

The "War OF Terror" By Martin Keerns

Today I'd like to discuss an often (mis)quoted term (in my opinion) one that has become regularly utilised in common parlance since around about the beginning of the 21st century. - Probably up until now, most of you guys and gals have mistakenly been using the words "War ON Terror" to describe the exact same phenomenon. - I've merely done a big favour for most of you: - I've "corrected" your slight error in pronunciation, (and in turn, grasp of the phrase's meaning), and by doing so I hope to help "clarify" your understanding of not just those three words, but also what the three of them TRULY mean. - By the time you've finished reading these sentences. I hope I'll have convinced you that not only is my interpretation of that phrase in fact the correct one, so is my understanding of its true meaning, and more importantly what this "War's" actual true purposes and goals really are. - M

It is my sincere wish that when some of you readers fully understand the true meaning of this phrase that one or two of you will hopefully decide to act (by informing others of these facts) and that some of them will do the same thing. It's just a simple wee goal but it's definitely a worthwhile one to me.

The first word we'll examine is "War".

WAR. An armed contest between nations. Grotius, *de Jur. Bell.* l. 1, c. 1. The state of nations among whom there is an interruption of all pacific relations, and a general contention by force, authorized by the sovereign. 1 Kent. *61. See, also, Commercial Cable Co. v. Burleson (D. C.) 255 F. 99, 105; Vanderbilt v. Travelers' Ins. Co., 184 N. Y. S. 54, 55, 112 Misc. 248.

Every connection by force between two nations, in external matters, under the authority of their respective governments, is a public war. If war is declared in form, it is called "solemn," and is of the perfect kind; because the whole nation is at war with another whole nation. When the hostilities are limited as respects places, persons, and things, the war is properly termed "imperfect war." Bas v. Tingy, 4 Dall. 37, 40, 1 L. Ed. 731.

As you can see here, you can't actually declare a war against what is a (purposefully) vague abstract single word description of something, like "terror". - Wars are armed contests that go on between NATIONS only. - Taken from Black's Law Dictionary (Vol. III).

- A war always has to have two sides:

In this instance it's the "terrorists" (and those who support them) who are supposedly on one side.

So by inference at least, ALL the rest of us must be on the "other" side.

- Hmmm. Those "terrorists" sure like long odds don't they?

- I mean there must be only a few thousand of these guys/gals tops, versus what, about 7 Billion of "us". - Let's be generous in fact for ease of calculation and say there's a whopping 7000 terrorists on the planet as you read this, if we did (and no serious figures EVER presented would even hint to there being anywhere near that number of people as being live active terrorists in the world today) -

That would equate to 1 Million people for every terrorist! - Don't these guys think about this? -

For fuck's sake - Those guys sure are unfuckbelievably optimistic (or really dumb) wouldn't you say?

Plus what I'd like to know is just how does "terrorism" actually "win" exactly?

Apart from ALL of those involved (whether as participants, victims, or those for or against this action) demonstrating to ALL their children, and worse, to ANYONE else (who they might not get on with) wherever it is that they the terrorist comes from, hmm.) These guys clearly demonstrate that the ONLY way to rebel against whatever it is you don't like (usually poverty or religion), but it can be anything from; colour, language, looks, beliefs, etc. is to magically "find" the money to buy loads of nice clean uniforms, a few tonnes of automatic weapons, a batch of explosives, millions of rounds of expensive ammunition, etc. (Which not too oddly rules out the whole "poverty" angle for my liking. - They're telling the world that they're skint, absolutely penniless, but yet they "somehow*" found all that money for a container full of AK-47's, semtex-bodywarmers, and maybe even some anthrax. Hmm, just like a chocolate waistcoat - that simply doesn't wash. Then, this "magically appearing" equipment is to only be used for indiscriminately killing innocent civilians, which as far as I know goes against EVERY god on the earth's teachings. (Which surely has to cancel out the religious angle). - Hmm. This whole terrorism pullava is rather full of weird contradictions don't you think? - It's almost like it's not their own ideology they're working to, or that they didn't finance this themselves.

Another weird coincidental fact about all these "magically" armed peasant wannabe Che Guevaras:

Why do these terrorists ONLY ever appear in countries that either the USA, UK, or Israel are totally itching for an excuse to invade? - The USA, UK, and Israeli "leaders" will be talking through our flag-waving complaint press and T.V. about how they're desperately wanting to smash this place or that to utter pieces (for totally made-up but "true" reasons) - (If only some halfwit from that country could "somehow" get the cash/weapons/training to be able to hurt some USA/UK/Israeli nationals) - Ta-Dah! - As if by magic, up will pop some "impoverished" loonies of said nation with millions of \$ of military equipment, to carry out (usually with USA/UK/Israeli assistance*) some atrocious act to "magically" give the excuse for USA/UK/Israel to pound the poor country back to the fucking stone-age!

- You'd think that these terrorists would have noted JUST FUCKING ONCE BY NOW that they have done this TO EVERY SINGLE COUNTRY TERRORISTS LIVE/"HIDE" IN

- You'd think the complete destruction of your country's infrastructure and guaranteed slaughter of nearly everyone that you know or love as a consequence of you being a "successful" terrorist would make it an unwise choice for ANY true patriot.

And what would VT Day (victory terrorism) look like? 7000 terrorists dancing up to their waists in the blood and carcasses of 7,000,000,000 innocent people? - Would that be "just, noble, heroism"?

Odd these guys never seriously thinking about ANY of this before joining the "million to one militia".

What you've got to ask yourself as a rational westerner (if we still exist) is: Why would ANYONE ON THIS EARTH KNOWINGLY bring this guaranteed annihilation of their nation onto themselves and their children? THE SIMPLE, LOGICAL, AND TRUE ANSWER IS: THEY WOULDN'T, AND THEY DIDN'T.

THE WORST OF THEM ARE PATSIES, STOODGES, OR MOUTHPIECES FOR THE WEST, AND NO MORE.

Why have none of these terrorist groups EVER went after ANY of the people who have organised, planned, or advocated their destruction? - I'm not talking about going for the president or PM, but why aren't the terrorists going for the "soft" targets? - The think tank guys who started off the philosophy calling for their extirpation? - Or the lobbyists paid for harassing politicians to go along with these policies. - Or the politicians who implement them. - Or the bankers who pay for it all?

You'd think these (mostly) unguarded, easy to find people, who make up a massive percentage of the men planning and providing the philosophy that harmed both their country or their efforts to change the situation. (They're planning, financing, and running the command and control structure of those truly scheming against these nations or people). - You would quite logically think that these men would be the terrorist's very TOP targets. - BUT FOR SOME REASON THE TERRORISTS DON'T GO AFTER THESE GUYS - EVER. - NO MATTER HOW EVIL THEIR PLANS OR WORDS AGAINST THEM WERE.

Odd that, just as odd as people with nothing but a mud-hut and some goats forming these "armies".

Remember Libya?

A "resistance" "Army" just "magically" appeared overnight.

LIBYA'S "CRIMES" AGAINST ITS PEOPLE?

1. In Libya, a home is considered a natural human right. 2. Education was free. 3. Medical treatment was free. 4. There were no electricity bills in Libya, electricity was free. 5. Gaddafi carried out the world's largest irrigation project, known as the Great Manmade River project, to make water readily available throughout the desert country. 6. All newlyweds in Libya would receive 60,000 Dinar (\$50,000 USD) by the government to buy their first apartment to help start a family. 7. A portion of Libyan oil sales is or was credited directly to the bank accounts of all Libyan citizens. 8. Libya had its own state bank. (ITS BIGGEST CRIME IN WESTERN EYES) 9. A bursary was given to mothers with newborn babies. When a Libyan woman gave birth she was given the equivalent to \$5000 USD for herself and the child. 10. If Libyans cannot find the education or medical facilities they need in Libya, the government would fund them to go abroad for it – not only free but they get US \$2,300/month accommodation and car allowance. Sources:

<http://911-truth.net/other-books/Muammar-Qaddafi-Green-Book-Eng.pdf>

<http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-884508>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/libya-ten-things-about-gaddafi-they-dont-want-you-to-know/5414289>

Same in Syria. Another pot-noodle instant resistance army.

YET NOT ONE PERSON IN THE WEST (ESPECIALLY IN THE EVER COMPLIANT STATE FRIENDLY MEDIA) HAS EVER ASKED THESE POT-NOODLE-PRESIDENTS-IN-WAITING THIS ONE OBVIOUS QUESTION: -

EXCUSE ME MR DICTATOR IN WAITING, JUST WHERE THE FUCK DID YOU HAPPEN TO "CHANCE UPON" OR "FIND" YOUR VERY WELL TRAINED AND EXTENSIVE ARMY/NAVY/ AIRFORCE/SOLDIERS/ SEAMEN (HE,HE)/AIRMEN/ - PLUS ALL THAT AMMUNITION, AND ALL THEIR WEAPONS, AND MASSIVE COLLECTION OF SUPPLIES, AND FUEL, OH, AND OF COURSE THE FORTUNE THAT'LL BE

REQUIRED FOR ALL THESE PEOPLE'S PAY MISTER (UNSUPRISINGLY) PRO-WESTERN PERFECT ENGLISH
SPEAKING LEADER CUM DICTATOR OF THE NEWLY FORMED RESISTANCE ARMY?

Saying that, most of you have never even asked that same simple question about Adolf Hitler's 1930's Germany. (Apparently people took a wheelbarrow to work with them just to carry half that days wages during Weimer Republic, (because the currency was practically worthless) because of hyperinflation (a word you'll be sick of hearing about quite soon) but yet by only a short period later, His Germany had new autobahns, near full employment, a thriving economy, and oh yeah, they also had by far the best equipped Army/Navy/Air-force in the world at that time, yet no one thinks to ask

- HOW IN THE NAME OF FUCK IN GOD'S NAME DID THESE NAZI'S MANAGE TO PAY FOR ALL OF THIS WHEN THEIR NATION WAS UTTERLY BANKRUPT ONLY A MERE DECADE OR SO BEFORE?

All of my life (That I can recall), I have always been seriously taken aback, and even shocked on occasions, by the vast majority of other people's weird behaviour with regards to this one part of their lives probably more than any other (especially the suddenly developed warped "powers of reasoning" exhibited by most of them on this issue):

- WHY DO SO MANY AMONGST YOU SEEMINGLY RATIONAL PEOPLE SO EASILY AND UNQUESTIONABLY FULLY ACCEPT (SELF-APPOINTED) AUTHORITY'S LATEST VERSION OF THE "TRUTH" ON THE LATEST MATTER UNDER PUBLIC SCRUTINY?

- ESPECIALLY CONSIDERING THAT THE LAST TIME THEY GAVE YOU THE TRUTH IT TURNED OUT LATER ON TO BE A TOTAL LIE, (ASSAD WASN'T USING CHEMICAL WEAPONS ON HIS PEOPLE) AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT, (GADDAFI WASN'T TERRORISING HIS PEOPLE), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT, (IRAQ DIDN'T HAVE ANY WMD's), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT (IRAQ HAS NOTHING TO WITH AL QAIEDA), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT, (THE TALIBAN HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH 911), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT, (AL QAIEDA AREN'T HIDING IN AFGHANISTAN), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT (LIBYA HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH THE LOCKERBIE TRAGEDY), AND THE TIME BEFORE THAT - AND THIS IS WHAT HAS HAPPENED FOR INFINITY! - TODAYS "NEWS" IS REALLY JUST TOMMOROWS DISCREDITED OPINION/BIT OF PROPOGANDA/OUTRIGHT LIE.

JUST WHY DO SO MANY OF YOU KEEP DOING THIS? - WHY DO YOU STILL EVEN LISTEN TO ANY INFORMATION OR "TRUTHFUL STATEMENT" FROM EITHER ANY BRITISH MINISTER OR POLITICIAN, ANY SO CALLED "PUBLIC WHITWASH ENQUIRY" OR ANYTHING REPORTED BY THE NEWSREADER OR ANY OTHER PAID MOUTHPIECE OF ANY BRITISH T.V. STATION. (BUT ESPECIALLY THE PAEDOPHILE AND COMON PURPOSE INFESTED OFFICIAL STATE MOUTHPIECE THE B.B.C.), AND WHY DO SO MANY OF YOU STILL GET YOUR "FACTS" FROM NEWSPAPERS? ALL THESE THINGS ONLY HIDE THE TRUTH.

80% OF PEOPLE APPARENTLY GET ALL OF THEIR INFORMATION SOLELY FROM PAPERS OR T.V.

DO YOU KNOW THAT EINSTEIN CALLED WHAT YOU'RE DOING THE VERY DEFINITON OF INSANITY.

- THE ENTIRITY OF THE "NEWS SPREADING APPARATUS" (T.V. STATIONS, RADIO, MAGAZINES, FILM, AND NEWSPAPER CORPORATIONS) WORLDWIDE, IS ALL TOTALLY OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY THE SAME GROUPS OF PEOPLE (AND THEIR CORPORATIONS) WHO ARE ALSO TREATING YOU AND YOURS AS NOTHING MORE THAN CHEAP SLAVES, OR AS AN EXPENDABLE AND CHEAP COMMODITY (THROUGH THE SAME CORPORATIONS). - YET FOR WHATEVER REASON YOU'RE NEARLY ALL STILL

TRUSTING THESE SAME GUYS TO INFORM YOU OF THESE FACTS, - YOU'RE ALL WAITING ON THE BAD GUYS TO ADMIT THIS MANIPULATION AND MISTREATMENT OF YOU AND YOUR CHILDREN TO YOU THROUGH THEIR WHOLLY OWNED AND CONTROLLED MEDIA OUTLETS!!! (THEIR CORPORATIONS).

AND YET SOMEHOW MOST OF YOU "NORMAL" TYPES THINK PEOPLE LIKE ME WHO ARE ONLY TRYING TO INFORM MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS OF THIS FACT ARE JUST A BUNCH OF CONSPIRACY NUTS - WHY IS THAT? OH YEAH IT'S GENERALLY BECAUSE THE PEOPLE WHO TELL YOU WHAT TO THINK THROUGH NEWSPAPERS AND T.V. SAID SO! (ADMITEDLY SOME OF US ARE JUST CRAZY CONSPIRACY NUTS WHO SEE "IT" IN EVERYTHING, BUT MOST ARE JUST INFORMED INDIVIDUALS).

Now let's look at the vague and all encompassing word - Terror.

This paper on the problems of the word is titled - The Impact of UK Anti-Terror Laws on Freedom of Expression - Submission to ICJ Panel of Eminent Jurists on Terrorism, Counter-Terrorism and Human Rights. London April 2006

3. UK ANTI-TERROR LAW AND PRACTICE AND ITS IMPACT ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

This section outlines our concerns with UK anti-terror law and practice and its impact on the enjoyment of the right to freedom of expression. We will first set out our concerns with the current definition of terrorism. Then, we will outline our concerns regarding recent use of anti-terrorist powers to prevent legitimate exercise of freedom of expression and assembly.

Finally, we will discuss our concerns regarding the recently enacted prohibitions on "encouraging" terrorism and related offences and prohibitions.

3.1. The Definition of Terrorism is Overbroad

We are concerned that the definition of terrorism in UK law, as found in the Terrorism Act 2000, 14 is both vague and excessively broad in its reach. It criminalises not only acts that are widely understood to be 'terrorist' in nature, but also lawful gatherings and demonstrations as well as many forms of behaviour that, while unlawful, cannot be regarded as "terrorism".

Section 1 of the Terrorism Act 2000 defines terrorism as follows:

(1) In this Act "terrorism" means the use or threat of action where-

(a) the action falls within subsection (2),

(b) the use or threat is designed to influence the government or an international governmental organisation or to intimidate the public or a section of the public, and (c) the use or threat is made for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause.

(2) Action falls within this subsection if it-

(a) involves serious violence against a person,

(b) involves serious damage to property,

(c) endangers a person's life, other than that of the person committing the action,

(d) creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or a section of the public, or

(e) is designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system.

...

(4) In this section-

(a) "action" includes action outside the United Kingdom,

(b) a reference to any person or to property is a reference to any person, or to property, wherever situated,

(c) a reference to the public includes a reference to the public of a country other than the United Kingdom, and

(d) "the government" means the government of the United Kingdom, of a Part of the United Kingdom or of a country other than the United Kingdom.

This definition is overbroad.

Anti-terror laws trigger executive powers that are very restrictive on human rights, often with reduced judicial oversight. As a matter of principle, their use should be confined to those circumstances when such severe restrictions can truly be deemed "necessary". Anti-terror laws should therefore be narrowly drafted and be proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued – protecting national security. We are concerned that the definition of terrorism in Section 1 of the Terrorism Act 2000 does not follow this basic principle.

Our concerns are twofold. First, the definition can be read to include legitimate gatherings and demonstrations.

...

3.2. Use of Anti-Terror Laws to Stifle Legitimate Protest and Other Activity

The Terrorism Act 2000 provides various powers, including powers to stop and search.

Over the past two years, these powers have increasingly been used to police lawful protests and trivial public order disturbances. Examples include the following:

The detention of more than 600 people during the 2005 Labour Party conference, including, famously, the detention of an 82 year old activist who had earlier been evicted from the conference for heckling Jack Straw

The arrest of a pedestrian for walking along a cycle path in Dundee

the stopping and searching of an 11 year old girl who participated in a peaceful protest at an RAF base

The detention of trainspotters at Motherwell, Reading, Slough and Croydon railway stations

The detention of an 80 year old RAF veteran who carried a placard and war t-shirt with “anti-Blair info”

The detention of a 21 year old student for taking pictures of the M3 motorway for a web-design company.

It has also been reported that police forces across the country operate wildly different interpretations of the Act and that the number of stops and searches under the 2000 Act has gone up dramatically in the last year.

While we acknowledge that to some extent, this reflects the different level of the terrorist threat in different parts of the UK, we believe there is evidence that different police forces interpret and use the powers available to them much more widely than others. For example, Kent police, who patrol the sensitive Channel Tunnel, use anti-terror laws very rarely; while Hampshire police, which patrols a largely rural area, carried out nearly 4,500 anti-terror stops and searches in the July-October 2005 period.

In a landmark decision on the use of the anti-terror stop and search powers, the House of Lords recently declined to rule that they constituted a violation of the rights to liberty, freedom of expression or assembly.

I pointed out before what the terror laws are for, and where they’re headed:

- I commented and posted a link about the up-coming demonization of the people who know the truth by TPTB weeks before Campmoron gave his speech on that very subject.- August 14, 2014 - “DHS Warns of “Domestic Violent Extremists” Targeting Government Officials, Law Enforcement” [https:// publicintelligence.net/dhs-domestic-violent-extremists/](https://publicintelligence.net/dhs-domestic-violent-extremists/) (I put the space in before public)-

The one that classifies about 95% of us in the “act on the plain facts collective” as extremists (we’ll be outright terrorists next year)

(Simply for knowing at least an approximation of the truth about 911 being an inside job, or 7/7 too).

- Apparently we are now all going to be looked on as “Non-Violent Extremists” or according to the article above as “Domestic Violent Extremists” in the USA.

- Incidentally this was the exact same type of speech that was given by Bush jnr. About a decade ago with his “My fellow armed Pelicans, and all other Earthicans, we not, now must, not now ever not, mctolerate any more of those darned totally untrue (my daddy says so) ridiculous conspiracy fairies” Or who can forget our own Mr Tony-thumb-of-power-vacuous-buzzwords-then-smile-sincerely-Blair’s equally baseless and perpetually glib, sound-byte-of-shite-athon that he gave on “911 and 7/7 conspiracy theories” - that was very similar to the other two examples just cited above in both context, content, and also in its vilification of normal people who can think for themselves. (As was also quite obviously being aimed for in the speeches that both Davy cabbage-patch-doll Campmoron and G.W. cokehead-quarterwit Bush gave on the matter). - Bit of a pattern forming there, did you spot it too? - (Apart from all our closet bum-boy sociopathic politicians perpetually and invariably talk utter bum-chocolate) - We’ll get another dose soon from Mrs Obummer or her man Mick next.

- Because here's where our enemy are going with this: Remember earlier I said I'd commented and posted a link on the site about the up-coming demonization of the people who know the truth by TPTB weeks before Campmoron gave his speech on that very subject. - The one that classified about 95% of us in the "act on the plain facts collective" as extremists (we'll be outright terrorists next year).

- Well, if you doubted what I've just said, I'd also factor in what was said in The Guardian on Monday 25 August 2014 - Were "Boris Johnson calls for 'GUILTY UNTIL PROVEN INNOCENT' for suspected terrorists" to see where "they" are really heading with this if I was you.

We're going - Pre-Crime!

If you don't think so, then read these next two articles too, and then combine that with both Boris' idea, and also Cameron's/Blair's/Bush's speeches. Then you'll be able to predict what their goal is:

Activist Post Sunday, June 29, 2014 - "Pre-Crime Police Target Mental Health" "Arizona is the latest state to begin using pre-crime models to supposedly thwart attacks by those who are "near the breaking point." The video below highlights how mental health police units look to harvest everything from medical records to gun purchases to ONLINE POSTS. Citing the crimes of Jared Loughner and Elliot Rodger, these units are being given the green light with new legislation to INVOLUNTARILY DETAIN those who are flagged."

The Daily Mail, 7/15/2013: "Brain scans of inmates could lead to 'Minority Report' style ability to predict if they will re-offend", "Groundbreaking new research could allow scientists to predict if prisoners will re-offend - potentially condemning those convicted of serious crimes - (My Note. Like potential terrorism or potential domestic non-violent extremism perhaps?) - to a LIFETIME behind bars. (I capitalised the key terms and words for you).

I can see EXACTLY where all of this shit is heading my dear friends. Can you? I reckon Stevie Wonder could, so if you can't "go back to sleep America, UK, Europe, the world, everything is under control".

DON'T STAY MUTE, ACT NOW, OR DO YOUR WEE BIT NOW, - OTHERWISE, IF YOU TAKE TOO LONG TO BUILD UP TO ACTUALLY DOING SOMETHING, YOU MIGHT FIND YOURSELF ALREADY IN THE CLINK FOR WHAT YOU WERE GOING TO DO - BEFORE YOU'VE EVEN HAD A CHANCE TO DO IT!

IF THERE'S THOUSANDS OF US, IF YOU CAN OPEN THE EYES OF ONLY 3-5 PEOPLE, WITH THE ONLY CONDITION FOR YOUR HELP BEING THAT THEY DO THE SAME AS YOU DONE FOR THEM FOR ANOTHER FIVE, - THOSE THOUSANDS WILL BECOME MILLIONS MUCH QUICKER THAN YOU THINK.

BE PART OF HISTORY IN THE MAKING AND DO SOMETHING FUNDEMENTALLY CONSTRUCTIVE NOW!

FOR MOST OF US, THIS COULD WELL BE THE ONLY GENUINE BONA FIDE CHANCE THAT WE MAY HAVE IN THIS WHOLE FUCKING MISERABLE LIFE TO DO SOMETHING THAT IS REALLY 100% HONEST TO DOG WORTHWHILE. - SOMETHING OUR CHILDREN, GRAND-CHILDREN, AND EVEN THEIR GREAT GRANDCHILDREN, WILL BE SO PROUD THAT WE DID FOR THEM. - ZERO OR HERO, YOU CHOOSE.

And to finish off, I think the facts speak for themselves: This isn't a war on terror (and never was) it's one OF terror, and its main victims are both the "patsies" themselves and more crucially the humungous amounts of intentionally ignored "collateral damage" in these foreign countries, and

most importantly for us in the “developed” and “civilised” and “free” nations: -The complete and total evisceration of our most basic and fundamental rights and freedoms.

BIG love to all. Martin Keerns. - Sorry for shouting so much but occasionally needs must my friends

Read Everything, Believe Nothing, Until You Can Go Prove It By Yourself. (William Cooper)