

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [hareman](#) on Mon, 15 Mar 2004 21:11:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Terrorism is defined as: violence or the threat of violence, especially bombing, kidnapping, and assassination, carried out for political purposes.

I would also add: it is intended to create terror and to incite violence among the populace of a given target. IT MORE CLOSELY CONNECTED WITH AN IDEOLOGY THAN POLITICS. There are two areas of terrorism that we concern ourselves with. The three types that we as Americans have had to deal with in the past (pre 1980s), The Reagan Time period and shortly thereafter and the hyper modern terrorism that abounds today.

For the early area of terrorism how many of you can even give one incident here? We as Americans have a shameful past where this concerned and for the most part is overlooked by everyone except historians, the court system and law enforcement.

The Reagan era is another era that is a great embarrassment to how we dealt with terrorism. The Reagan administration viewed as a consequence of the global struggle with the Soviets. If you want to place a great deal of blame here is where it belongs. The military's first large scale operation was a horrible tragedy (can you say Desert One?) And before someone corrects me I fucking know that Carter was president. But this incident is what enabled Reagan to take the White house, that and the back channel negotiations that resulted in the result of the hostages. The end result of these negotiations was ... IRAN-CONTRA. A patently illegal operation that supported terrorism and traded arms for hostages. A trade that was in direct opposition to stated the policy at the time. OMG a politician lied to the public. This was during THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY. Many of what we in law enforcement see as a trend began with the actions of OUR OWN country under both political parties

And Yet, starting with the Reagan era we see mismanagement of too many incidents to be even looked at as anything but criminal.

Let's start with my own first hand knowledge:

Grenada, a goat situation from the word go. A country, in this case Cuba, takes over another. It probably wouldn't have been much of a big deal until the locals angry with Americans take over the medical school and the Cubans refuse to do anything about it. How we found out is nothing short of an intelligence failure. Hell, when we found out about the medical school The US had not one idea that there were Cubans there in the first place. I quote from an official who was involved with planning Grenada "what the fuck are all those Cubans doing there and why didn't we know about it?"

To confront the Cubans we sent a contingent of Marines, Army Rangers Air Force Special Ops and Navy Seals to deal with what was essentially 2 companies of Cuban troops. The mismanagement was atrocious. There was no support for Seals that held the Governors mansion shipped home 100 + Aks on the US tax payer. Army Rangers were landed in broad daylight so the

The next major incident was the bombing of the American Embassy over 240 men and women serving the country died in this incident. Did any of you know that it was preventable? A few months earlier a team of naval personnel had conducted a threat assessment of the embassy and had concluded an attack on was highly likely given the distrust of the locals. That report even described where and how the attack would take place. A procedure was outlined that would have saved the embassy but the report was given little credence by the embassy personnel. And so we lost those lives unnecessarily.

That is part of a lecture I gave in terrorism

---

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 04:39:34 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

What are you trying to prove here, that Reagan should be blamed for the terrorism we experience now?

Where did you give this lecture (just curious)?

---

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 05:08:37 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

no but the era of hyper modern terrorism began with Reagan's policies. He is no more at fault than say ..... LBJ for supporting Pol Pot and we know how that ended up.

There are many examples of how poorly intelligence and operational art have been handled by the administration of successive presidents since Reagan. We among the operators have always said give us the intell and the assets and we can take care of the problem.

What I am saying is that every administration since Truman (YOU could probably make a good case for the FDR years as well) has supported terrorism worldwide, created the very conditions that these groups thrive in.

There is no President that can claim he has done more or less to stop it either. Post 9/11 data supports the conclusions that today's terrorists are better funded, better trained and there is also a 3 fold increase over pre 9/11 in recruits.

SO you make up your mind about where the true failures of our system come from. Adn it is not at the operational level.

I can't say where I gave the lecture but I can say it was to a group that influences policy

---

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 06:10:33 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

haremanI can't say where I gave the lecture but I can say it was to a group that influences policy  
Let me guess, you'd have to kill me if you told me?

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 11:48:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You forgot the Panamanian FUBAR.

A platoon of SEALs airdropped at night into choppy water, overloaded with gear. Men die, and the SEALs dump all their gear, but their rifles. Then once ashore, the nitwit in command gets his platoon pinned down on the tarmac of the airport while trying to take out Noriega's planes. Major loss of life from the Panamanian regulars in the hangar. The regulars find out that skipping bullets off the tarmac is quite efficient at slaughtering SEALs.

The only part of this that went well was blowing up his personal yacht.

This is why SEALs should not be incorporated into JSOC, and why they should not be directly supervised by the Joint chiefs. Glory hounds in Washington get warriors slaughtered.

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 14:23:15 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

haremanThere are many examples of poor [how poorly] intelligence

"Border relations between Canada and Mexico have never been better!" -- You know who.

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 14:30:59 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

LMAO I have no issues with an open border it is one of the benefits of a "free and democratic" society and changing that means 'they' have won

---

Subject: Terrorism

Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 15:48:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You talk about intelligence failure, so how is it that you know this?

Quote:There is no President that can claim he has done more or less to stop it either. Post 9/11 data supports the conclusions that today's terrorists are better funded, better trained and there is also a 3 fold in crease over pre 9/11 in recruits.

Seems to directly contradict your position. What data? My post 9\11 data says "purple monkey dishwasher."

---

---

Subject: Terrorism  
Posted by [KIRBY098](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 17:30:12 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Mine says, buy a gun, and know how to use it.

---

---

Subject: Terrorism  
Posted by [hareman](#) on Tue, 16 Mar 2004 18:20:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Ack' reply not worth the time of day

---

---

Subject: Terrorism  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Wed, 17 Mar 2004 00:13:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Mine says, buy a gun, and know how to use it.

Take a pretty big gun to stop a plane.

We should just put an Aegis Cruiser turret in the middle of all major cities.

No civilian airliner's going to get through a near-solid wall of depleted uranium shells...

---

---

Subject: Terrorism  
Posted by [Aircraftkiller](#) on Wed, 17 Mar 2004 00:59:31 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

You don't even know what an Aegis system is, much less how it's used.

Most DDGs use Standard missiles as anti-air defense. Some can hit large missiles but that's not

---

too often from what I remember.

DU shells aren't going to stop an airliner before it crashes into a city. A network of SAM sites would.

Furthermore, aren't you the same guy who bitched about DU being used in Iraq, thus causing all sorts of maladies for Iraqi civilians? :rolleyes:

---