

State-Sponsored Terrorism

The Rev. David R. Graham
May 26, 2011

“[The Clinton administration’s] novel theory that a new kind of mega-terrorism had emerged that did not involve states served to sidestep the difficult question of how to respond to state-sponsored terrorism.”

Dr. Laurie Mylroie, *How Little We Know*

http://www.lauriemylroie.com/files/0610_How_Little_We_Know.pdf

Dr. Mylroie’s words lit a light in my mind. The following thoughts, mine, not necessarily Dr. Mylroie’s, tumbled out.

Thought The First

What if there is no such thing as "non-state terrorism," "non-state bad actors?" Wouldn't that mean there is no such thing as "asymmetrical warfare?" That everything going on now is state-on-state?

What if what we're looking at as GWOT is entirely state-sponsored terrorism -- including AQ, KSM, Sadr, "imams," obviously Iran, China, North Korea and Venezuela and the myriad "home-grown, self-organizing terrorists" -- being responded to in dream-motion by state-sponsored push back, and fecklessly at a few tactical functionaries, not at their state sponsors?

Then, what if the extant leader cadre of one of the states fecklessly in dream-motion pushing back against the array of terrorist states (not "rogue states," terrorist/imperialist states) itself adopts a terrorist/imperialist posture against one of that state's long-standing strategic and cultural allies, albeit one long given to espionage against its allies, especially the one whose leader cadre has just turned terror on it?

What if the leader cadre who just turned terror on an ally isn't mentally incompetent, as is being circulated, but terrorist, just like its academic/oligarchic source and supports are? (True, terrorism is a defect, physical mental, and spiritual, but the battlefield is material, not psychological, unless one goes for grounds of impeachment. Anyone propose winning GWOT by submitting tactical perps, including executive, academic and oligarchic actors, to psychoanalysis?) What if that cadre and its supports have turned a cynosure nature/nation into a terror-supporting, terror-sprouting one?

What if that includes said cadre's operations in the realm of finance, such as to un-employ, agitate and starve national populations, including its own, for this goal and that amenable to the cadre and its supports?

What if the key thing not being said in public, actually hidden from view by, say conservatively, three consecutive US Executives, is that all this crap being thrown around all over the world is not being thrown around by "cells" of "individual home-grown terrorists with no connection to terrorism" (and how DO "drug cartels" build submarines?), "shadowy groups," "one-off individuals," angry, deranged Mohammedans and the like, whatever they are, but rather by nation states, quit a few of them, now to include the one reputedly most capable of terrorizing every creature on the planet?

If it's true, the problem is both larger and simpler than "thinkers" and the public have been taking it. If it's true, Americans have been chasing their own tails trying to figure out what went wrong and how to fix it.

What if socialist/"progressive" academics and oligarchs who have been tolerated for decades in the USA, under the rubric of academic freedom, compare with the socialist/Baathist academics and oligarchs of Syria: that is, they are leader cadre of a state sponsoring terrorism? A leader

cadre having no compunction about ordering bullets, bombs and other invasions into opponents domestic and foreign? Is that what's going on?

If it's true, Israel has just been put under threat from a Baathist-like leader cadre that has fledged another terrorist state sponsoring state terrorism: The United States of America.

Thought The Second

Somehow I think we Americans have been chasing our tails, so to speak. We've been going after this discrete irritant and that, metaphorically our own tail, and not seen the large, quite simple picture: that we're under siege by an array of state-sponsored terrorists. Not non-state individuals or non-state groups, not one-offs "having no connection to terrorism." Tactical teams sponsored by nation states. To include AQ and all the rest, and the "imams." Rather of lot of them, actually. All state-sponsored. And we haven't even begun to hear about the Chinese teams.

Now Israel has the leader cadre of a state that cadre newly made terrorist giving her the stink eye. This is new, both the stink eye at Israel and the USA made terrorist state. A Baathist-like regime (secular, shi'ite, sectarian, socialist) has overtaken the USA Executive. French socialism in hip-hop. Will the perversions of the French Revolution never be a stakeholder, in the heart?

There is no such thing as non-state terrorism or non-state bad actors. No a-symmetrical warfare.

Any unpleasantness going down is state-sponsored terrorism with an hegemonistic goal. And this one against Israel by this state is new.

Curious this terrorist regime chose to reveal it now. It's been in their kit bag for decades. I suspect they're vacillating between feeling powerful

and vulnerable and so their actions are abrupt and, while true to deepest intent, impulsive without poise. Time to impeach, before more bodies are molested or loaded with lead. A legal insurrection.

Thought The Third

I would add "jihad," "religious extremism," etc. to the list of things that aren't, that are in fact state-sponsored terrorism in service of some state-denominated hegemonistic goal. Words like jihad, extremism and islamism keep us chasing our tails, so to speak, avoiding sight of the nation states motivating it all. More to the point, avoiding movement against those nation states to stop their destructive assertions.

Sure there is ideology, but it's from state-supported scholars who get paid head count for recruits to the teams states supporting them want to do this or that. And the recruits get jacked up on ideology, no doubt, but as much or more on women, men, girls, boys, sheep, goats, food, money, drugs, weapons, physical conditioning, entrée, yearning for adventure and glory, status, etc.

Look at it in cold sober terms: the requirements of states/regimes intending self-promotion at others' expense vice the resources of private individuals and groups. States need teams of operators not easily traceable to them, at least in the early stages of whatever it is they have in mind to accomplish. Neither individuals nor groups have resources sufficient to field or maintain self-directed teams over time. e.g., AQ. Of course the Pakistanis, Saudis, Haqqanis, Iranians and others were supporting the bastard, and of course they betrayed him when he was of no further use to them.

"Jihad" is good brainwashing but, like all ideologies, it is insufficient to sustain personal, group or national impulses for self-promotion at others' expense. No, the inducements available only to nation-states are

sufficient to sustain activities heretofore myopically ascribed to "terrorist groups."

Every bit of crap we're seeing thrown about is nation on nation. Community of Nations? Bullshit. Congeries of Natives. Does a Baathist-like regime's occupation of the White House derive from foreign national operations, state on state?

"At stake are careers, and the CIA and others past and present who have dealt with terrorism are heavily invested in absolving Iraq for 9/11."

Dr. Laurie Mylroie, *Sarah and Saddam*

<http://spectator.org/archives/2008/09/15/sarah-and-saddam>