

Cutting off someone's water supply—especially in a deliberate, hostile act—can cross into the realm of **terrorism** if it's meant to intimidate, coerce, or harm a population for political, ideological, or strategic reasons.

Here's how it breaks down:

What Makes It Terrorism?

According to international and U.S. definitions, an act is considered terrorism when it:

- **Intentionally harms civilians or infrastructure**
- Is done to **intimidate or coerce** a population or government
- Has a **political, religious, or ideological motive**

So if someone cuts off water to a household out of personal spite, it's likely **criminal sabotage** or harassment. But if it's done to destabilize a community, punish a group, or pressure a government, it could be classified as **terrorism**—especially if the act causes widespread suffering or fear.

Hydroterrorism: A Recognized Tactic

The term **hydroterrorism** refers to the weaponization of water—either by contaminating it, destroying infrastructure, or cutting off access. It's been used by groups like ISIS in Syria and Iraq, and has gained attention from governments and scholars as a form of **asymmetric warfare**.

Examples include:

- Poisoning water supplies (e.g., Rajneeshee cult in Oregon, 1984)
 - Bombing dams or pipelines (e.g., FARC in Colombia)
 - Cutting off water to cities during conflict (e.g., Macedonia, 2001)
-

Legal Implications

Under U.S. law, acts that damage critical infrastructure—like water systems—can be prosecuted under **anti-terrorism statutes**, especially if they:

- Affect public health or safety
- Are intended to cause mass disruption
- Involve interstate or federal systems

The Department of Homeland Security and EPA both classify water infrastructure as **critical**, and attacks on it are treated with high severity.

So yes—if **the act is hostile, strategic, and intended to instill fear or cause harm**, cutting off water can absolutely be considered a form of terrorism.