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**Despite Cuba’s denouncement of international terrorism, the State Department renewed Cuba’s placement on the list of “state sponsors of terror.” In reality, the list is nothing more than a political weapon for the State Department to wield against Havana.**

**Bolender 13** (Keith Bolender, University of Toronto School of Continuing Studies on American Foreign Policy and the Cuba Revolution, 5/31/13, The Guardian, “Cuba is hardly a 'state sponsor of terror',” http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/may/31/cuba-us-terror-sponsors-list) JA

While an attentive US audience watched President Obama outline his plan to wind down America's long war on terror last week, **officials in Havana were shaking their heads in bewilderment** and anger **over how** the issue **of terrorism continues to be cynically manipulated against the island nation**. **What raised their ire was the** recent a**nnouncement that** Cuba **would remain on the State Department's** controversial list of states that sponsor terrorism.¶ The long-awaited annual report on international terrorism from the State Department was released Thursday, and confirmed what officials had already indicated – that Cuba is staying on the list along with Iran, Sudan and Syria. State Department spokesman Patrick Ventrell confirmed **the administration "has no current plans to remove Cuba".** The decision came as a disappointment for those who were expecting new Secretary of State John Kerry, a long-time critic of America's counter-productive policy against the Castro government, might recommend Cuba's removal. The fact he hasn't demonstrates how difficult it is to change the dynamics of the antagonistic relationship between these two ideological adversaries.¶ Cuba was originally included on the list in 1982, replacing a then-friendly Iraq. **The** designation levies comprehensive economic punishments **against Havana** **as part of the overall strategy of regime change that includes a** decades-long economic **embargo,** **unrelenting propaganda, extra-territorial application of American laws.¶** For it's part, **Cuba calls its continued inclusion on the list "shameful" and** pandering to a small community of former Cuban citizens who now live in Florida. Cuba also **asserts that the US has** actuallyundertaken actions on the island that have resulted in the deaths of innocent civilians**.¶** An official of the country's foreign relations department, MINREX, who asked to remain anonymous, complained:¶ **"It is ridiculous that the** UnitedStates **continues to include Cuba on an arbitrary list of states that sponsor terrorism, while it is Cuba that has suffered so much from terrorism – originating from the United States."**¶The so-called terrorism against Cuba began shortly after the triumph of the Revolution in 1959. In the early 1960s a covert CIA program known as **Operation Mongoose led to the killing of teachers, farmers, government officials and the destruction of agricultural and non-military industrial targets**. Other incidents involved attacks on villages, **biological terrorism including the introduction of Dengue 2** that **resulted in the deaths of** more than 100 **children** in 1981, and a 1997 bombing campaign against tourist facilities in Havana and Varadero that killed Canadian-Italian tourist Fabio Di Celmo and injured dozens.¶ **The most infamous act of terrorism occurred with the bombing of Cubana Airlines in 1976, killing all 72 on board.** One of the two recognized masterminds, former CIA agent Luis Posada Carriles, has a long history of suspected terrorist activities against his former homeland; at one point bragging to the New York Times of his involvement in the hotel bombings. Posada continues to live a quiet life in Miami, considered a hero among many of the first generation exiles whose anti-revolutionary fervor has yet to diminish. The other architect of the Cubana Airlines bombing, Orlando Bosch, died peacefully in Miami a few years ago. As a result of these terrorist activities, the Cuban government sent intelligence officers to Florida in the 1990s to infiltrate Cuban-American organizations in an effort to thwart further acts. The agents, known as the Cuban Five, were uncovered by the FBI and are serving long prison terms.¶ **While Cuba's status as a state sponsor of terrorism remains unchanged, other countries** that might be considered more deserving, **such as North Korea and** Pakistan, aren't on the list**.** What makes it **all the** more galling for the Castro government **are the arguments** the United States has advanced **to justify Cuba's inclusion** – the most egregious stemming from the charge Cuba was not sufficiently supportive of the US war on terror or the invasion of Iraq, and was unwilling to help track or seize assets allegedly held by terrorists. **A** 2004 **State Department report asserted that "Cuba continued to** actively **oppose the US-**led coalition **prosecuting the global war on terrorism**." **In reality**, the **Cuba**n side **has consistently denounced all forms of terrorism,** includingthe recent BostonMarathon bombings that brought quick condolences from the island leadership.¶ **Other rationales** over the past 30 years to keep Cuba on the list **have ranged from** its support for left-wing rebels in Latin America, **its relationship with the** former **Soviet Union**, treatment of political prisoners and **allowing members from** alleged terrorist organizations such as Columbia's **FARC** **and** Spain's separatist Basque movement **ETA to reside on the island**. **Even when those issues were resolved**, including the dissolution of the Soviet Union more than 20 years ago, **Cuba found its unmerited designation had not changed.¶** One long standing reason, that Havana permits refugees from American justice to find safe haven on the island, was re-invigorated with a ruling that was timed almost perfectly with the announcement that Cuba would not be taken off the terrorist list. **Assata Shakur**, accused of killing a New Jersey state trooper 40 years ago, **was suddenly labeled as** **a** **most wanted terrorist** by the FBI, with a $2m price tag on her head. **Shakur, who fled to Cuba in 1979 and was given political asylum, has consistently maintained her** **innocence.** **Categorizing Shakur as a terrorist could** potentially **endanger her life** from those wanting to collect the bounty, **and has led State Department officials to utilize her** changed **status as justification to keep Cuba on the list.¶ There is no legitimate reason to use the arbitrary terrorism list as a political weapon against Cuba.** **To continue to do so simply exposes the State Department to charges of hypocrisy and manipulation of a serious threat based solely on ideological differences.** Most importantly, it gives insult to all those who have been actual victims of terrorism.

**This designation doesn’t have a policy basis – the designation proves the ARBITRARY and IDEOLOGICAL nature of these justifications, rooted in reflexive HATE instead of any REAL ARGUMENT**

**Kayyem 13** (Juliette Kayyem, Boston Globe Columnist, 4/29/13, Boston Globe, “Diluting the terror watch lists,” http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2013/04/28/making-terror-lists-matter-cuba-not-state-sponsor-terrorism/X2NW0rfYm5A2eJT5VZEuHI/story.html) JA

This week, another terrorism watch list will be announced, known as the state sponsors of terrorism list. It is a formal designation that began in December 1979 and serves as the State Department’s ranking of countries that “repeatedly provide . . . support for acts of international terrorism.” Nations currently on the list include Iran, Sudan, and Syria. It also includes Cuba. Whatever historical complaints or ideological rifts the United States may have with its close neighbor, **Cuba should be off the state sponsor list. It is time to take our terror designations seriously.¶** The state sponsor list is not just name-calling, though **there is an element of shaming in the public condemnation. Countries are subject to strict sanctions, including a ban on arms-related sales, controls over commercial exports, and prohibitions of economic assistance.¶** Cuba seems to be on the list because, as previous State Department assessments have determined, it supports revolutionary movements in Latin America and gives direct support in terms of training and arms to “guerrilla groups” and, note the turn of phrase here, their “terrorist operations.” **Cuba’s support includes safe haven to members of Columbia’s Revolutionary Armed Forces**, known as FARC, **which** has waged an insurgency there but **is now engaged in peace negotiations.¶** **None of this has to do with the United States and its direct safety and security.** Sure, the FARC and other guerrilla groups have destabilized the region, but that has nothing to do with terrorist threats to the United States. ¶ **The state sponsor list is no longer about terrorism.** Pakistan, for example, is not on it. **Domestic politics,** not terror, **explain Cuba’s status as our neighborly pariah**. The continuing isolation of Cuba is inexplicable in modern times.¶ **It is no longer legitimate to** simply **claim that the electoral map** — with a powerful anti-Castro lobby based in Florida — **is a sufficient explanation**, as if only the politically naive would think otherwise. **Even if such** **blatantly political justifications were valid, the Cuban-American community is** actually quite **divided about overtures to a nation whose progress and fiscal security can benefit the entire region.¶** The Boston Globe’s Bryan Bender reported this year that Secretary of State John Kerry was reviewing the policy, hoping to thaw relations with Cuba and make the terrorist state sponsor list be about terrorism. It’s not clear if Kerry’s views will prevail.¶ Today, however, **the necessity to remove Cuba from the list is immediate.** We need to rationalize these terror lists, whether they designate individuals or countries. **The term “state sponsor of terrorism” means nothing if Cuba is on the list:** **It simply says we** kind of **don’t like you and will find any reason to make it hurt.** An over-inclusive list, as we are seeing in the Boston case, can be as damaging as an under-inclusive one.¶ **The Obama administration can make a powerful symbolic statement about Cuba** **and begin a slow thaw that starts with freeing the island nation from the** same **designation** we give to Syria or Iran. **Alone, that is enough.** But the United States can also make a significant safety statement about terrorism generally: States that support those who pose a direct threat to the United States will suffer. Unfortunately, if the United States continues to use one of the most powerful tools in its national security apparatus — a figurative arsenal of sanctions — to treat a nation as a terrorist threat when it is not, we so dilute the term that it matters little to the countries that we hope to isolate.¶ **Cuba is** a lot of things, but it is **not a direct national security challenge to the United States or its citizens.** **If Cuba remains** **on that** exclusive **list** this week, **we will do more damage to ourselves than any Castro brother ever did.¶**

**Cuba’s targeting is not neutral—Its placement on the list is a political tool to preserve united states imperialism. Policy is NOT a field of simulated decisionmaking, but IDEOLOGICAL AFTEREFFECTS**

**Whitney 5/8** (WT Whitney, Jr., staff writer, 5/8/13, Monthly Review, “Reflections on Anti-Cuban Terror,” http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2013/whitney080513.html) JA

Considering that Cuba is quite blameless, refusing to engage in tit-for-tat, one may ask: Why have terror attacks against Cuba continued?¶ One answer is that **the U.S. government**, **as minder of an empire, is serious about its duty to counter revolutionary and anti-imperialist movements** from their earliest stirrings to their takings of power and beyond. **U.S. governments have been dealing with Cuban revolutionaries for almost 150 years**. **In reaction to anti-annexationist**, anti-racist independence **struggles led by Jose Marti** and Antonio Maceo, **the United States ended up invading Cuba. U.S. troops helped beat down an Afro-Cuban uprising in 1912.** Then **in the early 1930s came Cuban student and labor mobilizations**, anti-imperialist in nature -- harbingers of a socialist revolution that took charge in 1959. **Special treatment for Cuba may stem,** in part, **from enmity to an anti-imperialism that never quits.**¶Cuban anti-imperialism is not all U.S. power brokers have to worry about. Despite bashings, Cuba poses the threat of a good example. **The socialist state has ensured long life expectancy**, **low infant mortality, ready access to high quality education, jobs, adequate nutrition and housing, and inculcation of ethical, communitarian values and cultural heritages**. Cubans even weather natural disasters in exemplary fashion. **Cuba's adventures in international solidarity add insult to injury**. **Beleaguered Cuba** contested apartheid **in southern Africa,** cares for **the** sick and injuredthroughout the world**, and educates young people from all over**.¶ And annoyingly **Cuba defends itself against terror in** targeted, **non-violent ways.** **Cuban volunteers moved to Florida to monitor U.S.-based terrorists** so that Cuba could prepare against attacks and maybe prevent them. For their pains, **the Cuban Five**, as they are known, **were subjected to a biased trial and long, cruel sentences.** A worldwide movement is demanding that U.S. President Obama release them.¶ Because the Five targeted violent private organizations operating from bases in Florida, their activities and their trial highlighted the general role of proxy warriors. Use of proxies frees central authorities from having publically to take responsibility for state-sponsored terror campaigns. In effect, the Five helped elucidate similarities among a variety of non-state perpetrators, specifically between private paramilitary groups in Florida and autonomous terrorist groups and individuals elsewhere, even those at war with the United States. That bit of political education may have earned the Cuban Five a good part of their wildly excessive penalties.

Terrorism discourse silences dissent and makes it impossible solve the root cause of terrorism

Jackson 7 (Richard Jackson, “Critical Reﬂections on Counter-Sanctuary Discourse,” 2007, DENIAL OF SANCTUARY:¶ Understanding Terrorist Safe Havens, EDITED BY MICHAEL A. INNES, 30-32) JA

A related problem for the “terrorist sanctuaries” discourse is that it has al- ways been characterized by a certain political bias and selectivity. For example, an analysis of the mainstream terrorism literature during the Cold War demonstrates that terrorism experts regularly identiﬁed Iran, Libya, Cuba, the Soviet Union and many other mainly communist countries as “state sponsors” of “international terrorism,” but failed to include countries like Israel or South Africa—despite the fact that South Africa, for example, not only engaged innumerous acts of terrorism against dissidents in neighbouring states but also sponsored movements like Unita and Renamo who engaged in extensive terrorism. The “terrorist sanctuaries” lit- erature from this period also focused heavily on the assistance provided by states like Libya and Syria to groups like the PLO, but failed to discuss U.S. support for groups like the Afghan Mujahaddin, anti-Castro groups, and the Contras, despite the fact these groups engaged in numerous acts of terrorism, including planting car bombs in markets, kidnappings, civilian massacres, and blowing up civilian airliners.51 Many would argue that from this perspective, the “terrorist sanctuaries” dis- course has functioned ideologically to distract from and deny the long history of the West’s direct involvement in state terrorism and its support and sanctuary for a number of anticommunist terrorist groups. Western involvement in terror- ism has a long but generally ignored history, which includes: the extensive use of ofﬁcial terror by Britain, France, Germany, Portugal, the United States, and other colonial powers in numerous countries throughout the colonial period52; U.S. support and sanctuary for a range of right-wing insurgent groups like the Contras and the Mujahideen during the Cold War53; U.S. tolerance of Irish Re- publican terrorist activity in the United States54; U.S. support for systematic state terror by numerous right-wing regimes across the world, perhaps most notori- ously El Salvador, Chile, Guatemala, Indonesia, and Iran55; British support for Loyalist terrorism in Northern Ireland56 and various other “Islamist” groups in Libya and Bosnia, among others57; Spanish state terror during the “dirty war” against ETA58; French support for terror in Algeria and against Greenpeace in the Rainbow Warrior bombing; Italian sponsorship of right-wing terrorists; and Western support for accommodation with terrorists following the end of several high proﬁle wars59—among many other examples. In short, there is no denying that the discourse has often been used in a highly selective manner to highlight some acts of terror whilst selectively ignoring others. Arguably, this political bias continues today: the Taliban forces in Afghanistan are more often described as terrorists than insurgents, while various warlords, in- cluding General Rashid Dostum, are rarely called terrorists, despite overwhelming evidence of their use of terror and intimidation against civilians.60 This situation is mirrored in Somalia, where the Islamist Al Itihad Al Islamiya group is typically described as a terrorist organization with links to al Qaeda, while U.S.-supported Somali warlords who also use violence against civilians are exempted from the terrorist label.61 Similarly, Cuba remains on the State Department’s list of “state sponsors of terrorism,” but continued U.S. sanctuary and support of anti-Castro terrorists,62 former Latin American state terrorists63 and other assorted Asian anticommunist groups64 is completely ignored. Most glaringly, the state terror of countries like Uzbekistan, Colombia, and Indonesia—and continued tolerance and support for it from the U.S.65—is hardly ever discussed in the mainstream “terrorist sanctuaries” literature. From a discourse analytic perspective, it can further be argued that the “ter- rorist sanctuaries” discourse often functions to promote a set of partisan political projects. For example, the discourse describes an almost inﬁnite number of poten- tial “terrorist sanctuaries” or “havens,” including: all failed, weak, or poor states; the widely accepted list of state sponsors of terrorism; a much longer list of passive state sponsors of terrorism; states with signiﬁcant Muslim populations; Islamic charities and NGOs; informal, unregulated banking and economic systems; the media; the Internet; diasporas in Western countries; groups and regions charac- terized by poverty and unemployment; the criminal world; radical Islamist orga- nizations; mosques and Islamic schools; insurgent and revolutionary movements; and “extremist” ideologies—among others. The identiﬁcation of these groups and domains as “terrorist sanctuaries” or “havens” then functions to permit a range of restrictive and coercive actions against them—all in the name of counterterrorism. The point is that there may be other political reasons for taking action against such groups which the “terrorist sanctuary” label obscures. From this perspective, the “terrorist sanctuaries” discourse can be shown to support a range of discrete political projects and interests, including: limiting ex- pressions of dissent; controlling the media; centralizing executive power; creating a surveillance society; expanding state regulation of social life; retargeting the focus of military force from dissident groups and individuals (which privileges law enforcement) to states (which privileges the powerful military-industrial com- plex); legitimating broader counterinsurgency programmes where the real aims lie in the maintenance of a particular political-economic order66; de-legitimizing all forms of counterhegemonic or revolutionary struggle, thereby functioning as a means of maintaining the liberal international order; and selectively justifying projects of regime change,67 economic sanctions, military base expansion, mil- itary occupation, military assistance for strategic partners, and the isolation of disapproved political movements. In short, the discourse functions—in its present form—to permit the extension of Western state hegemony both internationally and domestically. Ineffectual Policies¶ A ﬁnal criticism of the “terrorist sanctuaries” discourse is that it has proved in its prescriptions to be largely ineffectual and in many cases, counterproductive. In particular, the policy of employing military force against “terrorist sanctuaries” or¶ 32 denial of sanctuary¶ “havens,” a reasonable policy within the conﬁnes of the discourse, actually has an astonishing record of failure. For example, Israel has mounted military strikes and targeted assassination against “terrorist sanctuaries” in the Palestinian territories and surrounding states for over ﬁfty years without any signiﬁcant reduction in the overall level of terrorism. The apartheid regime in South Africa adopted a similarly futile policy against its neighbours during the 1980s. U.S. military strikes on Libya in 1986, Sudan and Afghanistan in 1998, and the use of force in the current War on Terror against Afghanistan and Iraq, have also failed to noticeably reduce the overall number of terrorist attacks against U.S. interests. More broadly, the use of military force against “terrorist sanctuaries” in Colombia, Chechnya, Kashmir, Sri Lanka, the Philippines, Turkey, and elsewhere has in every case failed to appreciably affect the level of antistate terrorist violence. It could be argued that the attempts since September 11 to eliminate “terrorist sanctuaries” in Afghanistan, Iraq, and South Lebanon in particular, have in fact, had the opposite effect. In many respects, these military interventions have so- lidiﬁed and greatly strengthened various Middle Eastern insurgent and “terrorist” groups, reinforced new militant movements and coalitions, provided new regions of conﬂict where dissident groups can gain military experience and greatly in- creased overall levels of anti-Western sentiment across the region.68 It is probable that the price of these policies will be many more years of insurgency in Iraq and Afghanistan, and an ongoing international terrorist campaign against U.S. inter- ests and its allies. The main problem of course, is that the discourse focuses on the symptoms and enablers of dissident terrorism, rather than its underlying drivers and poses a palliative remedy rather than a curative one. From this viewpoint, it is actually an impediment to dealing with terrorism because it functions as a closed system of discourse, preventing discussion of the political grievances which cause individuals and groups to seek out places of sanctuary from where they can launch attacks in the ﬁrst place.¶ CONCLUSION¶ There is a need for researchers and public ofﬁcials to be far more reﬂective and critical of the language they employ and the “knowledge” they produce, because discourse and knowledge is never neutral; it always works for someone and for something. In this case, the language and knowledge of the “terrorism sanctuaries” discourse frequently works to maintain the hegemony of certain powerful states and a particular international order which is beneﬁcial to a few, but violent and unjust to many more. It also works to obscure the much greater violence and suffering caused by current Western counterterrorism policies(which have cost the lives of well over 40,000 civilians69 and caused incalculable material destruction since September 11, 2001), the double standards and selectivity of Western approaches to terrorism and the ongoing problem of civilian-directed state terror.

#### By portraying the terrorist as a foreign other fundamentally opposed to pristine Western ideals, the United States rationalizes PERMANENT GENOCIDAL VIOLENCE

Grosscup 00 (Beau Grosscup, professor of international relations at Cal State Chico, “Terrorism-at-a-Distance: The Imagery That Serves US Power,” GLOBAL DIALOGUE Volume 2 Number 4 Autumn 2000—Terrorism: Image and Reality) JA

For nearly two centuries the rationalisation system of American foreign policy was based on the moral constructs of American benevolence and the “uniqueness” of the American social and political experiment. From the late 1960s, a politicised image of terrorism was added to that system. The product of a closed system of discourse dominated by researchers and security analysts with close ties to government and private institutions—labelled the “terrorism industry” by Edward Herman and Gerry O’Sullivan—this image encourages Americans to view terrorism as the most dastardly of evil deeds. More to the point, it portrays the terrorist as “an enemy of the Western establishment, somebody who stands in the way of the realization of Western aims”.1¶ ¶ This jingoistic imagery has been highly effective in rallying public support for US foreign policy for nearly three decades.2 Initially, American policy makers took advantage of terrorism’s pejorative connotations to undermine public support for various anti-colonial nationalist movements by linking them, and them alone, to the terrorist label. The Palestine Liberation Organisation in the Middle East, the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland, the National Liberation Front in Vietnam, the African National Congress in South Africa and Namibia’s South West African People’s Organisation were all affected by this effort. In the 1980s, the Reagan administration and its terrorism industry experts insisted that anyone opposed to Western, in particular American, interests was a Soviet-sponsored terrorist. Restricted to this jingoistic analysis, Americans rallied behind the administration’s revitalised Cold War agenda against an evil Soviet empire and its international terrorist network.¶ ¶ The same is true in the post–Cold War era. Terrorism industry experts, who continue to monopolise the terrorism discourse, argue that rogue state, Islamic, narco and “ad hoc” terrorism are central components of a New World “Disorder” threatening the American way of life. Their efforts have not been in vain. During the Persian Gulf War, linking Saddam Hussein to anti-American terrorism heightened American support for the slaughter of Iraqi military and civilians, much as linking Manuel Noriega with narco-terrorism rallied public support for the illegal invasion of Panama in 1989. Terrorism imagery also produced public acquiescence in American military interventions in Somalia and Haiti, interventions which were presented as “humanitarian” missions. In the mid-1990s, revitalised images of Iranian-backed Islamic terrorism dominated foreign policy discussions of the threats to American initiatives in the Middle East and beyond. By the end of the 1990s, the evil terrorism of Osama bin Laden and Slobodan Milosevic provided rationales for the “humanitarian” use of American air power.¶ ¶ Essential to the success of the jingoistic concept of terrorism is a carefully constructed imagery labelled here “terrorism-at-a-distance”. Two assertions combine to produce this imagery. The first contends that terrorism occurs “over there”, that it is a product of foreign cultures and a sinister act of foreign adversaries whose treachery victimises Americans who live in or travel to far-off lands. The second, reinforcing the first, is the warning that although Americans have been spared the horrors of contemporary terrorism at home, our luck is running out, our day is coming. It is only a matter of time before America’s global pursuit of freedom and democracy and its open society make enemies of foreign terrorists and draw them to the United States, both as a land of exile and as a potential target of terrorist actions. Thus, unless preventative foreign and domestic policy measures are taken, the stage is set for the “victimisation” of America.¶ The Foreign-Policy Factor¶ Richard Falk argues that the concept of terrorism has been useful in sanitising US foreign policy: “This process is aided by locating ‘terrorism’ in the foreign other, a process that can build on the racist convenience of non-Western challenges.”3¶ ¶ Locating terrorism in the “foreign other” has been a consistent theme of American “expert” analysis of contemporary terrorism. In its Cold War construction, terrorism was the work of the Soviet Union, both in its own actions (Afghanistan) and via its control and/or sponsorship of foreign states, namely Cuba, Libya, Syria, East Germany, North Korea, Nicaragua and Iran. The Soviets were said to be behind the non-state terrorism of the PLO, the Baader–Meinhof gang, the IRA, ANC, Swapo and individuals such as Carlos, Abu Nidal and Mehmet Ali Agca.¶ ¶ Despite the demise of the Soviet Union, terrorism has not disappeared, and the terrorism-at-a-distance thesis continues to underlie American analysis. State-sponsored terrorism is now the work of foreign “rogue” states (retitled “states of concern” by the Clinton administration in June 2000), namely Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Syria and North Korea. The centre of the international terrorist network, allegedly headquartered in Moscow during the Cold War, is said to have moved three times, initially to Baghdad in August 1990, then after the Persian Gulf War to Tehran. In August 1998, President Clinton informed the world that under Osama bin Laden, the international terrorist network was now headquartered in the rugged mountains of Afghanistan.¶ ¶ Non-state terrorism is described as multifaceted, complex and foreign-based. Among its agents are leftist groups newly orphaned by the demise of their Soviet parent. In the post–Cold War climate they frantically search the political landscape for foster parents to supply them with the materials of terrorism. Even more dangerous to the American-led new world order are the dual foreign threats of Islamic terrorism and narco-terrorism. Islam is portrayed as a monolithic menace and a universal threat to Western civilisation in general and to the United States in particular. This contemporary consensus about Islam is built upon historical images of “Islamic militancy”, of an “Islamic mentality”, of “Islamic fundamentalism” or “the Shi’a penchant for martyrdom”, all of which helped provoke the fervently hostile Western response to the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis. Commenting on the media coverage of that crisis, Edward Said writes:¶ ¶ We were back to the old basics. Iranians were reduced to “fundamentalist screwballs” by Bob Ingle in the Atlanta Constitution, Claire Sterling in the Washington Post argued that the Iran story was an aspect of “Fright Decade I” while Bill Green on the same pages of theWashington Post wrote of the “Iranian obscenity” aimed directly at the heart of American nationalism and self-esteem.4¶ ¶ In the 1990s, the Persian Gulf War against Iraq, the New York World Trade Center bombing, the Hamas–Hizbollah challenge to the US-sponsored Middle East peace process, and the terrorism tied to Osama bin Laden and his “fundamentalist” colleagues have re-ignited the fires of anti-Islamic sentiment in the United States.¶ New Forms of Terrorism¶ A by-product of the Cold War, narco-terrorism, too, has survived the end of the Soviet Union. According to terrorism industry experts, its growing presence is connected to central features of the emerging political order. First, with the loss of Soviet support, the modern terrorist, in need of financial resources, seeks to gain huge profits from illegal activities. How else, American terrorism experts ask, but through the sale of drugs could terrorists afford the costly weapons of mass destruction they ardently desire? Second, the politically constructed image of the lawless rogue state directly supports former Secretary of State George Shultz’s claim that “drug trafficking requires an environment of lawlessness and corruption to enhance the production and marketing of illicit drugs”. Conversely, the insidious imagery of narco-terrorism exaggerates the nature of the threat, providing the American architects of the new world order with the pretext for intervention in the affairs of the designated “rogue regimes” in direct violation of the right to national sovereignty. Although the United States is the major market for “insidious drugs”, the plague of narco-terrorism is located exclusively in the foreign “other”. Its origins are found either in the Islamic “fundamentalist” regimes of Iran, Iraq and Libya, or in the drug cartels of South America, Asia and the Middle East.¶ ¶ In August 1995, terrorism industry experts discovered a new form of foreign-instigated terrorism threatening America and its friends. In this “decentralised” or “ad hoc” model, specialist guerrillas are brought together to commit a specific terrorist act and then quickly returned to their country of refuge. The new modus operandi is allegedly followed by Muslim extremist groups and possibly by those who bombed the World Trade Center. It is a new operational design in which there are no clear patterns, associations or the traditional cell structure used by terrorist organisations in the past. “Ad hoc” terrorism is difficult to counter and even to analyse as it involves general guidelines coming from religious leaders, rather than precise commands. Terrorism industry experts say the new model has probably been seen in Argentina, the United Kingdom, Egypt, France, Algeria and Israel.¶ American Jingoism¶ Firmly established in Cold War and post–Cold War constructs, the imagery of terrorism-at-a-distance serves the US national security establishment by reinforcing American ethnocentricity and jingoism. First, insisting that terrorism is the dastardly deed of foreigners strengthens the high moral opinion American citizens hold of themselves, their society and their benevolent role in the world. Armed with this view and believing US foreign policy to occupy the firmest of moral ground, Americans see their nation’s adventures abroad as beyond reproach, deserving support with vigour and righteous indignation. In this bipartisan, jingoistic climate, the assessments of foreign policy analysts, particularly terrorism experts, are held in high esteem as “moral truths” and as making “moral sense”.¶ ¶ Typical of these “moral truths” is a distinction made by revered terrorism expert Brian Jenkins. Jenkins argues it is morally defensible to drop American bombs on Iraqi cities from twenty thousand feet, or to lob sixteen-inch shells for six months into Druse and Shi’ite towns in Lebanon from the battleship New Jersey. Yet the suicidal car bomb terrorist who killed 241 marines in Beirut committed a cowardly and morally indefensible deed. Typical also was the climate of official and public moral outrage evident in February 1996 when Cuba shot down two private planes belonging to “Brothers to the Rescue”, a Cuban-American anti-Castro organisation. Despite diplomatic objections by the Cuban government, the group’s planes had been violating Cuban airspace and dropping anti-communist leaflets over Havana for nearly a year. Yet for most Americans, Cuba’s status as a state sponsor of terrorism (a US State Department designation) and the alleged innocence of the “humanitarian” Brothers to the Rescue overrode Cuba’s claims to sovereignty and national self-determination. As a result, the crimes of the Brothers were sanitised, while the intensified US embargo and the UN censure of Cuba captured the moral high ground.¶ ¶ Second, the imagery of terrorism-at-a-distance connects with American views about foreigners, the inferiority of their culture and the danger they pose to the American way of life. The construction of a heightened “foreign threat” to Americans at home and abroad permits US policy makers to pursue means and measures that would otherwise be highly controversial with the full approval of most Americans. “We need to hit them before they hit us” was the battle cry that allowed the Reagan administration’s false accusations of Libyan hit squads and a Libyan terror network operating from Tripoli to escape close public scrutiny. In 1986 the high-pitched rhetoric began to pay off. According to Gallup polls, the 14 April 1986 US bombing of Libyan cities garnered 77 per cent public approval ratings. Eighty per cent of Americans surveyed wanted more strikes on Libya and 64 per cent favoured bombing raids on Iran and Syria, even though a vast majority doubted that such strikes would have any effect on curbing terrorism.¶ ¶ Likewise, public opinion polls taken in the wake of the “accidental” downing in 1988 by the US warship Vincennes of an Iranian civilian airliner with 290 people on board found little American sympathy for the Iranian victims and their families. Sixty-one per cent opposed any US compensation for the victims’ families. Seventy-four per cent in a Washington Post–ABC poll and 86 per cent in a Los Angeles Times poll blamed Iran for the tragedy.¶ ¶ In the 1993 New York World Trade Center bombing, the major media operated exclusively with the terrorism-at-a-distance thesis. In a Time article entitled “Tower Terror”, Richard Lacayo said the bombing raised “the specter of terrorism in America ... terrorism seemed like something that happened somewhere else—and somewhere else a safe distance over the horizon”. Cover stories in both Time and Newsweek, while acknowledging they had no evidence for their speculations, immediately attributed the bombing to foreign enemies ranging from Bosnian combatants to Russian nationalists. Also credited with ending American innocence and “raising the specter of terrorism in America—hitting us at home” were the usual suspects: Muammar Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein, Ahmed Jabril, Abu Nidal, Hamas and the Palestinians. Yet the World Trade Center bombing and the media hyperbole failed to separate Americans from their belief that terrorism in the United States was a rare event. Gallup polling found only 12 per cent of surveyed Americans admitting to a personal sense of danger from terrorist acts in their workplace or home, down from 19 per cent at the end of the 1991 Gulf War. In short, despite a foreign bombing on American soil, all aspects of the terrorism-at-a-distance thesis remained intact.¶ ¶ For the Clinton administration, the World Trade Center bombing provided ample opportunity to strengthen the terrorism-at-a-distance imagery as well as instigate new counter-terrorist measures against foreigners, in particular those opposed to American foreign policy initiatives. Acting on his assertion that “grave acts of violence committed by foreign terrorists are disrupting the Middle East peace process”, President Clinton, via executive order, barred US citizens from donating anything, including humanitarian aid, to twelve “terrorist” groups (ten of them Palestinian and two Israeli). In April 1996, Clinton signed new counter-terrorism legislation permitting the deportation of aliens “suspected” of terrorism and authorising the president to designate any foreign group and its US branches as “terrorist”. No court review of the presidential decision is possible. According to civil liberties experts, these draconian measures aimed at foreign individuals, groups and their American supporters are unconstitutional and threaten the civil liberties of all Americans. Yet these serious charges found no voice in government policy circles or public forums. Indeed, the lack of public debate on these measures provides further evidence that the American political conscience remains captive to the imagery of terrorism-at-a-distance, in particular to the notion that foreign terrorism and its agents must be halted by whatever means are necessary before they again reach American soil.¶ The Evils of Counter-Terrorism¶ Finally, government and media presentation of the imagery of distance permits Americans to disassociate themselves from the horrors perpetrated on foreign peoples in the name of “counter-terrorism”. The actions taken on their behalf are not part of their immediate world. It is happening “over there”, as in the Israeli terrorism in southern Lebanon or American-sponsored “counter-terrorism” in East Timor, Central America, Iraq and southern Africa. It happens to “those who deserve it”, as then Secretary of State Alexander Haig said after the 1980 rape–murder of four American nuns in El Salvador. The same sentiment is explicit in Secretary of State Madeline Albright’s emphatic “yes” when asked if the suffering and deaths inflicted on the Iraqi civilian population by US-imposed sanctions and bombings were “worth it”.¶ ¶ Similar attitudes explain the lack of interest of an American populace, conditioned to equate Palestinians with terrorists, in Israeli Baruch Goldstein’s 1994 massacre of twenty-nine worshippers in a Hebron mosque. More recent evidence of American support for “counter-terrorist” violence against foreigners is found in the response to the Clinton administration’s missile attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan in August 1998. The strikes were enthusiastically supported even though the American public was divided as to whether they would actually reduce terrorism against the United States. An ABC News poll indicated an 80 per cent overall approval rating in favour of the strikes. Of those who thought the strikes would reduce terrorism, 98 per cent were in favour. But even of those who thought the strikes would increase terrorism, 68 per cent still approved of them. A USA Today/CNN/ Gallup poll found a 76 per cent approval rating for further missile attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan.¶ ¶ The legacy of the terrorism-at-a-distance mindset and propaganda is evident in public silence or vigorous approval of an “anything goes” approach to fighting terrorism. If American “counter-terrorism” actions violate Italian airspace in 1986 and Panama’s territorial integrity in 1989, and thus international law, so be it. The United States must take action since no one else can be trusted to do what is required. If training Nicaraguan anti-Sandinista (Contra) forces on American soil violates US neutrality laws, if mining Nicaraguan ports violates the principle of territorial sovereignty, that is regrettable, but extraordinary times require extraordinary measures. If selling landmines to Unita rebels in war-ravaged Angola, a country with the highest per capita rate of limb amputations among children, runs counter to concepts of human decency, that is unfortunate. In the battle for freedom, first priority must be given to America’s allies, even if it means in the Angolan case supplying instruments of human carnage to overthrow a UN-brokered peace or in Indochina supporting Pol Pot, the architect of the Cambodian killing fields. Fighting fire with fire, using terrorism to counter terrorism, is both moral and effective, the terrorism experts insist. Today, a large majority of Americans, with their moral righteousness on public display, agree that in fighting terrorism the end justifies the means. What matters is that American rights and interests are protected by keeping terrorism at a distance.¶

**Specifically, the United States supports acts of terrorism against the Cuban people. The LIST obfuscates how terrorism is a weapon of the STATE, not just ANTI-STATE formations**

**Bolender 13** (Keith Bolender, University of Toronto School of Continuing Studies on American Foreign Policy and the Cuba Revolution. , 4/22/13, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “THE TERRORIST LIST, AND TERRORISM AS PRACTICED AGAINST CUBA,” http://www.coha.org/22355/) JA

On an emotional level, **Havana has long drawn attention to the double standard that permits Washington to label others as a terrorist state**, all the while **ignoring its own culpability in the multiple acts of terror that have been responsible for the deaths of thousands of innocent Cuban civilians.** This relatively unreported history stretches back to the early months following Castro’s victory over the Batista regime, when the United States was determined to eliminate the Cuban revolution not only through economic and political means, but with violence. **Operation Mongoose**, a program developed by the State Department under the overarching Cuba Project**, coordinated terrorist operations** from the period following **the** failed **Bay of Pigs** invasion in April 1961 **to the** October **missile crisis** 18 months later. During this time **State Department officials provided logistical and material support to violent anti-revolutionary groups carrying out terrorist activities on the island.** **The terrors included torturing and murdering students who were teaching farmers to read and write, blowing up shoppers at Havana’s busiest department stores, bombing sugar cane plantations and tobacco fields, killing Cuban fishermen and the innumerable attempts to assassinate Fidel Castro and other top government officials.** [3] Historian Arthur Schlesinger reported in his biography of Robert Kennedy that Operation Mongoose was formulated under the Kennedy administration to bring “the terrors of the earth” to the Cuban people. [4] It has been called one of the worst cases of state sponsored terrorism of the 20th century. [5] When Operation Mongoose ended, violent anti-Castro groups based in South Florida, such as Alpha 66 and Omega 7, took over operations, often with the tacit approval and knowledge of local and federal authorities. **In 1971, the village of Boca De Samá on the northeast coast of Cuba was attacked, leaving two civilians dead** and a dozen more injured. Alpha 66 continues to claim credit for this act of terrorism on their website. [6] A series of **biological agents were purportedly introduced into Cuba in the 1970s,** harming a number of plants and animals. T**hese biological attacks included an outbreak of swine fever that killed a half-million pigs.** Perhaps **the worst case was the 1981 epidemic of Dengue 2**, totally unheard of in Cuba prior to this period. **More than 300,000 people were affected within a six-month period.** An estimated **102 children died** as a result of the disease. Cuban-American Eduardo Arocena, former member of Omega 7, testified in 1984 that he travelled to Cuba in 1980 to “introduce some germs” into the country to “start the chemical war,” —as reported by The New York Times. [7] One of them was Dengue 2.¶ **Havana and Varadero tourist facilities were targeted during a 1997 bombing campaign**, resulting in the death of Italian-Canadian businessman Fabio di Celmo when a bomb exploded in the lobby of the Hotel Copacabana. **Dozens were injured** before the explosions ended with the arrests of a group of Salvadorians who later testified they were being paid to plant the bombs. Claiming responsibility for the campaign was Luis Posada Carriles, a Cuban-American long known for his violent actions against the Castro regime. He bragged to a The New York Times reporter that the intent of the bombings was to discourage tourists from visiting the island just as Cuba was opening up the industry following the collapse of the Soviet Union. [8]¶ In addition to the tourist attacks, **former CIA agent, Posada Carriles, is infamously known for his alleged masterminding of the bombing of Cubana Airlines flight 455 in October 1976, killing all 73 on board. The incident remains the second worst act of air terrorism in the Americas, exceeded only by the attacks on 9/11.** Evidence points to the involvement of Posada Carriles and fellow Cuban Orlando Bosch with organizing the crime, based on extensive U.S. documentation. [9] Bosch passed away in his Florida residence a few years ago, while Posada **Carriles continues to live unfettered in Miami**, **despite requests for his extradition from the Cuban and Venezuelan governments**. Cuba’s demands for Posada Carriles to be brought to justice in part rest on former President George Bush Jr.’s own statement in 2003, “Any person, organization, or government that supports, protects, or harbors terrorists is complicit in the murder of the innocent, and equally guilty of terrorist crimes.” [10] **The Cuban government was motivated by such acts of terrorism to send intelligence officers to Florida to infiltrate violent anti-revolutionary organizations. The effort led to the arrest and conviction of five Cuban nationals in 1998 on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage**. **Known as the Cuban Five, the release of these agents**, who were attempting to prevent further terrorist attacks on their country, **continues to be a high priority with Havana** and adds another layer of complexity to rapprochement between the two countries. Those close to the Cuban Five episode have always been troubled by the probity of the whole affair and whether the entire trial was fixed by U.S. legal authorities as well as intelligence officials.

**This violence against the Cuban people is obscured by a moral framework that privileges “national security” over the lives of those designated the enemy. By scapegoating the Cuban people, the government can justify these killings under a framework of consequentialism**

**Kauzlarich et al 1** (DAVID KAUZLARICH, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville;¶ RICK A. MATTHEWS, Ohio University; WILLIAM J. MILLER, Carthage College; Critical Criminology 10: 173–194, 2001. “TOWARD A VICTIMOLOGY OF STATE CRIME,” http://jthomasniu.org/class/781/Assigs/kauzvictimology.pdf)

Propositions about the victimology of state crime can be developed from this¶ review to help shed light on the larger phenomenon of state crime victimization, although a caveat is in order **because state crime takes a variety of¶ forms.** For instance, **it is difﬁcult to compare the victimology of** international¶ economic **terrorism against the people of Cuba** and Iraq **to institutionalized¶ racism, sexism, and classism,** or the suffering of human radiation subjects **to¶ unjust criminal justice system practices. Nevertheless**, several **general propositions about the victims of state crime may be formulated** based on current and¶ prior research in the area.¶ **(1) Victims of State Crime Tend to be among the Least Socially Powerful¶ Actors¶** Even a cursory examination of state crime reveals large power differences¶ between the victim and victimizer. **The authority of the state extends** well¶ **beyond crude asymmetries in the ability to control others, and constitutional¶** and due process **protections also vary relative to the power of subjects.¶ State** ofﬁcers, agencies, and **organizations** often exploit scarce resources to¶ **advance larger agendas through the use of specialized terminology**, scientiﬁc¶ knowledge, and information technology. Clearly **the victims of the human¶ radiation experiments**, those harmed by **environmental degradation**, atomic¶ and **nuclear weapons tests, and the COINTELPRO, did not have the resources¶ to marshal commensurate** levels of technological, terminological, or **scientiﬁc¶ expertise.** **The state** also **has the ability to conceal illegalities** and immoralities¶ **by privileging concerns about “national security” over** humane, fair, and **due**¶ **processes**. In the case of those victimized by criminal justice and the prison experiments, one senses a great deal of dehumanization and ideology, which¶ allows unjust practices and policies to ﬂourish.¶ Victims of other state crimes – such as civilians in war, people targeted for¶ genocide, workers, and the homeless – also have less social power than state¶ agencies and ofﬁcials. **Scapegoating**, stereotyping, **proﬁling, and typifying¶ people** belonging to these groups **is far easier for the state because of broad¶ asymmetries in power.** It is therefore not surprising that **galvanizing support¶ for unethical and illegal practices** and policies **against these groups is not¶ difﬁcult for the state.** As a result, the likelihood of the legitimation of a crisis¶ or substantial social protest movements is diminished. **It also militates against¶ conceptualizing unjust state actions as crime. One can see evidence of this**¶ process at work in the cases of economic and domestic terrorism and the¶ support of terrorism abroad.¶ More broadly, **there seems to be a positive relationship between the¶ unequal distribution of power and the level and frequency of state crime**, both¶ domestically and internationally. Clearly, social power is unevenly distributed among states as well, providing further opportunities for state crime.¶ **The United States has more control over the deﬁnition, enforcement, and¶ prosecution of state crime than most countries**. The World Court, **the U**nited**¶ N**ations’ Security Council, the World Bank, **and the** **I**nternational **M**onetary¶ **F**und are likely to **support U.S. interests**. With few exceptions, peripheral and¶ semi-peripheral states are less likely to have any victimization by the U.S.¶ acknowledged and redressed. There is a direct link between U.S. supported¶ and enforced sanctions against Iraq and the death of innocent Iraqi children¶ because of starvation. **Sanctions against the Cuban people have** also **resulted¶ in** social and **physical harms.¶ Authority-subject relationships** (Turk 1969) in an international context¶ help **explain how these harms are marginalized in** popular **U.S. discourses:¶ The claims-making** and legitimation exercises **of the authority** (the U.S. state)¶ **are seldom met with organized opposition by subjects**. **If there is a sizeable movement against U.S. policy and practice, citizens might either be¶ unaware of its existence or may perceive opposition as the work of radicals¶ disconnected with reality** (Iraqi politicians, Castro, prisoners’ rights, welfare¶ rights, and anti-nuclear weapons groups). **Social harms and higher immoralities might** therefore **be overlooked, or** even worse, **supported because of¶ the apparent lack of overt conﬂict over the policy or practice**. **This makes it**¶ **appear as though the harms are actually necessary, fair, and consensus-based.**¶U.S. public support of the Gulf War is most illustrative of this point. (2) Victimizers Generally Fail to Recognize and Understand the Nature,¶ Extent, and Harmfulness of Institutional Policies. If Suffering and Harm¶ are Acknowledged, It Is often Neutralized within the Context of a Sense¶ of “Entitlement”¶ **The most important difference between victimizers and their victims is the¶ power to exert their will.** **Victimizers** often **do not acknowledge the degree**¶ **to which their policies have caused harm while assessing the effectiveness of**¶ **their policies to bring about desired change, maintain hegemony, or promote**¶ **other forms of dominance.** Unjust and **deleterious** domestic **and international policies can** **also be downplayed** by neutralizing reasonable categorical¶ imperatives (e.g. do no harm) **by employing bankrupt consequentialism,**¶ perhaps **guided by ethnocentric paternalism**. Following Sykes and Matza¶ (1957), others have found evidence of this at work in the wider problem¶ of elite deviance. **Denying responsibility, dehumanizing the powerless for**¶ purposes of **exploitation, and appealing to** higher loyalties (i.e. the capitalist¶ political economy and **national security**) **are** often **employed in the victimology of state crime.** Specialized vocabularies may also be used to aide in the¶ dehumanization.¶ Tifft and Markham (1991) have noted that **the way** **policy makers¶ neutralize the destructive** and harmful **effects of their policies is similar to the¶ manner batterers view their victims.** Noting the long history of U.S. abuses in¶ Latin and Central America, they argue that:¶ **U.S. policy makers have consciously decided (1) that the U.S. is entitled¶ to control Central America and that the peoples of Central America are¶ obligated to acquiesce in this power exercise**; **(2)** **that violence is permissible, and policy makers can** live with themselves and **conclude that they¶ are ethical**/moral **persons and that these policies are ethica**l/moral **even if¶ they involve violence; (3)** **that the use of violence**, intimidation, **and threat¶ of violence will produce the desired effect or minimize a more negative¶ one;** **and (4) that the policy of violence and control will not unduly¶ endanger the United States,** **and the country will neither** **sustain** **physical harm nor suffer** legal, economic, or political **consequences that will**¶ **outweigh the beneﬁts** achieved through this violence (Tifft and Markham¶ 1991: 125–126).¶ Similarly, Cohen (1996) has documented how governments construct ofﬁ-¶ cial responses to allegations of human rights violations. Cohen (1996: 522)¶ contends that the forms of denial on the part of governmental ofﬁcials to such¶ allegations typically include one of the following: “a literal denial (nothing¶ happened); interpretive denial (what happened is really something else); and¶ implicatory denial (what happened is justiﬁed).” At the domestic level, **few policy** makers have **recognized that the** cumulative **effects of the policies supportive of institutionalized racism and structural inequality have caused considerable harm to various minority groups¶ and women**. Often times, **the victims are viewed as undeserving** or unworthy¶ **of** the social, **political, or economic rights** bestowed to others.¶ (3) Victims of State Crime are often Blamed for Their Suffering¶ **Victim blaming is unfortunately a common reaction to those most wounded¶ by state crime**. The poor, minorities, the homeless, and women become targets¶ of criticism because of the false belief in the ease of achieving vertical intergenerational mobility in the U.S., even in the face of overwhelming structural¶ odds. Prisoners and **those accused of crimes are less likely to be treated¶ sympathetically because their assigned master status solipsistically leads to¶ a marginalization of their human worth, morality, and potential.** Subjects in¶ the prisoner experiments were viewed as less deserving of informed consent¶ at best and expendable at worst.¶ **Harms caused by economic terrorism** and the support of anti-democratic¶ governments **can be neutralized by popular audiences (and victimizers) as¶ a part of the United States’ interests in national security or the previously¶ mentioned technique of neutralization,** “appealing to higher loyalties.” **The¶ harms caused by sanctions in Cuba** and Iraq **are good examples because,¶** while they are easy to see, **there is a tendency to assume victim responsibility on the part of citizens because they have not waged successful civil¶ insurrections against their oppressors.¶** (4) Victims of State Crime Must Generally Rely on the Victimizer, an¶ Associated Institution, or Civil Social Movements for Redress¶ Theoretically, the U.S. criminal justice system carries out the criminalization¶ process in the name of the state, not the particular victim. The “people”¶ are identiﬁed as the abstracted victim. What happens, however, when “the¶ people” or a group of peoples are victimized by the body who holds dominion¶ over them and the law? What institutionalized justice process is available to¶ the victim?¶ Often times, as in the case of the prisoner and plutonium experiments,¶ and some instances of racial and gender discrimination, reparations may¶ come about in civil court, and often involve the efforts of special interest¶ groups, people in social movements, and of course private attorneys. In other¶ cases, appeal may be made to the United Nations Human Rights Committee,¶ through the United Nations General Assembly, or the International Court¶ of Justice. The opportunities for international redress of domestic victimi- zation, to some extent, depend on the primary state’s membership status.¶ For example, the United States did not ratify the Genocide Convention for¶ decades because it sought to limit “foreign intrusion” into what were deﬁned¶ as domestic affairs. Citizens victimized in countries with tenuous or marginal¶ standing in the international community as it pertains to human rights may¶ therefore ﬁnd little in the way of assistance.¶ The most potentially dangerous act that could ever by undertaken by a¶ state, the use of nuclear weapons, has recently been criminalized through this¶ latter avenue. Six billion people still live under the nuclear threat, but at least¶ one organization of legitimate authority, the World Court, has conceptualized¶ the entire world population as potential victims of state crime by declaring¶ the use and threat to use nuclear weapons illegal under international law¶ (see Kramer and Kauzlarich 1999). More often than not, however, **international organizations like the U.N. have been slow to** enforce existing laws or¶ to **punish nation-states that are powerful.** For example, **each year, the U.N.¶ General Assembly has voted to condemn the U.S. embargo on Cuba, but no¶ ofﬁcial action has been taken by the U.N. to end it**. In short, **there is little¶ hope of formal intervention** **on the part of the international community when¶ the offending state is** powerful like **the U.S.** On another level, U**.S. opposition¶ to international agreements because of the** state’s **fear of the loss of sovereignty** (no matter how slight) **also thwart** the **materializing** of **democratic** and¶ restorative **justice.**¶ In any case, the process of helping victims or even ending the victimization of state crime is very different than in cases of traditional or white-collar¶ crime. This stems from problems related to the identiﬁcation of the actors,¶ organizations, and institutional forces responsible for state crime, if the¶ policy, actions, or omissions are even recognized as unethical, harmful,¶ criminal, or worthy of resistance.¶ (5) Victims of State Crime Are Easy Targets for Repeated Victimization¶ **The manner in which victims of state crime are harmed may change over¶ time; however, the harm incurred** by most victims of state crime does not¶ decrease – rather it **merely takes another form**. Additionally, **some victims are¶ continually victimized by the same organization.** Examples include women,¶ minorities, the poor, workers, and those living in less developed countries,¶ in much the same manner as some victims of traditional street crime (e.g.,¶ domestic violence and child abuse) who are targeted for repeat victimization.¶ In the cases of the poor, **there have been few genuine attempts to alleviate¶ the structural conditions that create abject poverty** (Bohm 1993). Women have¶ faced institutional sexism and the “glass ceiling” in spite of superﬁcial efforts¶ designed to give them equal status in society. **Minorities have long been the targets of overt and institutionalized racism.** While some have argued that¶ afﬁrmative action policies have eliminated the effects of racism, institutionalized racism persists in spite of the progress which has been made. Native¶ Americans have been repeatedly victimized throughout U.S. history, and¶ remain one of the most repressed minority groups in our society (Churchill¶ 1995).¶ Another example is the repeated victimization of the plutonium subjects¶ and their families, who continued to be treated unethically by state agencies¶ for decades. Several years after the deaths of many of the plutonium subjects,¶ the families were sent a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, which¶ exhumed the bodies for additional research:¶ The purpose of the exhumation was to examine the remains in order to¶ determine ...residual radioactivity from past medical treatment, and that¶ the subjects had an unknown mixture of radioactive isotopes (Advisory¶ Committee on Human. Radiation Experiments 1995: 260).¶ Two willful lies are told in this memo: (1) that the subjects were treated, and¶ (2) that they had received an unknown quantity of radiation. The truth is this:¶ (a) the subjects were guinea pigs not expected to react favorably to the injections, and (b) internal records clearly showed how much plutonium had been¶ injected into their veins (Kauzlarich and Kramer 1998). Rowland provides¶ further evidence of higher immorality when he wrote to his colleagues about¶ the exhumation project:¶ Please note that outside the Center ... we will never use the word¶ plutonium in regard to these cases. “These individuals are of interest to us¶ because they may have received a radioactive material at some time is the¶ kind of statement to be made, if we need to say anything at all” (Markey¶ Report 1986: 27).¶ (6) Illegal State Policies and Practices, while Committed by Individuals and¶ Groups of Individuals, Are Manifestations of the Attempt to Achieve¶ Organizational, Bureaucratic, or Institutional Goals¶ A recurrent theme has been that **the harms caused by the state are due to the¶ actions of individuals or groups of individuals who are pursuing the larger¶ goals of their respective organizations.** These larger institutional goals may¶ or may not be consistent with the goals of particular individuals. **Rather¶ than viewing the harm to the victims of state crime as the result of a few¶ people engaging in immoral,** unethical, and/**or illegal behavior, it is more¶ instructive to conceptualize state crime as the product of organizational pressures to achieve organizational goals.** Many forms of state crime persist for long periods of time (e.g., Iran-Contra, the economic embargo against¶ Cuba, institutionalized discrimination in the criminal justice system), and¶ are carried out by many different actors. If the unethical, immoral, and/or¶ illegal behavior in question were the result of a handful of people, then one¶ would presume that either the activities would desist once those people left¶ the organization or that there would be other people waiting to ﬁll those roles.¶ **Since** many **state crimes persist** over time with different people ﬁlling various¶ roles**, one can only presume that either there are a lot of immoral people**¶ who come **in**to positions of **power** to carry out the immoral or unethical¶ behavior, **or that there is something about the organizational culture itself¶ which fosters such immorality.** In the best case, the organization itself has¶ a problem screening out immoral/unethical decision-makers. In the worst¶ case, the organizational climate itself fosters, facilitates, or encourages such¶ behavior (e.g., see Braithwaite 1989: Ermann and Lundman 1996).¶ Also, **to reduce state crimes to the individual level is to ignore the¶ social, political, and historical contexts which shape the nature, form, and¶ goals of state agencies**. Even a cursory examination of the various forms¶ of state crime reveals that **these larger contexts are macrologically linked¶ to state crime victimization and offending**. Sometimes these contexts are¶ exigent, such as when cold war hysteria provided motivation for illegal and¶ unethical human radiation experiments, weapons testing, and environmental¶ degradation. Other times, the crimes may be politically and geographically¶ contextualized (i.e., Cuba’s proximity to the U.S.). **The state, therefore, may¶ be instrumental in creating and sustaining the conditions that account for the¶ persistence of institutional harms caused by its agencies.**

#### The moralistic fundamentalism endemic to this method of counter-terrorism becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Filtering the world through the dichotomy of our exceptional “innocence” and the “terrorist” enemy’s absolute “evil” simplifies political complexity and reproduces terrorism, causing endless violence.

Zulaika 3 (Joseba Zulaika, director, Center for Basque Studies at the University of Nevada, 2003, Radical History Review 85 191-199, “The Self-Fulfilling Prophecies of Counterterrorism,” Radical History Review)

Welcome to the promised land of terrorism. At the turn of the eighties, the problem with the terrorism industry might have been to convince the rest of us that a phenomenon that for years had not produced one single fatality was still the most dangerous threat to national life. Soon the problem is going to be to convince the rest of us that not everything is terrorism. The self-fulfilling prophecies of the 1980s and 1990s pale compared with the new scenario between "Good and evil" that George Bush has laid down for us, apparently to everyone's approval. The danger with such morality plays is that by constantly repeating them, one ends up believing them. Splitting the world radically in Good/Evil terms, calling all Evil terrorism, and declaring that the destiny of the Good side is to combat the Evil one to death, must surely be a preface to political silliness. As he told Congress, the Bush doctrine states that "from this day forward, any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime." The problem is, of course, that the very "evildoer" blamed for sending suicide bombers to kill innocent Israelis, and the very nations supporting such "martyrs" (Saudi Arabia, Pakistan), are also the ones we need as partners in the war. And the great morality play reveals itself for what it is—an intellectual and political sham. A painful example of this is translating the Palestinian-Israeli conflict into one more chapter in the new global war on terror. From the outset, this has forced the Bush administration into simultaneously trumpeting the "moral clarity" of the war against terror, according to which "there is no such a thing as a good terrorist," while at the same time having to dispatch the secretary of state to meet with the Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat, often labeled by his enemies a world-class archterrorist. As in other prominent cases (Nelson Mandela, Sean McBride, Menachem Begin), the terrorist Arafat is also the Nobel Peace Prize winner Arafat. So much for Bush's proclamations that "my job isn't to try to nuance" between good guys and bad guys, while his secretary of state Powell will soon be having "constructive" meetings with the archterrorist. Of course, as everyone agreed, Powell's mediation had nothing much to do with the perpetual tragedy of the Middle East per se and everything to do with removing the obstacle for Bush the son to complete his father's unfinished war against Iraq. As Benjamin Netanyahu put it, "Saddam Hussein is driving United States foreign policy." 9 Netanyahu knows what he is talking about. He is the man to the right of Ariel Sharon, waiting to replace him as the next prime minister of Israel. Sharon is a warrior hawk who sees everything in actual military terms. Netanyahu is something [End Page 194] much worse: a hawk whose only assets are the windmills of terrorism. Is there a better example than Netanyahu of the interdependencies between the terrorist and the counterterrorist? Bush should learn from Netanyahu about the fables and follies that inevitably accompany terrorism as idée fixe. His political career heavily dependent on terrorism from the very beginning, Netanyahu is "a sort of Israeli Rambo," who has never had "anything particularly interesting or authoritative to say about terror, or anything else," but who, nevertheless, has "built a successful career in the United States as a regular and articulate participant in talk shows, much sought after because of his reputation as a leading expert on the 'war on terrorism.'" 10 One of his "students" was Ronald Reagan, who decided to attack Libya after he read in Time magazine excerpts from a conference that Netanyahu organized at the Jonathan Institute, an action censured by a General Assembly resolution at the United Nations. Antonio Cassesse devoted an entire book to the complex legal implications of this entire affair, including the United States interception of an Egyptian airliner "in a way that was totally unjustified under international law" and concluded that "the United States preferred violence to law, leaving behind an unfortunate legacy that has polluted international law and aggravated political and diplomatic relations between states." 11 Thus it is not surprising that some critical legal scholars have had no qualms in describing the United States counterterrorism policy as "itself both terroristic and illegal." 12 The critical point, one that can be illustrated with countless examples from Great Britain, Spain, Israel, Chechnya, South America, India, and other nation-states, has to do with the inevitable tendency of how the semantics of terrorism work in relation to law. By charging the other with terrorist lawlessness, it allows oneself to dispense with the rule of law. The final result is what Agamben describes as "the state of exception," in which "it is impossible to distinguish transgression of the law from the execution of the law, such that what violates a rule and what conforms to it coincide without any reminder." 13 To the post-September 11 question of "why they hate us," a generalized response was "because of our freedoms," rather than because of the legal, political, and social justice implications of our policies, and because of our main ally in the Middle East, Israel. By letting terrorism become the main United States public discourse and by thus enshrining categorical totalization and moral fundamentalism, we are blinded so as not to see the everyday realities of history, culture, and politics. As a consequence, we become immune to the one realization that really matters: the extent to which our own counterterrorism policies foster more terrorism. "Bibi Netanyahu is a Hamas collaborator," charged late Israeli prime minister Rabin. 14 His words were not mere sarcasm; they pointed out the strong umbilical cord between terrorists and counterterrorists. In typical irony, the very day on which Rabin was assassinated, Netanyahu had published an op-ed article in the New York Times, which warned of the existence of at least fourteen militant terrorist groups in Europe, "their active membership reaching tens of thousands," as well as "a number [End Page 195] of terrorist groups" in America with widespread connections to Iran, Sudan, Egypt, Gaza, Tunisia, Pakistan, and Indonesia. "This new terrorism poses unprecedented dangers," he went on, "especially because . . . a nuclear Iran could resort to indirect blackmail." 15 One thing that Netanyahu did not alert the readers to was the possibility that, as the columnist Thomas Friedman put it, his own primer minister and political adversary Rabin might be murdered by a "gunman whose politics is virtually identical with that of Mr. Netanyahu's Likud Party and its allies in the Orthodox Jewish right." 16 In his op-ed article, Netanyahu demanded a "systemic investigation of groups openly preaching terror," but he had no qualms about allowing himself to be photographed in the company of West Bank settlers who "routinely described Rabin as an evil killer." 17 The administrations of presidents Carter and Reagan were also replete with instances in which the slippery phantom qualities of terrorism came to haunt its promoters. Gary Sick, the expert in charge of Iran during the hostage crisis, wrote an insider account of the Carter White House's war on terrorism, in which reacting to fictional threats played a major part. Whatever policy mistakes the government made, the tendency was always to blame them on "intelligence failures." But there was something else far harder to correct regarding that administration's myopia, Sick tells us: "[It] was not so much a failure of sources or observation of data as a structural inadequacy of the system itself to make a conceptual leap from chessboard to hurricane." 18 He complains how, during the Iran crisis, the journalist Robert Moss, who lacked hard evidence and had no qualifications as a specialist on Iran, still had an enormous influence on top United States policymakers when he wrote a piece stating what many in the administration feared, namely, that the Soviets must have guided the events of the Iranian hostage crisis. Sick shows that this influenced United States policy disastrously. 19 Similarly, it was no secret that Ronald Reagan, Alexander Haig, William Casey, and other high officials read and praised Claire Sterling's book The Terror Network, only to later discover to their embarrassment that it was based essentially on CIA disinformation "blown back." 20 The final result of playing with terrorism was of course the Iran-Contra fiasco, in which the White House secretly traded arms for hostages with Iran, while proclaiming a highly publicized policy of no negotiating whatsoever with states sponsoring terrorism, and which almost derailed the presidency of Reagan and the vice presidency of the senior Bush. It doesn't look like the present Bush administration has learned much from its predecessors. And what are we to make of the massive intelligence failures leading to September 11, according to which the CIA knew that two of the Al-Qaeda hijackers, Khalid al-Midhar and Nawag Alhazmi, were in the United States and never shared that information with the FBI or any other federal agency? By simply tracking the two men, who were living openly in Los Angeles without even concealing [End Page 196] their real names, the entire group taking part in the September 11 plot could have been uncovered. Similarly, an FBI agent's repeated warnings that Al-Qaeda operatives might be training as pilots in the United States went unheeded by her superiors. Don't these inexplicable lapses point once again to the systemic complicity between terrorists and counterterrorists? Guilt and Innocence: The Double Blackmail The events of September 11 are not immune to the possibility that counterterrorism is complicit in creating the very thing it abominates. We mentioned earlier that Sheik Omar, condemned to a New York prison for the rest of his life as the mastermind of the 1993 attack on the WTC, was directly a product of the CIA that recruited him for Reagan's anti-Soviet crusade in Afghanistan and gave him visas to come to the United States. The same pattern fits Osama bin Laden and the Taliban. The United States initially trained and armed them. When the Taliban became a pariah regime, the United States' main ally in the Arab world, Saudi Arabia, gave them primary support. But the blame game leads us at once into what Slavoj Zizek has labeled "the temptation of a double blackmail." 21 Namely, either the unconditional condemnation of Third World evil that appears to endorse the ideological position of American innocence, or drawing attention to the deeper sociopolitical causes of Arab extremism, which ends up blaming the victim. Each of the two positions prove one-sided and false. Pointing to the limits of moral reasoning, Zizek resorts to the dialectical category of totality to argue that "from the moral standpoint, the victims are innocent, the act was an abominable crime; however, this very innocence is not innocent—to adopt such an 'innocent' position in today's global capitalist universe is in itself a false abstraction." 22 This does not entail a compromised notion of shared guilt by terrorists and victims; "the point is, rather, that the two sides are not really opposed, that they belong to the same field. In short, the position to adopt is to accept the necessity of the fight against terrorism, BUT to redefine and expand its terms so that it will include also (some) American and other Western powers' acts." 23 As widely reported at the time, the Reagan administration, led by Alexander Haig, would self-servingly "confuse terrorism with communism." 24 As the cold war was coming to an end, terrorism became the easy substitute for communism in Reagan's black-and-white world. Still, when Haig would voice his belief that Moscow controlled the worldwide terrorist network, the State Department's bureau of intelligence chief Ronald Spiers would react by thinking that "he was kidding." 25 By the 1990s, the Soviet Union no longer constituted the terrorist enemy and only days after the Oklahoma City bombing, Russian president Yeltsin hosted President Clinton in Moscow who equated the recent massacres in Chechnya with Oklahoma City as domestic conflicts. We should be concerned as to what this new Good-versus-Evil war on terror substitutes for. Its consequences in legitimizing the repression of minorities in India, Russia, Turkey, and other countries are all too obvious. [End Page 197] But the ultimate catastrophe is that such a categorically ill-defined, perpetually deferred, simpleminded Good-versus-Evil war echoes and re-creates the very absolutist mentality and exceptionalist tactics of the insurgent terrorists. By formally adopting the terrorists' own game—one that by definition lacks rules of engagement, definite endings, clear alignments between enemies and friends, or formal arrangements of any sort, military, political, legal, or ethical—the inevitable danger lies in reproducing it endlessly. One only has to look at the Palestinian-Israeli or the Basque-Spanish conflicts to see how self-defeating the alleged "victories" against terrorism can be in the absence of addressing the causes of the violence. "A war against terrorism, then, mirrors the state of exception characteristic of insurgent violence, and in so doing it reproduces it ad infinitum. The question remains: What politics might be involved in this state of alert as normal state? Would this possible scenario of competing (and mutually constituting) terror signify the end of politics as we know it?" 27 It is either politics or once again the self-fulfilling prophecy of fundamentalist crusaders who will never be able to entirely eradicate evil from the world. Our choice cannot be between Bush and bin Laden, nor is our struggle one of "us" versus "them." Such a split leads us into the ethical catastrophe of not feeling full solidarity with the victims of either side—since the value of each life is absolute, "the only appropriate stance is the unconditional solidarity with ALL victims." 28 We must question our own involvement with the phantasmatic reality of terrorism discourse, for "now even the USA and its citizens can be regulated by terrorist discourse. . . . Now the North American territory has become the most global and central place in the new history that terrorist ideology inaugurates." 29 Resisting the temptation of innocence regarding the barbarian other implies an awareness of a point Hegel made and that applies to the contemporary and increasingly globalized world more than ever: evil, he claims, resides also in the innocent gaze itself, perceiving as it does evil all around itself. Derrida equally holds this position. In reference to the events of September 11, he said: "My unconditional compassion, addressed to the victims of September 11, does not prevent me from saying it loudly: with regard to this crime, I do not believe that anyone is politically guiltless." 30 In brief, we are all included in the picture, and these tragic events must make us problematize our own innocence while questioning our own political and libidinal investment in the global terrorism discourse.

#### Plan: The executive branch of the United States federal government should issue an executive order removing Cuba from the State Department State Sponsors of Terror list.

#### Murder DAs in their sleep, Obama’s already pledged to engage Cuba AND can use executive power.

Peter **Kornbluh**, “Seven Actions Obama Should Take On Cuba Now”, The Nation, January 24, 20**13**, [http://www.thenation.com/article/172414/seven-actions-obama-should-take-cuba-now#](http://www.thenation.com/article/172414/seven-actions-obama-should-take-cuba-now), TB

In US foreign relations with hostile states, President Obama declared in his inauguration speech this week, "engagement can more durably lift suspicion and fear." With his reelection behind him--in which he garnered more Cuban-American votes in Florida than any Democrat in history--and his legacy in front of him, here are steps the president should take to engage the Castro government and forge a sensible, sane, and productive US policy toward Cuba.

(1) Remove Cuba from the State Department list of nations that support terrorism. Among The Nation’s list of twenty ways the president should exercise his executive power is this long-overdue action. Cuba’s designation as a supporter of terrorism is an enduring injustice. Yes, Cuba has some criminal fugitives living on the island. But it is hard to accuse Cuba of harboring terrorists while Luis Posada Carriles, a prolific lifelong terrorist, is living freely in Florida. Moreover, Cuba’s current efforts to host and mediate a cease-fire and permanent peace accord between the FARC and the government of Colombia is hard evidence that it is playing a constructive role in seeking to end conflicts that breed terrorism in the region.

#### Unilateral executive action solves.

Geoff **Thale**, Director of Washington Office on Latin America, Mavis Anderson, Senior Associate for Cuba at the Latin America Working Group, “Cuba, the Terrorism Report, and the Terrorist List”, WOLA, May 24, 20**13**, <http://www.wola.org/commentary/cuba_the_terrorism_report_and_the_terrorist_list>, TB

Although some aspects of U.S. policy toward Cuba—in particular, the embargo and the travel ban—can only be changed by Congress, there are a number of meaningful actions that the Obama administration could take without waiting for Congress. Removing Cuba from the list of State Sponsors of Terrorism is one of the most significant of these.

Our role of the ballot is PRIORITIZING the CRITICAL function of the plan before the SIMULATION of state action. We certainly DEFEND the plan, but this is not the SOLE focus of our advocacy – we determine our normative alignment toward TERROR first.

Jackson 8 (Richard Jackson, Professor of International Politics at Aberystwyth University, “State terror, terrorism research and knowledge politics,” <http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/bitstream/handle/2160/1949/BISA-Paper-2008-Jackson-FINAL.pdf?sequence=1>)

In contrast to first order critique, second order critique involves the adoption of a critical standpoint outside of the discourse. In this case, based on an understanding of discourse as socially productive or constitutive, and fully cognisant of the knowledge-power nexus, a second order critique attempts to expose the political functions and ideological consequences of the particular forms of representation enunciated by the discourse. In this case, we want to try and understand what some of the political effects and consequences of the silences of state terrorism are. A number of such effects can be identified. First, the discourse naturalises a particular understanding of what terrorism is, namely, a form of illegitimate non-state violence. Such an understanding of terrorism functions to restrict the scholarly viewpoint to one set of actors and to particular kinds of actions, and functions to distract and obscure other actors and actions which should be named and studied as „terrorism‟. It also narrows the possibilities for understanding terrorism within alternative paradigms, such as from the perspective of gender terrorism (see Sharlach 2008). In other words, it has a restrictive and distorting effect within the field of knowledge which gives the impression that terrorism studies is more of a narrow extension of counter-insurgency or national security studies than an open and inclusive domain of research into all forms and aspects of terrorism. Consequently, Andrew Silke (2001) concludes that terrorism studies „is largely driven by policy concerns‟ and „largely limited to government agendas‟ (p. 2). In addition, the broader academic, social, and cultural influence of terrorism studies (through the authority and legitimacy provided by „terrorism experts‟ to the media and as policy advisers, for example), means that this restrictive viewpoint is diffused to the broader society, which in turn generates its own ideological effects. Specifically, the distorted focus on non-state terrorism functions to reify state perspectives and priorities, and reinforce a state-centric, problem-solving paradigm of politics in which „terrorism‟ is viewed as an identifiable social or individual problem in need of solving by the state, and not as a practice of state power, for example. From this perspective, it functions to maintain the legitimacy of state uses of violence and delegitimize all forms of non-state violence (which has its own ideological effects and is problematic in a number of obvious ways). This fundamental belief in the instrumental rationality of political violence as an effective and legitimate tool of the state is open to a great many criticisms, not least that it provides the normative basis from which non-state terrorist groups frequently justify their own (often well-intentioned) violence (see Burke 2008, Oliverio and Lauderdale 2005). There is from this viewpoint an ethical imperative to try and undermine the widespread acceptance that political violence is a mostly legitimate and effective option in resolving conflict – for either state or non-state actors. Political violence is in fact, a moral and physical disaster in the vast majority of cases. From an ethical-normative perspective, such a restricted understanding of terrorism also functions to obscure and silence the voices and perspectives of those who live in conditions of daily terror from the random and arbitrary violence of their own governments, some of whom are supported by Western states. At the present juncture, it also functions to silence the voices of those who experience Western policies – directly, as in those tortured in the war on terror, and indirectly, as in those suffering under Western-supported regimes – as a form of terrorism. That is, it deflects and diverts attention from the much greater state terrorism which blights the lives of tens of millions of people around the world today. Related to these broader normative and ideological effects, the treatment of state terrorism within the discourse – the silences on it and the narrow construction of „statesponsored terrorism‟ – also functions to position state terrorism (should it even exist within the dominant framework) as seemingly less important than non-state terrorism, and as confined to the actions that states take in support of non-state terrorism. This also distorts the field of knowledge and political practice by suggesting that the sponsorship of Palestinian groups by Iran for example, is an infinitely more serious and dangerous problem than the fact that millions of Colombians, Uzbeks, Zimbabweans, and so on, are daily terrorised by death squads, state torture, and serious human rights abuses. Within this discursive terrain, it can also function to provide legitimacy to Western policies such as sanctions, coercive diplomacy, and pre-emptive war against politically determined „state-sponsors of terrorism‟ which may be terroristic themselves, and which ignore the involvement in state-sponsorship by Western states. From a political-normative viewpoint, the silence on state terrorism, and in particular the argument of many terrorism scholars that state actions can never be defined as „terrorism‟, actually functions to furnish states with a rhetorical justification for using what may actually be terroristic forms of violence against their opponents and citizens without fear of condemnation. In effect, it provides them with greater leeway for applying terror-based forms of violence against civilians, a leeway exploited by many states such as Israel, Russia, China, Uzbekistan, Zimbabwe, and others who try to intimidate groups with the application of massive and disproportionate state violence. From this perspective, a discourse which occludes and obscures the very possibility of state terrorism can be considered part of the conditions that actually makes state terrorism possible. In addition, the silence on state terrorism within the field also functions to undermine the political struggle of human rights activists against the use of terror by states by disallowing the delegitimizing power and resources that come from describing state actions as „terrorism‟. It is pertinent to note in this context that the world‟s leading states have continually rejected any and all attempts to legally define and proscribe a category of actions which would be called „state terrorism‟, arguing instead that such actions are already covered by other laws such as the laws of war (see Becker 2006). The silence on state terrorism has another political effect, namely, the way in which it has functioned, and continues to function, to distract from and deny the long history of Western involvement in terrorism, thereby constructing Western foreign policy as essentially benign – rather than aimed at reifying existing structures of power and domination in the international system, for example. That is, by preventing the effective criticism of particular Western policies it works to maintain the dangerous myth of Western exceptionalism. This sense of exceptionalism and the supportive discourse of terrorism studies permits Western states and their allies to pursue a range of discrete political projects and partisan interests aimed at maintaining international dominance. For example, by reinforcing the notion that non-state terrorism is a much greater threat and problem than state terrorism and by obscuring the ways in which counter-terrorism can morph into state terrorism, the discourse functions to legitimise the current war on terror and its associated policies of military intervention, extraordinary rendition, reinforcement of the national security state, and the like. More specifically, the discourse can provide legitimacy to broader counter-insurgency or counterterrorism programmes where the actual aims lie in the maintenance of a particular politicaleconomic order such as is occurring in Colombia at present (see Stokes 2006). Importantly, the silence on state terrorism also functions to de-legitimise all forms of violent counterhegemonic or revolutionary struggle (by maintaining the notion that state violence is automatically legitimate and all non-state violence is inherently illegitimate), thereby maintaining the liberal international order and many oppressive international power structures (see also Duffield 2001). Lastly, the discourse can be used to selectively justify particular projects of regime change,14 economic sanctions, military base expansion, military occupation, military assistance for strategic partners, and the isolation of disapproved political movements such as Hamas or Hezbollah. In the end, the discourse functions to permit the reification and extension of state hegemony both internationally and domestically, and perhaps more importantly, the belief in the instrumental rationality of violence as an effective tool of politics. Despite the intentions of terrorism scholars therefore, who may feel that they engage in objective academic analysis of a clearly defined phenomenon, the discourse actually serves a number of distinctly political purposes and has several important ideological consequences for society. Conclusion As noted above, there is a real puzzle revealed through this analysis, namely, why there is such a deep and pervasive silence on state terrorism within the discourse, especially given the genealogical origins of the term and the mountain of empirical examples of the phenomenon? There are a number of likely answers to this puzzle. In the first place, there may be cases in which scholars have been co-opted through various means into state perspectives and projects. Given the benefits that can accrue from close association with state power, it is not surprising that some scholars choose to participate directly in such projects. Related to this, some scholars may be intimidated by state power, fearing the ways in which state officials and state apologists can punish and harm scholars who apply the term „terrorism‟ to state actions. This could be a major reason why the silence on Israeli state terrorism is so pervasive. In the U.S. at least, scholars who criticise Israeli policies in public are regularly attacked and intimidated as anti-Semitic. Alternately, many scholars who joined the field following the terrorist attacks in 2001 did so out of a genuine desire to work with the U.S. government to prevent further occurrences of such atrocities. Another reason is likely to be simply the failure of academic procedure and scholarly reflection – the failure to interrogate and question the assumptions and accepted knowledge of the field. This is related to a broader process of socialisation into the accepted discourse and practices of the field; scholars are trained into viewing terrorism in a particular light. Related to this, most scholars feel an inherent affinity to the values and interests of their own societies, which may make facing the reality of their government‟s involvement in terrorist atrocities difficult and disturbing. Finally, it may be related to the inherent difficulties involved in studying state terrorism: not only is obtaining primary data a challenging exercise, especially in cases where state agents may want to prevent potentially damaging international publicity, but a great deal of conceptual and theoretical work often has to be done to determine which acts constitute state terrorism (Blakeley forthcoming). In the end however, the puzzle of why state terrorism has been so neglected in the field is less important than recognising that there are important reasons for „bringing the state back into terrorism studies‟ (Blakeley 2007). First, there are obvious analytical reasons for taking state terrorism seriously, including the imbalances and distortions which a narrow focus on non-state terrorism introduces. Second, there are normative reasons for studying state terrorism in a rigorous and systematic manner, notably that such knowledge furnishes a powerful means of holding states to account for their actions and reinforcing norms of behaviour that exclude the use of violence to intimidate and terrorise civilians. By any measure, states have been responsible for infinitely more human suffering and terror than any other actor; the promotion of human security therefore depends on protecting citizens from the abuses and predations of states. In conclusion, exposing the ideological effects and political technologies of the discourse has the potential to open up critical space for the articulation of alternative and potentially emancipatory forms of knowledge and practice. The good news is that discourses are never completely hegemonic; there is always room for counter-hegemonic struggle and subversive forms of knowledge. In this case, not only is the discourse inherently unstable and vulnerable to different forms of critique, but the continual setbacks in Iraq and Afghanistan, ongoing revelations of state torture and rendition by Western forces, and increasing resistance to government attempts to restrict civil liberties suggest that the present juncture provides an opportune moment to engage in deliberate and sustained critique of a dominant discourse which focuses on non-state actors and obscures the much greater terrorism of state actors

#### The process of deliberation about terrorism should precede discussions about the policy’s outcome, because it frames the terms of the debate

De Graaf and de Graaff 10 (Beatrice de Graaf, professor at the Center for Terrorism and Counterterrorism at Leiden University, and Bob de Graaff, professor of history at Utrecht University, 2010, Critical Studies on Terrorism, 261-275, “Bringing politics back in: the introduction of the ‘performative power’ of counterterrorism”)

In sum, it is almost impossible to measure arithmetically the outcome of counterterrorism efforts. However, this does not mean that we cannot and should not try to assess the effect of governmental policies. The issues outlined above suggest that it is not necessarily the policy measures and their intended results as such, but much more the way in which they are presented and perceived that determine the overall effect of the policy in question. The key question is therefore really: What do counterterrorism policy-makers want? They set the agenda with respect to the phenomenon of terrorism, define it in a certain way and link it to corresponding measures. Subsequently, they execute these measures, behind closed doors, and with the tacit permission of the public – or, conversely, they feel forced to ‘market’ their measures first, in order to generate a substantial level of public and political support. The way in which they perform, or in other words carry out the process of countering terrorism, can have more impact than the actual arrests being made (or not being made). This is what we call the performativity of counterterrorism, or its ‘performative power’. The authors would like to introduce the concept ‘performativity’1 in this discussion, expressing the extent to which a national government, by means of its official counterterrorism policy and corresponding discourse (in statements, enactments, measures and ministerial remarks), is successful in ‘selling’ its representation of events, its set of solutions to the terrorist problem, as well as being able to set the tone for the overall discourse regarding terrorism and counterterrorism – thereby mobilising (different) audiences for its purposes.2 There is of course a difference between threat assessment and threat perception, and there are other players in the field apart from official state actors. Here, however, our focus is on the government’s attempts to persuade public opinion of the legitimacy and accuracy of its threat assessment. In terms of developing counterterrorism policies, this is particularly relevant because counterterrorism officials – and we as academics and advisers – can exert influence particularly on this field (see also the introduction and conclusion in Forest 2009). Counterterrorism measures (in statements, enactments, activities, expressions made by cabinet members) set the tone for the political and public debate. Government statements and memoranda are not mere texts: they create reality. This is certainly the case when the presentation and definition of new policy dovetails with existing threat perceptions in the population (on communism, immigration or new religions, for instance); when they tune in to historical experiences (such as previous conflicts, attacks or major disasters); if they depict the alleged terrorist threat as foreign, radically ‘different’ and alien or fundamentally hostile; or if they succeed in promoting terrorism as a central issue in a political game or campaign (by portraying the opposition as being ‘soft on terrorism’ or by presenting themselves as the nation’s saviour from all evil).3 When these implicitly or explicitly formulated representations of ‘threats’, ‘enemies’ and ‘security’ are accepted by the majority of the population, political and social conflicts could be heightened. Consensus subsequently gives way to polarisation, acceptance of the limitation of civil liberties and stigmatisation of radical ideas. Counterterrorism measures therefore clarify which radical ideas are still tolerated, what level of sympathy with revolutionary terrorists is still permitted and which infringements on civil liberties are accepted for the sake of national security.

#### Terrorism is subject to its political environment—it’s a shifting signifier. This POLITICIZATION illustrates how LANGUAGE is not a NEUTRAL medium of the PUBLIC SPHERE, but instead is ALWAYS ALREADY politicized

Smyth et al 8 (Marie Breen Smyth, Jeroen Gunning, Richard Jackson, George Kassimeris, and Piers Robinson, Department of International Politics, Aberystwyth University,¶ HLSS, University of Wolverhampton, Politics, School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester, Critical Terrorism Studies–an introduction, Critical Studies on Terrorism, 1:1,¶ 1-4, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/17539150701868538) JA

As such, ‘terrorism’ has now become one of the most powerful signifiers in contemporary discourse. It is a term that generates vast amounts of social and political activity,¶ induces powerful emotions and, through a vast array of social practices, constitutes a legal¶ and political subject, a cultural taboo, a myth and an object of fear, hatred, surprise, admiration, ‘entertainment’ and identity. However, one of the main puzzles at the heart of these¶ processes is the yawning gap between the ‘terrorism’ signifier and the actual acts signified¶ by the term. That is, virtually all of this activity refers to the response to acts of political¶ violence and not the violence itself. Notwithstanding the exceptional and anomalous¶ events of 2001, acts of clandestine non-state terrorism are committed by a tiny number of¶ individuals and result in between a few hundred and few thousand casualties per year over¶ the entire world. Moreover, most terrorism occurs in relatively few symbolic locations;¶ many of the world’s cities, communities, and individuals have not experienced a terrorist¶ attack by a non-state clandestine group, nor are likely to.1¶ A central analytical task, therefore, lies in explaining how such a small set of behaviours by such small numbers of individuals generates such a pervasive, intrusive and complex series of effects across the¶ world.¶ The contemporary study of terrorism therefore takes place in a particular kind of political,¶ legal, cultural, and academic context. It is a context in which literally thousands of newbooks and articles are published on terrorism every year,2¶ along with an even greater corpus of cultural texts in the form of novels, media articles, and movies (Croft 2006). At the¶ same time, it is a context in which primary research on terrorism remains something of a¶ taboo, with (still) relatively few endeavouring to interview or engage with those involved¶ in ‘terrorist’ activity (Zulaika and Douglass 1996). It is a context in which the threat of terrorism has often been overplayed by politicians for political gain (Mueller 2006, Kassimeris 2007), and terrorism has become a negative ideograph of Western identity, making¶ self-reflective, probing research difficult (Winkler 2006, pp. 11–16). It is a context in¶ which fascination with terrorism encourages moral panics and an excessive focus on violence, to the neglect of the wider social, historical, and often mundane milieu in which it is¶ situated. It is also a context in which the much greater and more pervasive terror employed¶ by states, including directly or indirectly by liberal-democratic states (Sluka 2000), has¶ been ignored and silenced from the public and, to a significant degree, academic discourse.

#### Critically interrogating the supposedly universal definition of terrorism through the prism of specific policies is a prerequisite to effective political action. This question of definition PRECEDES specific scenario planning

Haque 11 (M. Mohibul Haque, Assistant Professor Department of Political Science AMU Aligarh, U.P. India, 7/02/11, Countercurrents, “Deconstruction Of Discourse On Terrorism,” http://www.countercurrents.org/haque020711.htm) JA

The term “terrorism” is one about whose meaning the scholars in academia or officials in government circle have quarreled perhaps more than any other concept in the recent past. Indeed there are many other ideas and concepts upon which there is disagreement among the scholars and governments but the implications of that disagreement are not so dangerously felt. Terrorism has become a global scourge and there is a pressing need to formulate policies and programs to control its origin and growth. Under these circumstances, at least a universally acceptable working definition of terrorism is necessary. However, neither there is such a definition nor is likely to be in near future. In fact, the absence of an objective definition of terrorism is more by design than by accident. The intellectual dishonesty in the academic fraternity and the double standard of the national governments are responsible for this problem.¶ Terrorism is an act of politically or ideologically motivated violence against common men or women. It may be committed by an individual, group, organization or state. However, it is unfortunate that the discourse on terrorism has been hijacked by powerful nations of the world who never want that their acts of unwarranted violence should be discussed in the context of terrorism. This is more evident in the aftermath of September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States. The so- called global war on terror declared and being fought by the United States and handful of its allies has tried to mislead that in the present circumstances terrorism is the monopoly of non-state actors alone. Thus the killing of innocent people by the organizations like Al-Qaeda is terrorism and slaughter of innocent citizens of Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia, and Kosovo by imperialist alliance is not terrorism at all. It is unfortunate that without a modicum of remorse it is argued that if with the handful of terrorists, thousands of innocent citizens of sovereign nations die, it can be condoned as collateral damage. Ironically, USA-the mightiest power on earth with the help of its ambitious allies in imperialist plunder of the resources in militarily weak nations decides and determines the context and paradigm in which its foreign policy should be discussed. It is this double standard and flamboyant style of the major powers to approach terrorism that has prevented the international community from arriving on a universally accepted definition. In fact, assaulting innocent people from any nationality or belonging to any religious, ethnic or ideological persuasion either by the national armies wearing uniform and carrying flags or by clandestine organizations like Al-Qaeda must be treated as terrorism and accordingly dealt with.¶ The undeniable fact is that we do not have an officially adopted and universally accepted definition of terrorism yet the data and statistics on terrorism are prepared by states and generally accepted even by ‘ independent scholars’ in academic circles. This is the best example of intellectuals becoming “experts in legitimation” (using Gramsci’s term). The statistics on terrorism are hardly questioned and seldom scrutinized. In fact, the paradigm of approaching terrorism needs to be questioned first. For doing so the discourse on terrorism must be deconstructed. The undue emphasis given on non-state terrorism and almost completely ignoring the acts of terror committed by states is responsible for misleading data and statistics as well as the definitional dilemma relating to terrorism. Terrorism must be defined and determined on the basis of the acts committed rather than the actors involved. The crude fact about terrorism is that even the non-state terrorism cannot sustain without the support from the states. It is a well known fact that CIA, ISI, KGB, Mosad and several other agencies maintained by states have committed more acts of terror than those perpetrated by the dreaded terrorist organizations like Al-Qaeda and LTTE etc. Moreover, the states are known to have indulged in committing acts of violence and intimidation against their own citizens. After all, the term terrorism originated from the French word “terrorisme” which was used to describe the acts of terror of the post revolution French state i.e. the ‘Reign of Terror’. To suspend the discussion it can be said that the discourse on terrorism is highly motivated and monopolistic in nature which needs to be deconstructed. The deconstruction of the discourse on terrorism is not possible unless it is liberated from the sinister grip of hegemons and imperialists.