

Who Are the Terrorists?

<https://thelastbastille.wordpress.com/2012/05/14/who-are-the-terrorists/>

May 30, 2012

Thanks to the complicit mainstream media, there is deliberately infused confusion about what terrorism actually is. Even [Dr. Jeffrey Record's study](#) of the so-called "War on Terror" admitted the malleability of the concept. This irregular method of warfare suffers from **verbicide**, which is defined as "[the use of words to effect change by means of covert subversion of intent.](#)" Before supporting or condoning what certain parties or non-state actors do, it would behoove all of us to critically examine what *exactly* is meant by the idea of terrorism.



According to [Title 22 United States Code subsection 2656f \(paragraph d\)](#), "the term 'terrorism' means premeditated, politically motivated violence perpetrated against noncombatant targets by sub-national groups or clandestine agents." This is interesting, since [Christopher Leibig simplified this further into 5 conditions that must be met for an action to be considered terrorism](#) (as per the USC definition). These are:

- 1) *Premeditated,*
- 2) *politically motivated,*
- 3) *violence,*
- 4) *against non-combatants, and*
- 5) *by sub-national or clandestine agents.*

Premeditated means to be '[done deliberately; planned in advance.](#)' Political motivation and the presences of physical violence I think are easy to discern, as is whether sub-national and/or clandestine agents are in play (as opposed to openly uniformed government agents, for instance).

Non-combatant is uniquely interesting. Generally speaking, [it refers to the civilian population;](#) however, [Article 43 under Protocol 1 of the Geneva Convention](#) states that:

1. The armed forces of a Party to a conflict consist of all organized armed forces, groups and units which are under a command responsible to that Party for the conduct of its subordinates, even if that Party is represented by a government or an authority not recognized by an adverse Party. Such armed forces shall be subject to an internal

disciplinary system which, inter alia, shall enforce compliance with the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict.

2. Members of the armed forces of a Party to a conflict (other than medical personnel and chaplains covered by Article 33 of the Third Convention) are combatants, that is to say, they have the right to participate directly in hostilities.

3. Whenever a Party to a conflict incorporates a paramilitary or armed law enforcement agency into its armed forces it shall so notify the other Parties to the conflict.

Obviously, most military personnel are considered **combatants**. The question to be answered, then, is whether American local, state, and federal police are accurately described as “combatants?” Considering the contemporary militarization of the police, especially in terms of both their training and gear, they do initially seem to be well-equipped to handle a full-scale ground invasion, at the very least. As a related side note, would other agents of the State (i.e. legislators, judges, & bureaucrats) count as combatants? What if, say, a particular Administrative Agency (such as the IRS) started training and maintaining their own **SWAT** units? Would they be considered combatants? Is the entire concept of SWAT a “**paramilitary**” entity, and if so, would that mean that any member of any SWAT unit of any government agency whatsoever is to be considered a combatant?

If “terrorism” is indeed the premeditated use of physical violence by sub-national actors or clandestine agents against *non-governmental* targets with the aim of achieving some political end, then so-called “**domestic extremists**” (or **political dissidents** of any kind) can’t ever be terrorists, since (at most) they’ve expressed the possibility of engaging *only governmental targets*!

People who physically attack government employees & property are **guerrillas**. Whether the cause of certain guerrillas is good or not is immaterial in regards to whether their behavior is terroristic or not. Even if a guerrilla’s cause is not a good one, *technically speaking* they can never be terrorists, due to fundamental dissimilarities in terms of **methodology**. Until such time that guerrillas of any political orientation target civilian populations, they too **by definition** cannot also be terrorists; therefore, the government’s “War on Terror” is just a self-serving excuse to ramp up the police state and clamp down on political dissent from the citizenry.

Upon examination of even recent history, the government constantly violates the **Non-Aggression Principle** with impunity. It’s very hard to recollect the last time a Patriot violated the NAP. It’s even harder to remember the last time any level or scope of government abided by the very “laws” that they themselves enacted.

If anything, it is the **alphabet soup boys** and **their bosses** who are the actual terrorists. The rebel US government uses the premeditated initiation of physical violence against *non-governmental* (i.e. civilian) targets with the intention of achieving some political goal; it is not uncommon for them to make use of **informants**, **agent provocateurs**, and **undercover operatives** in order to carry out successful operations. **State-sponsored false-flag terrorism** is the more sneaky form of the more overt police state terrorism that the government uses to suppress the population. They have provably done it some many times it’s unbelievable they haven’t been stopped yet.

A Google Chrome extension is available. [More Info](#) [Install Print Friendly Extension](#) [No thanks](#)