary forces. He was sentenced, in absenteeism, for his primary role in the slaughter of nearly five thousand people in the early 1990's.[311] The

---

[309] George W. Bush, "Remarks by the President on Iraq," (Ohio: Cincinnati Museum Center, 7 Oct. 2002).
[310] Chomsky, "Leading Terrorist."
[311] Noam Chomsky, "Noam Chomsky on Haiti," Third world Traveler University of Massachusetts, 17 Mar. 2004: online at: http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Haiti/Chomsky_Haiti_DN.html

government continues to harbour him because Constant has close ties to the CIA and the American government and, according to Chomsky, he most likely knows some classified information.[312] The Haitian government has the evidence, with which they were able to convict him and they want him handed over. Constant, as a leading figure in the slaughter of thousands of people in a neighbouring country, should be extradited according to the American government's own declarations against harbouring "terrorists"; but the issue is closed as far as they are concerned.

Costa Rica has for over two decades asked the American government to surrender former rancher John Hull. They discovered that his land was being used by the Reagan administration as a base for major terrorist attacks against their neighbour Nicaragua. Even though it is a crime to use your land for "terrorist" attacks, the American government will not surrender Hull to the Costa Rican authorities and instead they "punished them for making the request" with economic sanctions.[313] Venezuelan officials as well declared the American government was being "hypocritical" in its position on terrorism by blocking the extradition of Luis Posada Carriles.[314] He is accused of organizing the bombing of a Cuban passenger jet in 1976 which killed 73 people. Vice President Jose Vicente Rangel decreed "the US government is a hypocrite in its fight against terrorism (...they are) manipulating justice".[315] Moreover, Orlando Bosch, responsible for the bombing of a Cuban freighter received a Presidential pardon in 1989

---

[312] Chomsky, Noam, "The Fifth Freedom," Stephen Marshall, interviewer, Guerrilla News Network Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.chomsky.info/interviews/200111--04.htm
[313] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[314] Tom Regan, "Venezuela accuses US of 'double standard' on terrorism: Charges come after Texas judge blocks extradition of man accused of blowing up a Cuban passenger jet in 1976," The Christian Science Monitor 29 Sept. 2005: online at: http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0929/dailyUpdate.html
[315] Regan.

despite the Justice Department's ruling that it would be against the public interest if America harboured Bosch, "because the security of this nation is affected by its ability to urge credibly other nations to refuse aid and shelter to terrorists".[316]

The American government also supports terrorist organizations like the Monafiqeen-e-Khalq (MEK); also known as the Mojahedin-e-Khalq Organization (MKO). MEK is an anti-Western, Iranian opposition group that was designated by the American government as a foreign terrorist organization in 1997. Interestingly, the American coalition forces conducted air-strikes against MEK only to afterwards sign a cease-fire agreement in 2003 and then disarm and protect them.[317] MEK has over 3,000 soldiers stationed in Iraq who are "singularly dedicated to one goal: overthrowing its "archenemy," the Islamic Republic of Iran".[318] The American government has actively supported this terrorist ("terrorist" under their own understanding and declaration) organization and encouraged them to use their weapons against "Iranian regime infiltrators" in Iraq.[319] [320] But this decision was reversed which eventually led to American troops surrounding, disarming and protecting them. Daniel Pipes and Patrick Clawson wrote in the New York Post in 2003:

> When the secretary of state next decides whether or not to re-certify the MEK as a terrorist group, he should come to the sensible conclusion that it poses no threat to the security of the United States or its citizens, and remove it from the list of Foreign Terrorist Organizations (...because) maintaining the MEK as an

---

[316] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 87.
[317] Daniel Pipes and Patrick Clawson, "Mujahedeen-e Khalq: A Terrorist U.S. Ally?" New York Post, 20 May 2003: online at: http://www.danielpipes.org/article/1100
[318] Pipes & Clawson.
[319] Pipes & Clawson.
[320] For more information on MEK violence see: Human Rights Watch, Human Rights Abuses in the MKO Camps (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2006): online at: http://hrw.org/backgrounder/mena/iran0505/4.htm

> organized group in separate camps in Iraq offers an excellent way to intimidate and gain leverage over Tehran.[321]

So what does 'terrorism' refer to here? It refers to any individual, group, organization or state which poses a "threat" to American interests. The "excellent way to intimidate and gain leverage" is, according to their own definitions, "terrorism" against Iran.

The American government has been actively supporting terrorist national security states and operating terrorist attacks within their borders. The American government supported the right-wing government of Turkey, which has repressed and incarcerated "hundreds of thousands of peasants, workers, students, teachers, and others [and has] tortured and executed thousands".[322] And they supported Indonesia in their violence against East Timor; a state of little interest to the Americans. The American government supported Indonesia with weapons for their invasion of East Timor which caused the deaths of between 100,000 to 200,000 people.[323] Even though the Americans were in violation of international law for their support and supplying of military weapons to the Indonesian terrorist security state, they still increased their arms flow "facilitate(ing) the huge massacres of that period".[324]

America has also been involved in terrorist attacks on its own allied states. Operation *Gladio* was a 40 year umbrella name for hundreds of bombings and attacks staged throughout Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America. The unimaginable violence orchestrated by Western intelligence agencies and NATO targeted "trains, buses, schools and school buses "knowing the images of dead children would get the population

---

[321] Pipes & Clawson.
[322] Michael Parenti, The Terrorism Trap: September 11 and beyond (San Francisco: City Lights Books) 44.
[323] Herman 141.
[324] Herman 141.

hopping mad".[325] Operation *Gladio* originally was a "stay-behind" clandestine paramilitary operation with the goal of countering possible Communist "invasions". Thus, these organizations would sabotage and attack the communists, should they arrive, behind enemy lines. However, these terrorist operations grew to involve false flag operations which were intended to influence government policies; blaming the left and communists for the attacks.[326] A brutal example of this was the August 2, 1980 bombing of the Bologna Central Station in Italy which killed 85 and wounded over 200.[327] On November 22, 1990 the European Union parliament passed a resolution condemning Operation *Gladio* demanding that all their activities cease.[328] i

The American government has for over forty years planned, encouraged, and perpetrated acts of terrorism against Cuba. Washington, using the CIA, has even engaged in over eight documented assassination attempts on President Fidel Castro since 1959 after he seized power.[329] In a bid to overthrow Castro and due to opposition in America and the anticipated reaction in Latin America, President John F. Kennedy planned and funded a covert invasion of Cuba using armed Cuban exiles trained by the CIA. The failed invasion attempt, known as the Bay of Pigs,[330] led to the creation of the terrorist campaign, Operation *Mongoose*, "a program of paramilitary operations, economic

---

[325] TerrorStorm: A History of Government Sponsored Terror, produced and narrated by Alex Jones, an Infowars Production, 2006: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=7860484536861762 30&q=terror+storm

[326] Jones, "TerrorStorm."

[327] Jones, "TerrorStorm."

[328] European Parliament resolution on Gladio, 22 Nov. 1990.

[329] Moyers, "Secret Government". Moyers notes that the CIA operated a small department under the name of Executive Action, which employed permanent assassination capabilities (linked to the mafia). Moyers states, to "get rid of the Cuban leader, our Secret Government turned to the Mafia just as we once made use of Nazis".

[330] "On 17 April 1961, Cuban exiles trained by the CIA at a base in friendly Guatemala landed on the southern coast of Cuba, at the Bay of Pigs. The U.S. had promised air support, but President Kennedy cancelled it. The invaders left defenceless, surrendered". Moyers, "Secret Government".

warfare, and sabotage".[331] President Kennedy gave a speech following the Bay of Pigs failed invasion saying, "We cannot, as a free nation, compete with our adversaries in tactics of terror, assassination, false promises, counterfeit mobs and crisis".[332] But as Moyers reveals, the President was lying when he spoke these words as Operation *Mongoose* was in full action and Operation *Northwoods* in the planning.

Thus, following Operation *Mongoose*, and the 1962 missile crisis, Operation *Northwoods* was conceived to further provoke Castro and to provide "pretexts which they would consider would provide justification for American military intervention in Cuba".[333] Operation *Northwoods*, a classified operation for over forty years, called for terrorist attacks against Cubans and Americans by the CIA (to be blamed on Castro) in order to create casualty lists in American newspapers which would "cause a helpful wave of national indignation" against Castro.[334] Operation *Northwoods*, according to James Bamford,

> ...had the written approval of the Chairman and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, (and) called for innocent people to be shot on American streets; for boats carrying refugees fleeing Cuba to be sunk on the high seas; for a wave of violent terrorism to be launched in Washington, D.C., Miami, and elsewhere. People would be framed for bombings they did not commit; planes would be hijacked. Using phony evidence, all of it would be blamed on Castro, thus giving Lemnitzer and his cabal the excuse, as well as the public and international backing, they needed to launch their war.[335]

Operation *Northwoods* also planned for false flag operations against their own military. From sabotaging aircraft, to blowing up ammunition and starting fires on military bases; the plan also recommended to "blow up a US ship in Guantanamo Bay and blame

---

[331] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 83.
[332] Moyers, "Secret Government."
[333] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 83.
[334] James Bamford, Body of Secrets: Anatomy of the Ultra-Secret National Security Agency From the Cold War Through the Dawn of a New Century (New York: Doubleday, 2001) 84.
[335] Bamford 82.

Cuba".[336] Operation *Northwoods* is among the best illustrative examples which show that the American government will *consider* any means to accomplish their ambitions, even resorting to terrorism when necessary.[337]

Although President Kennedy did not authorize Operation *Northwoods* against Castro, President Lyndon Johnson "went operational" with *Northwoods* on June 8, 1967 during the six-day Israeli-Arab war (June 5 to June 10).[338] Washington and Israel orchestrated a false flag operation, attacking one of their own ships. A Report to the Department of Defense filed by the USS *Liberty* Veterans Association stated that the USS *Liberty*, then the most sophisticated American intelligence ship, was "savagely attacked without warning or justification by air and naval forces of the state of Israel".[339] During the attack, 34 seamen were killed and 171 wounded with survivors reporting that Israeli attack helicopters fired on inflated life boats; an international war crime.[340] Although the Israeli reconnaissance aircraft flew over the USS *Liberty* over eight times before they attacked, officials explained they "never made a positive identification of the nationality of USS *Liberty"* yet they unleashed a two hour deadly attack on an unidentified ship regardless of what nation it may have belonged to.[341] This explanation is dubious because if the identity of the ship was unknown, then it could very easily have

---

[336] Bamford 84.
[337] Knowing the American government will resort to any means necessary Moyers remarks, "It is a chilling thought made more chilling by the assassination of John Kennedy. The accusations linger. In some minds, the suspicions persist of a dark unsolved conspiracy behind his murder. You can dismiss them, as many of us do. But knowing now what our Secret Government planned for Castro, the possibility remains. Once we decide that anything goes, anything can come home to haunt us." Moyers, "Secret Government".
[338] Jones, "TerrorStorm."
[339] USS *Liberty* Veterans Association, Inc., A Report: War Crimes Committed Against U.S. Military Personnel, June 8, 1967 (Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 8 June 2005): online at: http://www.ussliberty.org/report/report.htm
[340] Veterans Association, "War Crimes."
[341] Veterans Association, "War Crimes."

been a Soviet ship and attacking it could have had significant consequences. Moreover, an oversized American flag flew from atop the ship throughout the attack according to the crew of the USS *Liberty*.[342] Israeli officials claimed that they mistook the ship for an Egyptian frigate (which is five times smaller than the *Liberty* and does not share the same profile).[343] The details of the Veterans Association's report are shocking ii.

The sole official American investigation into that attack, the Veterans Association claims, was deficient and prejudiced. Richard Helms, the Director of Central Intelligence at the time of the attack, explained "that there could be no doubt that the Israelis knew exactly what they were doing in attacking the *Liberty*".[344] Half-an-hour into the attack the Israeli naval officer informed the American Naval Attaché in Tel Aviv that Israeli forces had "mistakenly" attacked an American Navy ship and apologized.[345] During the attack the *Liberty* was able to send a distress call to nearby American ships and two aircraft fighter jets were launched to defend the *Liberty*. However, the jets were recalled by the Whitehouse in mid-flight when the Israeli message was received. What is so revealing is the one-and-a-half hour continued Israeli assault on the USS *Liberty* after the mistaken identity message was transmitted. Alex Jones, former *New York Times* correspondent, Pulitzer Prize winner, and syndicated radio host, interviewed former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Tomas Moore who revealed that orders were given to falsify the American investigative reports into the Attack.[346] Moreover, Jones reports that President Johnson said "I want that god-damn ship going to the bottom! No help…recall

---

[342] Loss of Liberty, written and directed by Tito Howard, Howard Films, 2002: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=7267134620652018859&q=uss+liberty
[343] Howard, "Liberty."
[344]Veterans, Association "War Crimes."
[345]Veterans, Association "War Crimes."
[346] Jones, "TerrorStorm."

the wings".[347] Jones concluded that President Johnson "maintained control of the USS *Liberty*, stationed the ship in the Mediterranean, made a backroom deal with Israel to attack and kill all on board (in order to) blame the attack on Egypt as an excuse to enter the six-day war with Israel".[348] The attack on the USS *Liberty* is among the best illustrative examples which show the American government has actually *resorted* to terrorism against its own military as a pretext for war.[349]

There has even been a judgment by the World Court and the Security Council, the highest international authorities, condemning the American government for their war against Nicaragua which Chomsky says, "must be characterized as terrorism, state sponsored terrorism".[350] That war was much worse than the September 11th attacks as tens of thousands of people were killed. Washington wanted to overthrow the Sandinista government and replace it with one which would end social reform; the World Bank and other international agencies had praised Nicaraguan policies as "'remarkable' and as 'laying the foundation for long-term socio-economic development'".[351] The CIA "created, funded, armed, trained, and directed the Contras" which went on to slaughter

---

[347] Jones, "TerrorStorm."
[348] Jones, "TerrorStorm."
[349] And this was not the last time the American government would use a false flag operation to fabricate a pretext for war. The Vietnam War started secretly with no Congressional declaration of war and it began with a false flag operation known as the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The operation was to be the pretext to commit the American population to a war in East Asia. President Johnson claimed the Vietnamese attacked an American destroyer in the Gulf of Tonkin and America needed to reply. However, the incident Moyers notes, "was not unprovoked (...) Johnson seized the incident to stampede Congress into passing the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. He then used it as a blank check for the massive build up of American forces." This unprovoked and illegal "dirty little war," is replete with horrific examples of state terrorism such as "free-fire zones, defoliation, the massacre at My Lai, napalm, and the CIA's Operation Phoenix to round up, torture and kill suspected Viet Cong". Moyers, "Secret Government".
[350] Noam Chomsky, The Culture of Terrorism (Boston: South End Press, 1988) 27.
[351] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 98.

thousands of innocent Nicaraguans.[352] The American plan was to force the Nicaraguans to rely on the Soviets giving them a pretext for war (and to overthrow the Sandinista government), thus allowing "apologists for U.S. international terrorism to justify it as defense against Soviet imperialism".[353] The Nicaraguans had every right, according to American precedent to retaliate by dropping bombs on Washington. However, like the Cubans, they went to the World Court with their case and won. The court ordered the American government to end all "unlawful use of force - international terrorism, in lay terms", and to pay considerable damages.[354]

As Chomsky explains, the American government dismissed the Court judgment and immediately escalated their war. Nicaragua went to the UN Security Council asking them to consider a resolution calling on "all states to observe international law" and the UN Security Council approved but the Americans vetoed the decision.[355] As their last resort Nicaragua went to the General Assembly, where there is no veto, and they upheld a similar agreement with the exception of the American and Israeli governments. The American government reacted to the court decisions by escalating "the terrorist war, while also issuing official orders to its forces to go 'after soft targets' and to avoid the Nicaraguan army".[356] The illegal terrorist war against Nicaragua is among the best illustrative examples of international condemnation of American terrorism, an undeniable "paradigm" case of state terrorism and a concrete example of how the American government *ignores* international norms.

---

[352] Stephen Rosskamm Shalom, Imperial Alibis: Rationalizing U.S. Intervention After the Cold War (Boston: South End Press, 1993) 145-146.
[353] President Ronald Regan even alluded to the notion that Nicaraguan, Soviet imperil agents would "conquer Central America (...and) invade Texas". Chomsky, "Culture" 27.
[354] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 99.
[355] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 100.
[356] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 102.

American state terrorism is a reality so the usage of the terrorism lexicon is without veracity because the American conception of 'terrorism' is such that American terrorism does not enter the equation. The American government is deeply hypocritical in its support for terrorist organizations and in their refusal to surrender known and convicted "terrorists". They support "terrorist" national security states[357] and they will consider any means to accomplish their goals. The American government has even resorted to terrorism against its own military and has for years ignored international norms. The Americans have been for more than fifty years "engaged in terrorism, and have sponsored, underwritten, and protected other terrorist states and individual terrorists [...such that they are] the world's greatest terrorist and sponsor of terror".[358] As discussed, they have supported, operated, and perpetrated acts of terrorism against Haiti, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Iran, Turkey, East Timor, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Europe; just to name those discussed here. American hypocrisy is most evident in cases where America professes its "dedication to democracy" while helping and supporting militaries to overthrow reformist governments in foreign countries and install governments which are favourable to American *corporate interests*.[359]

America as Victim

The word 'terrorism' as constructed in American political rhetoric falsely leads one to believe that United Sates is a victim and the September 11th attacks were due to the

---

[357] The following are characteristics of a National Security State according to Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer: the Military Industrial Complex (MIC) has the greatest authority and directs society (through the appearance of democracy), the MIC has enormous political and economic power, it has an obsession with evil and dangerous enemies thus justifying the total eradication of these enemies, and it operates in secrecy to limit public discourse and democratic participation. Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer, Brave New World Order (New York: Orbis Books, 1992).
[358] Edward S. Herman and David Peterson, "Who terrorizes Whom?" Z Magazine 18 Oct. 2001: online at: http://musictravel.free.fr/political/political15.htm
[359] Parenti 80.

terrorist's hate for Western freedoms. As President Bush has overtly said, "the terrorists despise creative societies and individual choice and thus they bear a special hatred for America. They desire to concentrate power in the hands of a few and to force every life into grim and joyless conformity".[360] In a hearing for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security, professor Walid Phares reported "Jihadism rejects the American constitution, the bill of rights, the international declaration on human rights, the United Nations and international law."[361] However, it is also the Americans who have rejected the international declaration on human rights, the United Nations and international law.

Moreover, the American government explanation is false as they discoursively constructed their own victim status by calling September 11th an "unexpected" and "unprovoked" attack. Jackson calls this "the myth of exceptional grievance" and it is used to establish America as the primary victim.[362] The exceptional "victim-hood" of the American people created by the September 11th attacks of evil and demonic "terrorists" is another discoursive construction which allows the population to acquiesce and/or support state terrorism against innocent civilians.[363] Also, in many speeches President Bush has linked September 11th to the attack on Pearl Harbor. This Pearl Harbor meta-narrative is another reference which Jackson says conveys a distinctive meaning to influence the population's interpretation of September 11th and to construct their perception of themselves as innocent victims.

---

[360] Bush, "Fighting to Win."
[361] Walid Phares, Subcommittee on Intelligence Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, Hearing for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security, Intercepting Radicalization at the Indoctrination Stage (Washington, DC: United States House of Representatives, 20 Sept. 2006).
[362] Jackson 35.
[363] Jackson 36.

However, they are far from innocent or absolved of any wrongdoing which has a causal effect on current Middle East anger, hate and violence towards them. There are factual reasons for Middle East anger and hate which are more veracious and explanatory than the reasons the government offers. One of the reasons "they" hate America is due to American support of Israeli state terrorism since 1948. Israel in their view was a state created by foreigners, supported and protected by America which was imposed upon them. Israel has relied crucially on American diplomatic, military, economic, and ideological support. America pays and supports the Israeli settlements which illegally break up the occupied territories.[364] The Israelis use American helicopters to carry out assassinations or attack civilian complexes. Current American policies toward Israel and Palestine are not improving the situation. Americans have even blocked diplomatic settlements that "almost the whole world has been in favor of (...) for 25 years, including the Arab states, Europe, and the former Soviet Union".[365]

Another veracious and explanatory reason for their hate is American support of Saddam Hussein, "for sound policy reasons", when he first took power and which continued for many years.[366] They supported Saddam Hussein because, even though he was a cruel dictator, he was an anti-Communist and some of his atrocious deeds were committed against American enemies like Iran.[367] America supported Saddam Hussein in his war against Iran and provided him with military and financial support. Middle East resentment is further fuelled by the continued American support of Saddam Hussein after he used chemical weapons and gases against the Kurds. American support would have

[364] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[365] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[366] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[367] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."

continued but he disobeyed American orders by invading Kuwait and "clients aren't supposed to disobey orders".[368] Regardless of the massacres Saddam Hussein was committing on the Kurd people, it was his invasion of Kuwait that made him an official American enemy. The American government had openly supported, financed and provided military equipment to a murderous "terrorist" dictator because he served their interests. It is only when he stopped serving American interests that he became an "evil" tyrant who helped support "international terrorism" and posed an international "threat" to the security of all nations. Although most Arabs detested Saddam Hussein, they saw American policy as "a particularly inhuman method of fighting [him], a method that (was) starving an entire nation".[369]

America, and a few European countries, devastated the civilian population of Iraq with their economic sanctions, while empowering Saddam Hussein at the same time. In a June 1997 UN child fatality report the UN had estimated up until that point that economic sanctions in Iraq had been responsible for 1.2 million deaths, 750, 000 of them being children under 5 years of age.[370] In fact, "hundreds of thousands of Iraqis lay dead as a direct result of the sanctions, (...) and four million Iraqis have fled the country in hope of a better life".[371] In 1996, on the CBS News program 60 Minutes, United States Secretary of State Madeleine Albright responded to the hundreds of thousands of dead Iraqi children by saying "I think this is a very hard choice, but the price...we think the price is

---

[368] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[369] Fareed Zakaria, "Why they hate us," Newsweek 15 Oct. 2001: 36.
[370] "Summary of Facts: Impact of the 7-year War on the People of Iraq," Jew Watch 1998: online at: www.jewwatch.com/jew-genocide-iraqiblockade-summary.html
[371] Jeff Lindemyer, "Iraqi Sanctions: Myth and Fact," New Politics: a Journal of Socialist Thought 8.4 (New York: New Politics Associates, Winter 2002): 79.

worth it".[372] Such statements are quite shocking as they reveal the callous and bellicose nature of American foreign policy. Juergensmeyer in examining Reconstruction Theology noted of Mike Bray, Dominican theologian and abortion clinic bomber, that "in Bray's mind a little violence is a small price to pay for the possibility of fulfilling God's law and establishing His kingdom on earth."[373] The parallels to Albright's sacrosanct statement are revealing and I think, disturbing. As Juergensmeyer says of religious terrorism, "enemies have to be invented if they do not already exist". Not paying attention to this and wilfully deceiving ourselves into believing "terrorists" hate us because we are so great, as Chomsky has noted many times, will guarantee even more "terrorist" attacks.

America is far from being a "victim" of senseless attacks of Middle Eastern "terrorism" and they were not attacked because of their beliefs and freedoms. The American government is the aggressor who was attacked due to its own terrorist and self-serving imperialistic political and economic interests and polices in other parts of the world. They are in fact responsible for the hatred with which the Arab world views them.[374] The Arab world views its relations with America as "filled with disappointments" and they don't want to become the "slums of the West".[375] Arabs see American foreign policy as hypocritical and "geared to [their own] oil interests, supporting thugs and tyrants without any hesitation".[376] The 1953 CIA covert operation to overthrow the Prime Minister of Iran, Mohammed Mosaddeq, is a good example of American foreign policy used to protect their (and their allies) oil interests. Although

---

[372] 60 Minutes: Lesley Stahl interview with Madeleine Albright, CBS News, 60 Minutes, aired 12 May 1996.
[373] Juergensmeyer 30.
[374] Even the American government internally acknowledges this fact.
[375] Zakaria 29 & 36.
[376] Zakaria 36.

Mosaddeq held power legitimately, he dared to nationalize the Iranian oil fields and thus remove British companies from controlling them. This infuriated Washington and Operation *Ajax* was conceived by the then "Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles and his brother Alan, Director of the CIA, (who) decided with Eisenhower's approval, to overthrow Mosaddeq and reinstate the Shah of Iran. The mobs paid by the CIA, and the police and soldiers bribed by the CIA, drove Mosaddeq from office."[377] Once in power, the Shah allowed American oil companies to acquire half of Iran's oil production. Not only did he do this, he tortured, jailed, and murdered detractors and in 1979 the Iranian people rose up against the CIA created Shah and shouted "Death to the Shah!" and "Death to the American Satan!"[378] [379]

Vast numbers of people in the Middle East live in misery and poverty and the wealth of the Middle East (mostly oil wealth) benefits the West, a few corrupt government heads, and Middle-East countries supported by the West. It has recently been revealed that the American government had plans to wage war with Iraq and privatize its oil reserves before September 11th 2001.[380] And there is currently a law making its way through the Iraq government which would give American companies the power to control Iraq's oil reserves, infrastructure and industry.[381] They hate America because they know this and live the worst of it. So it's not a matter of them hating America because it stands for freedom, democracy, and prosperity. If this were the case, why didn't "they" target, as

---

[377] Moyers, "Secret Government."
[378] Moyers, "Secret Government."
[379] For more information on Operation Ajax and American terrorism in Iran see: Stephen Kinzer, All the Shah's Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror (New Jersey: John Wily & Sons Inc., 2003).
[380] Greg Palast, "Secret US plans for Iraq's oil," Newsnight BBC Two 17 Mar. 2005: online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/4354269.stm
[381] Ahmed Janabi, "Row over Iraq oil law," Al Jazeera 5 May 2007: online at: http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/0D09B919-D28A-4CC4-A79F-0EE500239225.htm

many have questioned, the statue of Liberty - the symbol of American freedom? The "terrorists" have expressed their discontent with American foreign policy in the Arab world and not with other freedom loving countries like Canada. They hate America because Americans have supported the oppressive, brutal, corrupt, and authoritarian regimes and have used their foreign policies to undermine their "democracy". They are also angered by the thousands of military troops occupying (thus "desecrating") the land near the two Holy Mosques.[382] This does not necessarily justify "terrorism" against America but it is by starting with "the premise that the United States is only a victim of terrorism, (that) one loses the opportunity to educate people to a fundamental truth about terrorism".[383] Although I do not condone September 11th, "September 11th was a perfectly understandable reaction to years of American policy".[384] We should be very concerned when President Bush in his entire demagogue splendour eulogizes,

> We wage a war (on "terrorism") to *save* civilization itself!
> We did not seek it, but we must fight it! - and we will prevail![385]

The Creation of al Qaeda

America has not only helped to support, finance, and supply military weapons to what they then called the "freedom-fighters" of Afghanistan, but they actually helped create the al Qaeda terrorist network against which they now wage war. In 1987 Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, wanted the Americans to help negotiate a peace and create a stable government in Afghanistan. The Americans refused and instead supported the Afghanistan fighter's "holy war" against the

---

[382] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 212.
[383] Herman & Peterson.
[384] Zakaria 41.
[385] George W. Bush, "President Discusses War on Terrorism," Address to the Nation World Congress Center, The White House, (Atlanta, Georgia, 8 Nov. 2001): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108-13.html

Soviet "aggressors".[386] But the American intentions were not actually to help the "freedom fighters" rid themselves of the Soviets; they wanted the communists to similarly suffer substantial human losses as they did in Vietnam.[387] In 1986, to accomplish these goals, the American government sent in CIA officials to train the Afghan men and transform them into warriors. But this proved to be "a major escalation in U.S. involvement [and this] turned the war around" leaving 15,000 Soviet soldiers dead.[388] They continued to support the Mujahidin until the Soviet withdrawal in 1989 when Afghanistan then fell into the hands of the freedom fighters. The war ended and the goal of preventing the communists from securing control over the region was accomplished. It was in this climate that the Mujahidin were born and when the Americans left Afghanistan in ruins. In response, a "terrorist" organization was formed to fight against the oppression of Muslims by corrupt governments. It gave Muslims a sense of meaning and purpose, which other Middle East leaders didn't. Arab fundamentalism gave those "who were dissatisfied with their lot a powerful language of opposition".[389]

So, angered by the 1991 American war on Iraq, the Mujahidin found their first enemy. Supplied with the American leftover arsenals and trained in American military combat, many of the 'freedom fighters' joined the organization, later named al Qaeda by the Americans, to fight against repressive and corrupt regimes in the Middle East and against their supporter; America. Prior to September 11th an American diplomat in Pakistan acknowledged the responsibility the Americans had in helping to form the

---

[386] Chomsky says they "went beyond supporting them. They organized them (...collecting from around the world) the most violent, crazed elements they could find (...) and forged them into a military force". Chomsky, "Ambitions" 107.
[387] Chomsky, "Ambitions" 107.
[388] Chomsky, "Fifth Freedom."
[389] Zarakia 33.

"terrorist group". The diplomat said, "You can't plug billions of dollars into an anti-Communist jihad [...] and ignore the consequences. But we did. Our objective was killing Communists and getting Russians out".[390] So the terrorist network was created with the direct and sustained intervention of the Americans in the ten-year war with the Soviet Union. In light of this it seems hard to view the Americans as victims of "terrorism" when the "terrorism" they are suffering from is a product of their own creation and support. Ted Honderich writes, "we are rightly to be held responsible along with the killers (...) those who condemn us have a reason to do so. Did we bring the killing at the twin towers on ourselves? Did we have it coming? Those offensive questions, and their offensive, but affirmative answer, do contain a truth".[391]

The American reasons for invading Afghanistan post September 11th were not for justice or retribution, because the Americans had no cause against the ruling Taliban, the Afghanistan military or the Afghanistan people. Their issue was with al Qaeda operating in Afghanistan. But nonetheless they pounded Afghanistan with 14,000 tons of bombs killing up to 3,413 civilians, and 6,000 Taliban soldiers in just the first nine weeks.[392] This could have been less violently handled in collaborating with the Taliban and the UN. According to Chomsky, not only did Washington not provide any evidence for their accusations against the Taliban,[393] they refused to negotiate the extradition of suspected al Qaeda members which the Taliban was willing to do, and the Americans did this in the

---

[390] Abu-Jamal Mumia, "Why? in S11: Truth and consequences; radical perspectives on September 11th" (2001): 7-9, in S11: Truth and consequences; radical perspectives on September 11th, by Solidarity, (Montreal: Solidarity, Sept. 2001): 7.
[391] Ted Honderich, After the Terror (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003) 125.
[392] Jackson 9.
[393] Chomsky notes that the American reasons for bombing Afghanistan were based on the supposition that the attackers of September 11th were known and that they were linked to Afghanistan. But Washington quietly admitted that they didn't know anything until eight months after they begun bombing Afghanistan. Chomsky, "Hegemony" 200.

face of international opposition.[394] The Americans were there not so much for justice and retribution,[395] but to "establish a permanent presence on the ground in Central Asia (so as to have) the ability to exert (their) will over the development of the oil and gas resources of what are considered the last major untapped fields in the world".[396]

So after the Americans were gone, using the leftover weaponry, the people of Afghanistan realized that "real change [comes] in taking up arms".[397] It was the Americans who became the enemy when, in the opinion of Osama bin Laden, they desecrated holy sites and supported the "evil" regimes. And the most effective way to deal with an enemy was to fight the enemy using the methods that the enemy had trained them with. Thus, Osama bin Laden declared "these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger and Muslims".[398] A Former Human Rights Director declared, "I am unable to appreciate any moral, political or legal difference between this *jihad* by the United States against those it deems to be its enemies and the *jihad* by Islamic groups against those they deem to be their enemies"[399]

---

[394] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 199.
[395] Contrary to Canadian Defence Minister, Gordon O'Connor's recent public statement. Andrea Sands, "Afghan mission 'retribution' for 9/11: O'Connor Speaks Out," The Gazette 21 Jan. 2007: A17.
[396] Max Kolskegg, "9/11: A Desperate Provocation By U.S. Capitalism," Indy Media UK 25 Jan. 2001: online at: http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2002/01/21075.html
[397] "Special television broadcast" BBC Television and Discovery Channel (2001).
[398] Osama bin Laden as quoted in Anti-defamation League, New Osama bin Laden Video Contains Anti-Israel and Anti-American Statements (New York: Anti-defamation League 2001) online at: http://www.adl.org/terrorism_america/bin_l_print.asp
[399] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 201.

The Threat of Saddam Hussein

In making his case for war against Iraq, President Bush claimed "that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons".[400] President Bush also argued Saddam Hussein has "killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September 11th".[401] But as was seen, American sanctions against Iraq alone killed more than a million people; that's more than fifty times the number of people who died at the hands of Saddam Hussein! President Bush had also declared that "Saddam posed an immediate and dangerous threat" but according to former American Secretary of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, and British Home Secretary, David Blunkett, "there is nothing in the contemporary threat information that we have that suggests such attacks are imminent" and if there were attacks "it is almost certain (they) would not replicate what we've seen so far".[402]

As the American government prepared for war in Iraq, the government insisted on co-conspiratorial links between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda. The American government continuously alluded to the transferring of WMD to al Qaeda should Saddam Hussein acquire them. The Government even encouraged the view that Saddam Hussein was directly involved in the September 11th attacks. In September 2002, President Bush declared, "You can't distinguish between al Qaeda and Saddam when you talk about the

---

[400] George W. Bush, "President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat," Remarks by the President on Iraq, Cincinnati, 7 Oct. 2002: online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html

[401] Bush, "Iraqi Threat."

[402] Tom Ridge and David Blunkett, Joint Press Conference with Secretary Tom Ridge and British Home Secretary Blunkett (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of the Press Secretary, 1 Apr. 2003) online at: http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0124.shtm

war on terrorism".[403] And the President, on March 6, 2003 within a week of Operation *Iraqi Freedom*, alluded that Saddam Hussein would use nuclear weapons to attack America if given the chance. President Bush said,

> ...Saddam is a threat. And we're not going to wait until he does attack" and added "if the world fails to confront the threat posed by the Iraqi regime, refusing to use force (...) free nations would assume immense and unacceptable risks. The attacks of September 11, 2001, showed what enemies of America did with four airplanes. We will not wait to see what terrorists or terrorist states could do with weapons of mass destruction.[404]

But all claims to WMD's in Iraq and links to September 11th were a total fabrication. The commission investigating the September 11th attacks stated that they found "'no credible evidence' in the link between Iraq and al Qaeda in the attacks against the United States".[405] The idea that Saddam Hussein would collaborate with Osama bin Laden is absurd as Osama bin Laden has declared "war" on Saddam Hussein and threatened to topple the Baathist regime. Former American deputy secretary of defence, Paul Wolfowitz, "has acknowledged that the evidence used to justify the war was "murky" and (he) now says that weapons of mass destruction weren't the crucial issue anyway".[406] The 2004 Senate Intelligence Committee's report stated that the American government "followed a pattern of using questionable intelligence, even documents that

---

[403] George W. Bush, "President Bush, Colombia President Uribe Discuss Terrorism," Remarks by President Bush and President Alvaro Uribe of Colombia, The White House, (Washington, DC, 25 Sept. 2002): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020925-1.html

[404] George W. Bush, "President George Bush Discusses Iraq in National Press Conference," The White House, (Washington, DC, 6 Mar. 2003): online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030306-8.html

[405] "9/11 panel sees no link between Iraq, al-Qaida: Commission opens final hearing before release of report." MSNBC 16 June 2004: online: http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5223932/

[406] Danny Postel, "Noble lies and perpetual war: Leo Strauss, the neo-cons, and Iraq," Information Clearing House 18 Oct. 2003: online at: http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article5010.htm

turned out to be forgeries, to support its case - often leaking classified information to receptive journalists - and dismissing information that undermined the case for war".[407]

What is particularly revealing regarding Iraq is American Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's January 2000 statement that "the first line of defense should be a clear and classical statement of deterrence - if (Iraq) do(es) acquire WMD, their weapons will be unusable because any attempt to use them will bring national obliteration" adding that rogue states "were living on borrowed time (...and) there should be no sense of panic about them".[408] But in 2002 Rice stated, "the danger from Saddam Hussein's arsenal is far more clear than anything we could have foreseen".[409] And in April 2007, Vice President Dick Cheney repeated the claim that Saddam Hussein had links to al Qaeda.[410] He made this claim within seven months of the Senate Intelligence Committee's report which stated there were no such links.[411] Incredibly, he also made this claim the same day the Defense Department reported that there is even more evidence that Saddam Hussein's government had no dealings with al Qaeda. The war in Iraq has failed terribly and Iraq lies in ruins with more Americans and members of congress calling for the government to withdraw. However, President Bush increases the military occupation justifying it by

---

[407] Jonathan S. Landay, "CIA leak illustrates selective use of intelligence on Iraq," Knight Ridder Newspapers 25 Oct. 2005: online at: http://www.realcities.com/mld/krwashington/news/special_packages/iraq/intelligence/12995512.htm

[408] Condoleezza Rice, "Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest," Foreign Affairs Jan.-Feb. 2000: online at: http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20000101faessay5/condoleezza-rice/campaign-2000-promoting-the-national-interest.html

[409] Condoleezza Rice "A balance of Power That Favors Freedom in Peace, War and Terrorism," (2006): 52-28, in Peace, War and Terrorism, by Dennis Okerstrom, ed. A Longman Topics Reader (Montreal: Person education, 2006) 54.

[410] "Cheney reasserts al-Qaida-Saddam connection: Vice president's words come as latest Pentagon report again dismisses link," MSNBC 6 Apr. 2007: online at: http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17975678/

[411] Adam Brookes, "Iraq war justifications laid bare: The Senate Intelligence Committee has found no evidence of links between the regime of Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda," BBC News Washington, 9 Sept. 2006: online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/5329350.stm

saying the "war on terror" has made us cross the Rubicon and "terrorists" would "use the vacuum created by an American retreat to gain control of a country, a base from which to launch attacks and conduct their war against nonradical Muslim governments".[412] [413]

In reality, the American occupation of Iraq is increasing "terrorists" and "terrorism" and will continue to provide fertile breeding grounds. A CIA report on "trends in world terrorism" reveals the direct link to the American occupation of Iraq and the creation of a new breed of "terrorist".[414] The Pentagon's Defense Science Board also recognized that a "strong correlation exists between U.S. involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States".[415] How ironic it is that a war initiated in the name of the GWOT ended up creating "precisely the situation the administration has described as a breeding ground for terrorists: a state unable to control its borders or provide for its citizens' rudimentary needs".[416] Jonathan Freedland writes of President Bush's "war on terror",

> It took a country that had been free of jihadist militants and turned it into their most fecund breeding ground; it took a country that posed no threat to the United States and made it into a place where thousands of Americans, not to mention many tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of Iraqis, have been killed. And it diverted resources from the task that should have been uppermost after September 11, namely the hunting down of Osama bin Laden and his top lieutenants.[417]

---

[412] "Bush: Iraq crucial in war on terror," CNN.com 7 Oct. 2005: online at: http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/10/06/bush.iraq/

[413] As previously discussed, the Americans are given carte blanche by the UN despite the UN resolution on the Inadmissibility of the Policy of State Terrorism and any Action by States Aimed at Undermining the Socio-Political System in other Sovereign states.

[414] Alarab, "Where Has Bush Lead America and the world?" Alarab Online 2006: online at: http://english.alarabonline.org/index.asp

[415] Ivan Eland, Foreign Policy Briefing No. 50, Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 17 Dec. 1998) online at: http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-050es.html

[416] Jeffrey Record, Bounding the Global War On Terrorism (Pennsylvania: The Strategic Studies Institute, Dec. 2003) online at: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB207.pdf

[417] Jonathan Freedland, "Bush's Amazing Achievement," The New York Review of Books 54.10 14 June 2007: online at: http://www.nybooks.com/articles/20251

The hidden agenda behind the war in Iraq was revealed on May 1, 2005 in the Secret Downing Street Memo. The memo contains the minutes of the British Prime Minister's senior ministers meeting which reveals that:

> Bush wanted to remove Saddam, through military action, justified by the conjunction of terrorism and WMD. But the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy. The NSC had no patience with the UN route, and no enthusiasm for publishing material on the Iraqi regime's record. There was little discussion in Washington of the aftermath after military action (...) the case was thin. Saddam was not threatening his neighbours, and his WMD capability was less than that of Libya, North Korea or Iran. We should work up a plan for an ultimatum to Saddam to allow back in the UN weapons inspectors. This would also help with the legal justification for the use of force.[418]

However, terrorism against Iraq had begun long before the March 2003 invasion. Both the American and the British governments had waged a secret war against Iraq nine months before, launching a "clandestine bombing campaign designed largely to provoke Iraq into taking action that could be used to justify the start of the war".[419] They wanted Saddam Hussein to provide the legal grounds for war which were quite lacking.[420] This secret war is another example of the illegality of the "war on terrorism" in Iraq as only the American congress has the authority to declare war and "any military action to oust Saddam before that point would constitute a serious abuse of power by the president".[421] The war against Iraq, according to international law specialist Richard Falk, is an "inescapable (...) crime against Peace of the sort for which surviving German leaders were indicted, prosecuted, and punished at the Nuremberg trials".[422] Connecting Saddam Hussein to "terrorism" allowed the government to amass the necessary political support

---

[418] David Manning, "The secret Downing Street memo," TIMES ONLINE 1 May 2005: online at: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article387374.ece
[419] Michael Smith, "The war before the war," New Statesman 30 May 2005: online at: http://www.newstatesman.com/200505300013
[420] Smith, "war before the war."
[421] Smith, "war before the war."
[422] Richard Falk as quoted in Chomsky, "Hegemony" 13.

to launch a violent and illegal war against Iraq. This is because, Bhatia explains, there is a relationship between the names applied and the decision to practice restricted or unrestricted warfare.[423] No name helps this cause more than that of 'terrorism'.

The New International Norm

The war in Iraq is the first test, Chomsky says, of the new "imperial grand strategy" of a new international norm of preventive war. This new norm, called the "Bush Doctrine" by Jackson,[424] is aptly characterized by a high ranking American official as our right of self-defence to act pre-emptively, and when necessary to act alone.[425] The case for war against Iraq was fabricated and based on little evidence. This was done, according to Chomsky, because "a successful conquest of Iraq would give the United States 'veto power' over its industrial rivals, Europe and Asia".[426] The fear manufactured by the American usage of 'terrorism' "provided enough of a popular base for the invasion of Iraq, instituting the new norm of aggressive war at will".[427] The war against Iraq in the name of 'terrorism' violates the highest authority of international law, the UN Charter.

The Center for Economic and Social Rights reported, that the Nuremberg Tribunal dismissed the Nazi preventative war argument and condemned the German officials as war criminals and "any return to this doctrine by powerful states such as the U.S. and U.K. would undermine world public order, and in the process encourage states and non-state actors alike to launch unilateral acts of aggression unconstrained by longstanding

---

[423] Bhatia 14.
[424] Jackson 11.
[425] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 21.
[426] Noam Chomsky, "Imminent Crises: Threats & Opportunities in the Middle East & Globally," Monthly Review 59.2 June 2007: 6.
[427] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 121.

principles of international law".[428] International lawyers, global legal associations, and human rights groups have all condemned the invasion of Iraq and have "initiated actions to hold (the American and British) governments accountable for war crimes and crimes against the peace".[429] The report concludes by saying the "war against Iraq cannot be justified under any reasonable interpretation of international law".[430] Even the former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan declared the American war against Iraq and the subsequent invasion "illegal under the UN Charter and international law".[431]

Invoking the "terrorist' threat and waging war against "terrorism" using the new norm allows governments to apply a different standard of law to that of international law on the basis of a unilateral decision that someone, some organization or some state is a "terrorist". Former British parliament member Michael Meacher has said "the catalogue of evidence (...shows) that the so-called "war on terrorism" is being used largely as bogus cover for achieving wider U.S. strategic geopolitical objectives".[432] 'Terrorism' has been and is used as an excuse for the American government to pursue a radical right-wing agenda. According to Amnesty International, ignoring the international rule of law and thus violating human rights in the name of 'terrorism' sends a "chilling message across

---

[428] "Tearing Up the Rules: The Illegality of Invading Iraq in In The Name of Democracy: American War Crimes In Iraq and Beyond," Center for Economic and Social Rights (2005): 24-32 in In the Name of Democracy, by Jeremy Brecher, Jill Cutler and Brendan Smith, ed. (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005) 28.
[429] "Tearing Up the Rules," 31.
[430] "Tearing Up the Rules," 32.
[431] "An Illegal War: BBC Interview with Kofi Annan in In The Name of Democracy: American War Crimes In Iraq and Beyond," BBC (16 Sept. 2004): 33-35 in In the Name of Democracy, by Jeremy Brecher, Jill Cutler and Brendan Smith, ed. (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005) 33.
[432] Michael Meacher, "This War on Terrorism Is Bogus: the 9/11 attacks gave the U.S. an ideal pretext to use force to secure its global domination in Peace, War and Terrorism," (2006): 39-44, in Peace, War and Terrorism, by Dennis Okerstrom, A Longman Topics Reader (Montreal: Person education, 2006) 43.

the world that international law can be ignored with impunity".[433] Imagine what would happen if we universalized the right for any state to use any means to protect their interests when they perceived a threat? [434]

What Are the Benefits?

As was seen above, the American government does not act as if "every life is precious". They have helped to indirectly and directly kill and murder hundreds of thousands of lives in just the examples described here. The American government has supported terrorists in order to overthrow foreign governments, supported terrorists states to threaten, coerce, and attack other states, invaded other states, ignored international law, deliberately targeted innocent civilians, instilled fear and hate into the lives of millions, and used all possible forms of "terrorist" means in numerous examples far exceeding the carnage of their "terrorists". They have fulfilled all the features of their own definitions of 'terrorism'. How is this any different from those on American national and international "terrorist" lists? How is this in any way different from what is ordinarily called "terrorism"?

This false belief does not 'separate' them from the enemy, for if it did, they would not have invaded Afghanistan and Iraq inevitably killing thousands of men, women, and children. President Bush has said, "we will not relent until justice is done and our nation is secure. What our enemies have begun, we will finish".[435] But as was elaborated above, the American government is the real instigator and party responsible for lighting the fire of Middle Eastern rage. President Bush also said "we fight, not to impose our will, but to

---

[433] Gilmore, "Amnesty International speech."
[434] There may be exceptional cases where a pre-emptive strike is justified, for example when the threat of attack by the enemy is undeniably and unanimously identified and all diplomatic means have failed. The 1967 pre-emptive strike by Israel may arguably be such an example.
[435] Bush, "Remarks to the Nation."

defend ourselves and extend the blessing of freedom".[436] But American interests and their political agenda cannot be ignored. In fact, the "Wall Street Journal called on President Bush to take advantage of the 'unique political climate' to 'assert his leadership not just on security and foreign policy but across the board'".[437] And it appears that Bush has done just that. This new international norm of preventative war against the "terrorist" threat is among the most worrisome consequences of our befuddled understanding of 'terrorism' and its implacable nature.

State terrorism is a vital part of the terrorism lexicon and must be acknowledged if there is to be any fairness in debate. If state terrorism is acknowledged then the American government becomes the largest state terrorist. The American government engages in unquestionable acts of state terrorism. Their usage of 'terrorism' has been employed to fabricate their "victim" status and to justify a new violent international norm. They are using 'terrorism' as their most significant political weapon. Thus, attempts at measuring the "terrorist threat" would involve a large amount of hypocrisy. The fact that states too engage in terrorism, Coady writes, "points to a certain hypocrisy in much common indignation about terrorism".[438] Is the "war on terror" a matter of American self-defence? No, it is an increase in violence to further a hegemonic state agenda.

The government chooses to create an enemy rather than examine what they have done to incite September 11th and what could have been done to prevent it and future attacks. The American government is not an "innocent victim" out to defend freedom and liberty. The war on Iraq is an illegal war which has killed hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and is a form of "terrorism" against Iraq. Using terrorism as a means to an end, the

[436] Bush, "Remarks to the Nation."
[437] Parenti 2.
[438] Coady 8.

American government is guilty of that which it condemns making their opposition to "terrorism" little more than propaganda. What is 'terrorism' describing when we employ it? If its usage contains an inherent cultural bias and it is pejorative and prejudicial by nature, then what benefits are there in using it? Furthermore, if it is used as a political weapon, a tool for propaganda, an excuse to remove civil liberties, and as a pretext to justify illegal wars, then what possible justification could its usage have which would outweigh these problems?

CHAPTER FIVE

"Terrorism is the war of the poor, and, war is the terrorism of the rich."
Peter Ustinov

Further Consequences

There is more to the problematic nature of the terrorism lexicon as using the word 'terrorism' has further significant negative consequences. As was seen, the consequences of using the word 'terrorism' groups together different ideologies or isolates one dimension, it makes something the case, it leads to the characterisation of the enemy as evil allowing the labeller to affirm a righteous and/or victimised position, it is used to undermine legal norms, it propagates mass consensus, and fogs a nuanced, complex and diffuse issue allowing states to practice unrestricted terrorism in the name of "freedom" and "counter terrorism". Some pragmatists and some anti-essentialists hold that the aim of inquiry is not truth but rather utility.[439] It is in this light that we continue to question the utility of this word as a meaningful and beneficial concept. Thus far, 'terrorism' amounts to a propagandistic tool used for mass manipulation and acquiescence. It lacks utility and it has still more dangerous consequences. Employing the word 'terrorism' in our discourses allows for the dehumanization of the enemy. The consequences of this can be seen in the prison abuses in Guantanamo Bay and Abu Ghraib[440] and in the abuses of Western Muslims post September 11th. It also gives legitimacy to the "terrorist" cause.

Labelling the other a 'terrorist' characterises them as an evil enemy allowing for their dehumanization and consequently their slaughter. Once the other is viewed as the terrorist enemy, they can be murdered because a "satanic enemy cannot be transformed; it

---

[439] Rorty 54.
[440] For more information on the torture of American terrorist prisoners see: In the Name of Democracy, by Jeremy Brecher, Jill Cutler and Brendan Smith, ed. (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005).

can only be destroyed".[441] Amnesty international has said the polarization in American political rhetoric has "accentuated th(e) gulf, dehumanising and demonising people (...) stigmatising them as a source of danger and encouraging a climate in which xenophobia and racism flourish".[442] This is so because the isolation of the enemy allows for the portrayal of them as "ontologically and gratuitously interested in wreaking havoc for its own sake (... such that terrorists) have no reality except that which tautologically confirms their terrorist essence".[443] Crucial to realize is that President Bush has proclaimed, "our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated".[444] This is an open call for the slaughter and eradication of countless people similar to those calls of violence against Israelis and Americans from Osama bin Laden, Hamas, and the Iranian government.

American Attorney General Alberto Gonzales sent a memo to President Bush saying, a "new Paradigm renders obsolete Geneva's strict limitations on questioning of enemy prisoners".[445] Because "terrorists" and "unlawful combatants" have no rights under the Geneva Convention III *On The Treatment of Prisoners of War*, abuses of al Qaeda and Taliban prisoners by soldiers becomes normalized and even encouraged.[446]

---

[441] Juergensmeyer 217.
[442] Gilmore, "Amnesty International speech."
[443] Edward W. Said, "The essential terrorist," The Nation 14 June 1986: 830.
[444] Bush, "No Nation Can Be Neutral."
[445] Brecher & Smith 68. For more information on the American government's defiance for the Geneva Conventions, see Human Rights Watch, Questions and Answers: U.S. Detainees Disappeared into Secret Prisons: Illegal under Domestic and International Law, (New York: Human Rights Watch, 9 Dec. 2005): online at: http://hrw.org/backgrounder/usa/us1205/index.htm
[446] Susan Sontag writes, "The notion that apologies or professions of 'disgust' (over the release of the prison tortures photos from Cuba and Iraq) by the president and the secretary of defense are a sufficient response is an insult to one's historical and moral sense. The torture of prisoners is not an aberration. It is a direct consequence of the with-us-or-against-us doctrines of world struggle with which the Bush administration has sought to change, change radically, the international

Former American Secretary of Defence, Donald Henry Rumsfeld, stated that "we are consistent with the Geneva conventions for the most part".[447] But this has been far from the case[448] as Rumsfeld has "officially sanctioned a secret programme of global intelligence gathering that was to include torture and 'any means necessary'".[449] Jackson says the language of administration officials and the creation of their victim status create a "loss of moral perspective".[450] He goes on to say,

> The practice of showing recruits video footage of the (September 11th) terrorist attacks not only acted to stroke soldier's outrage and desire for revenge, it also reinforced the belief that they were the main victims and that they were not the aggressors. In this way, the discursive construction of exceptional suffering made the daily humiliations handed out to prisoners in Abu Ghraib prison seem inconsequential compared with the atrocity of '9-11'.

Sontag reveals that Washington's first reaction to the released prison torture scandal and photographs[451] was one of shock and disgust and the avoidance of the word 'torture'. Washington claimed "the prisoners had possibly been the objects of 'abuse,' eventually of 'humiliation' - that was the most to be admitted" with Rumsfeld commenting "my impression is that what has been charged thus far is abuse, which I

---

stance of the United States and to recast many domestic institutions and prerogatives." Sontag, "Torture of Others."

[447] The Road to Guantanamo, directed by Michael Winterbottom, Film Four, A Revolutions Films Production, International Distributors, 2006: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=-5990988055306776 22&q=Road+to+Guantanamo&total=70&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=0

[448] For example see: Nadia Abou El-Magd, "Egyptian cleric claims torture after CIA kidnap: Italy indicts 26 Americans, 5 Italians," The Gazette 23 Feb. 2007: A14.

[449] Jackson 12.

[450] Jackson 37.

[451] Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld said, "There are a lot more photographs and videos that exist. (...) If these are released to the public, obviously, it's going to make matters worse (for us)." Sontag, "Torture of Others."

believe technically is different from torture (...a)nd therefore I'm not going to address the 'torture' word."[452] [453] However, Sontag writes,

> To refuse to call what took place in Abu Ghraib - and what has taken place elsewhere in Iraq and in Afghanistan and at Guantanamo Bay - by its true name, torture, is as outrageous as the refusal to call the Rwandan genocide (in which 800,000 Tutsis were slaughtered) a genocide (...) that they count as torture cannot be doubted.[454]

Another consequence of the "us against them" ideology, was a wave of racist attacks which occurred against Muslims, Arabs and Sikhs in the West immediately following September 11th. They were stabbed, beaten and shot and hateful graffiti was written across Mosques and some were burnt to the ground. There was a universal outcry from the left to end the violence by sending a clear message that violence against Muslims, or other communities, was unacceptable and would not be tolerated. This was needed because the polarization of the enemy and the subsequent bifurcation used by the president encouraged this kind of behaviour effectively contributing to "terrorism" against the Muslims.

In Canada, a recent poll showed a large majority of Canadians are calling for racial profiling, "more than two in five Canadians believe racial profiling – security

---

[452] Sontag, "Torture of Others."

[453] Sontag writes: "Here is one of the definitions of torture contained in a convention to which the United States is a signatory: "*any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession.*" (The definition comes from the 1984 Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. Similar definitions have existed for some time in customary law and in treaties, starting with Article 3 - common to the four Geneva conventions of 1949 - and many recent human rights conventions.) The 1984 convention declares, "*No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.*" And all covenants on torture specify that it includes treatment intended to humiliate the victim, like leaving prisoners naked in cells and corridors." Sontag, "Torture of Others."

[454] Sontag, "Torture of Others."

screening based on a person's appearance, ethnicity or citizenship – should be used in the fight against terrorism".[455] Amnesty International has called on governments to, "ensure that members of ethnic, religious or other minorities are not victimized. (Upholding) the principle of non-discrimination on grounds such as race, colour, ethnic origin, sex, language, religion and social status (is) the very bedrock of international law".[456] American Muslim citizens are victimized and discriminated against but it is not just by other members of the population, but by the government itself. As Jackson notes, "within a few months of September 11th 2001, the activity of these new law agencies and programmes had already culminated in the arrest and preventive detention of more than 1,200 mainly Muslim suspects across America".[457]

Helping the Terrorist

Labelling the others as "terrorists" also inadvertently helps their cause, thus further damaging any benefit or justification in using the terrorism lexicon. According to Derrida, deconstructing 'terrorism' is the only politically responsible course of action because the public use of the word 'terrorism' perversely helps the "terrorist".[458] Habermas believes declaring war on 'terrorism' is "a serious mistake" because it in effect gives political legitimacy to the "terrorists".[459] Prior to September 11th, the existence and importance of al Qaeda was nominal, but declaring war on the demonic "terrorists" gave them international recognition. This, coupled with their own past American terrorism and present terrorism in Afghanistan and Iraq, allows the "terrorists" to generate public

---

[455] "Canadian's fear of terrorism grows – so does support for profiling," The Gazette 9 Sept. 2006: A4.
[456] Amnesty International, Amnesty International Report 2002 (2002) Introduction, online at: http://web.amnesty.org/web/ar2002.nsf/intro1/intro1?OpenDocument
[457] Jackson 13.
[458] Derrida in Borradori XIII.
[459] Habermas in Borradori 34-35.

support. As Juergensmeyer notes, it "makes recruitment to (the "terrorist's") cause easier, for it demonstrates that the secular side can be as brutal as it has been portrayed by their own religious ideologues" and "any response to the perpetration of the violent acts, even in the form of retaliatory strikes, will enhance the credibility of the terrorists within their own community".[460]

Furthermore, acknowledging the full problematic nature of the terrorism lexicon, an important question remains: who should decide the definition of the label and its application to individuals, organizations and states? As Chomsky notes, "(...) terrorism is (currently) what our leaders declare it to be. Period".[461] And Derrida says, "the dominant power is the one that manages to impose and, thus, to legitimate, indeed to legalize (...) the terminology and thus the interpretation that best suits it in a given situation".[462] [463] The only answer, Derrida believes, is in creating "a new international law, a new international force in the service of new international institutions, a new concept and a new concrete figure of sovereignty (...)".[464] But he admits that this is an unattainable idealistic fantasy such that,

> Democracy to come is a promise disjoined from any possibility of proper or full actualisation. As such it cannot be tied into any ideal or empirical institutions, activities or possibilities, rather unfolding as a questioning comportment that constitutes a sustained 'engagement with regards to democracy'.[465]

---

[460] Juergensmeyer 230 & 237.
[461] Chomsky, "Hegemony" 110.
[462] Derrida in Borradori 105.
[463] On December 18, 2000 President Bush said, "if this were a dictatorship it would be a heck of a lot easier ... just so long as I'm the dictator".
[464] Derrida in Borradori 119.
[465] Jacques Derrida, "Remarks on Deconstruction and Pragmatism in Deconstruction and Pragmatism," (1996) in Deconstruction and Pragmatism by Chantal Mouffe, ed. (New York: Routledge, 1996), 83.

The Role of the Public

To find realistic answers to the variety of "terrorist" threats we, according to Derrida and Habermas, need to legitimize political action in public discourse. Even John Stuart Mill, in his 1859 essay on *Liberty*, argued that subjecting arguments to public scrutiny was unconditionally beneficial and best assured a way of sorting out good from bad arguments.[466] The ideological deployment of the word 'terrorism' would not meet the conditions for rational debate in the Habermasian sense. For Habermas, what is rational is communicatively justified in an intersubjective well grounded argument. Habermas believes that rational will and opinion formation, through the discursive principle (communicative action), can help in our understanding or legitimizing this word. Habermas believes, that through "the course of mutual perspective-taking there can develop a common horizon of background assumptions in which both sides accomplish an interpretation that is not ethnocentrically adopted or converted but rather, intersubjectively shared".[467] However, "the substance of communication is mutual understanding, and yet, understanding cannot occur in a completely unregulated context, namely, one in which lies, mystification, and manipulation predominate".[468] This is exactly what our usage of 'terrorism' and our labelling of others as 'terrorists' does. Habermas believes the devastating stratification of world society will continue to remain implacable unless there is a political taming of unbounded capitalism.[469]

---

[466] John Stuart Mill quoted in Joseph E. Stiglitz, On Liberty, the Right to Know, and Public Discourse: The Role of Transparency in Public Life: Oxford Amnesty Lecture (United Kingdom: The World Bank, 27 Jan. 1999) online at: http://www2.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty/jstiglitz/download/2001_On_Liberty_the_Right_to_Know_and_Public.pdf

[467] Habermas in Borradori 37.

[468] Habermas in Borradori 46.

[469] Habermas in Borradori 36.

What I am arguing, at the very least, is that we need to reengage what Habermas calls the "disengaged public" and make the public aware of how they have been positioned in the discourse. We need to engage the public in deliberation and reason on the meanings of 'terrorism', its public usages and its inherent problematic nature and the ease with which it can be misused and abused. Currently, "endless war is taken to justify endless incarcerations. This endless 'global war on terrorism' (...) inevitably leads to the demonizing and dehumanizing of anyone declared by the Bush administration to be a possible terrorist: a definition that is not up for debate and is, in fact, usually made in secret".[470] The public must play a role in the discourse and deliberations about 'terrorism' and its multiple meanings and the practice of labelling others.[471] This is necessary if we are to use dialogue, rather than supporting state violence, to resolve our inevitable future conflicts.

The Alexandrian Solution

However, this is far from ever being an actual possibility thus I propose the Alexandrian solution to the Gordian definitional knot to accomplish the objective of engaging the public and to move towards finding solutions which produce long-term peace. To do this, we need to acknowledge that "one of the first rules of conflict resolution is the willingness to accept the notion that there are flaws on one's own side as well as on the opponent's side. This is the sensible stand if one's goal is to get along with

---

[470] Sontag, "Torture of Others."

[471] Moyers commented in 1987, "Many of the secret warriors in Southeast Asia (...) turned the war powers of the United States over to, well we are never really sure who, or what they're doing, or what it costs, or who is paying for it. The one thing that we are sure of is that this largely secret global war carried on with less and less accountability to democratic institutions, has become a way of life. And now we are faced with a question brand new in our history. Can we have the permanent warfare state and democracy too?" Moyers, "Secret Government."

others and avoid violence".[472] The current American usage of the "war on terror" has "alienated much of the world", especially our employment of the word 'terrorism'.[473] The Alexandria solution corrects these problems by levelling the discursive playing field leaving room for more nuanced and intersubjective perspectives. Just as Alexander the Great fulfilled prophecy and conquered Asia after slicing through the intricate Gordian knot in one fell swoop, we should slice through the 'terrorism' definitional "knot" by abandoning our usage of it. We must also be very careful not to replace the word 'terrorism' with another word which does the same or similar ideological work. After acknowledging that there is no veracity or utility to the terrorism lexicon and that its fog is pervasive and permanent, we are left without good reasons to keep using it as well as very good reasons to avoid using it.

This thesis has provided a multitude of arguments which support these claims. What I am proposing is not so radical in light of the previous examples of creditable international news and humanitarian institutions that have already rejected the terrorism lexicon. No substitute can be given for the word 'terrorism' as can clearly be drawn from this thesis. But some may ask, "how will we then discuss what we currently call 'terrorism'?" We can do this by simply following the examples of the BBC, Reuters, and Amnesty International. We are fully able to describe violence without labelling it 'terrorism' or those who use it as 'terrorists'. We can use ordinary language to describe the events of an attack by some group or individual. From a legal perspective, the existing domestic and international criminal laws and the Geneva Convention are more

---

[472] Juergensmeyer 149.

[473] The Economist, "Language of war has alienated much of the world: Treating terrorists as criminals rather than enemies strips them of their glamour," in The Gazette 11 July 2007: online at: http://www.canada.com/montrealgazette/news/editorial/story.html?id=7ff8280c-ec81-466f-a816-374e5d7ac99e&k=45029

then sufficient to deal with "terrorism". For those who insist otherwise they must, at the very least, do so acknowledging American state terrorism and thus the implications this carries. In the words of Amnesty International:

> Be assured - the consequences of the imprecise command of this term are not merely semantic. Rather, it is the case that the term's fluidity is serving to obfuscate the accountability of the state and of others' whose actions amount to human rights abuses. (...) Equally problematic to the cause of justice is the inconsistent application of the term to non-state actors. (...I)t is quite simply true that existing domestic laws and international treaties provide an ample basis in law on which to apprehend and prosecute those who employ such violent means to secure their political objectives. We have no need of the language of terrorism to condemn these acts. (...) In reality, there was and is no need to invoke the rhetoric of terrorism unless, of course, governments seek its immoral garb to deftly cloak actions that otherwise would be exposed as illegitimate. Is this then the underlying motivation for the war against terror: that in a climate of fear, people are prepared to accept a wide range of measures from which they would otherwise, in the name of freedom, resist? It appears a convenience to governments that what was unacceptable on the 10th of September 2001 became acceptable on the 12th.[474]

[474] Gilmore, "Amnesty International speech."

CHAPTER SIX

"Darkness cannot drive out darkness; only light can do that. Hate cannot drive out hate; only love can do that. The chain reaction of evil –Hate begetting hate, wars producing more wars –Must be broken, Or we shall be plunged into the dark abyss of annihilation."
Martin Luther King, Jr.

Conclusion

There are hardly any political words which are not in some way difficult to define or are persuasive in nature or both. I am not suggesting that we should abandon all our political words in the same way that I propose we discard 'terrorism'; as we have done with other words such as "nigger". What I am encouraging is that we regard the word 'terrorism' with caution and reserve at the very least. The unique nature of the 'terrorism' lexicon is that it is without ideological consensus, it is indefinable and it is persuasive, negative, powerful, dangerous, manipulating, polarizing, bigoted, bestows legitimacy or denies it, plays a role in numerous logical fallacies, and is now employed to wage wars of aggression. The fact that this word is used to remove civil liberties and justify illegal wars and violent occupations distinguishes it from all other words. Derrida believes, "terrorism *is* irreducibly ineffable and enigmatic(;) this truth is hard to accept but even more dangerous to reject".[475]

The terrorism lexicon has not a verisimilitude of veracity and goes beyond the point of no utility to one of having dangerous ramifications. The fog which envelopes the word 'terrorism' is evident and we ignore the lacuna in the discourse while employing the word with certainty and condemnation. American state hypocrisy and terrorism is pervasive and alarming. To end "terrorist" violence, one would need to stop state terrorism and its related activities as Nielsen, Chomsky, and Parenti, (among many

[475] Borradori on Derrida in Borradori 153.

others) have all clearly argued. Any discussion of "terrorism" should begin with acknowledging the reality of state violence and America's position as the world's leading terrorist state.

Because the American government promulgates its own simple narrative, new counter narratives are needed. Many authors, including Amnesty International, have argued that acts currently defined as 'terrorism' would be, at the very least, better defined as 'criminal'. The systematic distorted communication concerning 'terrorism' is created by the American government to manipulate public consent for state violence and we must take *immediate action* to correct this. Thinking critically about 'terrorism' and avoiding the word completely with its implacable, manipulative, and dangerous problematic nature is the only way, I believe, to clear the fog and find lasting solutions.

I am unable to fully understand Arab fundamentalism and violence. However, I do see the connection to the Western historical record and in this light I am able to understand how Arab fundamentalism is able to flourish in response and gain so many devoted followers. There is an ever increasing growth in support for Sharia law and Muslim extremism. Yet, however inflated, distorted, and manufactured these "threats" may be the question remains, how should the West respond? By promoting our own religious intolerance and propaganda, by bombing Muslim countries in an attempt to eradicate all "extremists" and any civilians who are in the way, by impoverishing Muslim and Arab populations, by exploiting Arab economies and stealing their natural resources so American corporations and politicians can make billions in the war effort and indefinite occupation of Iraq, by dividing the world into those who support American imperialism and those who suffer under its power, by adopting laws which force Muslims

not to practice their religious traditions, illegally (and often secretly) imprisoning any individual who is discriminately declared a "terrorist" "threat", by supporting Arab dictators, by forcing Muslims into submission and by removing civil liberties and silencing dissent?

This is the current strategy and it will not work and it has only encouraged further growth in the use of "terrorism". There are other alternative ways of working towards and not against peace. Being the stronger force in this struggle and having much undeniable responsibility, the West must first take responsibility for its participation and instigation in the current crisis and let these insights guide our communications. If the violence is to end, we need to clearly understand this reality and engage in undistorted dialogue among ourselves and with others. Western state violence cannot eradicate the Arab fundamentalist movement and only contributes to its continued growth and success.

Our use of 'terrorism' does not aid us in understanding or in finding solutions to terrorism and has furthermore, many dangerous consequences. This thesis has, I hope, demonstrated through critical analysis, deconstruction, and through examples that our present concept and usage of the word 'terrorism' is fraught with problems urgently requiring informed public debate concerning its validity as a legitimate political concept. Although this debate may never be settled, avoiding the word altogether allows for the possibility to correct, or at least address, our cultural biases and our distorted government discourses. The solution lies not in manufacturing equivocal definitions and polarizing the debate to exploit others, but rather in increasing our understanding and our comprehension of others through clear, factually informed and continuous discourses in order to accomplish the possibility of sustained peace. We must understand the "enemy"

with nuance, vision and collaboration and we can effectively and greatly advance this by removing the word 'terrorism' and 'terrorist' from our vocabulary. I would like to leave the reader with a final salient quote from Nobel Peace Prize Laureate, Muhammad Yunus, "We must address the root causes of terrorism to end it for all time. [...] I believe putting resources into improving the lives of poor people is a better strategy than spending it on guns".[476]

[476] Muhammad Yunus, quoted in Washingtonpost.com, "Nobel Laureate: Poverty Fight Essential," Washingtonpost.com 10 Dec. 2006: online at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/10/AR2006121000148.html

ENDNOTES

---

i

"European Parliament resolution on Gladio" Wikisource (22 Nov. 1990) online at: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/European_Parliament_resolution_on_Gladio

European Parliament resolution on Gladio:

Joint resolution replacing B3-2021, 2058, 2068, 2078 and 2087/90
A. having regard to the revelation by several European governments of the existence for 40 years of a clandestine parallel intelligence and armed operations organization in several Member States of the Community,
B. whereas for over 40 years this organization has escaped all democratic controls and has been run by the secret services of the states concerned in collaboration with NATO,
C. fearing the danger that such clandestine network may have interfered illegally in the internal political affairs of Member States or may still do so,
D. whereas in certain Member States military secret services (or uncontrolled branches thereof) were involved in serious cases of terrorism and crime as evidenced by, various judicial inquiries,
E. whereas these organizations operated and continue to operate completely outside the law since they are not subject to any parliamentary control and frequently those holding the highest government and constitutional posts are kept in the dark as to these matters,
F. whereas the various 'Gladio' organizations have at their disposal independent arsenals and military ressources which give them an unknown strike potential, thereby jeopardizing the democratic structures of the countries in which they are operating or have been operating,
G. greatly concerned at the existence of decision-making and operational bodies which are not subject to any form of democratic control and are of a completely clandestine nature at a time when greater Community cooperation in the field of security is a constant subject of discussion,
1. Condemns the clandestine creation of manipulative and operational networks and Calls for a full investigation into the nature, structure, aims and all other aspects of these clandestine organizations or any splinter groups, their use for illegal interference in the internal political affairs of the countries concerned, the problem of terrorism in Europe and the possible collusion of the secret services of Member States or third countries;
2. Protests vigorously at the assumption by certain US military personnel at SHAPE and in NATO of the right to encourage the establishment in Europe of a clandestine intelligence and operation network;
3. Calls on the governments of the Member States to dismantle all clandestine military and paramilitary networks;
4. Calls on the judiciaries of the countries in which the presence of such military organizations has been ascertained to elucidate fully their composition and modus operandi and to clarify any action they may have taken to destabilize the democratic structure of the Member States;

5. Requests all the Member States to take the necessary measures, if necessary by establishing parliamentary committees of inquiry, to draw up a complete list of organizations active in this field, and at the same time to monitor their links with the respective state intelligence services and their links, if any, with terrorist action groups and/or other illegal practices;
6. Calls on the Council of Ministers to provide full information on the activities of these secret intelligence and operational services;
7. Calls on its competent committee to consider holding a hearing in order to clarify the role and impact of the 'Gladio' organization and any similar bodies;
8. Instructs its President fo forward this resolution to the Commission, the Council, the Secretary-General of NATO, the governments of the Member States and the United States Government."

---

ii

USS *Liberty* Veterans Association, Inc., A Report: War Crimes Committed Against U.S. Military Personnel, June 8, 1967 (Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 8 June 2005) online at: http://www.ussliberty.org/report/report.htm

In 2003, an independent commission of highly regarded experts was created investigate the attack. The Commission consisted of Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, United States Navy (Ret.), Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; General Raymond G. Davis, United States Marine Corps, (MOH), Former Assistant Commandant of The Marine Corps; Rear Admiral Merlin Staring, United States Navy (Ret.), Former Judge Advocate General Of The Navy; and Ambassador James Akins (Ret.), Former United States Ambassador to Saudi Arabia.

The "*Moorer Commission*" (Chaired by Adm. Moorer) investigated the attack and made the following findings:

"We, the undersigned, having undertaken an independent investigation of Israel's attack on USS Liberty, including eyewitness testimony from surviving crewmembers, a review of naval and other official records, an examination of official statements by the Israeli and American governments, a study of the conclusions of all previous official inquiries, and a consideration of important new evidence and recent statements from individuals having direct knowledge of the attack or the cover up, hereby find the following:

1. That on June 8, 1967, after eight hours of aerial surveillance, Israel launched a two-hour air and naval attack against USS Liberty, the world's most sophisticated intelligence ship, inflicting 34 dead and 173 wounded American servicemen (a casualty rate of seventy percent, in a crew of 294);
2. That the Israeli air attack lasted approximately 25 minutes, during which time unmarked Israeli aircraft dropped napalm canisters on USS Liberty's bridge, and fired 30mm cannons and rockets into our ship, causing 821 holes, more than 100 of which were rocket-size; survivors estimate 30 or more sorties were flown over the ship by a

minimum of 12 attacking Israeli planes which were jamming all five American emergency radio channels;
3. That the torpedo boat attack involved not only the firing of torpedoes, but the machine-gunning of Liberty's firefighters and stretcher-bearers as they struggled to save their ship and crew; the Israeli torpedo boats later returned to machine-gun at close range three of the Liberty's life rafts that had been lowered into the water by survivors to rescue the most seriously wounded;
4. That there is compelling evidence that Israel's attack was a deliberate attempt to destroy an American ship and kill her entire crew; evidence of such intent is supported by statements from Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Undersecretary of State George Ball, former CIA director Richard Helms, former NSA directors Lieutenant General William Odom, USA (Ret.), Admiral Bobby Ray Inman, USN (Ret.), and Marshal Carter; former NSA deputy directors Oliver Kirby and Major General John Morrison, USAF (Ret.); and former Ambassador Dwight Porter, U.S. Ambassador to Lebanon in 1967;
5. That in attacking USS Liberty, Israel committed acts of murder against American servicemen and an act of war against the United States;
6. That fearing conflict with Israel, the White House deliberately prevented the U.S. Navy from coming to the defense of USS Liberty by recalling Sixth Fleet military rescue support while the ship was under attack; evidence of the recall of rescue aircraft is supported by statements of Captain Joe Tully, Commanding Officer of the aircraft carrier USS Saratoga, and Rear Admiral Lawrence Geis, the Sixth Fleet carrier division commander, at the time of the attack; never before in American naval history has a rescue mission been cancelled when an American ship was under attack;
7. That although Liberty was saved from almost certain destruction through the heroic efforts of the ship's Captain, William L. McGonagle (MOH), and his brave crew, surviving crewmembers were later threatened with "court-martial, imprisonment or worse" if they exposed the truth; and were abandoned by their own government;
8. That due to the influence of Israel's powerful supporters in the United States, the White House deliberately covered up the facts of this attack from the American people;
9. That due to continuing pressure by the pro-Israel lobby in the United States, this attack remains the only serious naval incident that has never been thoroughly investigated by Congress; to this day, no surviving crewmember has been permitted to officially and publicly testify about the attack;
10. That there has been an official cover-up without precedent in American naval history; the existence of such a cover-up is now supported by statements of Rear Admiral Merlin Staring, USN (Ret.), former Judge Advocate General of the Navy; and Captain Ward Boston, USN, (Ret.), the chief counsel to the Navy's 1967 Court of Inquiry of Liberty attack;
11. That the truth about Israel's attack and subsequent White House cover-up continues to be officially concealed from the American people to the present day and is a national disgrace;
12. That a danger to our national security exists whenever our elected officials are willing to subordinate American interests to those of any foreign nation, and specifically are unwilling to challenge Israel's interests when they conflict with American interests; this policy, evidenced by the failure to defend USS Liberty and the subsequent official cover-

up of the Israeli attack, endangers the safety of Americans and the security of the United States.

---

iii

Eisenhower, Steven Spiegel, The Other Arab-Israeli Conflict (Chicago, 1985), 51.

"... it is easy to understand the traditional US opposition to the peace process. The UN resolutions call for an international conference, and the US brooks no interference in what President Eisenhower described as the most "strategically important area in the world," with its enormous energy reserves. As Henry Kissinger explained in a private communication, one of his major policy goals was "to ensure that the Europeans and Japanese did not get involved in the diplomacy," a goal achieved at Camp David in 1978, and again today (the official "peace process"). Furthermore, UN and other initiatives endorse a Palestinian right of self-determination, which would entail Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories. While there has been elite disagreement over the matter, the prevailing judgment has been that enhancement of Israeli power contributes to US domination of the region. For such reasons, the US has always blocked attempts at diplomatic resolution. The basic terms of the international consensus on the Arab-Israel conflict were expressed in a resolution brought to the Security Council in Jan. 1976, calling for a settlement on the pre-June 1967 borders (the Green Line) with "appropriate arrangements...to guarantee...the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of all states in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries," including Israel and a new Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The resolution was backed by Egypt, Syria, Jordan, and the PLO -- in fact "prepared" by the PLO according to Israel's UN Ambassador Haim Herzog, now President. It was strenuously opposed by Israel and vetoed by the United States."

REFERENCES

TEXTS

Ali Tariq. The Clash of Fundamentalisms: Crusades, Jihads, and Modernity. (London: Verso, 2002).

Amnesty International. "Iraq: Civilians Under fire." Brecher, Cutler, and Smith 39-42.

Austin, J. L. How To Do Things With Words. Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2001.

Bamford, James. Body of Secrets: Anatomy of the Ultra-Secret National Security Agency From the Cold War Through the Dawn of a New Century. New York: Doubleday, 2001.

BBC. "An Illegal War: BBC Interview with Kofi Annan." Brecher, Cutler, and Smith 33-35.

Borradori, Giovanna, ed. Philosophy In a Time of Terror. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Boulden, Jane & Weiss, Thomas G., ed. Terrorism and the UN: Before and After September 11. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press 2004.

Brecher, Jeremy, Cutler, Jill, and Smith, Brendan, ed. In The Name of Democracy: American War Crimes In Iraq and Beyond. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005.

Center for Economic and Social Rights. "Tearing Up the Rules: The Illegality of Invading Iraq." Brecher, Cutler, and Smith 24-32.

Coady, C.A.J. "Defining terrorism." Primoratz 3-14.

Chomsky, Noam. Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for Global Dominance. New York: Owl Book, 2003.

---. Imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post-911 World. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2005.

---. The Culture of Terrorism. Boston: South End Press, 1988.

Collins, Paul David. The Hidden Face of Terrorism: The Dark Side of Social Engineering, From Antiquity to September 11. New York: 1st Books Library, 2002.

Derrida, Jacques. "Remarks on Deconstruction and Pragmatism." Deconstruction and

Pragmatism." Ed. Chantal Mouffe. New York: Routledge, 1996. 77-88.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Drury, Shadia B. Leo Strauss and the American Right. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Gareau, Frederick H. State Terrorism and the United States: From Counterinsurgency to the War on Terrorism. Atlanta: Clarity Press, 2004.

Geifman, Anna. Thou shalt kill: Terrorism in Russia 1894-1917. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Held, Virginia. "Terrorism, Rights, and political goals." Justice Law and Violence. Ed. James B. Brady and Newton Garver. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991. 59-79.

Herman, Edward S. The Real Terror Network: Terrorism in Fact and Propaganda. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1982.

Honderich, Ted. After the Terror. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2003.

Jackson, Richard. Writing the War on Terrorism: Language Politics and Counter-Terrorism. New York: Manchester University Press, 2005.

Juergensmeyer, Mark. Terror in the Mind of God: the Global Rise of Religious Violence. California: University of California Press, 2000.

Kinzer, Stephen. All the Shah's Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror. New Jersey: John Wily & Sons Inc., 2003.

Laqueur, Walter. Terrorism. Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.

Mahajan, Rahul. The New Crusade: America's War on Terrorism. New York: Monthly Review press, 2002.

Martin, Gus. Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues. California: Sage Publications, 2003.

Meacher, Michael. "This War on Terrorism Is Bogus: the 9/11 attacks gave the U.S. an ideal pretext to use force to secure its global domination." Okerstrom, 39-44.

Mumia, Abu-Jamal. "Why?" S11: Truth and consequences; radical perspectives on September 11th." Solidarity, Montreal: Solidarity, September 2001. 6-7.

Nelson-Pallmeyer, Jack. Brave New World Order. New York: Orbis Books, 1992.

Nielsen, Kai. "Violence and Terrorism: Its Uses and Abuses." Values in Conflict: Life, Liberty and the Rule of Law." Ed. Burton M. Leiser. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1981. 435-439.

Okerstrom, Dennis A. Peace, War and Terrorism: Longman Topics Reader. Montreal: Person education, 2006.

Parenti, Michael. The Terrorism Trap: September 11 and beyond. San Francisco: City Lights Books.

Primoratz, Igor. Terrorism: The Philosophical Issues." New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

---. "What is Terrorism." Primoratz 15-30.

Rauschning, Dietrich, Wiesbrock, Katja and Lailach, Martin ed. Key Resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly 1946-1996. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Ray, David R., ed. and Scott, Peter D., ed. 9/11 and American Empire: Intellectuals Speak Out. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press, 2007.

Rice, Condoleezza. "A balance of Power That Favors Freedom." Okerstrom, 52-58.

Rorty, Richard. Philosophy and Social Hope. England: Clays Ltd., 1999.

Schmid, Alex P. Political Terrorism: A Research Guide. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1984.

Shalom, Stephen, Rosskamm. Imperial Alibis: Rationalizing U.S. Intervention After the Cold War. Boston: South End Press, 1993.

Simpson, Peter. "The War on Terrorism: Its Moral Justification and Limits in Peace, War and Terrorism." Okerstrom, 9-23.

Trotsky, Leon. Against Individual Terrorism. New York: Pathfinder Press 1974.

Whittaker, David J. Terrorists and Terrorism: In the Contemporary world. New York: Routledge, 2004.

DICTIONARIES

Anderson, Sean, K. and Sloan, Stephen ed. Historical Dictionary of Terrorism. 2nd ed. London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 2002.

Dictionary.com. Unabridged 1.1. Random House, Inc. Online at: <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/terrorism>

Herbst, Philip. Talking Terrorism: A Dictionary of the Loaded Language of Political Violence. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2003.

Online Etymology Dictionary. Douglas Harper, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, November 2001. Online at: http://www.etymonline.com/index.php

Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. Subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, 1989. Online at: http://0-dictionary.oed.com.mercury.concordia.ca/cgi/entry/50249598?single=1&query_type=word&queryword=terrorism&first=1&max_to_show=10

Thackrah, John Richard. Dictionary of Terrorism. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004.

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. 4th ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, Bartleby, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, 2000. Online at: http://www.bartleby.com/61/26/T0122600.html

The American Heritage New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy. 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005. Online at: <Dictionary.com http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/terrorism>

Urban Dictionary.com. 1997-2007. Online at: http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=terrorism

Webster's New International Dictionary. ProQuest Information and Learning Company, subscriber: Concordia University Library, Montreal, 1996-2003. Online at: http://0-collections.chadwyck.com.mercury.concordia.ca/mwd/htxview?template=basic.htx&content=frameset.htx

JOURNALS

Baxter, Richard R. "A Skeptical Look at the Concept of Terrorism." Akron Law Review 7.3 (1974): 380-387.

Best Steve. "The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act: New, Improved, and ACLU Approved." Journal for Critical Animal Studies V.1 (2007): 1-17.

Chomsky, Noam. "Simple Truths, Hard Problems: Some thoughts on terror, justice, and self defence." Philosophy 8 (2005): 5-28.

Coady, C. A. J. "The Morality of Terrorism." Philosophy 60 (1985): 47-69.

Cronin, Audrey Kurth. "Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism." International Security 27.3 (Winder 2002-03): 30-58.

Ganor, Boaz. "Defining Terrorism: Is one man's Terrorist Another Man's Freedom Fighter?" Police Practice and Research 3.4 (2002): 287-304.

Golder, Ben and Willams, George. "What is 'Terrorism'? Problems of legal definition." UNSW Law Journal 27.2 (2004): 270-295.

Goldstick, Danny. "Defining Terrorism." Nature, Society and Thought 4.3 (1991): 261-266.

Lindemyer, Jeff. "Iraqi Sanctions: Myth and Fact." New Politics: a Journal of Socialist Thought 8.4. New York: New Politics Associates. (Winter 2002): 32-79.

Murphy, Jeffrie G. "The Killing of the Innocent." The Monist 57.4 (Oct. 1973): 527-550.

Nielsen, Kai. "Commentary on the Moral Justifiability of Terrorism (State and Otherwise)." Osgoode Hall Law Journal 41.2 & .3 (Summer-Fall 2003): 429-430.

Nuzzo, Angelic. "Reasons for Conflict: Political implications of a definition of terrorism." Metaphilosophy 35.3 (2004): 330-344.

Stevenson, Charles Leslie. "Persuasive Definitions." Mind 47.187 (July, 1938): 331-350.

Wellman, Carl, "On Terrorism Itself." Journal of Value Inquiry 13 (1979): 250-258.

PERIODICALS

Bhatia, Michael V. "Fighting words: naming terrorist, bandits, rebels and other violent Actors." Third World Quarterly 26.1 2005: 5-22.

Burke, Jason. "Al-Qaeda: a meaningless label." Guardian unlimited Observer Worldview Extra, Sunday 12 Jan. 2003: online at: http://observer.guardian.co.uk/waronterrorism/story/0,,872957,00.html

Chomsky, Noam, "Imminent Crises: Threats & Opportunities in the Middle East & Globally." Monthly Review 59.2 June 2007: 1-19.

---. "Noam Chomsky on Haiti." Third world Traveler University of Massachusetts, 17 Mar. 2004: online at: http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Haiti/Chomsky_Haiti_DN.html

---. "The United States is a leading terrorist State." Monthly Review 53.6 Nov. 2001: 10-19.

Chouvy, Pierre-Arnaud. "Narco-Terrorism in Afghanistan." Terrorism Monitor II 6 25 Mar. 2004: 7-9.

Frank, Joshua. "Bye, Bye Civil Liberties: Blame the Democrats." Dissident Voice 9 Oct. 2006: online at: http://www.dissidentvoice.org/Oct06/Frank09.htm

Freedland, Jonathan. "Bush's Amazing Achievement." The New York Review of Books 54.10 14 June 2007: online at: http://www.nybooks.com/articles/20251

Herman, Edward S. and Peterson, David. "Who terrorizes Whom?" Z Magazine 18 Oct. 2001: online at: http://musictravel.free.fr/political/political15.htm

Laqueur, Walter. "Reflections on Terrorism." Foreign Affairs 65.1 Fall 1986: 86-100.

McVeigh, Tracy. "Israeli attacks kill Lebanese civilians." Guardian Unlimited 15 July 2006: online at: http://observer.guardian.co.uk/world/story/0,,1821462,00.html

Poulsen, Kevin. "Hackers face life imprisonment under 'Anti-Terrorism' Act." SecurityFocus, 24 Sept. 2001: online at: http://www.securityfocus.com/news/257

Regan, Tom. "Venezuela accuses US of 'double standard' on terrorism: Charges come after Texas judge blocks extradition of man accused of blowing up a Cuban passenger jet in 1976." The Christian Science Monitor 29 Sept. 2005: online at: http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0929/dailyUpdate.html

Rice, Condoleezza. "Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest." Foreign Affairs Jan.-Feb. 2000: online at: http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20000101faessay5/condoleezza-rice/campaign-2000-promoting-the-national-interest.html

Pipes, Daniel and Clawson, Patrick. "Mujahedeen-e Khalq: A Terrorist U.S. Ally?" New York Post 20 May 2003: online at: http://www.danielpipes.org/article/1100

Said, Edward W. "The essential terrorist." The Nation 14 June 1986: 828-833.

Smith, Michael. "The war before the war." New Statesman 30 May 2005: online at: http://www.newstatesman.com/200505300013

Walzer, Michael. "Five Questions About Terrorism." Dissent Winter 2002: 5-10.

NEWS ARTICLES

"9/11 panel sees no link between Iraq, al-Qaida: Commission opens final hearing before release of report." MSNBC 16 June 2004: online:

http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/5223932/

Abou El-Magd, Nadia. "Egyptian cleric claims torture after CIA kidnap: Italy indicts 26 Americans, 5 Italians." The Gazette 23 Feb. 2007: A14.

Ackerman, Seth. "Who Knew? The unanswered questions of 9/11." In These Times 3 Sept. 2003: online at: http://www.inthesetimes.com/article/615/who_knew/

Agence France-Press. "U.S. charges against Australian are made up, lawyer says." In The Gazette 3 Mar. 2007: A17.

Alarab. "Where Has Bush Lead America and the world?" Alarab Online 2006: online at: http://english.alarabonline.org/index.asp

"America's New War: Mayor Giuliani Addresses the U.N. Assembly." CNN Live Event/Special CNN.com transcripts, aired 1 Oct. 2001: online at: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0110/01/se.15.html

"Army Of God Anthrax Threats." CBS News 9 Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2001/11/09/national/main317573.shtml

Associated Press. "Hamas, Hizbullah not on Russia's terror list." Y Net News.com 28 July 2006: online at: http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3282840,00.html

Bauch, Hubert. "Terrorism? Who says?: The difficulty lies in the definition." The Gazette 9 Sept. 2001: A4.

Berthelsen, Christian. "Bomb plot may have been inside job; Failed attempt against Iraqi VP." The Gazette 27 Feb. 2007: A17.

Brookes, Adam. "Iraq war justifications laid bare: The Senate Intelligence Committee has found no evidence of links between the regime of Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda."
BBC News Washington, 9 Sept. 2006: online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/5329350.stm

Browitz, Andy. "Bush urges using Woodward's book as alternative fuel source: burning book could wean U.S. from Middle-eastern oil, President says." YubaNet.com 3 Oct. 2006: online at: http://www.yubanet.com/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi/10/43176

"Bush: Iraq crucial in war on terror." CNN.com 7 Oct. 2005: online at: http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/10/06/bush.iraq/

"Bush says it is time for action." CNN.com 6 Nov. 2001: online at:

http://archives.cnn.com/2001/US/11/06/ret.bush.coalition/index.html

Butcher, Tim. "Group accuses Israeli soldiers of using girl, 11, as human shield." The Gazette 10 Mar. 2007: A18.

"Canadian's fear of terrorism grows – so does support for profiling." The Gazette 9 Sept. 2006: A4.

"Cheney reasserts al-Qaida-Saddam connection: Vice president's words come as latest Pentagon report again dismisses link." MSNBC 6 Apr. 2007: online at: http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/17975678/

Chomsky, Noam. "The Fifth Freedom." Stephen Marshall, interviewer. Guerrilla News Network, Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.chomsky.info/interviews/200111--04.htm

Clemons, Steven C. "Extraordinary Rendition? America Outsources Torture." The Washington Note 2004: online at: http://www.thewashingtonnote.com/mt/mt-comments.cgi?entry_id=211

Cloud, David S. and Johnson, Ian. "In Post-9/11 World, Chinese Dissidents Pose U.S. Dilemma." Wall Street Journal 3 Aug. 2004: online at: http://uyghuramerican.org/articles/60/1/In-Post-911-World-Chinese-Dissidents-Pose-US-Dilemma/In-Post-911-World-Chinese-Dissidents-Pose-US-Dilemma.html

"Darwin 'source of terrorism'." The Gazette 3 Feb. 2007: A17.

Frew, Wendy. "PM dubbed eco-terrorist." Farifax Digital 26 May 2005: online at: http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2005/05/25/1116950760760.html?oneclick=true

Harnden, Toby. "Libby guilty verdict bad news for Bush." The National Post 7 Mar. 2007: front page.

Huggler, Justin. "Carpet bombing 'kills 150 civilians' in frontline town." The Independent London, 19 Nov. 2001: online at: http://www.rawa.org/s-kill2.htm

"Immigration bill lacks terrorism definition." CBC News 3 Oct. 2001: online at: http://www.cbc.ca/canada/story/2001/10/03/immigration011003.html

"Iraqis react to al-Dari warrant." Al Jazeera 18 Nov. 2006: online at: http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/38761D75-390E-42F5-94C6-65ABF31C25F9.htm

Isseroff, Ami. "Speech of Yasser Arafat Before the UN General Assembly: November 13, 1974." Middle East Web 2005: online at:

http://www.mideastweb.org/arafat_at_un.htm

Janabi, Ahmed. "Row over Iraq oil law." Al Jazeera 5 May 2007: online at: http://english.aljazeera.net/NR/exeres/0D09B919-D28A-4CC4-A79F-0EE500239225.htm

James, Ian. "Belafonte Calls Bush 'Greatest Terrorist'." CommonDreams.org The Associated Press 9 Jan. 2006: online at: http://www.commondreams.org/headlines06/0109-06.htm

---. "Chavez takes case to U.N." The Washington Times Associated Press 24 Apr. 2007: online at: http://washingtontimes.com/world/20070423-095315-1471r.htm

Kolskegg, Max. "9/11: A Desperate Provocation By U.S. Capitalism." Indy Media UK 25 Jan. 2001: online at: http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/2002/01/21075.html

Landay, Jonathan S. "CIA leak illustrates selective use of intelligence on Iraq." Knight Ridder Newspapers 25 Oct. 2005: online at: http://www.realcities.com/mld/krwashington/news/special_packages/iraq/intelligence/12995512.htm

Luyendijk, Joris. "Agreement on terms." Le Monde diplomatique Mar. 2007: 16.

Manning, David. "The secret Downing Street memo." TIMES ONLINE 1 May 2005 online at: http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/uk/article387374.ece

Mansour, Riyad. "Palestinian Official Calls Israeli Artillery Strike 'State Terrorism.'" VOA News 9 Nov. 2006: online at: http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2006-11/2006-11-09-voa40.cfm?CFID=98976627&CFTOKEN=51516023

McDougall, Dan. "M 15 establishing new base in Scotland -Muslims cry victim at being scrutinised as possible terror source." Militant Islam Monitor.org 6 Feb. 2005: online at: http://www.militantislammonitor.org/article/id/421

"New Osama bin Laden Video Contains Anti-Israel and Anti-American Statements." Anti-defamation League. New York: Anti-defamation League 2001 online at: http://www.adl.org/terrorism_america/bin_l_print.asp

"Nobel Laureate: Poverty Fight Essential." Washingtonpost.com 10 Dec. 2006: online at: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/12/10/AR2006121000148.html

Palast, Greg. "Secret US plans for Iraq's oil." Newsnight BBC Two 17 Mar. 2005 online at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/newsnight/4354269.stm

Postel, Danny. "Noble lies and perpetual war: Leo Strauss, the neo-cons, and Iraq." Information Clearing House 18 Oct. 2003: online at: http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article5010.htm

Rouleau, Eric. "Terrorism: the chosen tool of the weak against the mighty: does 'global war on terror' mask a new imperialism?" Le Monde diplomatique June 2007: 14

"Russia denies poisoning ex-spy in London." Farifax Digital 21 Nov. 2006: online at: http://www.theage.com.au/news/World/Russia-denies-poisoning-exspy-in-London/2006/11/21/1163871369747.htmlt

Sands, Andrea. "Afghan mission 'retribution' for 9/11: O'Connor Speaks Out." The Gazette 21 Jan. 2007: A17.

Shah, Amir and Faiez, Rahim. "Air strike hits Afghan house, killing 9 of family." The Gazette 6 Mar. 2007: A17.

Sontag, Susan. "Regarding the Torture of Others." New York Times 23 May 2004: online at: http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/23/magazine/23PRISONS.html?ex=1400644800&en=a2cb6ea6bd297c8f&ei=5007&partner=USERLAND

The Economist. "Language of war has alienated much of the world: Treating terrorists as criminals rather than enemies strips them of their glamour." In The Gazette 11 July 2007: online at: http://www.canada.com/montrealgazette/news/editorial/story.html?id=7ff8280c-ec81-466f-a816-374e5d7ac99e&k=45029

Toppo, Greg. "Education chief calls teachers union 'terrorist organization'." USA Today MSNBC.com 23 Feb. 2004: online at: http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2004-02-23-paige-remarks_x.htm?POE=NEWISVA

"U.N.: Child sex trade 'a form of terrorism'." CNN.com 17 Dec. 2001: online at: http://archives.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/east/12/17/childsex.conference/index.html

"US Armed Forces Push for Offensive Biological Weapons Development." The Sunshine Project News release 8 May 2002: online at: http://www.sunshine-project.org/publications/pr/pr080502.html

"U.S. terrorist watch list soars to an unmanageable 435,000: up from fewer than 100,000 files in 2003." The Gazette 26 Mar. 2007: A16.

Watson, Steve. "Endemic: The move To Label All Civil Disobedience "terrorism": Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act makes protesters terrorists." Inforwars.net

1 Dec. 2006: online at: Infowars.net

Zakaria, Fareed. "Why they hate us." Newsweek 15 Oct. 2001: 22-40.

INSTITUTION AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Amnesty International. Amnesty International Report 2002. 2002 Introduction. Online at: http://web.amnesty.org/web/ar2002.nsf/intro1/intro1?OpenDocument

Arizona. If you encounter: any of the following, call the Joint Terrorism Task Force. Arizona: Federal Bureau of Investigation, Phoenix anti-terrorism task force, front Page online at: http://www.keepandbeararms.com/images/FBI-MCSOTerroristFlyer-Front.jpg and back page online at: http://www.keepandbeararms.com/images/FBI-MCSOTerroristFlyer-Back.jpg

Bush, George W. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Washington, DC: The White House, September 2002. Online at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Emergency Preparedness and Response, Bioterrorism Overview. Atlanta: Department of Health and Human Services. Online at: http://www.bt.cdc.gov/bioterrorism/overview.asp

Cornel University Law School. Annual country reports on terrorism. New York: Legal Information Institute. Online at: http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/html/uscode22/usc_sec_22_00002656---f000-.html

Eland, Ivan. Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record. Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 17 Dec. 1998. Online at: http://www.cato.org/pubs/fpbriefs/fpb-050es.html

Federal Bureau of Investigation, Counterterrorism Threat Assessment and Warning Unit, National Security Division. Terrorism in the United States 1999: 30 Years of Terrorism – A Special Retrospective Edition. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, 1999. Online at: http://www.fbi.gov/publications/terror/terror99.pdf

Gilmore, Kate. The war against terrorism: a human rights perspective: speech by Kate Gilmore. Florence: Amnesty International, 2002. Online at: http://web.amnesty.org/pages/ec_briefings_fora_terror

Human Rights Watch. Human Rights Abuses in the MKO Camps. New York: Human Rights Watch, 2006. Online at: http://hrw.org/backgrounder/mena/iran0505/4.htm

Human Rights Watch. Needless Deaths in the Gulf War: Civilian Casualties During the

Air Campaign and Violations of the Laws of War. New York: Human Rights Watch, 1991. Online at: http://www.hrw.org/reports/1991/gulfwar/INTRO.htm

Human Rights Watch report. Off Target: The Conduct of the War and Civilian Casualties in Iraq. New York: Human Rights Watch, Dec. 2003. Online at: http://www.hrw.org/reports/2003/usa1203/

Human Rights Watch. Questions and Answers: U.S. Detainees Disappeared into Secret Prisons: Illegal under Domestic and International Law. New York: Human Rights Watch, 9 Dec. 2005. Online at: http://hrw.org/backgrounder/usa/us1205/index.htm

Jarboe, James F. The Threat of Eco-Terrorism, Testimony of Domestic Terrorism Section Chief. Counterterrorism Division FBI, the House Resources Committee, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, 12 Feb. 2002. Online at: http://www.fbi.gov/congress/congress02/jarboe021202.htm

Martin, Jerry and Neal, Anne. Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America And What Can Be Done About It. American Council of Trustees and Alumni, Feb. 2002.

Monke, Jim. Agroterrorism: Threats and Preparedness. The Library of Congress: CRS Report for Congress, 13 Aug. 2004.

Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism. Patterns of Global Terrorism 2002: US Department of State Publication 11038. Washington, DC: State Department, Apr. 2003. Online at: http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/20177.pdf

Phares, Walid. Subcommittee on Intelligence Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment, Hearing for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security, Intercepting Radicalization at the Indoctrination Stage. Washington, DC: United States House of Representatives, 20 Sept. 2006.

Record, Jeffrey. Bounding the Global War On Terrorism. Pennsylvania: The Strategic Studies Institute, Dec. 2003. Online at: http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB207.pdf

Ridge, Tom and Blunkett, David. Joint Press Conference with Secretary Tom Ridge and British Home Secretary Blunkett. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of the Press Secretary, 1 Apr. 2003. Online at: http://www.dhs.gov/xnews/releases/press_release_0124.shtm

SERC State Environmental Resource Center, Alec's Animal and Ecological Terrorism Act. Wisconsin, Dec. 2002. Online at: http://www.serconline.org/alec/alec21.html

Sofaer, Abraham D. and Goodman, Seymour E. A Proposal for an International Convention on Cyber Crime and Terrorism Article 1.2. The Center for

International Security and Cooperation, Aug. 2000. Online at: http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/11912/sofaergoodman.pdf

Stiglitz, Joseph E. On Liberty, the Right to Know, and Public Discourse: The Role of Transparency in Public Life. United Kingdom: The World Bank, 27 Jan. 1999. Online at: http://www2.gsb.columbia.edu/faculty/jstiglitz/download/2001_On_Liberty_the_Right_to_Know_and_Public.pdf

Texas. Terrorism: What the public needs to know. Texas: Department of Public Safety Criminal Intelligence Service, 2006. Online at: http://www.pvamu.edu/Include/EHS/TDPS/Terrorism.pdf

The Institute for Bio Security. Bioterrorism - Quick Reference Material. Missouri: Saint-Louis University School of Public Health. Online at: http://www.bioterrorism.slu.edu/bt/quick.htm

United Nations. Definitions of terrorism. United Nations: United Nations Office on Drug and Crime, 2006. Online at: http://www.unodc.org/unodc/terrorism_definitions.html

United States of America. Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002. Washington, DC: Public Law 107-188 107th Congress, 2002. Online at: http://www.fda.gov/oc/bioterrorism/PL107-188.html

United States Department of Defense. Joint Publication 1-02: Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. Washington, DC: United States Department of Defense, 5 June 2003. Online at: http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/new_pubs/jp1_02.pdf

US Department of State International Information Programs. Post-Millennium Terrorism Review Speech by Ambassador Michael A. Sheehan, Coordinator for Counterterrorism. Washington File: Brookings Institution, 10 Feb. 2000. Online at: http://cryptome.org/mas021000.htm

USS *Liberty* Veterans Association, Inc. A Report: War Crimes Committed Against U.S. Military Personnel, June 8, 1967. Washington, DC: Secretary of Defense, 8 June 2005. Online at: http://www.ussliberty.org/report/report.htm

Virginia. Terrorism & Security Awareness Orientation for State Employees. Virginia: The Virginia Department of Emergency Management, 2003. Online at: http://www.virginianewssource.com/images/VATerrorismManual.pdf

PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES

Bush, George W. "2007 State of the Union Policy Initiatives." The White House.

Washington, DC, 23 Jan. 2007. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/stateoftheunion/2007/initiatives/index.html

---. "No Nation Can Be Neutral in This Conflict: Remarks by the President To the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism." The White House. Washington, DC, 6 Nov. 2001. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011106-2.html

---. "President Bush, Colombia President Uribe Discuss Terrorism." Remarks by President Bush and President Alvaro Uribe of Colombia. The White House. Washington, DC, 25 Sept. 2002. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020925-1.html

---. "President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat," Remarks by the President on Iraq. Cincinnati, 7 Oct. 2002. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html

---. "President Discusses War on Terrorism," Address to the Nation World Congress Center. The White House. (Atlanta, Georgia, 8 Nov. 2001. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011108-13.html

---. "President George Bush Discusses Iraq in National Press Conference." The White House. Washington, DC, 6 Mar. 2003. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030306-8.html

---. "President's Radio Address, July 22, 2006." The White House. Washington, DC, 22 July 2006. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/07/20060722.html

---. "President's Remarks to the Nation." The White House. New York, 11 Sept. 2002. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020911-3.html

---. "President: We're Fighting to Win - And Win We Will: Remarks by the President on the USS Enterprise on Pearl Habor Day." The White House. Washington, DC, 7 Dec. 2001. Online at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2007/01/20070123-2.html

---. "Remarks by the President on Iraq." Ohio: Cincinnati Museum Center, 7 Oct. 2002.

DOCUMENTARIES

Loss of Liberty. Written and directed by Tito Howard. Howard Films, 2002: online at:
http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=7267134620652018859&q=uss+liberty

TerrorStorm: A History of Government Sponsored Terror. Produced and narrated by Alex

Jones. An Infowars Production, 2006. Online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=7860484536861762 30&q=terror+storm

The Power of Nightmares: The Rise of Politics of Fear. Produced by Stephen Lambert and Peter Horrocks. Written and produced by Adam Curtis. BBC documentary, 92004, 10 Apr. 2007: online at: http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=881321004838285177

The Road to Guantanamo. Directed by Michael Winterbottom. Film Four, A Revolutions Films Production. International Distributors, 2006: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=-5990988055306776 22&q=Road+to+Guantanamo&total=70&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=0

The Secret Government: The Constitution in Crisis. Bill Moyers. PBS documentary (Public Broadcasting Service), 1987: transcript online at: http://www.wanttoknow.info/050423secretgovernment

TELEVISION NEWS PROGRAMS

60 Minutes: Lesley Stahl interview with Madeleine Albright. CBS News. 60 Minutes, 12 May 1996.

Is Bush an Idiot? MSNBC. News report: online at: http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=-1792905136727686476&q=is+Bush+an+Idiot%3F&total=1321&start=0&num=10&so=0&type=search&plindex=6

"Showdown: Iraq." CNN Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer. CNN.com transcripts, 9 Mar. 2003: online at: http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0303/09/le.00.html

OTHER ONLINE SOURCES

"Amiriyah shelter." Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia. 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amiriyah_shelter

Conachy, James. "US killed hundreds of Iraqi civilians in "precision" strikes." World Socialist Web Site. 18 June 2004: online at: http://www.wsws.org/articles/2004/jun2004/iraq-j18.shtml

"King David Hotel bombing." Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia. 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_David_Hotel_bombing

Terror-Free Oil Initiative visit: http://www.terrorfreeoil.org/endorsements.php

"Terrorism Act No 83 of 1967." Wikipedia: the free encyclopaedia. 2007: online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terrorism_Act_No_83_of_1967