

Oct 2005

## Fighting Terrorism: Are We Programmed for Defeat?

Part Two

By George A. Torres, MBA

Part One briefly examined the historical context of terrorism and some related issues. Part two assesses various defensive strategies. Understanding what is at stake and recognizing the nature of the enemy is paramount to developing a defense. Make no mistake that some tactics are controversial and unfortunately, political. The reality is that there are many aspects to this battle. Some are obvious and others are subtle. Of course tactics like profiling as a precursor to identification, intelligence gathering and reasonable searches are more obvious. Subtle issues include attitudes, language, media and politics.

Let's examine the subtle issues first. Attitudes and language promoted by the media and political establishment has a significant influence in combating terrorism. Especially when promoting the legitimacy or righteousness of the cause. The media has been giddy about recent polls that indicate the support for the War on Terror is waning. Is this an accurate assessment? Are Americans tiring of the fight? The answer demonstrates the subtle influence of attitude, language and politics.

Attitude is an important factor in any conflict. For decades the liberal educational and entertainment establishments, along with the media exhibited an effort to program the public to have a negative view of America and U.S. History. Americans are often depicted as imperialist conquerors of weaker societies, which can affect the public's psyche. For example, Hollywood's frequent portrayal of Native Americans as noble warriors fighting the imperialistic U.S. that committed one atrocity after another. Not to say that atrocities did not occur, because they did. But during this period of history both sides committed brutal acts that would meet the definition of terrorism. To instill fear, Indian war parties slaughtered non-combatant frontier settlers and enslaved prisoners. The reality is that each side brutally fought to preserve and promote their way of life, a fact that is seldom depicted.

Consider the way the liberal media reported the war in Viet Nam. The American public was bombarded with negative news and consistent body counts, which resulted in a decline of support for the war. Years later Ho Chi Min admitted they considered surrender after their defeat in the TET offensive in 1968. However, due to the lack of public and political support for the war, created and reported by the U.S. media, they decided to endure the fight until the U.S. gave up. The enemy was victorious because they recognized Americans did not have the will to win. In the War on Terror much of the same is occurring. The liberal press misinforms, rarely reports accomplishments, consistently reports negative news and body counts, and uses language that legitimizes terrorists, all of which result in a waning support for the fight for our survival.

Language can have a major influence on the public attitude. For example, the entrenched concept of "political correctness" is creating a vulnerability that will be difficult to overcome. The philosophy of political correctness is often used as a basis to redefine the 1<sup>st</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> amendments by creating constitutional protections where none exist. The effect this has on the War on Terror is significant in that it makes it more difficult to defend against terrorism and easier for terrorists to plan and execute operations that murder innocent Americans. Security is compromised for absurd reasons, like not offending or hurting one's feelings.

The politicizing of the War on Terror is destructive. Politicians that make statements that are demoralizing for political gain are reprehensible. These comments place Americans at home and abroad at increased risk. For example, consider the statements made by Dick Durbin, D-ILL that falsely accused U.S. soldiers of atrocities at Guantanamo Bay. His

reckless comments were broadcasted on Al-Jazeera and in the days after his comments the bombings increased and more American soldiers and Iraqis were killed than in previous months. When terrorists are given legitimacy by U.S. officials they are further emboldened to fight. Politicizing the war projects divisiveness, a lack of support and a perception of weakness. This invites terrorist attacks on U.S. soil and international interest, which increases the necessity for American citizens, law enforcement and business to be even more vigilant to provide security for individuals and assets.

To provide security and win this war there is a need for good intelligence, a means to recognize and identify the enemy and develop a strategy to neutralize them.

Unfortunately, due to the nature of the enemy, the war will not be fought exclusively by the military on foreign soil. U.S. soil is now a battleground and law enforcement, businesses and corporate America need to be more vigilant and overcome defeatist programming. I am not advocating the dismissal of civil liberties and support adherence to the U.S. Constitution. I support the protections granted by the Constitution, but not those non-existent protections created by jurists with an agenda. What I am advocating is an assessment of all reasonable means for survival. The defense of our nation, our commerce and way of life necessitate the need to train personnel to profile terrorists, use computer technology to “data mine,” gather intelligence, and conduct reasonable searches and proactive, aggressive and effective investigations.