



Terrorist War Mythologies

Charles Lamb once wrote a highly entertaining essay on popular fallacies. The interpretation of terrorist war by the press media of the United Kingdom, the United States, Western Europe and, indeed, of South Africa always favors Islamic and African terrorism. The media has created an insidious body of mythology, the ultimate object of which is to destroy and subvert morale in America and the Christian West. Some salient features identified of that mythology include:

1. That there is no ultimate defense against terrorism.

This is certainly true if there is a climate of opinion among ruling political circles that naturally gravitates towards anarchy and the collapse of civilized government. For one fundamental truth of counter-insurgency warfare must be grasped - **terrorism can never succeed militarily, only psychologically.** That it has succeeded is due primarily to the cult of appeasement and capitulation, which has dominated American and British

foreign policy since the World War II. This cult of appeasement is the Clauswitzian culminating point of two generations of moral exhaustion that followed the World Wars.

Western military machines have hardly ever devised successful means of coping with terrorism. The reasons for this are somewhat complex. The first answer is implicit in the psychological fabric of the political circles ultimately controlling operations. One has the predisposed will to surrender, discussed above. This helplessness of metropolitan European governments in the face of terrorist disruption is not, of course, confined to Britain. As late 20th Century events have shown, the Portuguese will to resist these pressures in Angola and Mozambique were paralyzed by this contagion of a negative political approach for a decade; the leftist military coup d'etat in April 1974, embodied the ultimate triumph of this disease. This psychological depressant activates a technological failure. An arch-military conservatism develops which is embodied in a blind adaptation of European patterns of warfare (in the form of ponderous armor or static heavily fortified garrisons) to jungle terrain and evasive guerrilla tactics. The result is an increasing defeatism on the part of the military, and, ultimately, fatalism. (This was the case with the Portuguese in Mozambique, the French in Indo-China, and the Americans in Vietnam).

In short, an initial political defeatism infiltrates the military arm. Military conservatism, moreover, yields a highly expensive form of warfare, which places an ever-increasing strain upon the metropolitan government's economy, thereby ultimately

yielding to a frame of mind that considers overseas wars as expensive luxuries. This was a major factor precipitating the American withdrawal from Vietnam (and currently in Iraq), compounded by a mood of national defeatism accruing from American military incompetence and the agencies of subversion harbored by the Eastern "liberal" establishment; the most notable subversive agency being the news media.

During the Vietnam War the continual condemnation by conventional army officers of the irregular methods of Special Forces personnel (the "Green Berets") operating in small groups, independent of lines of communication and the chain of command - is symptomatic of the peculiar military blindness by is exhibited by leftist controlled military institutions. The particular American obsession in Vietnam was gross over-reliance upon highly sophisticated air power.

To reiterate, militarily the terrorist can never win. While he can never be totally destroyed (simply because he blends so perfectly into the civilian population), militarily he cannot destroy trained security forces. Terrorist victory comes from the paralysis of the will to resist; a paralysis that results from a defeatism emerging from a totally unimaginative military approach. Major Hoare (whose strategy of highly mobile flying columns in the Congo revealed an imaginative and highly intelligent military grasp of irregular warfare) stated that "African and communist terrorism would have been destroyed long ago by an imaginative and determined approach". The answer lies in the fundamentally false premise of the view that numbers are necessary to contain terrorism.

The deployment of large numbers is disastrous to successful COIN (Counter Insurgency) warfare. The absorption of increasing numbers of military personnel into terrain, which renders conventional warfare impossible, is the strategic objective of the terrorist, as it results in a profound dislocation of economic and political life. Viewed in this light, limited manpower resources are not a key to ultimate defeat, but to ultimate victory, as they necessitate tactical and strategic thought adapted to evasive guerrilla tactics. In American armed forces only US Army Special Forces have the imagination and warrior ruthlessness required to deal with such situations.

2. The problem of terrorism can only be resolved by compromise and negotiation.

The answer to this perverse mythology was succinctly formulated in a speech by Rhodesian Lieutenant General Walls who said, "...the essence of which was that terrorism is not a means to an end (an end which can be negotiated) - but a way of life (or rather anti-life)." The second myth quoted above is continually fostered by the left-wing establishment in the West, which knows full well that compromise with terrorists - the implacable enemies of all civilized government, infused with racial hatred - can only be interpreted as appeasement, inevitably leading to ultimate surrender. After months of "negotiation" and political cant, the end product of negotiations with Islamic imperialism

will be outright surrender by a leftist American regime. (Powerful oil interests prevent the development of more efficient and cheaper synthetic fuel in America and England.)

3. Terrorist war represents a "national war of liberation" or "civil war" against the established government.

Such statements as above can be exposed as total rubbish by pointing out the fact that the terrorist is essentially a criminal (seeking influence and power within a chosen area with the familiar instruments of the criminal - terror and intimidation), and certainly not a soldier. Hostile news media seeks to identify the former with the latter. This is reflected in the willful and glib confusion of the two terms "guerrilla" and "terrorist".

A guerrilla is essentially one who places a strain upon his opponent's conventional forces by a process of attrition - both psychological and physical; this process centering upon demoralizing attacks - particularly upon supplies and lines of communication - while avoiding the classical military configuration. The terrorist's major object of attack is the civilian population within the theater of operations. By a calculated process of intimidation and terror, he seeks to undermine his assailant's authority within a chosen area. His attacks upon his assailant are, admittedly, based upon guerrilla tactics, but this is necessitated by a combination of numerical weakness and physical cowardice. His object of attack, however, is not so much the enemy itself but the prestige of that enemy within the eyes of the civilian population.

It is apparent that the enemy's major assault is not upon the physical forces of America and Britain, but rather upon the moral fibers of both nations. In this battle for the national mind, the terrorist has some formidable allies: some unwitting (e.g. those who see compromise as the ultimate road to security), and some conscious exponents of the terrorist's ideology (the most notable exponent is, of course, the leftist media in both nations). To such agencies of subversion, Cicero is the spiritual counterpart when he stated: "A nation can survive its fools, and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and carries his banners openly. But a traitor moves among those within the gate freely, and his sly whispers rustling through all the alleys are heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears no traitor; he speaks in accents familiar to their victims and wears their face and their garments, and appeals to the baseness which lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soul of the nation; he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared."

Breaker McCoy