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<http://onfaith.washingtonpost.com/onfaith/panelists/willis_e_elliott/2010/07/terrorism_is_newspeak_for_psywar.html>

**"Terrorism" is newspeak for psychological warfare**

*In its 2010 National Security Strategy, the Obama administration sought to sever the relationship between Islam and terrorism, rejecting the use of terms like 'Islamic terrorist' and 'jihad' to describe acts of terror.*

The linguistic change was a policy shift from the Bush administration and part of Obama's overall strategy to reinvent America's relationship with the Muslim world.

But the policy change has its critics. On Monday, the Washington Institute for Near East Policy published a report rebuking the Obama administration's approach, suggesting that the new strategy dangerously ignores the religious motivations of terrorists.

*What should we call terrorists, some of whom claim to be motivated by their religion? Can one be an Islamic terrorist? What about a Christian terrorist? Does what we call terrorists matter?*

While "terrorism" was a late-18th-century term for what now we call state terrorism (the French "Reign of Terror" occurring after the revolutionaries had seized the Ancien Regime), today it is newspeak for *anti*-state violent psywar (psychological warfare), which in World War II the U.S. officially defined as "the use of any weapon to influence the mind of the enemy." That definition will do for our present purpose, though there are a dozen types of terrorism and scores of definitions.

1. By the asymmetrical warfare of violent sneak-attacks, "they" (the terrorists) are trying to frighten "us" into irrational, chaotic, self-defeating behavior if not into immobility. But hold it! Sometimes a government or population needs frightening, and it's the good guys who are the terrorists. Here, for example, are two *terrorists who got the Nobel Peace Prize*:

(a)Menachem Begin, before become prime minister of the State of Israel, was the commander of the most powerful Jewish insurgent-terrorist group in Palestine, the Irgun Zwei Leume, which by increasing violence discouraged the British from continuing their protectorate. (Killing tourism was one aspect of Begin's terrorism. I remember looking out from a huge hole blown into a tourist haven, Jerusalem's King David Hotel.) That terrorism's result: a democracy.

(b) Nelson Mandela became, in 1961, the commander-in-chief of the Umkhonto we Sizwe, for armed resistance to the South African government, and he took to organizing guerilla bands. He and his African National Congress, by election, became the Government of South Africa after his 27-year imprisonment, which could have ended at any time by his taking a pledge of non-violence against the government. The steady threat of mass violence gradually broke down the apartheid government's resistance to an election open to all South Africans. Mandela never participated in any violence; but the threat of mass violence is frequently more effective than sporadic-episodic violence. That terrorism's result: a democracy.

2. But the terrorism the West, including Israel, now faces intends the opposite of democracy. Not the people, but Sharia (Islamic law) is to rule. Indeed, this terrorism -*suicidal terrorism* - is aimed specifically at democracies. It is, currently, *Islam's party of death and destruction*.

3. Islam has*parties of life and peace*, and to confront its party of death and destruction is an obligation more of these parties than it is of any or all of the world's *non*-Islamic parties of life and peace. But the Muslim world is failing its duty, is largely silent about violent jihadism's suicidal terrorism. Where are the eminent Islamic voices denouncing this crime against humanity and blasphemy against God, and proclaiming that suicide bombers are hell-bound? The silence can be partly understood by the fact that in much of the Muslim world, 9/11 was celebrated rather than mourned.

4. In the mind of the media and the people, 'terrorists' are Muslims who kill themselves in the process of killing civilians, destroying property, maximizing chaos, and driving wedges between populations and their governments. No*non*-Muslim criminals meet these five criteria. The Oklahoma bomber, whatever his motives, did not kill himself. In the Vietnam war, Buddhist monks who immolated themselves in protest were terrifying, but they did no harm except to themselves. As for 'a Christian terrorist' meeting the five criteria, who can name even one in the whole of Christian history? 'Terrorist,' today, is short for a phrase whose adjective signals *a particular religion*("Muslim..." or "Islamic...") *or party* ("Islamist..." or "Jihadist...") within that religion.

5. While I applaud Obama's desire to "reinvent America's relationship with the Muslim world," his word-manipulation is too clever by half. "We are at war," he says; but he refuses enemy-identification - refuses to face the reality that this is*a war of religion* - refuses to name the religious party the world, especially the Muslim world, should denounce, resist, and defeat.

6. "The Obama administration" wants "to sever the relationship between Islam and terrorism"? Besides being an Orwellian *falsehood*, this notion's primary effect is further to sever the relationship between "we the people" and our President: trust in Obama is in steep decline.

7. Yes, how we name the enemy *matters*. It would be hard to overemphasize how much.

**BY WILLIS E. ELLIOTT  |  JULY 13, 2010; 6:09 PM ET**

**Comments**

**Please report offensive comments below.**

Is the "War on Terror" justified? Let's look at the numbers.

Note: Prior to 2001 Terrorism did not even exist as a category in the mortality statistics. Terrorism is a form of homicide and up until then was considered just that. In 2001 they created a new classification in the official ICD (International Classification of Diseases). U01 is the designation for Homicide Associated with Terrorism.[**http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/icd/terrorism\_code.htm**](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/icd/terrorism_code.htm)

In 2001 there were 2,922 American civilian deaths under this classification; all as a result of 9/11.

In 2002 there was one death. (Not sure if this was a 9/11 victim who lived on into 2002)

2003 - 0
2004 - 0
2005 - they shuffle around how deaths are reported and who they get reported to, and
now we have 56 deaths attributed to 'terrorism.'

2006 - 28 deaths.

Note; these are Terrorism Deaths of Private US Citizens listed by country where the deaths took place.

In 2005: (56 deaths)

Afghanistan: 1
Egypt 2
Iraq 47
Israel/Gaza/WB - 1
Jordon 4
UK 1
Territorial US: 0

2006 (28 deaths):

Afghanistan: 3
iraq 22
Israel/Gaza/WB 1
Pakistan 1
Thailand 1
Territorial US: 0

(It is not clear if these are 'contractors' or just civilians (media people, etc) in the war zone. But the numbers speak for themselves and the implications are clear. (stay out of Iraq)

For comparison take an average year of US deaths caused by:

Tobacco 435k
Poor diet and Exercise 365k
Alcohol 85k
Microbial agents 75k
Toxic Agents 55k
Motor Vehicles 26k
Adverse reaction to prescriptions drugs 32k
Suicide 30k
Firearms 29k
Homicide 20k
Sexual 20k
Drugs 17k
Aspirin/Tylenol 7k
Snake bites 3-500 per year

So literally thousands of times more Americans die from Aspirin every year, than terrorism. Maybe we should have a war on Aspirin? We need to speak out against this farce and get properly informed.

\*Statistics to 2006 paraphrased from the video work of David Chandler from architects and engineers for 9/11 Truth.

**POSTED BY: WINSTON9 | JULY 24, 2010 11:33 PM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

.
................................................. ^
................................................ \*.\* >
.................................... ,\_\_\_\_\_./
.................................. /......**A**......\
................................. |...**BOMB**...|
.................................. \\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/
……………………….
....... (/('('('(')')')')')\)
......... /................\......
....... \_|....\_....\_....|\_
....... |.|..-(♠)--(♠)..+ ......
........ \|...... m ......|/
......... \.....(---)...../
........... \............/.
............. ”**###**”.....
................ '##'..........
.................. '#'.................
.
**TRUTH + FREEDOM** = Our-Religion NO PELEG-Islami!
.......................................
1 **Space-Ship Earth**, 1 **LiFE**, 1 **G-D**?, 1 i + **Holyi-TiME**
............................ \_.-(\_).\_ ...........
........................... '\_\_\_\_\_\_'. .......
.......................... {\_\_\_\_\_\_} . . . "If iSLAM **is A Peaceful**
.......................... /.**/**.♥.**\/**.♥.**\**.\ . . **Ummah**, Then WHY Art
.......................... |.**\\_\_/\\_\_/**.|.. . YE **Acquiring** 'WMD"?
.......................... \.....**--**....../ ..
......................... /'....**"""**....'\ .
....................... \/\_..............\_\ ......
....................... (\_\_/....'|....\\_\_) ........
.......................... |\_\_\_.|\_\_\_| .............
........................... '---------'. . . . By STAN & **Family**
.
PS: YO; YE[i] & WE, Art **STUDENTS-FOREVER** of
SOURCE-1 AND i [WE] Never Graduate. SO YO?
-
PEACE,*PAZ,****SHALOM,SALAAM****,MIR,FRIEDAN,AHIMSA,ZINGHYU*
-
Credit: "JJ" .. @ .. [**http://onwapo.com**](http://onwapo.com/)

**POSTED BY: FAITH-ON-SPACE-SHIP-EARTH | JULY 17, 2010 6:52 PM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

The 'terrorists' want to pick a fight and call it a 'holy war.' Just because some Christians are all for the idea doesn't mean we should let those Christians terrorize \*us\* into the same fight.

Call them 'criminals' and 'insane,' ...whatever you want to believe about what's happening, that's the best way to show them for what they are, ...marginalize the terrorists from their own communities, who also don't really want any part of it, but are also not motivated to be the first to 'disarm' when the Fundies over \*here\* are baying for the same 'holy war.'

**POSTED BY: APAGANPLACE | JULY 17, 2010 10:10 AM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

TO ISRAELMEDAD:

I agree with both of your points about one of my two examples of GOOD terrorism, i.e., terrorism leading to democracy.

My thesis was/is that anti-democratic terrorism (1)is BAD terrorism,(2)extensively uses suicide,(3)and should be identified as a movement within Islam (for accurate enemy-identification).

Islamic suicide-terrorism is a movement not only against the West but also against Islam's historic denominations, and Obama should be calling on Muslim leaders as well as non-Muslims to oppose and defeat this movement.

**POSTED BY: ELLIOTTWL | JULY 16, 2010 8:34 PM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

On Menachem Begin, Elliot writes: "[the Irgun] violence discouraged the British from continuing their protectorate."

They were charged with a Mandate to reconstitute the Jewish national home by the League of Nations in 1922. Big difference. This wasn't a matter of British colonialism but a betrayal of international trust.

and also he writes of "(Killing tourism was one aspect of Begin's terrorism. I remember looking out from a huge hole blown into a tourist haven, Jerusalem's King David Hotel.)"

While tourism surely would have been affected byt the attack, it was solely the southern wing of the hotel which was targeted, which had been for the previous seven (7!) years expropriated by the Brisih Mandatory government and the British Army to be used as offices. The section attacked was not a "civilian" target directed against "tourists" as could be inferred.

**POSTED BY: YISRAELMEDAD | JULY 15, 2010 3:38 AM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

Perhaps some Americans are too dumb by half in not differentiating between carpet bombing of whole people and religion, and smart targetting of who are the terrorists who happen to be Muslims.

Perhaps it is not being too clever by half to recognise that Muslims in Muslim majority countries are fighting both the terrorists in their midst who have various causes and agendas, and their oppressive governments too, whose only agenda and cause seem to be their own hold on power and survival, never mind the public good.

American presidents come and go, but terrorism by groups and governments outside the US go on where there are, and are best resolved by the populace.

Obama want to wants "to sever the relationship between Islam and terrorism"? So do I. Severing the relationship between Islam and terrorists is as important as severing the relationship between Islam and odious governments purportedly acting in the name of Islam.

How we see the issue matters. The real "enemy" is willful ignorance on realities of bad governance, bad policies leading to the disaffected, the alienated, the just plain angry taking matters in their own hands to make their points in acts of violence.

This is a war between people of other places and other countries on the sort of governance they want - from Morocco to Algeria to Turkey to Pakistan to Malaysia to Indonesia and every Muslim majority states in between.

**POSTED BY: JIHADIST | JULY 14, 2010 2:51 PM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

How deep does Obama's Muslim rabbit hole go? Find out by scoping his shady past fast free and accurate anytime with the Historyscoper at[**http://historyscoper.com/obamascope.html**](http://historyscoper.com/obamascope.html)

**POSTED BY: TLWINSLOW | JULY 14, 2010 12:38 PM****REPORT OFFENSIVE COMMENT**

"5. While I applaud Obama's desire to "reinvent America's relationship with the Muslim world," his word-manipulation is too clever by half. "We are at war," he says; but he refuses enemy-identification - refuses to face the reality that this is a war of religion - refuses to name the religious party the world, especially the Muslim world, should denounce, resist, and defeat."

War is a collective act. By "we", I assume the president means the USA. That begs the question of who the "other" is and the language change is a bid to erase the other and substitute criminal actions of individuals instead of war.
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