

# A “Formula” for Terrorism

by Alfred Adask

Cole Porter crooned, “In olden days, a glimpse of stocking was looked on as something shocking.” Same could be said for mass murder of innocent civilians. There was a time when wars were fought by soldiers and armies who served individual kings or governments. Civilians sometimes watched epic battles from the sidelines as spectators, much like modern fans watch football games. Civilized nations did not intentionally engage in the mass murder of civilians.

However, with the American Civil War, and then World Wars I & II, “collateral damage” (the deaths of civilian non-combatants) became widespread and acceptable. Later, the Cold War and the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), elevated the idea of killing civilians from unfortunate “collateral damage” to the war’s fundamental object. Combatants no longer threatened to destroy each other’s armies; they threatened to annihilate each other’s nation. As Mr. Porter sang, “Now Heaven knooows, an-y-thing goes!”

The following excerpt from an interview with a former Soviet intelligence officer hints at the philosophical reason why non-combatants are no longer safe from military annihilation: popular government. When nations were ruled by monarchies or dictatorships, the common man was excused from annihilation by foreign armies because commoners had no say in the operation of their government and thus could not be held personally liable for their government’s acts. The foreign army’s object was to capture or kill the enemy king and all those who fought on his behalf. The non-combatant subjects of a king were recognized as innocents and (though subject to inadvertent harm) not “officially” attacked or killed.

However, with the onset of “popular” governments—Republics and democracies where the mass of ordinary people had some control over the operation of their governments—that mass of ordinary people also became personally liable for their government’s acts and thus subject to punishment for those acts.

On September 14, 2001—just three days after the 9/11 attack—the semi-official Russian news service “Strana.ru” published an interview with Andrei Kosyakov, a former Soviet intelligence officer. Mr. Kosyakov offered some surprising insight into the possible causes of the 9/11 assault. An excerpt from his interview reveals that—just as the United States and former USSR held each other’s citizens (and the world) subject to Mutually Assured Destruction—terrorists likewise hold subjects of *democracies* personally liable for their government’s acts.

Q: Do you think there will be new attacks?

Kosyakov: . . . The fact that the terrorists are not claiming responsibility, indicates that they will strike again and again. Until the second stage is reached—the stage of *global conflict*. This is the goal of all these actions. . . .

Q: You say the [next] attack will be *in America*?

Kosyakov: Yes. . . . remember that besides the airplanes, also an automobile was blown up. So, what would have prevented the terrorists from also simultaneously blowing up a couple of automobiles in Europe, if they are preparing to carry out actions *all over the world*? No, the target was *America*, and the *civilian population* in particular.

There is a formula: In *democratic* countries the *population* is responsible for the actions of their government. This formula guides the terrorists. Therefore, the next attacks will follow the same principle.<sup>1</sup>

Note that this “formula” is not only *recognized* by terrorists and Russian intelligence, but even by our own democratic government. We catch a glimpse of the people’s individual liability in *American Communications Association v. Douds*, 339 U.S. 382, 442, where the U.S. Supreme Court ruled:

“It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the Government from falling into error.”

That may seem like pretty flimsy evidence, but it illustrates that even our own government agrees that *people*—not government—are responsible for governmental errors.

In “Judgement Day in Mystery Babylon,” author Anthony C. Lobaido explored the Moslem world’s reasons for hating the USA. Those reasons involved the American people’s “failure” to “keep Government from falling into error.” He wrote in part:

America has killed over 500,000 Iraqi *children* under the age of 5 years old with our anti-Saddam sanctions. When asked about this death toll, former Secretary of State Madeline Albright said, “Well it was worth it.” . . . Where are our tears for

the half-million Iraqi children? Or don't they count?

A Clinton adviser was quoted in George Stephanopolous' book describing the "Clinton Doctrine" as "kill their *civilians* until their military can't take any more." [Emph. add.]

Although we don't like to talk about it, the ragtag Moslem terrorists are not alone in their willingness to kill non-combatants. Virtually every major government on earth (including ours) accepts the murder of innocent civilians.

Thus, according to the terrorists' "formula," the American *people*—not the government or military—are "legitimately" liable for their government's acts. Based on that liability, terrorists feel justified in attacking men, women and children who we regard as "innocent".

And why not? Whether they know it or not, the subjects of a democracy implicitly accept their status as persons without unalienable Rights to "Life, Liberty or the pursuit of Happiness". Insofar as they've rejected the God-given Right to *Life*, why shouldn't they be killed? If the subjects of democracy allowed their government to precipitate the deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children, what moral or spiritual principle should shield those subjects from suffering similar tragedies?

The "formula" that holds democracies liable for their government's acts is *recognized* by intelligence agents, terrorists and even our own government—and is consistent with the belief that adverse spiritual consequences may follow switching from a Republic that secured God's blessings (individually-held, unalienable Rights) to a democracy that denies the existence of those Rights and the relevance of the God who granted them.

Atheists may dismiss that hypothesis as more silly Bible-thumping, but it raises a disturbing question: Could the philosophical foundation for the Cold War—Mutually Assured Destruction (global thermo-nuclear war)—have been embraced or even advanced by a *Republic* built on the premise that "all men are created equal, and endowed by their *Creator* with certain unalienable Rights"?

I doubt that any such Republic could legally, philosophically, or spiritually adopt a strategy that called for the indiscriminate and inten-

### Common Law Immunities Seminars

Our two-day seminars explain income tax in the context of the *Declaration of Independence*. We teach administrative and legal strategies which enable you to claim common law immunities from income taxation. You can use this strategy to:

- Claim a refund on income taxes paid for previous years.
- Claim exemption (immunity) from current taxes.
- Claim this immunity for others as a "third party".

Our next seminars will be on the weekend of **June 9 & 10** at the Best Suites Hotel, 125 Kaliste Saloom Road, **Lafayette, Louisiana.**

Seminar Fees are **\$250 for two days** and include written lessons and sample forms. Call for more information or register by fax at **337-993-2539**. Send fees to:

**College of Common Law, PMB 32  
3527 Ambassador Caffery, Lafayette, La. USA 70503**

tional murder of millions of non-combatants. I doubt that any such Republic could easily adopt a strategy that risked poisoning the planet with doses of radiation so toxic that entire species—including our own—might be rendered extinct.

But, on the other hand, such devastation could be easily embraced by any *collective* society (communism, socialism or democracy) that denied the existence of God-given, individually-held “unalienable Rights”.

Collectivism kills. And it doesn’t kill a few individuals or even a few towns. It kills nations, civilizations, species and perhaps even the world. And much of this death flow from a “formula” that holds sub-

jects of a democracy liable for the acts of their government. That personal liability is just since, at bottom, the subjects of democracy have rejected unalienable Rights, the source of those Rights (God), and (implicitly) the idea that any man has a soul. Thus, collectivism in any form (even the seemingly benign democracy) provides a subtle invitation to evil.

When it comes to killing one man or a million, the collectivist’s only question is “Why not?” For collectivists, there is no answer. For example, some estimate that Communists killed over 100 million during the 20th Century. If anyone asked “Why not?”—no collectivist has so far offered a compelling answer.

In our American democracy, we’ve murdered 50 million children by abortion over the past forty years. Some clerics and Christians lament those deaths, but can anyone provide a “why not” to a collectivist government that refuses to recognize God? Apparently not.

Insofar as collectivism is the philosophical foundation for Mutually Assured Destruction, genocide, abortion and (in the extreme) the end of the world, then even atheists should see the desirability of living in a Republic. Even atheists should admit that they’re more likely to live to a ripe old age in a Republic that recog-

nized their unalienable Rights to “Life” than in a democracy that recognized nothing but the *vox populi*.

**T**hose who study “End Times” eschatology are perplexed by prophecies that Israel will fight alone. Apparently, the mighty U.S.A. plays no role in Armageddon. Some believe this absence implies the U.S.A. will have been destroyed or incapacitated long before the “final battle”. But could such national destruction take place unless God were no longer inclined to “bless America”?

I suspect that the spiritual and political differences between our former Republic and our current democracy are so great, that the choice between them may be a life-or-death decision. I believe that if the God of the Bible is real and democracy is a collectivist political

## Store Food NOW!

We have been attacked and may be again! Our food and water supply may be at risk! Can you risk *not* having some food stored? You *can* afford our prices!

We offer the highest quality, longest storing, best tasting dehydrated, freeze-dried foods and real meats available. Basic, 11 case, 1 Year Food Supply: \$720.00 + s/h. *Official Pocket Survival Manual*, \$15.00 ppd. Family grain mill, \$87.75 delivered. SproutMaster, \$16.00 delivered.

*Check out our canned meats!*  
Bruce and Phyllis Hopkins  
**Best Prices Storable Foods**  
1737 Cascade Street  
Mesquite (Dallas) Texas 75149  
(972) 288-0262  
<http://www.internet-grocer.com>

system, then America can't survive for long as a democracy.

*Jeremiah 1:16* warns,

"I will pronounce my judgments on my people because of their wickedness in *forsaking* me."

Maybe God won't forgive the insult of collectivism. Maybe God *won't* bless a people who "forsook" their Republic (and the God-given Rights on which it was built) to embrace a "separated" democracy.

Or maybe *Jeremiah* is old news and doesn't apply in this instance. Maybe God just loves everyone unconditionally who lives north of the Rio Grande and south of Canada. Maybe the post-9/11 extravaganza where Celine Dion and a choir of Hollywood celebrities sang "God Bless America" was enough to keep God blessing this nation forever. Could be.

But *Jeremiah 2:19* warns again:

"... Consider then and realize how evil and bitter it is for you when you *forsake* the Lord your God and have no awe of me," declares the Lord, the Lord Almighty.

Collectivist political systems (like democracy) are necessarily atheistic because they *can't* show "awe" (respect or recognition) for God or the Rights (blessings) he provides.

Again, *Jeremiah 2:27-28* warns:

... They have turned their backs to me and not their faces; yet when they are in trouble, they say, 'Come and save us!' Where then are the gods you made for yourselves? Let them come if they can save you when you are in trouble!

I can't help wondering if America crossed a dangerous spiritual "line" when we rejected our State Republics to become a single National democracy.

Did we forfeit God's former protections by crossing that "line"? Could it already be too late to cross back to a Republic ... ?

We shall see.

If the stock market bounces back up to 11,000 and beyond ... if bin Laden et al are captured or killed ... if terrorist attacks on the USA cease—then my concerns are groundless, my analysis of the spiritual implications of democracy is nonsense, and maybe all religions *do* speak the same message.

We shall see.

It may take a few years. But we shall see.

<sup>1</sup>The complete interview can be found at: [http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/01/09/WTC\\_Kosyakov.html](http://www.fpp.co.uk/online/01/09/WTC_Kosyakov.html).

