

# MAD MEN AT THE HELM

By Monte L. Myers



# Contents

<b>Part 1: Pax Americana</b> .....	pg 4
<b>The Wofowitz Memorandum and Geopolitics</b> .....	pg 6
<b>Escaping the Matrix</b> .....	pg 9
<b>The History of the New World Order</b> .....	pg 12
<b>Collectivism vs Individualism</b> .....	pg 13
<b>The Patriot Movement</b> .....	pg 15
<b>A Democracy vs A Republic</b> .....	pg 18
<b>The Fabian Society</b> .....	pg 20
<b>The Central Bank</b> .....	pg 22
<b>The Trade Deficit</b> .....	pg 26
<b>The Road to War</b> .....	pg 26
<b>Part 2: World War I</b> .....	pg 28
<b>The Sinking of the Lusitania</b> .....	pg 30
<b>Treaty of Versailles</b> .....	pg 33
<b>Part 3: World War II</b> .....	pg 38
<b>The Neutrality Act &amp; The Ludlow Amendment</b> .....	pg 39
<b>Hitler’s March to War with Europe</b> .....	pg 39
<b>Hitler Invades Poland</b> .....	pg 41
<b>Evasion of the Neutrality Act</b> .....	pg 41
<b>Pearl Harbor—Roosevelt’s Back Door to War</b> .....	pg 45
<b>The United Nations and GATT</b> .....	pg 51
<b>A Quiet Country Meeting in Bretton Woods</b> .....	pg 51
<b>Berlin Airlift</b> .....	pg 52

<b>Part 4: The Korean War—The Bay of Pigs</b> .....	pg 54
The Bay of Pigs Incident.....	pg 56
Operation Northwoods.....	pg 58
<b>Part 5: The Vietnam War</b> .....	pg 60
The Gulf of Tonkin Incident.....	pg 60
<b>Part 6: The Gulf War</b> .....	pg 62
The Case for Desert Storm.....	pg 64
<b>Part 7: September 11, 2001</b> .....	pg 66
Afghanistan.....	pg 71
The Pipeline Plots.....	pg 72
The War on Terror.....	pg 76
Conspiracy Aside; the Current Situation.....	pg 78
The United Nations Debate on the War on Iraq.....	pg 80
The Euro vs the Dollar.....	pg 82
The End of Cheap Oil.....	pg 86
The War on Drugs.....	pg 90
The Rush to War with Iraq.....	pg 91
The Pony in the Manure Story.....	pg 95
Why Are We Hated in the Islamic World?.....	pg 96
The Loss of Civil Liberties.....	pg 99
The Patriot Act.....	pg 100
A Case in Point.....	pg 105
The Return of the Draft.....	pg 107
Epilogue.....	pg 109

# Pax Americana

Since time immemorial, there have been those who wished to conquer the world and preside over an empire. Many have tried and failed. History has shown us that all the great ancient empires of earth, from the Persian to the Roman, fell when they were at their peak; none withstanding. Roman civilization had many parallels to our own. The Roman Empire was a historical construct, and contemporary Romans always referred to their country as a Republic.

Of course, Rome became an empire as successive Emperors consolidated power and began ruling far flung provinces. But the republican values were an egalitarian fiction until the fall of Rome. It is interesting to note that the United States is never officially referred to as an empire, although our country has assumed many imperial characteristics. The Roman Empire did not fall to one superior enemy. Rather the Empire died the death of a thousand cuts, suffering repeated attacks against her frontiers and invasions by increasingly larger and better organized enemies. By the end of the Empire, Roman citizens were loathe to join the legions and defend their country—the wars were fought with slaves.

It was Caesar who transformed the Roman Republic into the Roman Empire. A brilliant general, he waged campaigns throughout modern-day France, Germany, Britain, and Turkey. In 46 BCE, he had himself appointed *Imperator* for life. Two years later, he was assassinated by a group of conspirators who believed they were striking a blow for the return of the Republic. Thirteen years of civil strife followed. The Republic was finished; but the Roman Empire persisted for another four centuries. Caesar had transformed his world; he was, for a brief time, the most powerful human being in the Western world.

Today the American Republic appears to many pundits to be at a juncture somewhat comparable to the one that Rome confronted in 50 BCE. The analogy is exceedingly imprecise, however. The U.S. is vastly more fearsome than Rome in every respect, possessing weapons no ancient emperor could have ever dreamed of. Moreover, President Bush is far from being a brave and tactically brilliant general as the great Caesar, who was also an eloquent orator. Our current American leader's abilities in this regard hardly require description; but for those who are not sure what I mean, I will let George W. Bush speak for himself:

*“Poor people aren't necessarily killers. Just because you happen to be not rich doesn't mean you're willing to kill.”*—President George W. Bush May 19, 2003

Nevertheless, Bush has seized nearly complete control of this nation and seems determined both to extend its global influence militarily, and to undermine its democratic institutions, just as surely as his ancient counterpart did.

John Quincy Adams admonished that America ought not “*go abroad in search of monsters to destroy.*”

I suppose no one could question our right to attack al-Qaeda in Afghanistan after September 11th, but that moral authority has been squandered by the reckless invasion of Iraq. 140,000 U.S. troops are now attempting to occupy the country against increasing resistance from indigenous guerrillas. One third of our standing Army is now committed to Iraq and Afghanistan, and the War on Terror is far from won. President Bush's imperial ambitions have scattered our Armed Forces across the globe.

Now this administration has publicly threatened Iran, as if occupying the entire Middle East will somehow eliminate terrorism. Rather these unwarranted attacks are winning over Arabs to a radical form of Islam, while providing targets to those militants by sending U.S. troops into their midst. The American people have good reasons to fear for the future, and nowhere to turn for answers.

The primary issue in the presidential election of 2004 is not about abortion, gun control, taxes, healthcare, or the economy; it is about the fundamental premise of our democracy and whether we desire to be a "Pax Americana" with George W. Bush as the first emperor, or a republic with John Kerry as president.

The purpose of this book, then, is to revisit the history of American foreign policy and the wars that followed. We will be examining issues that may make you wonder "What on earth has this to do with today." But I can assure you, when we reach the end of our journey; you will see that everything we cover has a direct relevance to today and, in particular, to the war on terrorism. Perhaps we can learn from those lessons of history, and somehow find a foreign policy for the new century that might unite most of us, and ensure that America endures as the greatest republic in history, rather than just another fallen empire. I cannot think of a more critical time in history when exercising our right to vote and protecting our republic was more important.

It was Will Durant who said, "*Those who know nothing about history are doomed forever to repeat it.*"

At the opening of the twentieth century there were five great Western empires—the British, French, Russian, German, and Austro-Hungarian—and two emerging great powers: Japan and the United States. By century's end, all the empires had disappeared. How did they perish? By war—all of them.

Yet, today, the Bush administration is reenacting every folly that brought these great powers to ruin—from arrogance and hubris, to assertions of global hegemony, to imperial overstretch, to trumpeting new "crusades," to handing out war guarantees to regions and countries where Americans have never fought before. A fateful "crossing of the Rubicon" has taken place without so much as a whimper from the people at large. Our country is today traveling the same path that was trod by the Roman and British Empires—to the same fate.

*"Terrorism is the best political weapon for nothing drives people harder than a fear of sudden death."*  
—Adolf Hitler

## The Wofowitz Memorandum and Geopolitics

With the end of the Cold War, internationalists quickly pressed the American neoconservatives to seize the moment to begin an era of “beneficent global hegemony.” The lure of empire is ancient and powerful, and over the millennia it has driven men to commit terrible crimes on its behalf. But with the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Soviet Union, a global empire was essentially laid at the feet of the United States. Our pre-eminence over the globe was supreme. To the chagrin of some, we did not seize it at the time, in large part because the American people have never been comfortable with themselves as a New Rome.

The Republican establishment was first to advance this imperialist vision. Its hand was tipped in early 1992 in a secret Pentagon memorandum leaked to the *New York Times*. Prepared under the direction of then Undersecretary Paul Wofowitz, the forty-six-page memo was described by the *Washington Post* as a “classified blueprint intended to help set the nation's direction for the next century....”

The Wofowitz memo envisioned permanent U.S. involvement on every continent. America's dominance was to remain so great as to deter “potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role.” The Pentagon had decided the United States would never permit any nation to rise ever again—even to the status of regional superpower. To maintain global hegemony, the Pentagon anticipated U.S. military intervention for promoting ends far beyond the protection of vital interests.

From society's point of view, geopolitics is a Darwinian collective struggle for increased carrying capacity; but from the individual geostrategist's viewpoint, it is a game. Indeed, geopolitics could be considered the ultimate human game—one with immense consequences, and one that can only be played within a tiny club of elites. As long as there have been civilizations and empires, kings and emperors have played some version of this game. The game attracts a particular kind of personality, and it fosters a certain way of thinking and feeling about the world and about other human beings.

The act of playing the game confers feelings of immense superiority, aloofness, power, and importance. One can begin to appreciate the supremely addictive intoxication that flows from playing the geopolitical game by reading documents composed by prominent geostrategists, national security briefing papers by people like George Kennan and Richard Perle, or books by Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Take, for example, this passage from Kennan's U.S. State Department Policy Planning Study #23 from 1948:

*“We have 50 per cent of the world's wealth, but only 6.3 per cent of its population. In this situation, our real job in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which permit us to maintain this position of disparity. To do so, we have to dispense with all sentimentality... we should cease thinking about human rights, the raising of living standards and democratization.”*

Why should we pay any attention to the ravings of this Wofowitz would-be Napoleon? What makes his nightmare visions important to us? Because in Sept of 1999, two *years* before 9/11, author Justin Raimondo wrote: “*That Paul Wofowitz, the author of this mad memorandum, is now a top foreign policy advisor to George Bush, the theoretician and behind-the-scenes policymaker who could well be the next Secretary of State, is a thought that ought to send chills down the spines of noninterventionists of every political persuasion and coloration. What could be clearer? If George W. Bush slips into the White House, we are headed for war.*”

Paul Wofowitz is now Deputy Secretary of Defense, under Rumsfeld, in the Bush administration. His story starts in 1977. As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Regional Programs, his job was to assess the impact of major budget decisions on U.S. long-term strategy for defending U.S. interests in the Gulf region. When he assumed office as Under Secretary of Defense for Policy in 1989, Wofowitz once again focused on strategic planning for the Gulf. In light of the magnitude of U.S. interests at stake, Wofowitz decided the potential Iraqi threat over the long term required serious U.S. attention.

Because the argument was persuasive with Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, plans for rapid deployment of U.S. military forces to the region were brought up to date, and measures to ensure effective deployment were undertaken. All they needed was a good reason to invade. Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait brought that reason in spades. The result we called *Desert Storm*.

Americans are now beginning to pay the price for sleeping through history classes, ignoring important information in the alternative media and neglecting to participate in their own political process. Apathy is no longer an adequate term of description for the steady erosion of the public’s involvement in the political life of the United States. I find it quite remarkable that we live in the largest non-participatory democracy in the world. Less than 1 in 4 of the America people even bother to vote. Traditional forms of party politics, political values and identities have little purchase on an evidently disenchanted public. Popular mistrust of authority is confirmed by the growing alienation of people from the system of elections where a significant proportion of the electorate believes that voting is a waste of time. This apathy towards our voting process plays right into the hands of the ruling elite. Increasingly, every election threatens to become an embarrassing reminder of the political wasteland that we inhabit. And how more graphically could that have been driven home than by the election in 2000? And in light of this, I find it quite disturbing that it remains so—for it is not in people's nature to be long content with their condition. A baby's first three words tend to be mama, dada, and *more*.

The reality that many fail to realize is that the reason why people don’t vote is not because they are extremely busy, politically illiterate, or because they can’t find the polling booth, but because there is a widespread conviction that politics simply *do not matter* and that most institutions have little bearing on their lives. It is widely feared that the world is out of control and there is little that human beings can do to master these developments or influence their destiny.

The imperialistic foreign policy and the assault on our civil liberties being proffered by our current administration is rooted in the beliefs of religious zealots and hegemonistic warmongers. “So what”, you may say, believing there are more reasonable people than there are religious zealots and hawks of war. There are. There is only one problem; we don't vote. The result is a form of oligarchic politics that is precisely the goal of the ruling elite—who *always* votes. They have mastered their influence on *their* destiny. We have ignored ours; and do so at our own peril.

*“Never forget that the iron law of oligarchy always obtains; few people will always run everything, no matter what the institution or what the country.”*

—James Madison

So, what do I mean when I say, “the ruling elite,” and how does its existence bear on the current issue before us in this most troubling time in American history? If one group is effectively in control of national governments and multinational corporations; promotes world government through control of media, foundation grants, and education; and controls and guides the issues of the day; then they control most options available.

The Council on Foreign Relations, financed by a number of the largest tax-exempt foundations, has done all these things, and promotes the “New World Order”—as they have for over 80 years. The CFR was founded for “*the purpose of promoting disarmament and submergence of U.S. sovereignty and national independence into an all-powerful one-world government.*” The CFR headquarters and library is located in the five-story Howard Pratt mansion (a gift from Pratt’s widow, who was an heir to the Standard Oil fortune) at 58 E. 68th Street, in New York City (on the corner of Park Ave. and 68th Street), on the opposite corner of the Soviet Embassy to the United Nations.

The CFR is the promotional arm of the Illuminati in the United States of America, and became the American headquarters. The Ancient Illuminated Seers of Bavaria, which became known as the ***Order of the Illuminati***, was organized on May 1, 1776 by Adam Weishaupt, at the behest of the newly-organized House of Rothschild (Five Jewish brothers who established banks wielding enormous power from the five great European capitals - Frankfurt, London, Paris, Vienna, Naples) with one goal in mind—a one world government. Most influential politicians, academics and media personalities are members of the CFR, and it uses its influence to infiltrate the New World Order into American life. Its’ “experts” write scholarly pieces to be used in decision making, the academics expound on the wisdom of a united world, and the media members disseminate the message.

I should emphasize that most of these people are not part of a secret society. The CFR calls itself a *semi* - secret organization, which, indeed, it is. Members, who do not adhere to its strict secrecy, can be dropped from their membership. But it is not *the* secret society; we will discuss them later in the book.

The CFR is at least two rings out from that secret society. Most members are not aware that they are controlled by an inner group. For the most part, they are merely opportunists who view this organization as a high level employment agency. They know that if they are invited to join their names will appear on a prestigious list, and the “*ruling elite*”—The Illuminati—seeking to consolidate global control, will draw upon that list for important jobs. However, even though they may not be conscious agents of *the* secret society, they have all been carefully screened for suitability. Only those who have the necessary mindset to be functionaries within the New World Order are invited.

What must be remembered is that this is not some lunatic-fringe group; these are members of one of the most powerful private organizations in the world: the people who determine and control American economic, social, political, and military policy. Members' influence and control extends to “leaders in academia, public service, business, and the media,” according to the CFR “Annual Report.”

Current Bush administration CFR members include: Colin Powell, George Tenet, Condolezza Rice, Richard Perle, Paul Wofowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, and Dick Cheney. CFR media personalities include David Brinkley, Tom Brokaw, William Buckley, Peter Jennings, Bill Moyers, Dan Rather, Diane Sawyer, and Barbara Walters.

In financial institutions, such as banks, the Federal Reserve System (Alan Greenspan CFR), the stock exchanges, and brokerage houses the total number of CFR members in controlling positions is 284.

In the Media there are past or present members of the CFR holding key management or control positions: Christian-Science Monitor, USA Today, Wall Street Journal, Los Angeles Times, New York Post, New York Times, San Diego Union-Tribune, Harper’s, National Geographic, Newsweek, Reader’s Digest, Rolling Stone, Scientific American, Time-Warner, Time, U.S. News & World Report, Washington Post, The Washingtonian, Weekly Standard, World Policy Journal, Worldwatch, ABC, CBS, CNN, NBC, PBS, RCA, and the Walt Disney Company.

Are you beginning to understand why we have a problem with our news and our media?

### **Escaping the Matrix**

What is reality? The defining dramatic moment in the film *The Matrix* occurs just after Morpheus invites Neo to choose between a red pill and a blue pill. The red pill promises “the truth, nothing more.” Neo takes the red pill and awakes to reality—something utterly different from anything Neo, or the audience, could have expected. What Neo had assumed to be reality turned out to be only a collective illusion, fabricated by the Matrix and fed to a population that is asleep, cocooned in grotesque embryonic pods.

Our perspective on the political process, and on the roles of the left and the right, is very far from reality. It is a fabricated collective illusion. Morpheus tells Neo that the Matrix is “*the world that was pulled over your eyes to hide you from the truth.... As long as the Matrix exists, humanity cannot be free.*” Consensus political reality is precisely such a matrix. Growing glitches in the matrix weren’t noticed by most people in the West, because the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century brought unprecedented levels of Western prosperity and social progress. But the matrix cannot fool all of the people all of the time. In the 1960s large numbers of Westerners, particularly the young and well educated, began to notice glitches in the matrix and, as you *know*, their intervention changed the world.

I know—I was one of those who rose to the occasion. Many of us saw the writings on the wall and began to develop a hypothesis on the origins of the matrix. At that time, it was difficult to garner any solid information to support our hypotheses. Today, with the advent of the Internet, together with the continued unfolding of the New World Order agenda on the ground, it has been relatively easy to confirm and to expand the original hypothesis. The evidence has become overwhelming and conclusive. There *is* a New World Order agenda; it is a consciously organized project; it brings the end of national sovereignty and the destabilization of Western democracy; it is based on the intentional maintenance of international conflict; and it is to be backed by a ruthless and centralized military force.

The American people are deeply unaware of their predicament; and with the soporific encouragement of television they are—as more than one commentator has put it, and on more than one occasion—“*sleepwalking through history.*” One might get the impression that this is a nation of imbeciles (and this does seem to be the view from the rest of the world); but Americans aren’t inherently any more stupid than anyone else. They are being deliberately and systematically programmed. Their attention is distracted and manipulated from morning till night by slick PR professionals in both corporate and government offices. To sum it up—we in the U.S. have become an *audience* to a presentation. As in the Roman Republic, the meaning of citizenship had been reduced to the act of watching circuses. Ask yourself these questions:

Do you get your news from alternative sources and think critically about world issues?”

Do you watch lots of television and pay minimal attention to civic and world affairs?

Are you so absorbed with work and family that you just don’t have time to think about much else?

The Council on Foreign Relations is one of several organizations with the same universal goal: “One World Order” and the subjugation of democracy as we know it. The Bilderberg Group, The Tri-Lateral Commission, The Order of Skull & Bones at Yale, and The Free Masons. I invite you to do a web search on these organizations. Start here: [http://www.propagandamatrix.com/archive\\_new\\_world\\_order.html](http://www.propagandamatrix.com/archive_new_world_order.html)

The CFR has only been investigated once, and that was in 1954, by the Special House Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (the Reece Committee), who said that the CFR was “*in essence an agency of the United States Government.*” The Committee discovered that their directives were aimed “*overwhelmingly at promoting the globalistic concept.*” Norman Dodd, the chief investigator for the Reece Committee interviewed Rowan Gaither, who was the President of the Ford Foundation at that time. Rowan Gaither was advanced in his years and died shortly after this interview:

Mr. Gaither said to Mr. Dodd, “*Would you be interested in knowing what we do here at the Ford Foundation?*” Then, without any prodding at all, Gaither says, “*Mr. Dodd, we operate in response to directives, the substance of which is that we shall use our grant making power to alter life in the United States so that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union (Leninists).*”

Dodd almost falls off of his chair when he hears that. Then he says to Gaither, “*Well, sir, you can do anything you please with your grant making powers, but don’t you think you have an obligation to make a disclosure to the American people? You enjoy tax exemption, which means you are indirectly subsidized by taxpayers, so, why don’t you tell the Congress and the American people what you just told me?*” And Gaither replies, “*We would never dream of doing such a thing.*”

The complete transcript of Mr. Dodd’s testimony: [www.realityzone.com](http://www.realityzone.com).

Just type “Norman Dodd” into the search box. It is a chilling and eye-opening read.

The question that arises in your mind is: How would it be possible for anyone to think that they could alter life in the United States so it could be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union and, by implication, with other nations of the world? What an absurd thought that would be—especially in 1954. That would require the abandonment of American concepts of justice, traditions of liberty, national sovereignty, cultural identity, constitutional protections, and political independence, to name just a few.

I know that many of you are thinking...hmmm, sounds like that far-right conspiracy foolishness....Well, yes it is, but it is not foolishness and I am far from that ideology. I am a registered Democrat, do not own a gun, and my closest right-wing affiliation is being a member of the Sierra Club. My only held government position to possibly sully my good name was that of a National Park Ranger.

It is important to realize that conspiratorial ideologies of globalization are not limited to tiny sects of paranoid mountain men or platoons of weekend warriors, as sound-bite stereotypes might suggest. So, keep your skepticism alive, but open your mind as you read on.

“*There’s really five companies that control 90 percent of what we read, see and hear.*”

—Ted Turner

## The History of the New World Order

The phrase “*new world order*” came to the attention of most present day Americans on an earlier September 11th—to be precise, September 11, 1990, during an address by the first President George Bush to a joint session of Congress regarding Saddam Hussein’s invasion of Kuwait. In that speech, after briefly describing four aims of an envisioned war against Iraq, the president made the following infamous statement: “*Out of these troubled times; our fifth objective—a **new world order**—can emerge... We are now in sight of a United Nations that performs as envisioned by its founders.*” The basic concept of the “*new world order*” is world government.

In the late nineteenth century, with the industrial revolution sweeping Europe and America, some of the more erudite of those from the wealthy, intellectual classes of England dreamed of a world far different from the one they lived in; a world organized in such a way that wars would be impossible and every aspect of human life would be arranged by educated men for the benefit of all. From the very beginning, they discussed how to alter life in the United States, how to change the attitudes of Americans to give up their cherished principles and concepts of government and be more receptive to what we will call the *collectivist* model of society. I will talk more about what the word *collectivist* means in a moment, but they used that word quite often.

After many months of deliberation, they came to the conclusion that, out all of the options available for altering the attitudes of people in the United States, there was only one that was really dependable. That option was *war*. In times of war, they reasoned, only then would people be willing to give up things they cherish in return for the desperate need and desire for security against a deadly enemy. And so the decision was made that it must do whatever it can to *manipulate* the United States into war. They also said there were other things needed, and these were their words: “*We must control education in the United States.*” They realized that was a pretty big order, so they teamed up with the Rockefeller Foundation and the Guggenheim Foundation to pool their financial resources to control education in America—in particular, to control the teaching of history. They assigned those areas of responsibility that involved issues relating to domestic affairs to the Rockefeller Foundation, and those issues related to international affairs were taken on as the responsibility of the Carnegie Endowment.

Their first goal was to rewrite the history books, and they discussed how to do that at great length. They approached some of the more prominent historians of the time and presented to them the proposition that they rewrite history to favor the concept of collectivism, but they were turned down flat. Then they decided—and these are their own words, “*We must create our own stable of historians.*” They selected twenty candidates at the university level who were seeking doctorates in American History. They interviewed them, analyzed their thinking processes, and chose the twenty they thought were best suited for their purpose. This group of twenty historians eventually formed the nucleus of what we know now as the American Historical Association.

Then toward the end of the 1920's the Carnegie Endowment Fund for International Peace granted to the American Historical Association the sum of \$400,000—a huge amount of money in those days—for a study of history in a manner that points to what this country can look forward to in the future. That culminates in a seven-volume study, the last volume of which is a summary of the contents of the other six. And the essence of the last volume is, the future of this country belongs to collectivism, administered with characteristic American efficiency.

### **Collectivism vs Individualism**

Collectivism. You are going to hear it a lot. Especially if you delve into the historical papers of the individuals and groups we are discussing, you will find them using the word over and over. Although most people have only a vague concept of what collectivism is, the advocates of collectivism have a very definite understanding of it, so let's explore that concept for a moment.

In order to appreciate the essence of collectivism, we need to step backward and look at the larger picture encompassing the political ideologies that divide people in this age. You find those who claim they are conservatives, and they will debate wildly with those who think of themselves as liberals. Left-wingers disagree with right-wingers. You find people who say they are Socialists or Communists or Fascists or whatever words they choose to identify their point of view. But, when you ask them to explain what those words mean, very few can agree. For the most part, they are merely labels without clear or precise definitions.

Let's put some meaning to them. I think that all of the great political issues, the ideological issues at least, can be divided into two viewpoints. All of the rest is fluff. Basically, a person is either a collectivist or an individualist. We are talking about collectivism vs. individualism. What do *these* words mean?

First of all, I should tell you that, from my observation, collectivists and individualists, for the most part, are all good people. They want the best life possible for their families, for their countrymen, and for the world—for mankind. They all want peace, prosperity, and justice. They want freedom. Sometime they disagree over what the tradeoff should be for freedom; but, still, they all want the good things for their fellow man. Where they disagree is how to bring those things about. Those two words have meaning, and they describe a chasm of morality that divides the entire Western world.

The collectivist sees government as the *solver* of problems. The individualist, by the way, is more skeptical. He tends to look at government as the *creator* of problems. If there is a really big problem, such as the environmental issue involving the whole planet, the collectivist is convinced that it cannot be solved except through the action of world government. The individualist, on the other hand, sees that if you sacrifice the individual for the group, you have made a huge mistake. You can't have a forest except *for* the trees.

Collectivists and individualists both agree that human rights are important, but they differ drastically over what is the origin of those rights. There are only two possibilities in this debate. Either Man's rights are *intrinsic* to his being, or they are *extrinsic*; either he possesses them at birth or they are given to him afterward. In other words, they are either hardware or software. Individualists believe they are hardware. Collectivists believe they are software. The view of individualism was expressed clearly in the United States Declaration of Independence, which said: "*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.*"

By contrast, all collectivist political systems embrace the view that rights are granted by the state. That includes the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists. It is also a tenet of the United Nations. Article 4 of the UN Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights says: "*The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize that, in the enjoyment of those rights provided by the State ... the State may subject such rights only to such limitations as are determined by law.*" The reason this is important is that, if we agree that the state has the power to *grant* rights, then we must also agree it has the power to *take them away*. When governments claim to derive their authority from any source other than the governed, it always leads to the destruction of liberty and tyranny.

In the Middle East and parts of Africa and Asia, there is a third ethic called theocracy, a form of government that combines church and state and compels citizens to accept a particular religious doctrine. That was common throughout early European Christendom and it appeared even in some of the colonies of the United States. It survives in today's world in the form of Islam, and it has millions of advocates. Any comprehensive view of political ideology must include theocracy.

Compare that with the Bill of Rights in the United States Constitution. It says Congress shall pass *no* law restricting the rights of freedom of speech, or religion, peaceful assembly, the right to bear arms, and so forth—not *except as determined by law*, but *no* law. What a difference there is between individualism and collectivism.

We are dealing here with one of the reasons people do make a distinction between Republics and Democracies. We have been taught to believe that a Democracy is the ideal form of government. Supposedly, that is what was created by the American Constitution. However, if you read the documents of the Founding Fathers who *wrote* the Constitution, you find that they spoke very poorly of Democracy. They said in plain English that a Democracy was one of the worst possible forms of government. And so they created what they called a Republic.

The bottom line is that the difference between a Democracy and a Republic is the difference between collectivism and individualism. Members of the American Patriot Movement are individualists, albeit they have their own special ideology.

## The Patriot Movement

According to the media, the political far-right is populated by paranoids and crazies, denizens of the “lunatic fringe.” But people with political views, which at first glance we find hard to understand, might not necessarily be crazy or irrational.

*Why* would patriotic Americans feel justified in carrying out a terrorist attack against the U.S. government, such as the destruction of the federal building in Oklahoma City and the outright murder of 168 innocent men, women and children? *What* would lead self-proclaimed “Patriots” to organize and arm themselves for war against their own government? *Why* do they fear that any day agents of the U.S. government will come to confiscate their property and arrest or even kill them? *What* leads them to believe that the United Nations and other international institutions are a grave threat to American sovereignty and the security of our Constitutional rights and liberties? *Why* would they see themselves as modern-day minutemen, citizen-soldiers prepared to defend their liberties against the depredations of federal agents and international elites?

However misplaced and misguided, they may be trying to make sense of a complex and changing world in terms of the ideas and information available to them. The goal here is not to arouse your sympathy for Patriot ideology, or to excuse the angry words or violent deeds of some Patriots. Rather, we will seek a *critical understanding* of their world view.

If you are like most Americans, you probably take it for granted that the U.S. is a *democracy*, and that democracy is a good thing. It may seem surprising, then, to find large numbers of people who consider themselves patriotic Americans but who deplore democracy and insist that the founders of our system of government never intended that it be a democracy. Far-right ideology does not recognize conventional political distinctions between “left” and “right.” However, like conservatives, Patriots believe that the government is too big and powerful, and that this damages individual rights and liberties. What separates Patriots from more mainstream conservatives is the Patriots' belief that the U.S. is now ruled by a *tyrannical government* which has far over-stepped the boundaries of legitimate federal power as laid out in the U.S. Constitution.

In Patriot movement ideology, the rights and liberties of the individual—especially his/her right to property—are fundamental. Patriots believe that the U.S. was founded as a *Constitutional Republic*, in which strict legal limits on government would prevent it from tyrannizing over individuals or impinging upon their rights to dispose of their property as they see fit—that is, a “free market.” By restraining government power, a Constitutional Republic protects those “unalienable Rights” with which we are endowed by our Creator, as the Declaration of Independence put it. Insofar as it protects God-given rights and liberties, the Constitutional Republic is seen as a divinely inspired form of government. Perceived enemies of the Constitutional Republic may then appear also to be enemies of God.

Patriot ideology fears democracy because democracy gives primacy to the rule of the many over the rights of the individual. In this sense, democracy is associated with unlimited government which eventually must result in tyranny. Either democracy will degenerate into mob rule which tramples upon the rights and liberties of individual citizens, or the mob will be controlled or manipulated by a political force powerful enough to keep it in check. In either case, the God-given rights and liberties of individuals are threatened.

*“Most Americans know something is eating away at the foundations of this great nation. Sadly, we witness the presence of powerful forces working to destroy the marvelous foundations given us by farseeing and noble men 200 years ago. The world government sought by the architects of this new world order would mean an end to the nation we inherited, and the destruction of the greatest experiment in human liberty in the history of mankind.”*— John McManus, President of the John Birch Society

McManus refers to “*the men who really run our country*” as “the Insiders.” They are no friends of the American Constitutional Republic. In the eyes of the Patriots, the “Insiders” seek to maximize their own wealth and power on a global scale, and to overcome all obstacles in the way of their desired *New World Order*. For them to attain their goal of absolute global dominance, the protections embodied in the U.S. Constitution must be weakened or destroyed. The concern of the Patriots, in a phrase, is the loss of the Constitution of the United States.

Militias place much stock in the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which says: “*A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.*” Militia members interpret this as Constitutional authority for them to own military-type firearms, and to organize and train as a citizens' military force. They see themselves as the spiritual descendants of the minutemen, ready to take up arms and fight the enemies of liberty on short notice.

For militia members and their sympathizers, then, gun control takes on a special significance. As they see it, military-style weapons are essential for them to fulfill their constitutional role. When the government limits their liberty to own and use firearms, it reduces their ability to resist tyranny and so moves us all one step closer to slavery. Disarmament is a necessary prelude to the pacification and subordination of a once free people and, since Patriots generally believe that this is indeed the ultimate goal of the elite conspirators, it seems to follow that elites will enforce gun control as part of their agenda of domination.

An armed citizen militia may be all that stands between us and the dreaded New World Order. And, of course, it stands to reason that the conspirators will try to crush such resistance, so Patriots and militia members expect to be the targets of federal agencies like the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), whom they depict as the storm troopers of the New World Order.

Here's a little side-bar to consider—the majority of the public, and most responsible criminologists, are in favor of effective gun-control. Yet the government refuses to implement meaningful gun control, allegedly because of “strong political pressure” from the National Rifle Association (NRA) and other pro-gun lobby groups. The plain fact is that effective gun control would be a politically *popular* move, the stridently vocal NRA notwithstanding. I suggest to you that the ultimate consequence of current policy is to create a situation where overwhelming public pressure will build for decisive government action against firearm ownership, and against the armed organizations. In other words, the “government” is intentionally allowing the situation to get out of hand, so that later it can “respond to public pressure” and eliminate the Second Amendment altogether.

I suggest to you that the Waco episode can be seen as an ominous omen, a microcosm of how government will ultimately deal with militias and gangs. When the time to act comes, after public polarization on firearms has reached a fever pitch, “the media” can be expected to launch a far-reaching campaign against these groups. “Revelations” and “leaked documents” will “unexpectedly reveal” the extent and perfidy of the “domestic terrorist threat.” Individual leaders of militias and gangs will suddenly become familiar faces on television screens (like Saddam), and it will be “discovered” that they have psychotic yet charismatic personalities, perverted sex practices and shocking drug habits, hidden bank accounts and racist attitudes, and/or all manner of other sins. Stay tuned.

One of the most important conduits channeling far-right conspiratorial ideology toward a more mainstream mass audience is evangelist Pat Robertson, former host of the 700 Club television talk show and founder of the politically powerful, million-member *Christian Coalition*: “*The Establishment*” (especially the Council on Foreign Relations) seeks “*to form a world system in which enlightened monopolistic capitalism can bring all the diverse currencies, banking systems, credit, manufacturing, and raw materials into one government-supervised whole, policed of course by their own world army.*”

Another important vehicle for the injection of New World Order ideology into the political mainstream has been the populist oratory, journalism and presidential campaigns of Patrick J. Buchanan.

Describing what he meant by “New World Order”, Buchanan explained: “*The UN is its political arm. The so-called International Monetary Fund is going to be the Federal Reserve of the world. The World Bank will provide the income transfers from the United States all over the world... The World Court will prosecute and convict people and their countries, take their citizens and try them in international tribunals. The World Trade Organization...will eventually get...more and more control of world trade, until one day we wake up like Gulliver, find ourselves tied down...with tiny silk strands that by the thousands have been done up during the night, with the strongest nation on earth suddenly immobile*” (*New York Times*, March 8, 1996).

Far-right conspiratorial ideology has gotten a lot closer to the mainstream of American politics than we might like to admit. It is important for students of American politics, and American citizens in general, to understand the fundamental ideas of this ideology so that they may recognize it, and be aware of its potential implications when they encounter it.

*“The unaware are unaware that they are unaware.”*

—Bo Gritz American Patriot and decorated War hero.

## **A Democracy vs a Republic**

In a pure Democracy, the concept is that the majority shall rule. That’s the end of the discussion. You might say, “What’s wrong with that?” Well, there could be *plenty* wrong with that. What about a lynch mob? There is only one person with a dissenting vote, and he is the guy at the end of the rope.

Ah, wait a minute, you say. Maybe the majority should not always rule. How can we protect the individual from the group? Maybe the group could become dangerous. Perhaps we should put limits upon Democracy. That is precisely what a Republic accomplishes. A Republic is simply a *limited Democracy*—a Democracy with limits on what the group can do, with limits on what the majority can do. Republics are characterized by written constitutions that say the government—even though it represents the majority—shall *not* do this; the government shall *not* do that; and it shall be prevented from doing *that*, also. We have individual liberties and rights that stand higher and are more important than the group. And so we begin to get a handle on the debate here, the issue, the cleavage between these two concepts: collectivism on the one hand, individualism on the other.

You can always spot a collectivist because, when he confronts a problem, his first reaction is to say, “There ought to be a law.” His attitude is that we must force people to do what we think they should do, because they are not as smart as we are—we collectivists.

By contrast, individualists say, “We also think we are right and others are wrong, but we don’t believe in forcing anyone to comply with our will because, if we grant that principle, then others, representing larger groups than our own, can compel us to act as they decree, and we will have lost our freedom. A classic example is the ongoing debate over seat belts and motorcycle helmets. The collectivist believes in coercion. The individualist believes in freedom.

There is a story of a Bolshevik revolutionary who was standing on a soapbox speaking to a small crowd in Times Square. After describing the glories of socialism and Communism, he said: “*Come the revolution and everyone will eat peaches and cream.*” A little old man at the back of the crowd yelled out: “*I don’t like peaches and cream.*” The Bolshevik thought about that for a moment and then replied: “*Come the revolution, comrade, you “will” like peaches and cream.*”

There's only one thing that makes sense in constructing a political spectrum and that is to put zero government at one end of the line and 100% at the other. Now we have something we can comprehend. Those who believe in zero government are the anarchists, and those who believe in total government are the totalitarians. With that definition, we find that Communism and Nazism are together at the same end. They are both totalitarian concepts.

Wait a minute, you say...isn't Communism far-left and Nazism far right? Here we have two powerful ideological forces pitted against each other, and the impression is that, somehow, they are opposites. But, what is the difference? They are not opposites at all. They are the same. The insignias may be different, but when you analyze Communism and Nazism, they both embody the principles of Socialism. Communists make no bones about Socialism being their ideal, and the Nazi movement in Germany was actually called the National Socialist Party. Communists believe in *international* Socialism, whereas Nazis advocated *national* Socialism. Communists promote class hatred and class conflict to motivate the loyalty and blind obedience of their followers, whereas the Nazis use *race* conflict and *race* hatred to accomplish the same objective. Other than that, there is absolutely no difference between Communism and Nazism. They are both the epitome of collectivism, and yet we are told they are, supposedly, at opposite ends of the spectrum! Once you get on the slippery slope of collectivism, once you accept that ideology, there is no place to stop until you reach all the way to the end of the scale, which is 100% government.

Regardless of what name you give it, regardless of how you re-label it to make it seem new or different, collectivism is totalitarianism, and it is but a short jump to the other end of the spectrum where anarchy has absolute rule by those with the biggest fists and the most powerful weapons. The only logical place for us to be is somewhere in the middle. That is what our founding fathers tried to leave us: a kind of government that was built on individualism; an ideology that pushes always toward that part of the spectrum that involves the *least* government necessary to make things work instead of collectivism, which always pushes toward the other end of the spectrum for the *most* amount of government to make things work. That government is best which governs least.

This leads us to the smaller subset of that ideology: the Republicans vs the Democrats, the right vs the left, and the conservatives vs the liberals. The pendulum swings back and forth, but never stays near the middle for long, and in our minds we feel democracy is at work; electing a democratic Congress to temper a Republican President—and vice versa. Meanwhile, the collectivists are slowly but surely eroding our republic; making successive efforts for world federation, a League of Nations, and the United Nations. These forces are still pushing for world government, first by one means, and then by another after the first method meets opposition. They never stop. They never admit defeat. There is only delay. It would appear that most politicians are marching to the same drummer with only a slightly different cadence. The major difference seems to be that of control not course.

I cannot help but draw a comparison with the fictional “The Borg” from the Star Trek series. A race of *collective* consciousness beings pillaged from *assimilated* humanoids from many different worlds. Their mantra, “*You will be assimilated, resistance is futile.*” So, who are these people behind the scenes you ask?

### **The Fabian Society**

As we have discussed earlier, the power centers of the United States are controlled by the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). This, in turn, is controlled by a submerged Round Table Group, which is associated with other Round Tables in other countries. These are extensions of a secret society founded by Cecil Rhodes who made his fortunes in South African diamonds and gold. The Rhodes scholarships established by the terms of Cecil Rhodes’ seventh will are known to everyone. Former President Bill Clinton is a Rhodes Scholar.

What is not so widely known is that Rhodes, in five previous wills, left his fortune to form this secret society based upon the theories of John Ruskin; a Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford University in 1870, who taught that those who had inherited the rich culture and the traditions of the British Empire had an obligation to rule the world and make sure that all the less fortunate and stupid people had proper direction. That was basically his message, but it was delivered in a very convincing and appealing manner. One of the best authorities on the Fabian Society is Carroll Quigley, who wrote the book, *Tragedy and Hope*.

This secret society was formed on January 4, 1884, to perpetuate the concept of collectivism based upon the theories and teachings of John Ruskin, and to carry on the *Illuminati* conspiracy and ideology. It was called the Fabian Society. The term “Fabian” itself was chosen because it stood for slow and patient conquest.

In April, 1884, their first publication was distributed, a four-page pamphlet called *Why Are We Poor?* George Bernard Shaw, Arnold Toynbee, H.G. Wells, and people of that high caliber were some of the founding members. Tony Blair, for example, England’s Prime Minister, is a member today.

Fabian leaders were drawn to Herbert George Wells (1866-1946), and his ideas of the ‘New Republic’ which he described as “*a sort of outspoken Secret Society ... an informal and open freemasonry,*” made up of the educated class, whose common goals would lead to the creation of a new World State, thus saving the human race from disaster. In his 1905 book, *A Modern Utopia*, he wrote of the World State taking control and creating a “sane order,” and how they maintained a central records system in Paris, which they used to keep track of every person on Earth, and aided the state to eliminate the *unfit*.

H.G. Wells also wrote a book to serve as a guide for Fabians and their friends showing how *collectivism* can be embedded into society without arousing alarm or serious opposition. It was called *The Open Conspiracy*, and the entire plan is spelled out in detail. To emphasize this strategy of patient gradualism, they adopted the tortoise as their symbol, and the emblem on their shield is a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Communists (Leninists), on the other hand, are less genteel. They are adept at using all the same tactics of deception and quiet penetration into power centers as used by the Fabians, but they are more inclined to rely on violence and terror to accelerate their progress. They raise the clenched fist and say, "*Let us come to power through revolution. Let us put masses into the streets and overthrow the target government by force and violence. Let the land be drenched with the blood of our enemies.*" Communists are in a hurry.

That is the debate. The only difference between Leninists and Fabians is a question of tactics. They may compete over which of them will dominant the coming New World Order, over who will hold the highest positions in the pyramid of collectivist power; they may even send opposing armies into battle to establish territorial pre-eminence over portions of the globe, but they never quarrel over goals. It is impossible to understand what is unfolding in the War on Terror today without being aware of that reality.

The structure of the secret society was formed along classical, conspiratorial lines. If you study any of the better-known conspiracies of history, you find that they often are structured as rings within rings. Generally there's a leader or a small group of two or three people at the center. They form a ring of supporters around them of perhaps eight or ten or twelve, and those people think they are the total organization. They are not aware that two or three of them are in control. And then the twelve are instructed to create a larger ring around them of perhaps one-or two-hundred people who all think they are the total organization, not realizing there are twelve who are really directing it. These rings extend outward until, finally, they reach into the mainstream community where they enlist the services of innocent people who perform various tasks of the secret society without realizing who is creating the agenda or why.

In the secret society, Rhodes was to be leader. Journalist William T. Stead, Lord Reginald Baliol Brett, and Lord Alfred Milner, who was Governor General and High Commissioner of South Africa, were to form an executive committee. Arthur Balfour (British Foreign Secretary who wrote to Rothschild in 1917 promising his support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine), Sir Harry Johnston, Lord Rothschild, Albert Grey, and others were listed as potential members of a Circle of Initiates, while there was to be an outer circle known as the Association of Helpers. Eventually, this Association of Helpers became the inner rings of much larger groups, which expanded throughout the British Empire and into the United States.

*"It is easier to rob by setting up a bank than by holding up a bank clerk."*

—Bertolt Brecht 1898-1956, German Dramatist, Poet

In 1909 through 1913, they organized semi-secret groups—known as Round Table Groups—in the chief British dependencies and the United States. A man by the name of Lionel Curtis established, in England and each dominion, a front organization to the existing local Round Table Group. This front organization, called the Royal Institute of International Affairs, had as its nucleus in each area the existing, submerged Round Table Group. In New York it was known as the Council on Foreign Relations, and it was a front for J.P. Morgan and Company.

Finally, we begin to understand the significance of an obscure organization that plays a decisive roll in contemporary American political life, The Council on Foreign Relations. Now we see where it came from, who controls it, and how its rings within rings fit into the global strategy for collectivism.

Their plan calls for political power to be concentrated in the executive branch of government, removing it from the control of the people through their elected legislative representatives. The choices presented to the people for the elected executives are limited to candidates selected by the political establishment, and not by the people themselves. Control over every aspect of human life is to be exercised in the form of an administrative dictatorship, from the top down, through an enormous bureaucracy of appointed officials, specialists, and planners accountable only to the elected executives.

In this way, the outward form of democracy is retained to an extent, but the power is entirely taken away from the people and concentrated in government. It is being carried out gradually, with appropriate “education” of the populace, until the system is fully in place. The thrust towards global government can be well-documented but at the end of the twentieth century it does not look like a traditional conspiracy in the usual sense of a secret cabal of evil men meeting clandestinely behind closed doors. Rather, it is a “networking” of like-minded individuals in high places to achieve a common goal. Why should this concern you? If you are an American, and believe in freedom, self-determination, liberty, limited government, free enterprise, the U. S. Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, this New World Order is against all of these things.

### **The Central Bank**

All that is needed to effectively control a government is to have control over the nation's money: a central bank with a monopoly over the supply of money and credit. This had been done in Western Europe, with the creation of privately owned central banks such as the Bank of England. The Bank of the United States (1816-36), an early attempt at an American central bank, was abolished by President Andrew Jackson, who believed that it threatened the nation.

He wrote: *“The bold effort the present bank had made to control the government, the distress it had wantonly produced...are but premonitions of the fate that awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it.”*

The U.S. managed to do without a central bank until early in this century, when, according to Congressman Charles Lindbergh, Sr., “*The Money Trust caused the 1907 panic, and thereby forced Congress to create a National Monetary Commission.*” Headed by Senator Nelson Aldrich (CFR), father-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, Jr.(CFR), the Commission recommended creation of a central bank.

*“I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies... The Central Bank is an institution of the most deadly hostility existing against the principles and form of our Constitution...if the American people allow private banks to control the issuance of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.”*

—Thomas Jefferson 1791

Though unconstitutional, as only “The Congress shall have Power...To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof...” (Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution) the Federal Reserve Act was passed in December 1913; ostensibly to stabilize the economy and prevent further panics, but as Lindbergh warned Congress: “*This act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth...the invisible government by the money power, proven to exist by the Money Trust investigation, will be legalized.*” Although called “Federal,” the Federal Reserve is *privately* owned by member banks, makes its own policies, and is not subject to oversight by Congress or the President.

As Lindbergh put it: “*The new law will create inflation whenever the trusts want inflation...they can unload the stocks on the people at high prices during the excitement and then bring on a panic and buy them back at low prices...the day of reckoning is only a few years removed.*” That day came in 1929, with the Stock Market crash and the Great Depression. It happened again with the tech bubble burst of 2000.

Economics 101—Capitalism must have growth and change in order to operate. The engine of capitalism is driven by wealthy investors who put their money into the economy in order to increase their wealth. If the economy offers no growth opportunities, then investors withdraw their money and the whole system collapses. A minor collapse is called a recession, and a major collapse is called a depression. Propaganda myth tells us that capitalism and free enterprise are one and the same thing. They are not. Under free enterprise a business can provide a service or product, make a profit in the process, and continue on stably for many years. Under capitalism such a business would be considered a failure—it does not provide a growth opportunity for an investor. Under capitalism, society is forced to continually destroy old ways of doing things and adopt new ways—not because it is good for society but because that is how wealthy investors can increase their wealth still further. That’s why General Motors and Firestone banded together to destroy excellent urban transit systems throughout the U.S. in the 1940s and 1950s—so that people would be forced to convert to automobiles and create growth for the automobile, tire, and petroleum industries.

One of the most important powers given to the Fed was the right to buy and sell government securities, and provide loans to member banks so they might also purchase them. This provided another built-in mechanism for profit to the banks if the government debt was increased. All that was needed was a method to pay off the debt. This was accomplished through the passage of the income tax in 1913. A national income tax was declared unconstitutional in 1895 by the Supreme Court, so a constitutional amendment was proposed in Congress by none other than—Senator Nelson Aldrich.

Since it was graduated, the tax would “soak the rich” ...but the rich had other plans, already devising a method of protecting wealth. By the time the (16th) Amendment had been approved by the states, the “ruling elite” had created “foundations.” They used them as repositories for their “divested” interests...making their assets non-taxable so that they might be passed down through generations without...estate and gift taxes. Each year the ruling elite can dump up to half their incomes into their pet foundations and deduct the “donations” from their income tax. With the means to loan enormous sums to the government (the Federal Reserve), a method to repay the debt (income tax), and an escape from taxation for the wealthy, (foundations), all that remained was an excuse to borrow money. History has shown us that nothing drives a government more deeply into debt than major war.

In 1914 World War I began, and after American participation the national debt rose from \$1 billion to \$25 billion dollars. In 1940, before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the public debt was \$42 billion or \$325 per capita. But, by 1945, with the cessation of hostilities, it was \$258 billion or \$1,800 per capita.

As of August 17, 2004, our national debt is \$7.3 trillion dollars or \$25,000 per capita, with a projected deficit for this year alone of \$521 billion—which exceeds the *entire* national debt at the end of 1972 which was \$449 billion—every cent of it borrowed at interest from somewhere. Check the figures for yourself here: <http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov>

In 2001, a study by then Secretary of the Treasury, Paul O’Neill, projected future “entitlement” expenditures (Social Security, Medicare, Veterans benefits, government retirement, etc) would exceed revenues by \$44 *trillion* dollars. It estimates that closing the gap would require the equivalent of an immediate and permanent 69 percent across-the-board income tax increase, or a 45 percent cut in Social Security and Medicare. Seventy-seven million baby-boomers are going to start retiring in five years' time. As they do, the number of retirees in America will double. At the same time the workforce supporting them will grow by a mere 15%. Solving this problem will hurt like hell.

So, just where do governments get the enormous amount of money they need? Most, of course, comes from taxation; but governments often spend more than they are willing to tax from their citizens and so are forced to borrow from the Federal Reserve and international bankers. The public is led to believe that our government borrows from “the people” through savings bonds. Actually, however, only a small percentage of the national debt is held by individuals in this form.

Most government bonds, except those held by the government itself through its trust funds, are held by vast banking firms known as international banks. Total foreign ownership is now almost *half* of our total debt. Foreign holdings accounted for just 20 percent of U.S. debt in 1993 but they have swelled in recent years as Asian banks loaded up on U.S. Treasuries, seeking to depress their currencies against the dollar to boost exports.

In 2003 alone, the foreign reserves held by Asian central banks grew by a third to \$1.9 trillion—\$1 of every \$4 the U.S. government owes alone. The two biggest foreign holders of U.S. Treasuries are Japan and China. South Korea, Thailand, Taiwan, China and Japan say they plan to shift out of U.S. treasuries to the euro. Asian-held U.S. debt has allowed the U.S. government to finance its budget deficit and maintain low interest rates. America has to attract approximately \$1.7 billion *a day* from foreign lenders and investors to finance this debt. Many people fear that such immense U.S. wealth in foreign hands could boomerang if, for example, the assets are unloaded abruptly in a deliberate attempt to destroy the American economy. This huge issue is hardly being covered by the CFR dominated media, is it?

For centuries there has been big money to be made by international bankers in the financing of governments and kings. Such operators, however, are faced with certain thorny problems. We know that smaller banking operations protect themselves by taking collateral, but what kind of collateral can you get from a government or a king? The process through which one collects a debt from a government or a monarch is not a subject taught in the business schools of our universities, and most of us—having never been in the business of lending money to kings—have not given the problem much thought. But there is a king-financing business, and to those who can ensure collection it is lucrative indeed.

Like a business, no government can borrow big money unless willing to surrender to the creditor some measure of sovereignty as collateral. Certainly, international bankers who have loaned hundreds of billions of dollars to governments around the world command considerable influence in the policies of such governments. But the ultimate advantage that the creditor has over the government or ruler is the threat that if the borrower steps out of line the banker can finance an enemy or rival and can even create an enemy by such means.

Therefore, if you want to stay in the king-financing business, it is wise to have an enemy or a rival waiting in the wings to unseat every ruler to whom you lend. If the king doesn't have an enemy, you must create one. Today, we have a little bit of a problem though. Not only are we the biggest borrower, but the only *enforcer* on the block. Thus the foreign banks move towards the euro is their only defense. Sounds ominous, doesn't it?

In his address to the Democratic National Convention, former President Bill Clinton said, "*Sure, they're competing with us for good jobs but can we enforce our trade laws against our bankers?*"

## **The Trade Deficit**

The trade deficit is a side effect of the American propensity to spend today, rather than save for tomorrow. Because Americans don't save nearly enough to pay for all the things they want, we have to borrow money from the foreigners. But, since we can't eat, wear or make computers out of money, we have to use the borrowed money to *buy* stuff from the foreigners. In so doing, we create the trade deficit.

At 5.1% of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) and growing, the current account deficit (CAD) is now even bigger than the federal budget deficit. It's also much larger than it was in the mid-1980s, which was the *last* time the CAD triggered a big financial crisis. This included a 40% decline in the value of the dollar, a huge spike in U.S. bond yields *and* the 1987 stock market crash. The problem with running enormous, open-ended CAD's is the debt that must be incurred to finance those deficits. Eventually, as deficit piles on deficit, the accumulated debt starts to grow *more* rapidly than the economy. The U.S. has already passed that point. We now owe the rest of the world a *lot* more than it owes us. During the eight years of the Reagan presidency, the United States moved from being the world's largest international creditor to the largest debtor nation. While Reagan cut taxes, he had to increase borrowing to pay our way. Capisce?

The only thing standing in the way of a repetition of the 1987 fiasco (or worse) is the continued flow of foreign capital into U.S. assets. With the ever increasing value of the European Union's euro to the dollar, more foreign investors are moving toward investing their money there, rather than in dollars. This trend could well denote great economic turmoil in the financial markets.

In 1791, Jefferson said: *"To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we (will then) be taxed in our meat and our drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the government from wasting the labor of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they (will) be happy."*

## **The Road to War**

I caution all to understand that there are many reasons why America goes to war. The Spanish-American War was not just due to the sinking of the Maine. WW I, the Great War, was not just due to the sinking of the Lusitania. WW II was not simply due to the attack on Pearl Harbor. Vietnam was not simply started due to the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The Gulf War was not due simply to Iraq invading Kuwait. And neither was the Iraq War a result of that terrible morning of 9/11. These were milestones but not cause and effect. The willful deception of the public for political and financial end, especially under the guise of national security, in order to take us to war is unconscionable. What an awful price we pay for such lies under any name: misinformation, disinformation, deceit, deception, or just plain dishonesty. The issue involves much more than a difference of philosophy, or political viewpoint.

Fabians say, *“Let us come to power quietly so as not to alarm anyone. Let us penetrate and capture control of the organs of society: the educational institutions, the media, the labor unions, agencies of government. Let us penetrate into the power centers of society and quietly guide it in the direction of collectivism. No one will realize what is happening, and there will be very little opposition or bloodshed.”*

Being that the Council on Foreign Relations was able to infiltrate our government, it is no wonder that our country has been traveling on the course that it has. The moral, educational and financial decline of this nation has been no accident. It has been due to a carefully contrived plot on behalf of these conspirators, who will be satisfied with nothing less than a one-world government.

As each year goes by, the momentum is picking up, and it is becoming increasingly clear, what road our government is taking. The proponents of one-world government are becoming less secretive, as evidenced by George Bush’s talk of a “New World Order.” The reason for that is that they feel it is too late for their plans to be stopped. They have become so entrenched in our government, our financial structure, and our commerce, that they probably *do* control this country, if not the world. In light of this, it seems that it will be only a matter of time before their plans are fully implemented. Growing up in the midst of the “Cold War,” our generation was taught that those who attempted to abolish our national sovereignty and overthrow our Constitutional government were committing acts of treason. And, as I alluded to earlier, to the *collectivists*, the only dependable way to achieve their goals was through the manipulation of *war*.

Pre-eminent in playing this game was the aforementioned famous House of Rothschild. No other name has become more synonymous with the *Illuminati* than the Rothschilds. The Rothschilds became incredibly wealthy during the nineteenth century by financing governments to war with one another. Amschel Mayer Rothschild, founder of the Banking House of Rothschild stated in 1838: *“Give me the power to control the issue of a nation's currency and I care not who makes that nation's laws.”*

In this country, through their American and European agents, they helped finance Rockefeller’s Standard Oil, Carnegie Steel, and Harriman’s Railroad. American and British Intelligence have documented evidence that the House of Rothschild, and other International Bankers, have financed both sides of every war since the American Revolution. The Rothschilds operate out of an area in the heart of London, England which is known as “The City.” All major British banks have their main offices here, along with branch offices for 385 foreign banks, including 70 from the United States. It is here that you will find the Bank of England, the Stock Exchange, Lloyd’s of London, the Baltic Exchange, Fleet Street, the London Commodity Exchange, and the London Metal Exchange. It is virtually the financial hub of the world. “The City” has actually become the last word in the country’s national affairs, with Prime Minister, Cabinet, and Parliament becoming only a front for the real power.

So, let us talk about the big lies that took us to war in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century; lies that changed history.

# World War I

President Woodrow Wilson was the father of modern American imperialism. Wilson's conception of a community of power implied a world of law and the collective prevention and punishment of aggression. It implied also that the United States would take a prominent and continuing enforcement role. This would be a drastic break with the Washington-Jefferson tradition of no entangling alliances and freedom of national action. American troops, for Wilson, might be sent into combat not just in defense of the United States, but in defense of *world order*, and might have to kill and die for what many would regard as a theory or a fantasy, and do so when the life of their own nation was not at stake.

Wilson was brought to Democratic Party headquarters in 1912 by Bernard Baruch (CFR), a wealthy banker. Wilson received an “indoctrination course” from those he met, and in return agreed, if elected: to support the projected Federal Reserve and the income tax, and “listen” to advice in case of war in Europe and on the composition of his cabinet. Wilson was elected President in 1913, beating incumbent William Howard Taft, who had vowed to veto legislation establishing a central bank. To divide the Republican vote and elect the relatively unknown Wilson, J.P. Morgan and Co. (CFR) poured money into the candidacy of Teddy Roosevelt and his Progressive Party.

Just prior to the passage of the Federal Reserve Act, Wilson's, *The New Freedom* was published, in which he revealed: “*Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men's views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the U. S., in the field of commerce and manufacturing, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it.*”

The tripwire that set off the century's first global conflict was Austria's declaration of war against Serbia on July 28, 1914, a month after Archduke Franz Ferdinand (the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne) was assassinated in Sarajevo by a Serbian fanatic. The fundamental causes of the conflict, however, were rooted deeply in the European history of the previous century, particularly in the political and economic policies that prevailed in Europe after 1871, the year that Germany emerged as a major European power.

Austria-Hungary were now presented with an opportunity to move against Serbia and resolve its' Balkan problems. Germany agreed to support Austria-Hungary and presented them with the infamous “Blank Cheque” resulting in unconditional support. Austria-Hungary issued an ultimatum containing impossible demands—in effect provoking war with Serbia.

However, Serbia agreed to most of the demands. Germany advised Austria-Hungary to negotiate but instead they declared war. Due to established alliances, this brought Germany, Russia, France and Great Britain into the war. In a flash, the whole continent was at war.

When the guns of August began firing in 1914, Americans began to get rich on the war trade, and the Allies began to depend upon it for survival. The Central Powers Alliance (German Empire, Austro-Hungarian Empire, Ottoman Empire (Turkey) and the Kingdom of Bulgaria), came to believe that only American food, money, and munitions kept the Allies fighting. World War I was fought using 20th Century Technology and 19th Century battle tactics. Casualties were enormous; the French losing 27,000 soldiers in one day. The term *World War I* did not come into general use until a second worldwide conflict broke out in 1939. Before that year, the war was known as the *Great War* or the *World War*.

The Battle of Verdun in 1916 is still considered by many military historians as the “greatest” and most demanding battle in history. In the end, the front lines were nearly the same as when the battles started while over 300,000 French and Germans were killed and over 750,000 were wounded.

On August 19, 1914, Wilson addressed Congress on the issue of neutrality. “*We must be impartial in thought, as well as action, must put a curb upon our sentiments, as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another.*” But as early as October, 1914, Wilson had secretly allowed credits for the Allies. Ninety percent of those loans went for arms and ammunition from the United States. During World War I, the Morgan Bank was the subscription agent for war loans to England and France. These loans would never be repaid without an Allied victory and huge reparations on Germany. But by 1917, victory was far from certain unless the U.S. Army was added to the equation.

As soon as the war began, Britain was determined to use its navy to choke off all trade of the Central Powers, and mined the North Sea in November 1914. Britain’s goal, First Sea Lord Winston Churchill candidly admitted, was to “*starve the whole population—men, women, and children, old and young, wounded and sound into submission.*” While German submarines did indeed take a toll on the crews of innocent merchant ships, the Allied blockade had the objective of starving an entire nation of which women and children would be the first to succumb. This action was not forgotten by the innocent German people who suffered.

The munitions trade to England was becoming essential to the economic life of America. By January 1917, the Allies had overdrawn their credit by nearly \$500 million. But the U.S. government could not help unless America was at war, for a neutral could not legally lend to a belligerent.

World War I produced both a large national debt and huge profits for those who had backed Wilson. Baruch, the wealthy Jewish banker who had helped Wilson become president, was appointed head of the War Industries Board, where he exercised dictatorial power over the national economy. He and the Rockefellers were reported to have earned over \$200 million during the war. Wilson backer Cleveland Dodge sold munitions to the allies, while J.P. Morgan loaned them hundreds of millions, with the protection of U.S. entry into the war.

The U.S. Ambassador to England at that time was Walter Page. Page was far more than just an ambassador. Among other things, he was a trustee to Rockefeller's General Education Board. It was in that capacity that he played a role in shaping educational policies to promote collectivism in America.

However, as Ambassador to England, Page sent a telegram to the State Department, and this is what he said, *"I think that the pressure of the approaching crisis has gone beyond the ability of the Morgan financial agency to the British and French governments. The greatest help we could give the allies is such credit. Unless we go to war with Germany, our government of course cannot make such a direct grant of credit."*

While profit was certainly a motive, the war was also useful to justify the notion of world government. William Hoar reveals in *Architects of Conspiracy* that during the 1950s, government investigators examining the records of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace—a powerful, prestigious tax-exempt foundation and long-time promoter of globalism—found that several years before the outbreak of World War I, the Carnegie trustees were planning to involve the U.S. in a general war to set the stage for world government.

The first plan was to offer the United States as a negotiator between both sides of the conflict. They would position the U.S. as the great peacemaker. But the goal was just the opposite of peace. They would make an offer to both sides that they knew would not be acceptable to Germany. Then, when the Germans rejected the offer, they would be portrayed in the press as the bad guys, the ones who wanted to continue the war. This is how the plan was described by Ambassador Page in his memoirs. He said: *"Colonel House arrived ... full of the idea of American intervention. First his plan was that he and I and a group of the British cabinet should at once work out a minimum program of peace which he assumed would be unacceptable to the Germans, and that the President would take this program and present it to both sides. The side that declined would be responsible for continuing the war. Of course the fatal moral weakness of the foregoing scheme is that we should plunge into the war, not on the merits of the cause, but by a carefully sprung trick."*

### **The Sinking of the Lusitania**

The main obstacle was that Americans did not want any involvement in European wars. Some kind of incident, such as the explosion of the battleship *Maine*, which provoked the Spanish-American War, would have to be provided to arouse anti-German sentiment. This occurred when the *Lusitania*, carrying 128 Americans on board, was sunk by a German submarine on May 7, 1915. The great ship sank in less than eighteen minutes. What was not revealed at the time, however, was that the *Lusitania* was transporting war munitions—which was forbidden by American law—from J. P. Morgan & Co., to England, making it a legitimate target for the Germans. Hidden under the guise of bales of fur and cheese boxes, were 3-inch shells and 6 million rounds of rifle ammunition.

Even so, Germany had taken out large ads in 50 American newspapers warning that the ship was carrying contraband, and asking that Americans not take passage on the ship. The U.S. State Department contacted all fifty of those newspapers and ordered them not to publish the ad. They threatened that they would be in dire trouble with the government if they did. There was only one newspaper, in Des Moines Iowa, that had the guts to go ahead and run the ad anyway—which is why we know about it today.

The evidence seems to point to a deliberate plan to have the ship sunk by the Germans. Colin Simpson, author of *The Lusitania*, wrote that Winston Churchill, head of the British Admiralty during the war, had ordered a report to predict the political impact if a passenger ship carrying Americans was sunk. German naval codes had been broken by the British, who knew approximately where all U-boats near the British Isles were located. According to Simpson, Commander Joseph Kenworthy, of British Naval Intelligence, stated: “*The Lusitania was deliberately sent at considerably reduced speed into an area where a U-boat was known to be waiting...escorts withdrawn.*”

Thus, even though Wilson had been reelected in 1916 with the slogan “He kept us out of war,” America soon found itself fighting a European war. Actually, “Colonel” E. M. House (CFR), Wilson’s “silent partner” and chief advisor, had already negotiated a secret agreement with England, committing the U.S. to the conflict. It seems the American public had little say in the matter.

House's biographer, Charles Seymour, called him the “unseen guardian angel” of the Federal Reserve Act, helping to guide it through Congress. Another biographer wrote that House believed: “...*the Constitution, a product of eighteenth-century minds...was thoroughly outdated; that the country would be better off if the Constitution could be scrapped and rewritten...*” His father, Thomas House, made a fortune in the United States as a lending agent for London banks which preferred to remain anonymous. It was widely believed that he represented the Rothschild consortium. He was one of the few in the South who emerged from the War Between the States with a great fortune.

At the time of the Lusitania sinking in 1915, German Ambassador Count Bernstorff had, as the result of a long conversation with President Wilson and two of his advisers, almost single-handedly prevented war between Germany and the U.S. This had been a great disappointment to the British who had hoped the incident would bring the United States into the war in Europe.

In 1916, after the sinking of the passenger liner Sussex, Germany agreed to end unrestricted submarine warfare in the “Sussex pledge.” The Sussex pledge only put off the inevitable American entry into the war. Woodrow Wilson began to actively campaign for Americans to support the allies. From 1914 to 1916 trade with the Allies grew from \$825 million dollars to \$3.2 billion dollars. If the Allies were to lose the war our trade would be threatened and the Morgan bank would lose the money they had loaned.

By 1916, the Germans, Austrians, and Ottomans had seemingly won the war against England, France, and Russia. The tide turned when Chaim Weizmann, who would become the first president of the state of Israel, struck a deal with the English. Turkey, Germany's main ally, had been in control of the Holy Land for nearly 400 years. If international approval for a Jewish homeland was to be secured, it would have to be sought through an Allied victory in the war. The best hope for such an approval lay with Great Britain, whose far-flung empire demonstrated that it was already engaged in the *great game* of international colonialism. If the Zionists could drag the United States into the war, their reward would be Palestine. The deal was sweetened by the knowledge that many Jews would leave Europe as a result. Weizmann, Brandeis, and Baruch helped convince Woodrow Wilson to enter the war.

On January 16, 1917, in an attempt to eliminate the threat of American involvement in Europe, a telegram from Foreign Minister Alfred Zimmermann (“Zimmerman Note”) was sent to the German minister of Mexico: It stated that Germany planned to begin unrestricted submarine warfare (meaning not restricted to British ships though still restricted to a war zone around the British Isles) on Feb. 1, that Germany would attempt to keep America neutral, but that should that attempt fail and war become inevitable, the German minister should propose a formal German-Mexican alliance to the Mexican president. One of the aims of the alliance would be the restoration of Mexican sovereignty over Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

The mere fact that the Zimmermann Note was sent had no effect whatever on America’s going to war. At no time did the German government want war with America, and the Zimmermann Note represented no change. It only represented contingency planning. Had it remained secret, and had America remained neutral, it would never have come into play. What did have a dramatic effect was that the note was made public. Let us see how this came about.

Accepted history is that the Zimmermann Note was sent encrypted on Jan. 16, 1917, intercepted by the British and subsequently decoded. In late February the text was given to the U.S. Embassy in London. It was transmitted to Washington and was released to the press on March 1. The Germans must have known that the Zimmermann Note, though only a contingency plan, could be used to their great disadvantage if it were to fall into British hands. The British should have had no difficulty in intercepting the original Berlin-to-Washington telegram, but the Germans must have been confident that they would be unable to decipher it.

The Germans had themselves been intercepting and deciphering Allied radio messages since 1914, so they must have had a good idea what could and could not be done. We do not actually know that the British were able to decipher the Zimmermann Telegram. All we know is that somehow or other the unenciphered text of the Zimmermann Note came into British hands. The Zimmermann Note could have been betrayed by Zionists in Berlin, smuggled to England, and there used for bargaining with the British government.

In 1938, the U.S. Army Signal Corps issued a classified bulletin entitled *The Zimmermann Telegram of January 16, 1917 and its Cryptographic Background*, by William Friedman and Charles Mendelsohn. They conclude that the British would have been able to read the original Berlin-to-Washington Zimmermann Telegram (ZT)—but only partially as the code used to encrypt the message was a new code unknown to British cryptographers at the time. It is also worth noting that a search of the National Archives—for a copy of this obviously important historical document—turns up the following results: *missing, and nowhere to be found*.

On January 22, 1917, the German government gave notice that unrestricted submarine warfare would be resumed. When five U.S. vessels had been sunk by April, Wilson asked Congress for a declaration of war on April 6, 1917. U.S. propaganda portrayed all Germans as Huns and fanged serpents, and all Americans opposing the war as traitors. America entered the war, the Austro-Hungarian Empire collapsed, and the Balfour Declaration, giving Palestine to the Jews, was delivered on November 2, 1917, to Lord Rothschild, head of the Zionist Federation in Great Britain, but it had been written 20 months earlier.

Eight days later, Congress authorized \$1 billion of taxpayer money to be sent to Britain and France to assist in the war effort. The next day, the first \$200 million was sent to Britain and immediately applied to the Morgan debt. A few days later, \$100 million was sent to France, and the same thing happened. It was applied to the Morgan debt. By the end of the war, \$9.5 billion had been sent to the Allies and applied to the Morgan Debt. Add to that the infinitely higher cost of American blood sacrificed on the alter of collectivism in a war supposedly to make the world “safe for democracy,” and you begin to see a different aspect of World War I than has been popularized in orthodox history books—which, incidentally, have been written and funded by collectivists.

The U.S. Navy was crucial in helping the British break the submarine blockade, and in the summer of 1918, during a long-awaited German offensive, fresh American troops, under the command of General John J. Pershing, played a decisive role on land.

In October 1918, Berlin asked Wilson for an armistice on the basis of his famous Fourteen Points—that he had put before Congress on January 18, 1918—as the conditions for peace. One of the main reasons Germany agreed to surrender was that Wilson promised no reparations would be demanded. On the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, the Great War ended.

### **The Treaty of Versailles**

But with the end of the war and the Treaty of Versailles, severe war reparations *were* demanded from Germany, and the way was paved for Hitler’s rise to power in Germany in 1933. Not one of Wilson’s principles was left unviolated at Versailles.

The actual peace terms harshly disappointed the Germans, who felt that they radically contradicted the promises Wilson had made to the pre-revolutionary German governments. The Germans, for right or wrong, felt betrayed by Wilson and the United States. Instead of a peace of reconciliation the Germans received a peace of submission and punishment. They called it a “diktat,” a dictated peace.

While the Germans were bitterly disappointed about what they saw as Wilson's “betrayal,” the Treaty of Versailles was a compromise between Wilsonian aims and French plans. The French, on the other side, felt disappointed by the treaty. They had hoped to weaken Germany more, maybe to dissolve it. To them, the treaty did not seem harsh enough. Divided and dismembered, Germany was put on the rack and ordered to pay the entire cost of the war, and accept moral responsibility for starting the war. A “war guilt” clause was inserted in the treaty. The war guilt clause was an intolerable humiliation. In 1914, the Kaiser had not wanted war, had not plotted war, and, after blundering in giving Austria the “blank check” to punish Serbia for the murder of the Austrian Archduke, had begged the tsar to stop mobilizing for war. But truth did not matter.

Military alliances resulting in Germany’s encirclement, diplomatic mistakes, the arms race, imperial rivalries and immediate causes combined to cause World War I. Each was a significant factor, no one cause was the sole cause. It is clear that the Articles of the Treaty of Versailles, claiming sole German responsibility for causing World War I was unjust, thus it was a shared responsibility for the cause of World War I. The Germans were given six weeks to review and sign the treaty. To convince them, U.S. warships maintained the blockade that had never been lifted at war’s end. Within six months of the armistice, that blockade had achieved a casualty list of 700,000 children, old people and women. The German people, starved and dying by the hundreds of thousands, were reeling deliriously between blank despair, frenzied revelry, and revolution.

*“Never in the lifetime of men now living has the universal element in the soul of man burnt so dimly.”*  
—John Maynard Keynes

The Versailles Treaty signed on June 28, 1919, took from the Reich an eighth of its territory and a tenth of its population. The noble work done, the peacemakers went home and were astonished fourteen years later that so many Germans could vote for a man like Hitler. *“We must regain our power,”* said General Hans von Seeckt, who would take command of the German Army, *“and as soon as we do, we will naturally take back everything we lost.”*

With the signing of the Treaty of Versailles, the political order of Europe was transformed beyond recognition. The German, Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman empires collapsed. New areas were carved out of their former lands, and the boundaries of many other countries were redrawn. The war also helped precipitate the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia which ushered in the ideology of Communism there.

Wilson had brought to the Paris Peace Conference his famous “fourteen points,” with point fourteen being a proposal for a “general association of nations,” which was to be the first step towards the goal of One World Government—the League of Nations. Versailles was worse than an unjust, dishonorable peace; it was a historic crime, justifying the U.S. Senate rejection and repudiation of Wilson’s League of Nations, whose Charter was written right into the Treaty. It tried to embroil them in the corrupt politics and quarrels of old Europe—which we had left Europe to escape. Henry Cabot Lodge, a vociferous Republican opponent (and Senate majority leader) of the Democrat President Woodrow Wilson—considered by many historians today Wilson's political nemesis, campaigned ceaselessly against U.S. participation in the League. What Wilson took home was France’s treaty of vengeance imposed in violation of everything he had pledged.

*“The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence. Leave her to march freely through the centuries to come as in the years that have gone...no blacker care ever sat behind any rider than we shall find in this covenant of doubtful and disputed interpretation as it now perches upon the treaty of peace.”*

—Henry Cabot Lodge August 12, 1919

Decrying the injustice of Versailles would become a universally popular plank in the platform of Hitler’s Nazi party. It is no wonder that the German people were so readily willing to follow the lead of an articulate charismatic madman.

*“Truly this was a peace which had the tragedies of the future written into it as if by the devils own hand.”*

—George F. Kennan American diplomat

With the defeat of the League of Nations, the *collectivists* realized that America would not join any scheme for world government without a change in public opinion. After a series of meetings, it was decided that an “Institute of International Affairs,” with two branches, in the United States and England, would be formed. The British branch became known as the Royal Institute of International Affairs, with leadership provided by members of the Round Table. On July 29, 1921, the Council on Foreign Relations was incorporated as the American branch in New York. The group was made up of high-ranking officers of banking, manufacturing, trading, and finance companies, together with many lawyers, concerned primarily with the effect that the war and the treaty of peace might have on post-war business.

Founding members were such potentates of international banking as J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller, Paul Warburg, Otto Kahn, Jacob Schiff, and “Colonel” E. M. House—the same clique which had engineered the establishment of the Federal Reserve System.

In 1922, at the Conference of Genoa, the gold exchange standard was introduced. In 1930, the world's first international bank was created, called the Bank for International Settlements, and was made immune from "expropriation, requisitions, seizure, confiscation, prohibition, or other restrictions of gold or currency export or import, or any other similar measures." The BIS immediately set to work in transferring currencies based on the gold in reserve. It originally consisted of the central banks of Belgium, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, and some commercial banks from the U.S. and Japan. This was the first time that bankers were able to operate internationally, independent of their governments. The only exception was the German bankers, who were still subservient to their government.

This international banking cartel was controlled by members of the CFR. In New York and London, these bankers manipulated the mark vs dollar exchange rate. In late 1922, the German government had tried to support the mark by purchasing it in the foreign exchange markets. However, since they continued printing new currency at a feverish rate, the attempt failed. The printing presses literally could not run out money as fast as it was depreciating. This also flooded the market with hoarded Reichsmarks, causing the rampant inflation in Germany in 1923. In almost no time, a loaf of bread cost thousands of marks to buy.

The bankers used dollars to buy jewelry, artwork, homes, businesses, farms, and factories from Germans who needed the money to buy food. Within months, the German bankers had become multi-millionaires and the German people had been reduced to paupers. While the rest of the world experienced the Roaring Twenties, a time of great prosperity, Germans were in abject poverty. Many of them starved and froze to death.

The German people turned to Adolph Hitler in 1933. Before Hitler came to power, 7 million Germans were unemployed, and over 6 million more were only partially employed. From 1929 to 1933, 250,000 Germans had committed suicide. In April 1924, Hitler had been sentenced to five years' imprisonment for treason following an attempt to overthrow Bavaria's right-wing separatist government. Here he dictated a book called *Mien Kampf* (*My Struggle*) to his faithful deputy Rudolf Hess. This ponderous work contained Hitler's views on race, history and politics, including plenty of warning of the fate that awaited his enemies, particularly the Jews, should he ever attain power.

On March 23, 1933, the Reichstag passed the Enabling Act, which gave dictatorial authority to Hitler's cabinet for four years. Armed with full powers, Hitler moved to eliminate all possible centers of opposition. Following the death of President Hindenburg on August 2, 1934, Hitler abolished the office of president and assumed the president's powers. Three years after his election, in 1936, Hitler had brought the nation back from the dead, creating full employment without inflation. In just four years, from 1933 to 1937, Germany became almost completely self-sufficient in the production of steel, aluminum, chemicals, petroleum, and general industry. How did he do it?

Hitler knew that the same banking interests that had destroyed Germany would eagerly lend money to it at exorbitant interest rates. If this had happened, control of the country would have entirely passed to the banks. What he did instead was ingenious. Knowing that bankers in Germany had become rich by exploiting Germans during the inflation of 1923, Hitler demanded that they sell back what they had bought at the same low prices they had paid for it. The Jewish bankers had deposited their profits in Swiss banks, and the Gestapo demanded information on the holdings. In 1935, as a measure to protect Jews, Swiss banks introduced secret numbered accounts. Thus the identities of account holders could not be disclosed. Hitler's next step was to remove the Reichsmark from the gold standard.

Hitler then began exchanging goods with other poor countries. For example, with Argentina he exchanged locomotives for food. Instead of Argentina borrowing money at high interest rates to buy German locomotives and Germany borrowing money at high interest rates to buy Argentina's meat, the two countries simply agreed upon an exchange index and bartered their goods.

Hitler had, in essence, created virtual money. Germany created its own credit. As Hitler told the Reichstag on January 30, 1937: *"A Community does not live from the fictional worth of Money, but from its productivity, which in turn gives Money its real worth. This Productivity is what guarantees the worth of Money, not the Banks or Treasuries full of Gold."*

On the eve of World War II the German chemical complex of I.G. Farben was the largest chemical manufacturing enterprise in the world, with extraordinary political and economic power and influence within the Hitlerian Nazi state. I. G. Farben has been aptly described as "a state within a state." German bankers on the Farben Board of Directors in the late 1920s included the Hamburg banker Max Warburg, whose brother Paul Warburg was a founder of the Federal Reserve System in the United States.

The Farben empire owned its own coal mines, its own electric power plants, iron and steel units, banks, research units, and numerous commercial enterprises. There were over 2,000 cartel agreements between I. G. and foreign firms—including Standard Oil of New Jersey, DuPont, Alcoa, Dow Chemical, and others in the United States. The full story of I.G. Farben and its world-wide activities before World War II can never be known, as key German records were destroyed in 1945 in anticipation of the Allied victory. However, one post-war investigation by the U.S. War Department concluded that:

*"Without I. G.'s immense productive facilities, its intense research, and vast international affiliations, Germany's prosecution of the war would have been unthinkable and impossible; Farben not only directed its energies toward arming Germany, but concentrated on weakening her intended victims, and this double-barreled attempt to expand the German industrial potential for war and to restrict that of the rest of the world was not conceived and executed "in the normal course of business." The proof is overwhelming that I. G. Farben officials had full prior knowledge of Germany's plan for world conquest and of each specific aggressive act later undertaken ...."*

# World War II

The commitment of troops to combat has been the perennial obstacle to American acceptance of the Wilsonian vision. It is a constitutional obstacle: how to reconcile the provision giving Congress exclusive power to declare war with the dispatch of American forces into hostility at the behest of a collective-security organization? And it is a political obstacle: how to explain to the American people why their husbands, fathers, brothers, sisters, daughters and sons should die in conflicts in remote lands where the local outcome makes no particular difference to the United States? Many Americans during the 1920s came to feel that America's entry into World War I, the “Great War”, “the war to end all wars” was a mistake; a decision imposed on the people by British propaganda, international bankers, munitions makers—as well as by Wilsonian delusions and deceptions. About all that America had seemingly derived from the war was debt, inflation, prohibition, influenza, and disillusionment.

During the 1920's, America also enjoyed a decade of prosperity, fueled by the easy availability of credit. Between 1923 and 1929 the Federal Reserve expanded the money supply by sixty-two percent. When the stock market crashed, many small investors were ruined, but not “insiders.” In March of 1929 Paul Warburg (CFR) issued a tip that the Crash was coming, and the largest investors got out of the market. With their fortunes intact, they were able to buy companies for a fraction of their worth. Shares that had sold for a dollar might now cost a nickel, and the buying power, and wealth, of the rich increased enormously. The stock market crash paved the way for the man Wall Street had groomed for the presidency, FDR. Portrayed as a “man of the little people,” the reality was that Roosevelt's family had been involved in New York banking since the eighteenth century. Most of his thoughts, his political “ammunition,”...were carefully manufactured for him in advance by the CFR-One World Money group.

In a letter to an associate dated November 21, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt wrote, “*The real truth of the matter is, as you and I know, that a financial element in the large centers has owned the government ever since the days of Andrew Jackson.*”

Taking America off the gold standard in 1934, FDR opened the way to unrestrained money supply expansion, decades of inflation—and credit revenues for banks. FDR's most remembered program, the New Deal, could only be financed through heavy borrowing. In effect, those who had caused the Depression loaned America the money to recover from it.

During the FDR years, the Council on Foreign Relations captured the political life of the U.S. Besides Treasury Secretary Morgenthau, other CFR members included Secretary of State Edward Stettinus, War Secretary Henry Stimson, and Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles. Since 1934 almost every United States Secretary of State has been a CFR member; and ALL Secretaries of War or Defense, from Henry L. Stimson through Richard Cheney.

In the early 30's, the anti-war sentiment in America and the memories of the men lost convinced many Americans that America must not get involved in any future European war. These sentiments combined with long-standing American isolationism resulted in the passage of a series of Neutrality Acts. These Acts prohibited United States companies from trading with belligerents.

### **The Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935**

*“Providing for the prohibition of the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerent countries; the prohibition of the transportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war by vessels of the United States for the use of belligerent states; for the registration and licensing of persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, exporting, or importing arms, ammunition, or implements of war; and restricting travel by American citizens on belligerent ships during war.”*

In 1937, Indiana Representative Louis Ludlow proposed a constitutional amendment requiring a nationwide referendum before the United States could take us into an *unprovoked* war without the consent of *We the People*. The Ludlow Amendment was rejected by Congress on the advice of President Franklin Roosevelt, who, even then, was maneuvering to get the U.S. into the war that he knew was coming. Right through 1941, polls showed 80 percent opposition to American involvement. Only after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor did U.S. entry into World War II become politically possible.

### **The Ludlow Amendment**

*“Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its Territorial possessions and an attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress, when it deems a national crisis to exist, may by concurrent resolution refer the question of war or peace to the citizens of the States, the question to be voted on being, Shall the United States declare war on \_\_\_\_\_? Congress may otherwise by law provide for the enforcement of this section. “*

### **Hitler's March to War with Europe**

One of Adolf Hitler's first major foreign policy initiatives after coming to power was to sign a nonaggression pact with Poland in January 1934. This move was not popular with many Germans who supported Hitler, but they resented the fact that Germany had been forced to cede territories with large German populations to Poland under the Treaty of Versailles after World War I.

These areas included the former German provinces of West Prussia, Poznan, and Upper Silesia. However, Hitler sought the nonaggression pact in order to neutralize the possibility of a French-Polish military alliance against Germany before Germany had a chance to rearm.

True to the prediction of General Hans von Seeckt following the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler's aggressive acquisition of territory began in 1936 when he ordered his army to reoccupy the Rhineland district of Germany that bordered France. The Rhineland had been designated as a demilitarized zone in the Versailles treaty. In the mid and late 1930s, France and especially Britain followed a foreign policy of appeasement and did nothing to stop him—he grew bolder.

Hitler formed an alliance with the Italian fascist dictator Benito Mussolini on October 25, 1936. This alliance was later expanded to include Japan, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria. They are collectively known as the Axis Powers. Then on November 5, 1937, at the Reich Chancellery, Adolf Hitler held a secret meeting and stated his plans for acquiring “living space” for the German people.

In September 1938, after signing away the Czech border regions, known as the Sudetenland, to Germany at the Munich conference, British and French leaders pressured France's ally, Czechoslovakia, to yield to Germany's demand for the incorporation of those regions. The Germans dismembered the Czechoslovak state in March 1939, in violation of the Munich agreement. Britain and France responded by guaranteeing the integrity of the Polish state.

It was quite clear that the conditions and boundaries imposed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles were for any length of time impossible and unacceptable. The continuous efforts of Germany to bring about tolerable relations between the German minority and the Polish population were of no avail. One could feel the abysmal hatred that the Poles had for anything German; hatred that was being engendered by an anti-German press, radio and pulpit propaganda.

This finally resulted in moral chaos in towns and in the country, accompanied by indiscriminate murders of thousands of defenseless and innocent minority Germans by Polish soldiers and armed civilians. Had the British war clique not continually urged Poland into an obstinate resistance towards the Reich, and had it not been for Britain's promises of the “blank cheque,” it is very doubtful whether Poland would ever have allowed things to go so far. The continuous murder and bestial butchery of Germanic people living in Poland could not longer be tolerated by Germany—this led to Hitler's invasion.

*“Poland wants war with Germany and Germany will not be able to avoid it even if she wants to.”*  
—Polish Marshal Rydz-Smigly as reported in the Daily Mail, August 6th, 1939

At this point Britain and France decided to make a stand, and they resisted Hitler's next demands for the return of the territories ceded to Poland under the Versailles Treaty. Hitler responded by negotiating a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union in the summer of 1939. The German-Soviet Pact of August 1939, which stated that Poland was to be partitioned between the two powers, enabled Germany to invade Poland and protect its German inhabitants without the fear of Soviet intervention.

*“The Polish State has refused the peaceful settlement of relations which I desired, and has appealed to arms. Germans in Poland are persecuted with bloody terror and driven from their houses. A series of violations of the frontier, intolerable to a great Power, prove that Poland is no longer willing to respect the frontier of the Reich. In order to put an end to this lunacy, I have no other choice than to meet force with force from now on.”*

—Adolf Hitler's Proclamation to the German Army.

## **Hitler Invades Poland**

On September 1, 1939, German troops swarmed across the Polish border and unleashed the first *Blitzkrieg* the world had seen. Hitler’s stated reason for invading Poland was to stop the massacre of German civilians. The historical record, as represented by the German government at the time, claimed 58,000 dead or missing German Poles by Feb 1940. The Germans invaded in September 1939, but it's important to understand that much of this genocide had *preceded* the German invasion. This was proved by the amount of decomposition of the bodies. Thus, many of these atrocities cannot be excused simply as reprisals for the German invasion.

While one cannot ever entertain a defense of the actions and atrocities of Hitler and the Third Reich, the examination of historical records and Hitler’s speeches makes it abundantly clear that Hitler did indeed make efforts to avoid war, resolve the regional conflicts, and bring to an end the atrocities inflicted upon the Germanic people of Poland. Poles had been merrily slaughtering anything German since at least as early as April 1939, with smaller incidents stretching back to the close of WW I—you haven't been told that by the Mass Media, or the fact that these atrocities were one of the main causes for the German invasion of Poland. It appears that this was meant by the Germans to be a local solution to a local problem. Germany had already done the “right thing” by protesting in writing to the League of Nations literally dozens of times. The League of Nations did nothing, yet the problem had to be solved. However, it is also clear that Hitler had two overriding objectives: creating an eastern empire for the Germans, and exterminating the Jews.

The British and French declared war on Germany on September 3, 1939. Britain and France had sworn to defend Poland. Honoring these obligations, the two countries sent ultimatums to Hitler demanding his withdrawal from Poland. Hitler never answered, and the rest is history.

## **Evasion of the Neutrality Act**

The Nazis launched their long awaited Western Offensive on May 10, 1940, and from the onset scored impressive successes. FDR wanted to help, but was restrained by the Neutrality Act, which among other provisions, prevented America from flying assembled air craft to Britain ready to fight.

The solution was to fly aircraft to the Canadian border, push them across the border, and then fly them on to Newfoundland where they could be loaded aboard ships for the British. This was not publicized at the time. American public opinion was still strongly isolationist and most Americans were convinced that the country should stay out of the war. Thus actions like this were done at great political risk.

In late June of 1940, with France overrun and the British driven into the channel at Dunkirk, still 86 percent of Americans said they did not want to go to war against Germany and Italy; only 5 percent wanted to fight. The platform the Democratic Party adopted in the summer of 1940 for the Roosevelt-Wallace ticket read: "*We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our army, navy, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in the case of attack.*"

On September 16, 1940, Congress passed the "Selective Training and Service Act", requiring male residents of the United States between the ages of 18 and 35 to register for possible induction into the armed services of the country. It was the first machinery for the introduction of peacetime conscription in the country's history. It represented one of the visible results of a five-month attack on the sensibilities of the American public conducted by one of the best-financed and most thoroughly organized propaganda machines the land had ever known. Roosevelt had in mind a universal service bill, a kind of majestic combination of all his projected agencies for mobilizing all the youth of both sexes into one or two years of "national service."

The first draft originally called for registering all men between the ages of 18 and 65 (some forty-two million), and paying those who were to be selected from this number (an expected 7,000,000) the princely pay of \$5 a month while in service. The bill contained among other things a 200-word sentence, a masterpiece of legalistic confused botchery, but which provided for the prosecution of "*anyone who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect to perform any duty required of him or in the execution of this act.*" While violation of the conscription act of 1917 was just a misdemeanor, violation of this new one was a felony, to be punished upon conviction by a possible five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine.

So, despite Roosevelt's hope to obtain a law which could be used to turn the armed forces into a gigantic welfare agency, he was being proffered a scheme to facilitate a level of militarism in the land utterly beyond comparison with any ever seen in the country previously.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson (CFR) probably earned first place in the hysteria steeplechase in August 1940 when he claimed the country was in grave danger of invasion by the German armies while stubbornly holding out for conscription of "*the whole manpower of the United States from 18 to 64.*"

Eventually a compromise amendment was agreed upon, limiting the service of those conscripted under this bill to one year, and confining the period of service to the Western Hemisphere, and to U.S. possessions and territories which might be elsewhere.

In a radio address broadcast to the nation on October 23, 1940, FDR gave “*this most solemn assurance*” that he had not given any “*secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any government or any other nation in any part of the world, to involve this nation in any war or for any other purpose.*”

Furthermore, the failure of the re-elected Roosevelt after November 1940 to embroil the country any deeper in the European or the Pacific War led to a long season of plodding and stumbling on the home front, much of it communicated to the conscript army, which looked forward to the termination of their year of service. The ominous acronym OHIO (Over the Hill in October) began to appear chalked on barracks walls, and a serious crisis was in full bloom by the time a galled and pressure-wracked House of Representatives voted, on August 12, 1941, by the majestic majority of just one, 203-202, to extend the period of service. Roosevelt signed the draft extension bill on August 18, 1941 fully aware of the grave and dramatic split which had occurred in the country. But ten weeks later it was all washed out by the fortuitous attack on Pearl Harbor by the Japanese on December 7, 1941, an event which was known in a variety of ways to be coming, even though it became a rigid Administration position that it was utterly unexpected, posing as innocents set upon in a treacherous fashion.

The attack on Hawaii was undoubtedly the most incredible windfall that ever befell any political regime in U.S. history, far exceeding the Confederate attack on Fort Sumter in 1861 or the preludes to U.S. involvement in war in 1898 and 1917 as an assist in propelling onward a war-bound administration.

What was needed was some way around the Neutrality Act, which stipulated that any belligerents had to pay cash on the barrelhead for weapons—and that loans could not be provided for those nations that had yet to repay their debts from the Great War. Franklin Roosevelt introduced the solution at a press conference on December 17, 1940, in typically homey, easily comprehensible language:

*“Suppose my neighbor's home catches on fire, and I have a length of garden hose four or five hundred feet away. If he can take my garden hose and connect it up with his hydrant, I may help him put out the fire. Now what do I do? I don't say to him before that operation, 'Neighbor, my garden hose cost me fifteen dollars; you have to pay me fifteen dollars for it.' No! What is the transaction that goes on? I don't want fifteen dollars—I want my garden hose after the fire is over.”*

In March 1941 the U.S. Congress passed the “Lend-Lease Act” and appropriated an initial \$7 billion to lend or lease weapons and other aid to any countries the president might designate, although both selling munitions to belligerents and convoying them were acts of war and contrary to international law. FDR publicly represented this as a peace measure. It gave the president the authority to aid any nation whose *defense he believed vital* to the United States and to accept repayment “*in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory.*”

Revisionist historians have noted that this was a nearly unprecedented concession of power to the executive branch; one probably unmatched until passage of the line-item veto in 1997, and still under dispute today. It was the first step on a long path to the Gulf of Tonkin and the Iran-Contra scandal. It was also somewhat disingenuous: Just how was England or anyone else to return a “garden hose” that German U-boats put on the bottom of the Atlantic? While Winston Churchill called it “*the most unsordid act in the history of any nation,*” it was, after all, an end-run around the will of the American people—and the law.

In the spring of 1941, FDR extended the navy’s neutrality zone to mid-Atlantic and put U.S. troops in Iceland and Greenland—all without the consent of Congress.

On June 22, 1941, Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, less than six months before Pearl Harbor. The Soviet Union was home to the second-largest Jewish population in Europe after Poland. There usefulness to Germany was over. Here he intended to enslave, expel or kill the Russians, Poles and other Slavic peoples to make room for German settlers. This was an objective many Germans shared. But his personal obsession had always been the extermination of the Jews. To many Americans, Russia was a far greater threat than Hitler’s Germany. In fact, then Senator Harry S. Truman stated, “*If we see Germany winning, we should help Russia, and if Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany and that way we can kill as many as possible...*”

Hitler, remembering the fatal blunder of the Kaiser in 1917 that brought the U.S. into World War I, ordered his submarines to avoid incidents with U.S. warships. But on Sept 4, 1941, the U.S. destroyer *Greer* exchanged fire with a German U-boat.

In a fireside chat in 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, looking to persuade Americans that the nation should side with Britain in its war against Nazi Germany, reported that a German submarine had launched an unprovoked attack on the USS *Greer* while it had been on a mail run to Iceland. Calling German U-boats “*rattlesnakes of the Atlantic*” he ordered U.S. warships to “*shoot them on sight.*”

In a Senate investigation, it was found that the USS *Greer* was not only *not* a mail ship, but that it had been cooperating with a British naval effort to find the sub and *destroy* it. Without authorization from Congress, the president had launched a naval war in the Atlantic.

Yet still, on October 7, 1941, a national poll found that two-thirds said it was more important to keep out of war than to defeat Germany. On October 27, in his famous “Navy Day” address, Roosevelt riveted the nation by claiming he had come into the possession of a “secret map” made in Nazi Germany that proved Hitler was lying when he said he had no designs on the Western Hemisphere. “*I have in my possession a secret map, made in Germany by Hitler's government-by the planners of the new world order. It is a map of South America and a part of Central America as Hitler proposes to reorganize it.*”

As has often happened, the truth about the map did not emerge until many years after the war: It was a forgery produced by the British intelligence service, most probably at its technical laboratory in Ontario, Canada. William Stephenson (code name: Intrepid), chief of British intelligence operations in North America, passed it on to U.S. intelligence Chief William Donovan, who gave it to Roosevelt. This map, the President explained, showed South America, as well as “*our great life line, the Panama Canal,*” divided into five vassal states under German domination. “*That map, my friends, makes clear the Nazi design not only against South America but against the United States as well.*”

Roosevelt went on to reveal that he also had in his possession “*another document made in Germany by Hitler's government. It is a detailed plan to abolish all existing religions—Catholic, Protestant, Mohammedan, Hindu, Buddhist, and Jewish alike*” which Germany will impose “*on a dominated world, if Hitler wins.*” “*In the place of the churches of our civilization there is to be set up an international Nazi church, a church which will be served by orators sent out by the Nazi government.*”

Of course, the other “document” cited by Roosevelt, purporting to outline German plans to abolish the world's religions, was just as fraudulent as the “secret map.” The most striking feature of the episode was the complicity of the president of the United States in perpetrating the fraud. Still, FDR’s deceit failed to move the nation.

### **Pearl Harbor—Roosevelt’s Back Door to War**

*“For a long time I have believed that our best entrance into the war would be by way of Japan....And, of course, if we go to war against Japan, it will inevitably lead us to war against Germany.”*

—Secretary of Interior Harold L. Ickes, October 18, 1941

After Hitler invaded the U.S.S.R. in late June 1941, and Japan occupied the rest of Indochina, FDR froze all Japanese assets, thus cutting off trade, including oil. Without oil, Japan could not long continue the war against China; without oil, the Japanese Empire would wither and die. Japan made numerous efforts to negotiate using diplomatic measures to avoid war, but the U.S. rejected their offers. Six days before he cut the oil lifeline, he was warned in a memo from the navy chief of war plans that “*doing so would lead promptly to Japanese action against the Philippines, which would involve us in a Pacific War.*”

An oil embargo was an “economic war” against an oil-starved nation, and FDR had a moral duty to inform the nation that he had pushed Japan into a corner where Tokyo must yield to America’s demand—or attack. But FDR did not do so. In an August poll, Americans, by 76 percent to 24 percent, said stay out of war with Japan.

On October 30, 1941, in a campaign speech in Boston, FDR made this amazing statement: “*And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I will give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again. Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.*”

As FDR was delivering this soothing message to the voters, the American and British military staffs were meeting secretly in Washington D.C., working out the details of a joint strategy. It was incorporated into a Navy war plan and given the code name Rainbow Number Five. We now have a great deal of information on this plan although, at the time, it was highly secret. The key for getting into the war was to maneuver the Axis powers to strike first to make it look like the U.S. was an innocent victim. Their first hope was that Germany would attack. If that didn't work, the fallback plan was to involve Japan. While no one can deny or excuse Japan's belligerence in those days, it is also true that our government provoked that country in various ways.

On November 25, 1941, Secretary of War and CFR member, Henry L. Stimson wrote in his diary: *"In spite of the risk involved, however, in letting the Japanese fire the first shot, we realized that, in order to have the full support of the American people, it was desirable to make sure that the Japanese be the ones to do this so that there could be no doubt in anyone's mind as to who were the aggressors... The question was, how we should maneuver them into firing the first shot without allowing too much damage to ourselves. It was a difficult proposition."*

The next day, America demanded that Japan relinquish all conquests since 1937, withdraw all her troops from both China and Indochina—and in effect abrogate her Tripartite Treaty with Germany and Italy—as the price of lifting the embargo. To Tokyo, this was an ultimatum.

Thus the day of reckoning came for the Empire of the Sun; diplomatic surrender and humiliating retreat from China, and the end of their reign as a great power—or a desperate lunge south to seize the vital resources for which Japan was starving. But first, they had to neutralize the one force that could prevent them from doing so: the U.S. battle fleet riding at anchor at Pearl Harbor. During the two-hour raid, Japanese warplanes sunk or seriously damaged 16 major U.S. naval vessels, including six battleships, and killed 2,400 American servicemen.

On December 8, 1941, FDR went before Congress to decry *"a date which will live in infamy."* The same day, former president Hoover wrote to his friends, *"You and I know that this continuous putting pins in rattlesnakes finally got this country bitten."*

The smoking gun was discovered in 1995. Author Robert Stinnett found a memo in the Navy Archives written by Lt. Commander Arthur McCollum, who was assigned to Naval Intelligence. The memo was dated October 7, 1940. It was directed to two of FDR's top naval advisors: Captain Dudley Knox and Capt. Walter Anderson, who was head of Naval Intelligence.

This memo was approved by both men and forwarded to FDR for action. The full text is now public information, and a photo of it appears in Stinnett's book, ***Day of Deceit; The Truth about FDR and Pearl Harbor.***

The McCollum memorandum contained an eight-point action plan to implement a two-point strategy. The two points were: (1) Aggravate Japan into a military strike as a matter of economic necessity and national honor on her part; (2) Facilitate the attack by not interfering with Japan's preparations and by making the target as vulnerable as possible. The memorandum concluded with this phrase: "*If by these means Japan could be led to commit an overt act of war, so much the better.*"

A Congressional investigation in 1946 revealed that, just a few days before the attack, Navy headquarters in Washington ordered twenty-one of the most modern ships in the 7th Fleet to leave Pearl Harbor and deploy at Wake and Midway Islands. The aircraft carriers, *Lexington* and *Enterprise* were among those ships. This not only left the remaining Fleet with drastically reduced protection, it also meant that the ships anchored in the harbor were primarily old relics from World War I, many of which were already slated to be scrapped.

As Secretary of War Stimson had stated in his diaries: "*The question was, how we should maneuver them into firing the first shot without allowing too much damage to ourselves.*"

Sacrificing only the old and marginally useful ships was the solution to that problem. Some will say that it was a necessary horror we had to endure to make the world safe for democracy. Pearl Harbor, this view holds, was a pawn sacrificed to capture a king—a master stroke. I invite you to finish this paragraph with your own words.

A Japanese spy, by the name of Tadashi Morimura, was sent to Pearl Harbor under the cover of a phony political assignment at the Japanese embassy. The FBI knew that his real name was Takeo Yoshikawa and that he had been trained as a military officer. He had no political experience, so they knew his assignment to a political post was a cover. They photographed him as he came off the ship. The FBI wanted to arrest Yoshikawa and send him home, but the Office of Naval Intelligence intervened, with White House approval, saying: Leave this guy alone. He is our responsibility. We'll handle it.

Just four days before the attack, U.S. Navy Intelligence intercepted this message from Yoshikawa:

"NO CHANGE OBSERVED BY AFTERNOON OF 2 DECEMBER. SO FAR THEY DO NOT SEEM TO HAVE BEEN ALERTED. SHORE LEAVE AS USUAL."

On December 6, just *one* day before the attack, this message was intercepted:

"THERE ARE NO BARRAGE BALLOONS AT THESE PLACES – AND CONSIDERABLE OPPORTUNITY IS LEFT FOR A SURPRISE ATTACK."

*"Those who wish to be ignorant and free, believe in something that never was and never shall be."*  
—Thomas Jefferson

Just one hour and seven minutes before Japanese bombs began falling on Pearl Harbor, an important telegram by General George Marshall, chief of Staff and CFR member, was dispatched to General Short in Hawaii:

“JAPANESE ARE PRESENTING AT ONE PM EASTERN STANDARD TIME TODAY WHAT AMOUNTS TO AN ULTIMATUM ALSO THEY ARE UNDER ORDERS TO DESTROY THEIR CODE MACHINE IMMEDIATELY STOP JUST WHAT SIGNIFICANCE THE HOUR SET MAY HAVE WE DO NOT KNOW BUT BE ON ALERT ACCORDINGLY STOP INFORM NAVAL AUTHORITIES OF THIS COMMUNICATION MARSHALL”

On the night before the attack, a Japanese coded message this telegram refers to was intercepted. It made clear even the exact hour that the strike would come. It was to be 1:00 PM Pearl Harbor time. The intercept was decoded 6½ hours before that. It was rushed to President Roosevelt and his top military advisors for immediate action. Their response was to do absolutely nothing. They sat on it and deliberately let the clock run out. According to witnesses, Marshall read and re-read the intercept and shuffled the paper from one side of his desk to the other while another half hour ticked away. Then, at 11:52, he finally sent a telegram to the commanders at Pearl Harbor.

Marshall could have used a trans-Pacific telephone to make sure that Hawaii learned instantly of this momentous news, but this was not done. Instead, this message was sent by regular commercial radio telegraph, and was not received by General Short and Admiral Kimmel until after the Japanese attack.

Angry Americans wanted to know why their Pacific fleet was caught by surprise, and who was responsible for the woeful lack of preparedness. In the rush to fix blame, attention naturally turned to the two men who were responsible for Pearl Harbor base security: Admiral Husband E. Kimmel, the ranking U.S. Navy commander in Hawaii, and his Army counterpart, Lt. General Walter C. Short.

Formal investigations found that Kimmel and Short had been seriously derelict in their duties, and responsible for the lack of preparedness. The two were stripped of their commands, and sent into the wilderness of an early retirement at lower rank. Until his death in 1968, Kimmel worked hard to clear his name, an effort that others, including his son and grandson, have carried on to this day.

In a 1958 interview (published in the winter 1991-92 Journal), Admiral Kimmel stated:

*“My belief is that General Short and I were not given the information available in Washington and were not informed of the impending attack because it was feared that action in Hawaii might deter the Japanese from making the attack. Our president had repeatedly assured the American people that the United States would not enter the war unless we were attacked. The Japanese attack on the fleet would put the United States in the war with the full support of the American public.”*

Of the studies demonstrating that Washington did know in advance, two merit particular acknowledgment: One is *The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor* by Rear Admiral Robert O. Theobald (Old Greenwich, Connecticut: Devin-Adair, 1954), a pioneer in unearthing the facts. The other is *Infamy: Pearl Harbor and Its Aftermath* by Pulitzer Prize-winner John Toland (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1982).

Many people are aware that tens of thousands of Japanese-Americans in this country spent the war in confinement camps. But few know that, under Roosevelt's instructions, the Census Bureau had already produced a complete list of their names and addresses *before* Pearl Harbor. If there is a lesson Pearl Harbor should teach us, it is to look at history beyond the reality created by headlines and Hollywood.

On a Thursday afternoon, December 11, 1941, four days after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Hitler declared war on the United States, citing as one American provocation, the forged map FDR used in his Navy Day address. Hitler's speech is a fascinating and illuminating glimpse into history. In his endless litany, he describes in great chronological order and detail Roosevelt's deception to the American people. The 88-minute address, which he had written himself, was broadcast to the nation. In it the German leader recounted the reasons for the outbreak of war in September 1939, explained why he decided to strike against the Soviet Union in June 1941, reviewed the dramatic course of the war thus far, and dealt at length with President Franklin Roosevelt's hostile policies toward Germany. Hitler detailed the increasingly belligerent actions of Roosevelt's government and then dramatically announced that Germany was now joining Japan in war against the United States. The day after it was delivered, a very inaccurate and misleading translation of portions of the address appeared in the New York Times. It should be of particular interest to Americans that a complete text of this important historical document has apparently never before been made available to the English-speaking world. It has now.

Here is an Internet link to the entire speech, and a rather telling excerpt from that speech:

[http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v08/v08p389\\_Hitler.html](http://www.ihr.org/jhr/v08/v08p389_Hitler.html)

*“It is a fact that the two historical conflicts between Germany and the United States were stimulated by two Americans, that is, by Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt, although each was inspired by the same forces. History has given its verdict about Wilson. His name will always be associated with the most base betrayal of a pledge [Wilson's “14 points”] in history. The result was the disruption of national life, not only in the so-called vanquished countries, but among the victors as well. Because of this broken pledge, which alone made the imposed Treaty of Versailles [1919] possible, countries were torn apart, cultures were destroyed and the economic life of all was ruined. Today we know that a group of **self-serving financiers** stood behind Wilson. They used this paralytic professor in order to lead America into a war from which they hoped to profit. The German nation once believed this man, and had to pay for this faith with political and economic ruin.”* —Adolf Hitler Dec 11, 1941

*“Naturally, the common people don’t want war, but after all, it is the leaders of a country who determine the policy, and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. This is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in every country.”*

—Hermann Goering at the Nuremberg trials.

The sentiment expressed is even more disturbing because it comes not from a venerated figure of antiquity, but from a reviled twentieth-century figure associated with the most chilling example of genocide in human history: Hermann Goering, Nazi Reich Marshall and Luftwaffe-Chief. His comments were made privately to Gustave Gilbert, a German-speaking intelligence officer and psychologist who was granted free access by the Allies to all the prisoners held in the Nuremberg jail. The famous quote offered above was part of a conversation Gilbert recorded with a dejected Hermann Goering in his cell on the evening of April 18, 1946, as the trials were halted for a three-day Easter recess. I find it rather ironic that the entire text is even more poignant.

*“Why, of course, the people don’t want war,”* Goering shrugged. *“Why would some poor slob on a farm want to risk his life in a war when the best that he can get out of it is to come back to his farm in one piece. Naturally, the common people don’t want war; neither in Russia nor in England nor in America, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy or a fascist dictatorship or a Parliament or a Communist dictatorship.”*

*“There is one difference,”* I [Gilbert] pointed out. *“In a democracy the people have some say in the matter through their elected representatives, and in the United States only Congress can declare wars.”*

*“Oh, that is all well and good, but, voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country.”*

It is one thing to be forewarned. Will we ever be forearmed? FDR himself once said: *“In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way.”*

In Reims, France, on May 7, 1945, German General Alfred Johl signed the unconditional surrender of all German forces, ending the European phase of World War II. Germany officially surrendered on May 8, after a frenzied week that saw Nazi leader Adolf Hitler kill himself, Berlin surrender to the Red Army, and several major German armies surrender to British forces in northern Europe.

The war had lasted five years, eight months, and six days, and cost millions of lives, including six million Jews slaughtered in the Holocaust and 20 million soldiers and civilians killed in the U.S.S.R. alone. On May 8, V-E Day—British Prime Minister Winston Churchill told war-weary Londoners, “*This is your hour,*” while President Harry Truman reminded Americans that until Japan's defeat, “*Victory is but half won.*”

After Japanese leaders flatly rejected the Potsdam Declaration to surrender, President Truman authorized use of the atomic bomb anytime after August 3, 1945. On the clear morning of August 6, the first atomic bomb, nicknamed Little Boy, was dropped on the city of Hiroshima. Leveling over 60 percent of the city, 70,000 residents died instantaneously in a searing flash of heat. Three days later, on August 9, a second bomb, Fat Man, was dropped on Nagasaki. Over 20,000 people died instantly. In the successive weeks, thousands more Japanese died from the after effects of the radiation exposure of the blast. President Harry S. Truman dropped the bombs on Nagasaki and Hiroshima not so much to end the war with Japan, but to intimidate Stalin, keep him out of the Pacific war, and deny him a share of the peace that we were going to impose on Japan. History shows there was probably not one single general officer in that war who approved of it, and they all went public very quickly to denounce their Commander-in-Chief. Japan officially surrendered on September 2.

### **The United Nations and GATT**

From the early days of World War II, FDR saw himself completing the work of Wilson, by creating a “*new world order*” and establishing a United Nations that would succeed where Wilson’s League of Nations had failed. The *Tehran Conference* was the meeting of Joseph Stalin, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill between November 28 and December 1, 1943, and took place in Tehran, Iran. It was the first war conference among the three world powers in which Stalin was present. It succeeded the Cairo Conference and was followed by Yalta Conference and Potsdam Conference. The conference was organized to plan the final strategy for the war against Nazi Germany and its allies. During their meeting, FDR explained his plans for what would later become the United Nations.

### **A Quiet Country Meeting in Bretton Woods**

In July of 1944, a small country inn in the State of New Hampshire known as Bretton Woods was selected as the site for a series of meetings designed to lay out the economic blueprints for the post-war recovery. Among those attending were U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau Jr. (CFR) (son of a founding CFR member), representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Russia, and forty-one other nations.

From July 1 to July 22, they created an accord which established the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and later (1947) resulted in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)—most of the instruments they would need to implement world government and a New World Order.

On February 11, 1945, following meetings at Yalta, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Joseph Stalin declared their resolve to establish “*a general international organization to maintain peace and security.*” Most of this work was done in the State Department Post-War Foreign Policy Planning Division, under the direction of Alger Hiss, who actually was in both camps at the same time. Not only was he an advisor to FDR and a former President of the Carnegie Endowment Fund (which puts him squarely in the Fabian-CFR-camp) he also was an undercover agent for the Soviets. Hiss was the man who personally delivered the newly drafted UN Charter to the founding meeting of the United Nations in San Francisco, and he became the first Secretary General of that organization.

If you are wondering about the significance of these facts, it is this: After smashing the world to bits in a world war for the second time, the UN became the collectivist blueprint for remolding it to the heart’s desire. On June 26, 1945, delegates of 50 nations met in San Francisco for the United Nations Conference on International Organization, and adopted unanimously the charter proposed which became the United Nations on Oct 24, 1945.

The American delegation to the San Francisco meeting that drafted the charter of the United Nations included CFR members Nelson Rockefeller, John Foster Dulles, John McCloy, and CFR members who were communist agents—Harry Dexter White, Owen Lattimore, and the Secretary-General of the conference, Alger Hiss. In all, the Council sent forty-seven of its members in the United States delegation, effectively controlling the outcome.

Hiss left the government in 1946 to become president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a foundation which under his leadership became a leading supporter of the U.N. He was serving in that capacity when before the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1948, Whittaker Chambers first made his public charges that Hiss was a secret communist. Chambers produced a number of copies of State Department documents and said they were given to him by Hiss for transmission to the Soviet Union. Perjury charges were brought against Hiss when he denied before a grand jury that he had committed espionage. He was later convicted of espionage and perjury. The Hiss-Chambers affair would prove to be the watershed case of the McCarthy period and one of the most important of the century.

### **The Berlin Airlift**

At the end of the war, Russia lay in ruins. They were so terrified, having been invaded quite a few times from the West—that they felt quite naked there. We promised \$20 billion worth of reparations at Yalta and reconfirmed our promise at Potsdam. They never got it. We said that we would include them in the Marshal Plan. We didn't. They took the position that we had declared war on them, by the division of Germany and by the re-arming of the Germans. That was the red flag that really scared them.

Russia began to collect the border states in eastern Europe as buffers and to acquire much needed money and manufacturing plants, as they didn't have any left. They were going to make sure that they controlled a row of states in eastern Europe. When they left central Europe to return gradually to their homeland, they didn't have enough trucks and tractors, so they used horses to pull their cannons back into holy Russia. They were that poor and that knocked down after losing 20 *million* people.

In 1945, the Allies agreed that Berlin should be jointly administered by the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Great Britain, and France. The city was divided into four zones. The Soviet Zone became the city of East Berlin, and the rest of the zones became the city of West Berlin. West Berlin found itself a small island of democracy surrounded by Communist East Germany. In order to travel from West Germany to West Berlin, you had to travel through East Germany. This meant that all supplies and food for the people of West Berlin had to travel through Communist territory.

On January 1, 1947, the British and Americans merged their zones for economic purposes into a single unified zone called Bizonia. The Soviets formally condemned the British and American economic merging of their two zones, claiming that this amounted to the establishment of a separatist German government in western Germany, and was a violation of agreements reached by the Allies at Yalta.

In West Germany the only active economy was then the black market. This now had to be destroyed, and this could only be done by currency reform—the substitution of the almost worthless Reichsmark for a brand new currency, the Deutsche Mark, with a stable and universally accepted value. The currency reform operation was carried out in the utmost secrecy, for any leak would have led to grave international repercussions. On June 18, the new currency was announced to the world. To keep the old currency from entering their zone, where it was still valid, the Soviets banned all travel to and from the eastern zone. This led to the Berlin Airlift in June 1948.

*“One of the most durable features of the U.S. culture is the inability or refusal to recognize U.S. crimes.”*  
— Edward Herman

Yes, it is a fact that they were paranoid and behaved extremely badly with their satellite countries. The “Cold War” was a complete fact. But it was based on an illusion that the Russians were coming. This was the propaganda that never ever let up, until finally Gorbachev dissolved the whole story. We had maintained the myth in order to keep 51% of the U.S. budget for a military which really had no enemy.

By 1949, all of the nations whose independence FDR and Churchill had believed were worth the death of 20 million Russians, 6 million Germans and Poles, and 1 million Americans and Brits—Czechoslovakia, Poland, China—receded into the Stalinist darkness and a communist empire as brutal and hostile as Hitler's. So, half a decade after America's second crusade to make the world safe for democracy, U.S. troops were again heading for Europe—and to war with Korea.

## The Korean War — The Bay of Pigs

At the conclusion of World War II, the Soviet Union and the United States occupied previously undivided Korea in order to expel the defeated Japanese who had ruled the entire Peninsula since 1910. On August 15, 1945, the U.S. drew up the Ordinance No. 1, which stipulated that “*the Japanese army in Korea south of 38<sup>th</sup> parallel shall be disarmed by the U.S. forces,*” and occupied the whole territory of south Korea.

The United States sought domination over as much of Korea as possible because of its strategic proximity to Japan, China, and the Soviet Union. Because the great majority of Koreans had their own vision of a democratic, independent, and socialist country, they stood in the way of U.S. plans. In view of the Cairo and the Potsdam Declarations, Korea should have been given the opportunity for independent and democratic development, instead of military occupation.

A temporary demarcation line separating the Russian and U.S. forces was created approximately along the 38th parallel. This line was not intended to create two separate countries. But as the Cold War deepened, both powers insisted that re-unification of North and South be carried out according to their own ideological bias. The U.S. supported an extremely repressive ruler in the South, Syngman Rhee, while the North was led by Kim Il Sung, a fiercely independent man greatly vilified by the West.

Long before the Korean War broke out in June 1950, there was another civil guerrilla war being waged within parts of the South between Koreans aligning themselves with their American occupiers, and those desiring clear independence from outsiders. Repression by Rhee's security forces against perceived dissenters with the protection of the U.S. presence was systematically brutal. The success of the revolution in next door China in 1949 greatly increased U.S. anxieties and contributed to firm support of the tyrannical, but anti-Communist Rhee.

Everything we learned about Vietnam had its forerunner in Korea: U.S. support of a corrupt, tyrannical ruler; regular atrocities; mass slaughter of civilians; torture and imprisonment of dissidents not assassinated; cities and many agricultural areas bombed to total destruction; intense and calculated management of the news about the war; and consistent sabotaging of peace talks throughout the war's duration. Earlier suppressed reports of atrocities committed by U.S. ground and air forces were re-affirmed in 1999 by eyewitness accounts of Korean survivors and American military veterans who had been ordered to kill large numbers of civilians, documented in the book, *The Bridge at No Gun Ri*, as well as declassified U.S. Air Force documents. In the summer of 1950, U.S. military forces opened fire on a group of South Korean refugees at a railroad trestle near the village of No Gun Ri. Survivors said hundreds died, mostly women and children. In one case some 2,000 Korean civilians were forced into an open mountain area near Yongdong and slaughtered from the air.

Prosecutors at the Pyongyang International Tribunal on U.S. Crimes in Korea released an indictment on July 25, 2003, charging that the United States of America has persistently committed all sorts of criminal acts, including aggression, plunder, murder and destruction, and, thus, inflicted intolerable misfortune and suffering upon the Korean people. Here are some of incidents the indictment claimed occurred:

*“In October 1946, when the South Korean people rose up in protest against the U.S. military government, the U.S. called in thousands of military personnel, policemen and terrorists, reinforced with planes, tanks and chemical weapons, to kill 25,000 protestors and other people from different walks of life in cold blood...From May 7 to the election day in 1948, the U.S. arrested, jailed and killed more than 50,000 patriotic people...When the April 3 Popular Uprising broke out against the May 10 separate election and lasted till June 1948 on Cheju Island, the U.S. military killed over 70,000 of the island’s population, which totaled about 300,000, and burned down more than 10,000 homes...From December 1949 to January 1950 the U.S. murdered over 40,000 people and wounded tens of thousands in the 5 districts, including those around Mt. Jiri, Mt. Thaebaek and Mt. Odae. The U.S. troops recklessly killed the patriots involved in the anti-U.S., anti-fascist resistance. During the five years of occupation, the U.S. troops killed more than one million patriotic people in the most barbarous ways.”*

The death and destruction inflicted, especially in the northern part of the Peninsula, defies imagination. It is now believed that more than four million people died in the war, perhaps as many as three million of whom were from the North of a population, at the time, of about nine million. All major cities, about five dozen, were totally destroyed in the North by U.S. airpower. For three years of war, the U.S. Air Force, and the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps made more than 800,000 and 250,000 sorties respectively. In Korea, they dropped over 600,000 tons of bombs and napalm, which amounted to nearly 3.7 times more than the 160,000 tons dropped in Japan during the entire Pacific War. Korea’s territory is only 1/3 of Japan’s territory. Thus, the intensity of the bombing is easily demonstrated. The brutal war that developed was fought in defense of the Syngman Rhee regime, not for the benefit of an undivided Peninsula benefiting all Koreans.

The Korean War started on June 25, 1950, and continued ruthlessly until an armistice ending the hot war was signed on July 27, 1953. Tragically, the real history of the Korean War remains largely unknown even today. As a result, most Americans continue to have a distorted understanding of the aims and consequences of U.S. foreign policy toward Korea.

And, because the carefully managed conventional history of the Korean War has helped U.S. policymakers maintain popular support for their foreign policy, it is necessary to challenge that history if we are to build support for a new U.S. policy towards Korea and meaningful solidarity with the Korean people.

To this date there has been no peace treaty signed, even though talks technically continue at Panmunjom on the northern side of the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). Officially the U.S. is still at war with North Korea. In summary, the war wreaked destruction hardly equaled in the worst battles of World War II in Europe. It has left bitter memories. Is it no wonder that Korea is never evoked when our nation's military past is put on display?

*“On the question of attacking northward, I can see the reasons for it, I think, and sympathize with the feeling that offense is the best and sometimes the only defense. However, it is very evident to us here that any such attack now, or even to talk of such an attack, is to lose American official and public support...The strong feeling...is that we should continue...to avoid any semblance of aggression, and make sure the blame for what happens is upon Russia.”*

—Dr. Robert Oliver, Penn State University, Pennsylvania, October 10, 1949 letter to Republic of Korea President Syngman Rhee.

### **The Bay of Pigs Incident**

When rebel forces under the command of Fidel Castro completed the overthrow of Cuban dictator Fulgencio Batista on New Year's Day, 1959, the future of U.S.-Cuban relations became uncertain, at best. As the year progressed, Castro solidified control over the revolutionary government and initiated an ambitious program of reforms, replacing American companies' control of key industries with economic measures focused on national development. The new policies threatened the profits and land holdings of U.S. businesses, causing President Eisenhower to increasingly turn a hostile glance at Cuba.

By the winter of 1960, just a year after the Revolution, President Eisenhower and his key foreign policy advisers were convinced that Castro's government needed to be replaced-soon and by any means necessary. On March 17, 1960, Eisenhower authorized a Central Intelligence Agency plan, titled *A Program of Covert Action Against the Castro Regime*. The document states that the program's objective is to “bring about the replacement of the Castro regime with one more devoted to the interests of the Cuban people and more acceptable to the U.S. in such a manner as to avoid the appearance of U.S. intervention.”

When John Kennedy entered the White House in January of 1961, the training and planning for the exile invasion were nearing completion. The CIA had organized a brigade of about 1,400 exile fighters at a secluded camp in Guatemala, and was infiltrating advance teams of organizers and saboteurs into Cuba. President Kennedy was excited at the prospect of secretly arranging Castro's overthrow, and took an active interest in the planning. Kennedy was cautious, however, concerned that the size of the operation would threaten his ability to deny U.S. involvement with the exile brigade. Throughout the preparations for the invasion he was enthusiastic about the CIA's Cuba program, but as the planned D-Day approached, Kennedy became increasingly worried that the U.S. hand in the operation could no longer be concealed.

Some of Kennedy's advisers shared his concern about the implications of a loss of deniability. A week before the invasion, Kennedy special assistant Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. wrote a memo to the President urging him to not get caught up in covering up the invasion: *“When lies must be told, they should be told by subordinate officials. At no point should the President be asked to lend himself to the cover operation.”*

Kennedy was as determined to have the Cuba program remain secret as he was to see it succeed. The “cover operation” Schlesinger referred to cranked into high gear in mid-April, 1961, as the CIA and the Kennedy administration labored to maintain the fiction that the exiles attacking Cuba were not under the employ of the United States.

On April 17, 1961, approximately 1,300 members of a CIA-supported counter-revolutionary Cuban exile force stormed the beaches of Cuba. Fidel Castro took personal command of the effort to repel the invaders. He quickly mobilized military and militia units, and instructed his few remaining fighter planes to bomb and strafe the invasion force (several of Cuba's aircraft had been destroyed in air strikes preceding the invasion).

The long-planned covert action to oust Castro met a surprisingly speedy defeat. Cuban air force pilots managed to destroy ships just off the beach that were to supply the invaders with needed ammunition and communication equipment. Cut off from this lifeline and running short on bullets, the exile brigade struggled in vain for a few days before almost all of its members were killed or captured. When the shooting was over, 114 members of the brigade were dead and 1,189 had become Castro's prisoners. Cuba's revolutionary army and militia had thwarted the invaders before they were able to establish a solid foothold on the island. In Washington, the White House went into a brief period of shock. President Kennedy recovered quickly, however, and made a statement acknowledging U.S. support for the invaders. Days later he said that U.S. efforts to oust Castro with the Bay of Pigs invasion had been restrained, and that future U.S. action against the Cuban government might be more severe.

The covert invasion of Cuba had been a foreign policy disaster, what one historian called “the perfect failure.” The events at the Bay of Pigs resulted in embarrassment for the Kennedy administration and provided Castro with a major issue with which to rally the people of Cuba. Though four decades have passed since the invasion, the memory of the Bay of Pigs continues to influence the present-day tensions between the U.S. and Cuba.

Kennedy's hatred of the CIA was well-known. After the Bay of Pigs disaster, he fired CIA Director Allen Dulles (CFR)(who had secretly developed plans to expand the Vietnam War), and said he wanted *“to splinter the CIA in a thousand pieces and scatter it to the winds.”* Using a federal statute, Kennedy was going to force J. Edgar Hoover, the aging Director of the FBI, to retire, because he wanted somebody who better represented his New Frontier.

## Operation Northwoods

For those military officers who were sitting on the fence, the Kennedy administration's botched Bay of Pigs invasion was the last straw. *“The Bay of Pigs fiasco broke the dike,”* said one report at the time. *“President Kennedy was pilloried by the super patriots as a 'no-win' chief . . . The Far Right became a fount of proposals born of frustration and put forward in the name of anti-Communism. . . Active-duty commanders played host to anti-Communist seminars on their bases and attended or addressed Right-wing meetings elsewhere.”*

According to secret and long-hidden documents, the Joint Chiefs of Staff drew up and approved plans for what may be the most corrupt plan ever created by the U.S. government. In the name of anti-Communism, they proposed launching a secret and bloody war of terrorism against their own country in order to trick the American public into supporting an ill-conceived war they intended to launch against Cuba. Code named Operation Northwoods, written with the approval of the Chairman and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called for innocent people to be shot on American streets; for boats carrying refugees fleeing Cuba to be sunk on the high seas; for a wave of violent terrorism to be launched in Washington, D.C., Miami, and elsewhere. People would be framed for bombings they did not commit; planes would be hijacked. Using phony evidence, all of it would be blamed on Castro, thus giving General L.L. Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and his cabal the excuse, as well as the public and international backing they needed to launch an unprovoked war on Cuba.

At 2:30 on the afternoon of Tuesday, March 13, 1962, Lemnitzer went over last-minute details of Operation Northwoods with his covert action chief, Brigadier General William H. Craig, and signed the document. He then went to a “special meeting” in McNamara's office. An hour later he met with Kennedy's military representative, General Maxwell Taylor. What happened during those meetings is unknown. But three days later, President Kennedy told Lemnitzer that there was virtually no possibility that the U.S. would ever use overt military force in Cuba. Although no such war took place, Operation Northwoods had the support of every single member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and even senior Pentagon official Paul Nitze argued in favor of provoking a phony war with Cuba. The fact that the most senior members of all the services and the Pentagon could be so out of touch with reality and the meaning of democracy would be hidden for four decades.

Read the memo here - <http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/northwoodsmemo.pdf>

While it is widely accepted that there was a conspiracy behind Kennedy's death, as the volumes of evidence prove, there has never been a single group pinpointed as the mastermind of such a plan. The complexities involved in such a cover-up, certainly point to the Illuminati, because they are the only group in the world, operating behind the scenes, able to influence and control all the elements necessary to pull off something like this.

Perhaps his murder was carried out publicly because they wanted the political leaders in this country to know who was in control. Ten days before he was shot in Dallas, it has been reported that President Kennedy said in a speech at Columbia University: *“The high office of President has been used to foment a plot to destroy the American’s freedom, and before I leave office I must inform the citizen of this plight.”*

There has been a phenomenal amount of research done on the case of President Kennedy’s murder, and it almost seems that when he died, the tide changed in this country. The forces behind the assassination of Kennedy were able to change the course of history at will, and with the new-found confidence at their success, the power they gained, literally allowed them to exert complete control over American government.

One fact that linked the Illuminati to the Kennedy conspiracy was the oil connection. Huge oil fields had been discovered off the coast of Vietnam in 1950, and Rockefeller was able to use oil as a ploy to ferment a fear that Vietnam would be lost to Communism, the way Cuba was.

However, Kennedy wanted to end American involvement in the war, and in October, 1963, he recalled 1,000 so-called advisers. He planned to bring home all American soldiers by 1965. After Kennedy was eliminated, the U.S. government escalated the war in Vietnam. Billions of dollars was being made from the war, because war is good business. This money source would have ended.

In 1968, Sen. Robert F. Kennedy promised an honorable end to the Vietnam War, and with Martin Luther King, Jr. delivering the Black support, Kennedy most likely would have been elected President. However, that did not fit into the plans of the Illuminati, who wanted to prolong the war, and wanted Nixon to be President, because he represented the instrument that would perpetuate their goals. Again, there is plenty of evidence that points to a conspiracy in the assassinations of Bobby Kennedy, as well as King. The likelihood that the same forces were involved is evident, because again, the course of the nation was altered to fit into their plans.

In his 1971 State of the Union Address, Nixon said: *“We in Washington will at last be able to provide government that is truly for the people. I realize that what I am asking, is that not only the Executive Branch, but even the Congress will have to change by giving up some of its power.”*

Three days later, he announced that the country was being divided up into ten federal districts, and in February, 1972, he signed Executive Order #11647, which gave the government the power to accomplish that division. The Ten Regional Councils, a direct extension of the Executive Branch, since then, have been getting control of local, county, and state governmental functions, through federal loans.

# The Vietnam War

## The Gulf of Tonkin Incident

Forty years ago on August 4, 1964, network television was interrupted at 11:36 p.m. EDT so President Lyndon B. Johnson could tell the nation that U.S. warships in a place called the Gulf of Tonkin had been attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats. The official story was that North Vietnamese torpedo boats launched an “unprovoked attack” against a U.S. destroyer on “routine patrol” in the Tonkin Gulf on Aug. 2—and that North Vietnamese PT boats followed up with a “deliberate attack” on a pair of U.S. ships two days later. In response to what he described as “open aggression on the open seas,” Johnson ordered U.S. airstrikes on North Vietnam. The airstrikes opened the door to a war that would kill 1 million Vietnamese and 58,000 Americans and divide the nation along class and generational lines.

Over the years, debate has swirled around whether U.S. ships actually were attacked that night, or whether, as some skeptics suggested, the Johnson administration staged or provoked an event to get congressional authority to act against North Vietnam. Recently released tapes of White House phone conversations indicate the attack never happened. The tapes, released by the LBJ Library, include 51 phone conversations from Aug. 4 and 5, 1964, when the Tonkin Gulf incident occurred. Was this provocation needed to initiate bombing, or to assist the Johnson administration during an election year? Either goal certainly seems plausible. At the time, Johnson was running his presidential campaign on a peace ticket. Johnson's main opponent for the presidency, Senator Barry Goldwater, was pushing for an even tougher U.S. stance in Southeast Asia. An “unprovoked attack” by North Vietnam would give Johnson the opportunity to respond with limited force and improve his image with the American people without appearing to agree with his main political opponent.

If this line of thinking was part of Johnson's plan, it was well-calculated. In response to the Tonkin Gulf attacks, the president launched a limited airstrike and warned Hanoi against further aggression. Thus, four months prior to the November election, he appeared firm but not a warmonger. His approval rating with the American people soared from 42 percent to 72 percent, and within three months he overwhelmingly won his campaign for the presidency.

As to the other possibility, rather than being on a routine patrol Aug. 2, the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* was actually engaged in aggressive intelligence-gathering maneuvers ( part of an American covert intelligence effort known as Operation Plan 34A) in sync with coordinated attacks on North Vietnam by the South Vietnamese navy and the Laotian air force. “*The day before, two attacks on North Vietnam...had taken place,*” writes scholar Daniel C. Hallin. Those assaults were “*part of a campaign of increasing military pressure on the North that the United States had been pursuing since early 1964*” They reflected plans the administration had *already* drawn up for gradually increasing its overt military pressure against the North.

In the absence of independent journalism, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution—the closest thing there ever was to a declaration of war against North Vietnam—sailed through Congress on Aug. 7. (Two courageous senators, Wayne Morse of Oregon and Ernest Gruening of Alaska, provided the only “no” votes.) The resolution authorized the president “to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.” The Resolution allowed Johnson to wage all out war against North Vietnam without ever securing a formal Declaration of War from Congress. The result of whatever actually did or did not happen in the Tonkin Gulf was that, by overwhelmingly approving the resolution, the U.S. Congress ceded to the president the power that America's Founding Fathers endowed only Congress—the power to declare war. Sound familiar?

The rest is tragic history. The events surrounding the resolution and its passage point to a tragic failure in the U.S. decision-making system of the time. At a crucial moment in history, U.S. intelligence-collection agencies directly fed *raw* intelligence data to U.S. policy-makers without submitting that data to thorough and proper analysis. The prevalence of this kind of unpolished intelligence support to government leaders helped open the door to full U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. Remember the 9/11 Report?

The significance of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution is not so much its deception, but rather, the misuse of power bestowed by the resolution. The language of the resolution plainly granted the powers the President subsequently used and Congress understood the breadth of those powers....But no doubt exists that Congress did not intend to authorize, without further, full consultation, the expansion of U.S. forces in Vietnam from 16,000 to 550,000 men, initiating large scale combat operations with the risk of an expanded war with China and the Soviet Union, and extending U.S. involvement in Vietnam for many years to come.

Daniel Ellsberg, the former Johnson administration member who leaked the Pentagon Papers to the press, said in November 1995, “*What I did not reveal in the Summer of 1964...was a conspiracy to manipulate the public into a war and to win an election through fraud...which had the exact horrible consequences the founders of this country envisioned when they ruled out— they thought as best they could—that an Executive Branch could secretly decide the decisions of war and peace, without public debate or vote of Congress....*”

Nearly three decades later, during the Gulf War, columnist Sydney Schanberg warned journalists not to forget “*our unquestioning chorus of agreeability when Lyndon Johnson bamboozled us with his fabrication of the Gulf of Tonkin incident.*”

Schanberg blamed not only the press but also “*the apparent amnesia of the wider American public.*” And he added: “*We Americans are the ultimate innocents. We are forever desperate to believe that this time the government is telling us the truth.*” And once more...sound familiar?

# The Gulf War

After the defeat of Germany and the Ottoman Empire in World War One, the area that had belonged to the Turks was broken up into mandates. The area that is now Iraq and Kuwait (as well as what is now Jordan and Israel, and parts of Saudi Arabia) was placed under British authority. The British created two kingdoms to reward Arab allies that had fought the Turks with them during the war. These were Transjordan, now called the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and Iraq.

The Kingdom of Iraq was composed of the Ottoman provinces of Al-Mawsil (Mosul), Baghdad, and Al-Basrah—with the exception of the area known as Kuwait. That area was retained as a base for the Royal Navy. The British, always a maritime power, needed to protect the sea lanes between the British Isles and the Indian subcontinent.

The Iraqi people saw the creation of Kuwait as a British protectorate as an affront to their newfound sovereignty. They claimed the British told them that Iraq was to include the entire former Ottoman province of Al-Basrah, which included Kuwait. However, following World War I, and well into the latter half of the twentieth century, Iraq was powerless to challenge British influence and authority in the region, until, in 1961, when Britain no longer needed Kuwait's harbor, it granted the sheikdom its independence, and the State of Kuwait was born. As soon as the British announced Kuwait's independence, Baghdad reiterated its claim on two Kuwaiti islands situated between Iraq and mainland Kuwait, Warbah and Bubiyan. Iraq also reiterated its claim on all of Kuwait, again based on the argument that the entire Ottoman province of Al-Basrah was part of Iraq.

The story of the Iraq-Kuwait confrontation that led to the Gulf War is well known. Following months of Iraqi demands for debt relief and Kuwaiti refusals to forgive Iraq's \$10 billion debt from the Iran-Iraq War, Iraqi forces moved to the northern border of the tiny sheikdom in 1990. Iraq claimed that Kuwait's slant drilling by Santa Fe Drilling was illegally extracting oil (valued at \$2.5 billion) from the Rumaila oil field on the Iraqi side of the *de facto* line of demarcation between the two countries. Santa Fe Drilling is a subsidiary of Sante Fe International, owned 100 percent by the Al Sabah family of Kuwait. On its board of directors were former President Gerald Ford (the President that appointed George Bush Senior to Director of the CIA), General Brent Scowcroft (at the time Bush Senior's National Security Advisor) and Roderich Hills (husband of Carla Hills, Bush Senior's Trade Representative).

It seems forgotten by our amnesiac—and CFR controlled—media that we once energetically supported Saddam Hussein in Iraq's war against Iran; and so he thought, not unnaturally, that we wouldn't mind his taking back land that had been part of Iraq for over 4000 years! Remember Saddam Hussein, in the Baghdad court room, wearing his natty pin-striped suit and scratching his homeless person beard wondering what the big fuss was about?

Washington feared the spread of Iran's theocratic, anti-Western ideology, which threatened imperialist interests in the region. So the U.S. armed and financed Saddam during the 1980-88 Iran-Iraq war which cost over one million lives and an astronomical \$1.19 trillion. The U.S. supplied Iraq with military intelligence, \$5 billion in food subsidies, \$2.5 billion in export loan guarantees, and \$141 million in direct export subsidies. According to Senator Robert Byrd in recent Congressional testimony, the U.S. also sent Saddam a “*witches' brew of pathogens*” including anthrax, botulinum, and West Nile virus. (*West Virginia Gazette*, 9/27/02)

“*The use of gas on the battlefield by the Iraqis was not a matter of deep strategic concern,*” explained Col. Walter P. Lang (retired senior Defense Intelligence officer) in an interview with the *New York Times*. An anonymous “senior U.S. officer” further commented that the Pentagon “*wasn't so horrified by Iraq's use of gas. It was just another way of killing people—whether with a bullet or phosgene, it didn't make a difference.*”

ABC News Nightline opened on June 9, 1993, with the truth for a change: “*It is becoming increasingly clear,*” said a grave Ted Koppel, “*that George Bush [Sr.], operating largely behind the scenes throughout the 1980's, initiated and supported much of the financing, intelligence, and military help that built Saddam's Iraq into the aggressive power that the United States ultimately had to destroy.*”

No wonder such certainty existed about Iraq’s chemical and biological weapons program. The Reagan/Bush administration had seen to it.

At the end of the costly Iran-Iraq war, Saddam's government was in trouble. Massive debts had been accumulated, and a boiling rage was building among the Iraqi people against the reckless policies which had led them into war and economic disaster. Fearing for his future, Saddam looked to stave off anger at home through a popular diversionary foreign adventure.

In a July 25, 1990 meeting with U.S. ambassador April Glaspie, Saddam Hussein was informed, “*We have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait.*” When Glaspie asked Hussein what his intentions were, he replied that Kuwait’s actions amounted to “*an economic war*” and “*military action against us.*” Hussein said he hoped for a peaceful solution, but if not, he said, “*it will be natural that Iraq will not accept death.*” She went on to say: “*James Baker has directed our official spokesmen to emphasize this instruction,*” leaving him to believe we would take no action against him if he did. Meanwhile, the U.S. encouraged Kuwait to continue its slant drilling into Iraqi oil fields.

Saddam took the bait, and on August 2, 1990, Iraq seized Kuwait. This allowed Iraq to cancel its debts and seize control of 20% of the world's known oil reserves. A few weeks later, Iraq declared it annexed as the nineteenth province of Iraq. Ever since the Arab oil embargoes of the 1970s, the U.S. had been seeking an opportunity to dominate the Middle East. Now the public had to be rallied to the “just war.”

## The Case for Desert Storm

A high point of the public relations campaign against Iraq was the testimony of a Kuwaiti refugee. She spoke before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on October 15, 1990, and told of Iraqi troops removing over 300 babies from incubators in Kuwait City hospital, and dumping them on the floor to die.

On January 6, 1992, John R. MacArthur, publisher of Harper's Magazine, revealed that "Nayirah," the alleged refugee, was the daughter of Saud al-Sabah, Kuwait's ambassador to the United States, and that Hill and Knowlton, a large public relations firm, had helped prepare her testimony, which she had rehearsed before video cameras in the firm's Washington office.

When George H. W. Bush ordered American forces to the Persian Gulf—to reverse Iraq's invasion of Kuwait—part of the administration case was that an Iraqi juggernaut was also threatening to roll into Saudi Arabia. Citing top-secret satellite images, Pentagon officials estimated in mid-September that up to 250,000 Iraqi troops and 1,500 tanks stood on the border, threatening the key U.S. oil supplier. But when the *St. Petersburg Times* in Florida acquired two commercial Soviet satellite images of the same area, taken at the same time, no Iraqi troops were visible near the Saudi border —"just empty desert."

On January 16, 1991, the U.S. launched "Desert Storm," killing 100-200,000 Iraqis in the most intensive bombing campaign in history. Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait briefly gave us a new Hitler and Bush Senior an opportunity to smash Iraq and to declare the building of a New World Order to be America's next crusade.

*"There was no war. No combat. There was only a deliberate, systematic genocide of a defenseless population while barely setting foot on Iraqi soil. When Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. said in 1967, 'The greatest purveyor of violence on earth is my own government', he could not have dreamed in his worst nightmare what the U.S. did to Iraq."*

—Ramsey Clark, former U.S. Attorney General

After driving Iraq out of Kuwait, the U.S. made a conscious decision not to invade Iraq to topple Saddam Hussein because it feared the potential consequences of such an action. A ground invasion posed the danger of radicalization and social upheavals throughout the Arab world, as well as unpopular heavy U.S. casualties. Removing Saddam ran the risk of leading to the break-up of the Iraqi state, which would seriously destabilize the region. To avoid such a scenario, the U.S. would have had to occupy Iraq to maintain stability—which Bush Sr. was unwilling to do. *"We would have been forced to occupy Baghdad and, in effect, rule Iraq.... There was no viable "exit strategy" we could see. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land."*

—George Bush Sr., in his memoirs, *A World Transformed*.

While George Bush Sr. was complicit in the strategy to invade Iraq in order to justify a continued U.S. presence in the Middle East, the neo-cons of the Republican Party were incensed with the apparent unwillingness of Bush Sr. to remove Saddam without UN approval, and consistently campaigned for the U.S. to “finish the job.” After the Gulf War triumph, the nation turned its back on Bush, giving 37 percent of the vote to a president whose approval, eighteen months earlier, had stood at 91 percent.

Moves to implement the Wofowitz Memorandum of 1992 seemed to have been laughed off the table. Senator Joseph Biden ridiculed the memo as a formula for “*a Pax Americana.*” Senator Edward Kennedy said the Pentagon plans “*appear to be aimed primarily at finding new ways to justify Cold War levels of military spending.*” However, we again saw a constitutionally untenable foray by President Clinton into Bosnia. In an attempt to prod recalcitrant legislators into supporting the Bosnia mission to deploy “peacekeeping” troops, the Clinton Administration made use of a familiar tactic: It sought to create a “bipartisan consensus” on behalf of the venture by enlisting the support of Establishment foreign policy “experts”—nearly all of whom were associated with the ubiquitous Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). The constitution that grew out of the Dayton Accords provides that Bosnia will be a nation effectively devoid of national sovereignty. Individual rights are “granted,” therefore, they can be taken away.

In another effort to dominate the Middle East, a memorandum titled *A Clean Break: a New Strategy for Securing the Realm* was submitted to Likud’s Prime Minister elect Benjamin Netanyahu in 1996. It was prepared by what is described as “A Study Group on a New Israeli Strategy Toward 2000.” Authors of this memorandum include Richard Perle, aka the “Prince of Darkness,” Douglas Feith, Paul Wofowitz and others, most of them now currently in high positions in the Bush administration. This document is remarkable for its very existence because it constitutes a policy manifesto for the Israeli government penned by members of the *current* U.S. government.

The authors presented a plan to Israel for overthrowing Saddam Hussein in Iraq both because Saddam Hussein poses a direct threat to Israel and in order to exert pressure on Syria whom the authors feel poses an equal threat to Israel. The authors also advocated “*Striking Syrian military targets in Lebanon, and should that prove insufficient, striking at select targets in Syria proper.*” The Study Group called for an end to the peace process and the beginning of a Reagan-style Cold War campaign in the Middle East that would establish Israeli hegemony, destabilize the Arab world and, in effect, institute a new order based on peace by conquest. This document advocated the scrapping of UN Resolutions 242 and 338—the “land for peace” formula—in favor of one based on the “balance of power.”

Indeed, the authors state, “*Only the unconditional acceptance by Arabs of our rights, especially in their territorial dimensions, ‘peace for peace,’ is a solid basis for the future.*” What makes the document even more significant is the fact that many of the recommendations proposed and even the specific language suggested appear to have been adopted by Netanyahu. Israel, however, chose not to invade Iraq.

# September 11, 2001

Whether or not the administration in some way orchestrated the events of 9/11, as alluded to by such noteworthy writers as Gore Vidal and Michael Ruppert, it was clearly poised to take advantage of them. The behavior of President George W. Bush on September 11<sup>th</sup> certainly gives rise to all sorts of not unnatural suspicions. I can think of no other modern chief of state who would continue to pose for warm pictures while listening to a young girl telling stories about her pet goat while hijacked planes were crashing into three buildings.

On the morning of September 11, 2001, four U.S. commercial airliners are hijacked between 7:45am and 8:10am, all the while on FAA radar. This is an unprecedented event already. By around 8:15am, it should have been rather apparent that something was terribly wrong. The FAA, NORAD, and the military have cooperative procedures by which fighter jets intercept commercial aircraft under emergency conditions. By law, once a plane has deviated from its flight-plan, fighter planes are sent up to find out why. Yet, the government's automatic "standard order of procedure in the event of a "hijacking" was not followed.

Andrews Air Force Base, just 10 miles from the Pentagon, has two squadrons of fighter jets with the job of protecting the skies over Washington D.C. Despite over one hour's advance warning of a terrorist attack in progress, not a single Andrews fighter took off to protect the city until *after* the Pentagon was hit.

Here is a chronology of the events of that mournful day:

8:13am: American Airlines Flight 11 was instructed by air traffic controllers at the FAA's Boston Center to climb to 35,000 feet. The plane did not obey the order and its transponder was turned off. According to FAA regulations, that was to be considered an emergency: "*Consider that an aircraft emergency exists when there is unexpected loss of radar contact and radio communications with any aircraft.*"

NORAD should have been informed immediately, so military planes could be scrambled to investigate. NORAD and the FAA both claimed NORAD was not informed until 8:40am. If NORAD's claim is false, and it was indeed informed within the time frame outlined in FAA regulations, that would mean NORAD did absolutely nothing for *almost thirty minutes* while a hijacked commercial airliner flew off course through some of the most congested airspace in the world.

8:21am: According to phone calls made by flight attendants Betty Ong and Amy Sweeney, the hijackers had stabbed and killed at least one passenger and two flight attendants aboard Flight 11.

8:35am: The President leaves his hotel for the Emma E. Booker Elementary School in Sarasota, Florida.

8:40am: NORAD is alerted of the hijacking of Flight 11.

8:42am: United Airlines Flight 175 is hijacked.

8:43am: NORAD is notified of the hijacking of Flight 175.

8:46am: American Airlines Flight 11 crashes into the North Tower. The first media reports of Flight 11's crash into the World Trade Center began around 8:48am, two or three minutes after the crash. So within minutes, millions were aware of the story, yet Bush supposedly remained unaware for about another ten minutes. Kia Baskerville, a CBS News producer traveling with Bush that morning, received a message about a plane crash at about 8:48—right as the story was first being reported. Meanwhile, CIA Director George Tenet was told of the crash a few minutes after it happened.

8:46am: American Airlines Flight 77 is hijacked. NORAD is *not* notified.

8:55am: President Bush arrives at the school. People waiting there had already heard about the crash. According to White House accounts, Andrew Card, White House Chief Staff informs the President of the first crash. How can one believe White House accounts that the President didn't know until this time? And even if it wasn't until he arrived at the school that he knew, he surely was told about the *other* hijackings in progress.

Because by that time, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), the National Military Command Center, the Pentagon, the White House, the Secret Service, and Canada's Strategic Command all knew that three commercial airplanes had been hijacked. They knew that one plane had been flown deliberately into the World Trade Center's North Tower; a second plane was wildly off course and also heading toward Manhattan; and a third plane had abruptly turned around over Ohio and was flying back toward Washington, DC. No one has apparently scrambled Air Force interceptors either.

9:00am: From a room with secure communications, Bush is updated by National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice on the situation. As National Security Advisor, Rice had to have had as much information as anyone. By the time she spoke to Bush, she must have known that three planes had been hijacked and that the country was under attack. So why, at 9:03 am—fifteen minutes after it was clear the United States was under terrorist attack—did President Bush sit down with a classroom of second-graders and begin a 20-minute pre-planned photo op?

However, at a press conference on the evening of 9/11, Press Secretary Ari Fleischer was asked by a reporter, "*And then this morning, when Andy Card told him about the first accident, was Andy Card or Condi Rice or any of those aware of the hijackings? What did they know when they --*" Fleischer cut in and replied, "*No, at that point they were not.*"

So supposedly, 15 minutes after the first crash, none of Bush's aides, not even Rice back in Washington, DC, knew a thing about the hijackings that had been reported to NORAD 20 minutes earlier? This simply is not plausible. Bush's own recollection of the first crash only complicates the picture. Less than two months after the attacks, Bush made the preposterous claim that he had watched the first attack as it happened on live television. On December 4, 2001, Bush was asked: "*How did you feel when you heard about the terrorist attack?*" Bush replied, "*I was sitting outside the classroom waiting to go in, and I saw an airplane hit the tower—the TV was obviously on. And I used to fly, myself, and I said, well, there's one terrible pilot. I said, it must have been a horrible accident. But I was whisked off there, I didn't have much time to think about it.*"

Think about that. Bush's remark implies he saw the first plane hit the tower. But we all know the video of the first plane hitting did not surface until the *next* day. Could Bush have meant he saw the second plane hit—which many Americans witnessed? No, because he said that he was in the classroom when Card whispered in his ear that a second plane hit. And we *know* that was true because we watched it on TV. And he wasn't *whisked* off, because he stayed at the school to hear the children read. Or was he watching the first crash in his Presidential limousine in *real* time? Think about what that possibility means.

On January 5, 2002, Bush stated: "*Well, I was sitting in a schoolhouse in Florida ... and my Chief of Staff—well, first of all, when we walked into the classroom, I had seen this plane fly into the first building. There was a TV set on. And you know, I thought it was pilot error and I was amazed that anybody could make such a terrible mistake. And something was wrong with the plane...*"

In his speech to the nation that evening, Bush said: "*Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government's emergency response plans.*" Duh...don't think so, Dubya.

9:03am: Flight 175 crashes into the South Tower. Bush's Secret Service agents watched the second crash live on television in an adjacent room to the classroom.

9:06: Andrew Card, White House Chief of Staff whispers to Bush that "*A second plane hit the second tower. America is under attack.*" We have all seen the video footage.

So what did the Commander in Chief do with the knowledge that the United States was under attack?

He did nothing.

Bush did not say one word. He did not ask Card any questions. He did not give any orders. He did not know who (or which country) was attacking, whether there would be more attacks, what military plans had been taken, what military actions should be taken—indeed, he knew virtually nothing about what was going on outside the room. He just sat there reading a book about a pet goat.

Has he instructed Chief of Staff Card to scramble the Air Force? No. An excruciating 25 minutes later, he finally deigns to give a public statement telling the United States what they have already figured out; that there's been an attack by hijacked planes on the World Trade Center. There's a hijacked plane bee-lining to Washington, but has the Air Force been scrambled to defend anything yet? No. Military pilots must have "permission from the White House" to shoot down a civilian aircraft, but if retaliatory strikes needed to the authorized, Bush was not available. If one of the planes had to be shot down to save more lives on the ground, Bush was not available.

9:06am: Secret Service agents burst into Vice President Cheney's White House office. They carried him under his arms—nearly lifting him off the ground—and propelled him down the steps into the White House basement and through a long tunnel toward an underground bunker. Bush is still reading about pet goats.

If Cheney was immediately evacuated, why wasn't Bush? Who was really in control? Certainly not Bush. In the back of the room, Press Secretary Ari Fleischer caught Bush's eye and held up a pad of paper for him to see, with "DON'T SAY ANYTHING YET" written on it in big block letters.

9:16am: Bush leaves the classroom. Remaining in the classroom for approximately five to seven minutes is inexcusable, but the video of Bush in the classroom suggests he stayed longer than that. The video contains several edits and ends before Bush leaves the room, so it also doesn't tell us exactly how long he stayed. One newspaper suggested he remained "for eight or nine minutes."

Think about that: rather than rush out of the room at the first chance, Bush actually stayed until after all the dozens of reporters had left! Having just been told of a Pearl Harbor-type attack on U.S. soil, Bush was indeed "openly stretching out the moment." But he still wasn't done. Bush then turned to principal Tose-Rigell, who was waiting to take him to the library for his speech on education. He explained to her about the terror attacks and why he had to leave. Finally, he went to an empty classroom next door where his staff was based. Given that Bush's program was supposed to end at 9:20, he left the classroom only a couple of minutes earlier than planned, if even that.

The reason given why Bush didn't leave as soon as Card told him the news is: "*Without all the facts at hand, George Bush had no intention of upsetting the schoolchildren who had come to read for him.*" [MSNBC, 10/29/02] Advisor Karl Rove said, "*The President thought for a second or two about getting up and walking out of the room. But the drill was coming to a close and he didn't want to alarm the children.*" [ABC, 9/11/02] This excuse is patently absurd, given the security risks and importance of Bush being informed and making decisions as Commander in Chief.

*"We will export death and violence to the four corners of the earth in defense of our great nation."*  
—George W. Bush

Once he was out of the classroom, did Bush immediately leave Booker? No. He stayed in the adjacent room with his staff, calling Vice President Cheney and National Security Advisor Rice, and preparing a speech. Incredibly, Bush was allowed to make his televised speech at 9:30am—at exactly the *time* and *place* stated on his advance schedule. Doesn't that make you shake your head?

9:16am: NORAD is notified that Flight 93 has been hijacked. (They now claim 10:07am)??

9:23am: “*Okay ... scramble Langley. Head them towards the Washington area.*”

9:24am: NORAD is notified that Flight 77 has been hijacked.

9:30am: The first fighter jets are scrambled, but head east out to sea.

9:40am: Flight 77 crashes into the Pentagon.

9:57am: President Bush departs Florida. But, incredibly, Air Force One took off without any military fighter protection. This defies all explanation.

10:10am: United Airlines Flight 93 crashes in Pennsylvania. Almost an *hour* after NORAD is alerted.

Between September 6 and 10, Wall Street was hit with a massive wave of short-selling shares of United Airlines and American Airlines stock. Short selling is a bet that the value of a stock will decline. When the value of those stocks plummeted after the attack, those who had done this stood to make a gain of eight-hundred percent. The CIA routinely monitors stock market movements and, by Sept 8, the agency was aware that something very unhealthy was planned for the airlines. Within a month of 9/11, the SEC, acting in concert with the Department of Justice, distributed a target list of 38 stocks to securities firms around the world looking for information about who might have profited by at least apparent pre-knowledge of the aerial attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. To date there has not been a public word from any agency as to whether they have snagged anyone.

How is it possible that *every* single element of our entire national security system—from the issuance of visas, U.S. Customs, airport security, the FAA, FBI, CIA, to NORAD—failed to detect this heinous act and prevent the simultaneous hijacking of 4 commercial airliners—much less do little, if anything, about it once it was known? And how is one to explain the blatantly cavalier attitude of our President in a time of crisis? Where was our military defense? Where were our leaders?

There is a story being constructed about these events...”*If you cannot manage the people, manage the information.*”

# Afghanistan

Since September 11th, 2001, there has been intense speculation regarding the Bush administration's negotiations with the Taliban regarding a pipeline through Afghanistan. American petroleum giant Union Oil of California very much wanted this project for years as an alternate route for transporting Caspian region oil and gas to the enormous Indian subcontinent markets and perhaps beyond to Southeast Asia. But it was stymied in 1998 after bin Laden blew up two American embassies in Africa, causing the Taliban to be diplomatically isolated. There have been a number of reports that describe a reinvigoration of this pipeline plan after Bush took office, and that further describe the Bush administration's negotiations with the Taliban including threats of war if the project was not allowed to pass through Afghanistan. Some say these threats, in the name of the pipeline, triggered the 9/11 attacks.

So why is this area so important that we would fight a war over it, you ask? Zbigniew Brzezinski tells us exactly why in a 1997 Council on Foreign Relations study called, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*. Brzezinski was a hawkish National Security Advisor to President Carter. He takes it for granted that the U.S. must exert control over the former Soviet republics of Central Asia, known to those who love them as “the Stans”: Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikstan and Kyrgyzstan—all of importance from the standpoint of security and historical ambitions to at least three of their most immediate and most powerful neighbors—Russia, Turkey, Iran, and China hinting. Brzezinski notes how the world's energy consumption keeps increasing; hence, who controls Caspian oil/gas may well control the world economy. Brzezinski then, reflexively, goes into the standard American rationalization for empire. *“We want nothing, ever, for ourselves, only to keep bad people from getting good things with which to hurt good people. It follows that America's primary interest is to help ensure that no single [other] power comes to control the geopolitical space and that the global community has unhindered financial and economic access to it.”*

He reminds the Council on Foreign Relations just how big Eurasia is. Seventy-five percent of the world's population is Eurasian. Eurasia accounts for 60-per cent of the world's GNP and three-fourths of the world's known energy resources. Brzezinski's master plan for “our” globe has obviously been accepted by the Bush neocons. Corporate America, long over-excited by Eurasian mineral wealth, has been aboard from the beginning.

To sum up: Brzezinski clearly envisaged that the establishment, consolidation and expansion of U.S. military hegemony over Eurasia through Central Asia would require the unprecedented, open-ended militarization of foreign policy, coupled with an unprecedented “*manufacture*” of domestic support and consensus on this militarization campaign. This reality is well understood in official Washington, but the most important CFR-controlled media outlets—the television networks and major national daily newspapers—will never tell you the true story about American foreign policy.

## **The Pipeline Plots**

Prior to U.S. involvement in Afghanistan in the 1980's, Unocal had done a study on the best way for getting oil out of Central Asia. The only feasible route was through Afghanistan to Karachi, Pakistan on the Arabian Sea. The Soviets were then occupying Afghanistan.

On the premise of preventing the expansion of Communism, the U.S. armed bin Laden and the other Mujahadeen to "liberate" the people. The terrorist camps were born, and U.S. special forces trained many of those who would graduate. Problem is, after the Soviets pulled out in 1989, the Afghans became uncooperative, and America and her allies then pulled all aid. Osama bin Laden and his henchmen then became enraged at the U.S. and, with the help of all those American weapons and expertise that Reagan, Bush, and others gave them, the terrorist camps were turned against U.S. interests.

Enron is a scandal so enormous that it's hard to wrap your mind around it. Not just a single financial disaster, it's actually a jigsaw of interlocking scandals, each outrageous in its own right. Enron had a \$3 billion investment in the Dabhol power plant, near Bombay on India's west coast. The project began in 1992, and the liquefied natural gas-powered plant was supposed to supply energy-hungry India with about one-fifth of its energy needs by 1997. It was one of Enron's largest development projects ever (and the single largest direct foreign investment in India's history). The company owned 65 percent of Dabhol; the other partners were Bechtel, General Electric and State Electricity Board.

The fly in the ointment, however was that the Indian consumers could not afford the cost of the electricity that was to be produced. The World Bank had warned at the beginning that the energy produced by the plant would be too costly, and Enron proved them right. Power from the plant was 700 percent higher than electricity from other sources. Enter the Afghanistan connection.

In late 1997, Unocal—one of the world's leading energy resource and project development companies, and the lead company in the formation of the (Central Asia Gas) Centgas consortium—was evaluating the construction of a 1,005-mile gas pipeline in order to exploit the vast Turkmenistan natural gas fields in Duletabad. The pipeline would extend through Afghanistan and Pakistan, terminating in Multan, near the India border.

In 1997, Enron announced that it was going to spend over \$1 billion building and improving the lines between the Dabhol plant and India's network of gas pipelines. Once a proposed 400-mile extension from Multan, Pakistan to New Delhi, India was built, Caspian Sea gas could flow into India's network to New Delhi, follow the route to Bombay—and bingo! A plentiful source of ultra-cheap Liquefied Natural Gas that could supply Enron's plant in India for three decades or more.

On February 12, 1998, John J. Maresca, vice president, international relations for Unocal, testified before the congressional Committee on International Relations. <http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/oil.html> Maresca provided information to Congress on Central Asia oil and gas reserves and how they might shape U.S. foreign policy.

The oil reserves are in areas north of Afghanistan—Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan and Russia. Routes for a pipeline were proposed that would transport oil in a 42-inch pipe southward thru Afghanistan for 1040 miles to the Pakistan coast at Karachi. Such a pipeline would cost about \$2.5 billion and carry about 1 million barrels of oil per day. Maresca told Congress that: *“It's not going to be built until there is a single Afghan government. That's the simple answer.”* In August 1998, Unocal suspended their participation in the project and withdrew from the consortium in December 1998.

So, in 1998 Osama bin Laden was identified as the villain behind the Taliban, Afghanistani women the victims of an oppressive Taliban regime, and the stage was set for a future “stabilization” effort. The invasion of Afghanistan was certainly a campaign against terrorism, but it may also have been a late colonial adventure.

From 1997 to as late as August 2001, the U.S. government continued to negotiate with the Taliban, trying to find a stabilizing factor that would allow American oil ventures to proceed with this project without interference. To this end, in December 1997, Unocal invited the Taliban contingency to Sugarland, Texas to negotiate protection while the pipeline was under construction. At that time, Unocal had already begun training Afghan men in pipeline construction, with U.S. government approval.

On December 31, 2001, nine days after the U.S.-backed interim government of Hamid Karzai took office in Kabul, President Bush appointed a former aide to the American oil company Unocal, Afghan-born Zalmay Khalilzad, as special envoy to Afghanistan. The nomination underscores the real economic and financial interests at stake in the U.S. military intervention in Central Asia. Khalilzad is intimately involved in the long-running U.S. efforts to obtain direct access to the oil and gas resources of the region, largely unexploited but believed to be the second largest in the world after the Persian Gulf.

As an adviser for Unocal, Khalilzad drew up a risk analysis of the a \$2 billion project which involved a 48-inch diameter pipeline from the Afghanistan-Turkmenistan border, passing near the cities of Herat and Kandahar, crossing into Pakistan near Quetta and linking with existing pipelines at Multan. Khalilzad became an American citizen while serving as a key link between U.S. imperialism and the Islamic fundamentalist mujahedin fighting the Soviet-backed regime in Kabul—the milieu out of which both the Taliban and bin Laden’s al Qaeda group arose. He later became Undersecretary of Defense in the Bush Sr. administration during the Gulf War, then on to the Rand Corporation, a top U.S. military think tank.

One day after the Clinton administration fired cruise missiles at targets in Afghanistan in August 1998, claiming that terrorists under the direction of Afghan-based Osama bin Laden were responsible for bombing U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania., Unocal put Centgas on hold. Two months later it abandoned all plans for a Trans-Afghan pipeline. The oil interests began to look towards a post-Taliban Afghanistan, and so did their representatives in the U.S. national security establishment.

Far from the American media machine, two French authors have released a book outlining U.S. attempts to finesse the issue of Osama bin Laden long before al Qaeda struck on September 11. Based on extensive firsthand reporting, Jean-Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquié write in their book, ***bin Laden: Forbidden Truth***, that the Bush administration went so far as to consider waging war against Afghanistan's ruling Taliban pre-9/11. Brisard and Dasquié argue the U.S. cared more about getting access to the region's oil than about getting the head of Osama bin Laden.

In general, according to the authors, the U.S. line on the Taliban was as such: *“OK, they are officially a bit wild, but let's not go overboard. Eventually we can make them acceptable.”* Under Clinton, few thought they could ever deal with the Taliban, and some wanted to pile on sanctions. But under Bush, talks started up once more. The purpose was legitimate at the start, Brisard notes. *“It was for the U.S. to negotiate that bin Laden be given to them,”* he says. *“Then it shifted to the point where advisers thought that the economic arguments would make the difference with the Taliban and accelerate the negotiations. They started to put the oil subsidies that would be given to the Taliban on the table. At the end of July, the negotiations broke down, because the U.S. threatened to go to war with the Taliban if they didn't accept the deal.”*

The book says that the negotiators said to the Taliban, you have a choice. You can have a *“carpet of gold,”* meaning an oil deal, or a *“carpet of bombs.”* The B-52's did that exactly as stated.

On January 8, 2002, CNN newscaster Paula Zahn announced, *“An explosive new book, published in France, alleges that the United States was in negotiations to do a deal with the Taliban for an oil pipeline in Afghanistan.”* Her guest Richard Butler, former chief U.N. weapons inspector, said, *“The most explosive charge, Paula, is that the Bush administration—the present one—just shortly after assuming office slowed down FBI investigations of al-Qaeda and terrorism in Afghanistan in order to do a deal with the Taliban on oil—an oil pipeline across Afghanistan.”*

She also discussed former FBI Deputy Director, John O'Neill's resignation over the Bush Administration's insistence that his department “back off,” while they negotiated with the Taliban. French intelligence analysts Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquie claim to have met with O'Neill several times in the summer prior to 9/11, and reported in their book that O'Neill had complained bitterly that the U.S. State Department—and behind it the oil lobby who make up President Bush's entourage—blocked his attempts to prove bin Laden's guilt.

They quote O'Neill as stating “*The main obstacles to investigate Islamic terrorism were U.S. oil corporate interests, and the role played by Saudi Arabia in it.*” The U.S. ambassador to Yemen forbade O'Neill and his FBI team from entering Yemen in August 2001.

John P. O'Neill had been not only a Deputy Director at the FBI, he had also been Osama bin Laden's main antagonist from within U.S. law enforcement. O'Neill had investigated the bombings of the World Trade Center in 1993, a U.S. base in Saudi Arabia in 1996, the U.S. embassies in Nairobi and Dar-Es-Salaam in 1998, and the USS Cole in 2000. In short, John P. O'Neill had been the point man for the FBI on al Qaeda. It is simply impossible to examine the FBI's role in pursuing terrorism prior to 9/11 without examining the work of John O'Neill in detail. However, John O'Neill will never testify before Congress. He had quit the agency just two weeks prior to the September 11 attacks to serve as Director of Security at the World Trade Towers, where he died in the attacks.

Was Afghanistan turned to rubble in order to avenge the 3,000 people slaughtered by Osama? Hardly. It's no coincidence that the map of terror in Central Asia is practically interchangeable with the map of oil. The administration is convinced that Americans are so simple-minded that they can deal with no scenario more complex than the venerable lone, crazed killer who does evil just for the fun of it 'cause he hates us, 'cause we're rich 'n free 'n he's not. As an added bonus, the U.S. military now has bases in Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan as well. Osama simply provided the necessary shock to put in motion a war of conquest and empire. At the very least, it was to stabilize the region so that oil resources could be developed for Asia—so that they wouldn't compete with us for Gulf oil.

It should never be forgotten that the American people did not want to fight in either of the twentieth century's world wars, but President Wilson maneuvered us into the First while President Roosevelt maneuvered the Japanese into striking the first blow at Pearl Harbor, causing us to enter the Second as the result of a massive external attack.

Well, the Taliban is now gone, Harmid Karzai, a former Unocal consultant, is now the Afghan President, and the pipeline deal is finally done. On December 28, 2002, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Turkmenistan signed a framework agreement for a U.S. \$ 3.2 billion gas pipeline project passing through the three countries. (ASHGABAT, Turkmenistan: Dec 28 (PNS) The framework agreement defines legal mechanism for setting up a consortium to build and operate the pipeline. Whether Unocal will participate remains to be seen.

As it proved, the conquest of Afghanistan had nothing to do with Osama. He was simply a pretext for replacing the Taliban with a relatively stable government that would allow “big oil” to lay its pipeline. Once the country was stable enough for the pipeline to be constructed, Osama became irrelevant, and we moved on to Iraq and the oil to be had there.

## The War on Terror

Although it is commonly believed that the War on Terrorism is a noble effort to defend freedom, in reality, it has little to do with terrorism and even less to do with the defense of freedom. There are other agendas at work; agendas that are far less praiseworthy; agendas that, in fact, are just the opposite of what we are told. One of the purposes of this book is to try to show that what is unfolding today is, *not* a war on terrorism to defend freedom, but a war on freedom that requires the defense of terrorism.

As we look back at history, we find that *every* time the U.S. has entered into a major military adventure, it has been enabled by a *dramatic* incident which aroused public sentiment overwhelmingly in favor of military action. These incidents have always been accepted at face value when they occurred, but as you have read here, in every case we have learned later that the incidents were highly suspicious. And in every case, the ensuing military action served some elite geopolitical design.

The leaders of the War on Terrorism, as in the past, are members of the Round Table and the Council on Foreign Relations. They advocate a world union of nations built on the model of collectivism. As before, they seek to change the social and political structure of the free world to accommodate that goal. Every move they make in this war results in strengthening the United Nations. Even when there is apparent disunity at the UN, a closer examination reveals that, as always, there is no disagreement over the goal of world government; it is only a squabble between Fabians and Leninists over who will dominate. Both sides in the contest continue to call for more and more power to the UN.

Writing for The Washington Times, on May 25, 2004, Bill Gertz reported, “*The Pentagon and State Department are planning to set up a 75,000-member international peacekeeping force for Africa, senior Bush administration officials told Congress yesterday.*” “*The program is called the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI).*”

The report also quoted Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz as saying, “*In most cases, the U.S.-funded peacekeeping force would operate under a U.N. mandate...an international force that could be used for peacekeeping operations would reduce 'the stresses' on U.S. forces.*” President Bush's plan to create a standing UN army at U.S. expense is a chilling revelation, and a clear omen of things to come.

The Leninist faction publicly pretends to oppose terrorism; but, covertly, they may be some of the primary sponsors of terrorism, which they use as a weapon against the Fabian faction. Their game plan could be to exhaust the United States and her Fabian allies in nuclear or bio-chemical war with puppet regimes so that Russia and China can emerge, unscathed, as the dominant world power. It would be foolhardy to take comfort in the thought that Communism is dead. Communism is only a word.

The Chinese government, under the control of Leninists, still classifies the United States as, what it calls, “Number One Enemy.” In 1999, the Chinese People’s Liberation Army published a document entitled *Unrestricted Warfare*. The main theme of that study was how to defeat the United States. It said that a new type of unrestricted war against America could be launched by “*an intrusion of [Internet] hackers, a major explosion at the World Trade Center, or a bombing attack by bin Laden.*” That was two years before 9/11.

Beijing Television produced a documentary entitled *Attack America*. As the video shows jets crashing into the Twin Towers, the narrator says: “*This is the America the whole world has wanted to see.*”

In June of 1963, JFK spoke on foreign policy at American University; the topic—world peace: “*Not a Pax Americana enforced on the world by weapons of war.*” “*Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts.*”

Then Kennedy described how discouraged he had been to read a Soviet text on military strategy and find such *allegations* as, “*American imperialist circles are preparing to unleash different types of wars...that there is a very real threat of preventive war being unleashed by American imperialists against the Soviet Union...and that the political aims of the American imperialists are to enslave economically and politically the European and other capitalists countries...and to achieve world domination...by means of aggressive wars.*”

Prophetic? Yes, and the Fabian collectivists plan in a nutshell as we well know. Less than six months later JFK was assassinated in Dallas, Texas. I wonder if he knew of what he spoke.

The Fabian/Illuminati game plan is to become the preeminent force in the world through economic and military dominance, particularly in the Middle East where that region’s vast oil reserves constitutes an extra prize. The plans for military occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq were drafted long before the terrorist attacks of 9/11. All they needed was a dramatic justification that would be acceptable to world opinion.

There are many who cannot bear the burden of this knowledge. They will prefer the reassuring analysis offered by the CFR-dominated media. They will dismiss all of this as conspiracy theory and claim that none of it is proof. In one sense, they will be right. There is no such thing as *absolute* proof. There is only evidence. Proof may be defined as sufficient evidence to convince the observer that a particular hypothesis is true. The same evidence that is sufficient to convince one person may be insufficient for another. The case may be proved to the first but not to the second who still needs more evidence.

Again, the purpose of this book has been to introduce at least some of the evidence, hopefully enough to convince you that it is worthy of further examination.

Having doubts about evidence reminds me of a story about a man who was worried that his wife was unfaithful. He told his friend about it and said, “I have doubts, doubts, always doubts.” His friend said, “Why do you have doubts?” He replied, “Well, every day she gets all dressed up, puts on perfume, leaves the house about noon and doesn’t get back until five or sometimes six, and I don’t know where she goes. I just can’t help having doubts, doubts, always doubts.” His friend said, “Why don’t you put an end to your doubts? Why don’t you follow her to see where she goes?” The husband thought about that for a moment and said, “OK, I’ll do it.”

So the next day he and his friend got together in the friend’s car and waited down the street at the end of the block. Sure enough, at about a quarter of twelve, his wife came out of the house, all gussied up, got in her car and headed into town. They followed her at a discreet distance to a quaint restaurant. As she entered, she was greeted at the door by a handsome young man. They embraced affectionately and then went inside, hand-in-hand. The husband and his friend peered through the window of the restaurant and observed that the couple was laughing and drinking Champaign and holding hands across the table.

When it was time to leave, the two men jumped back into their car and observed from a distance. The wife got into the handsome young man’s car and, of course, the husband and his friend followed. Eventually, the couple pulled into a motel and checked into a room, and the two men hid in the bushes just outside. As they were looking through the window of the room, they saw the couple tenderly embrace for a long moment. Next, the woman loosened the young man’s tie. Then she walked over to the window and closed the drapes. Whereupon the husband turned to his friend and said, “There, you see? Doubts! Doubts! Always doubts!”

### **Conspiracy Aside; the Current Situation**

For the moment, let’s lay our Illuminati-Fabian Society-CFR conspiracy aside, and look at the current situation and the underlying facts as we see them today. First, we *know* that our government has a strategic plan for the Middle East. By the end of the 1990s, crucial elements of that plan had been adopted by our Republican Congress, and passively accepted by the American people. Containment (sanctions, fly-overs, UN inspectors) a defensive strategy, had given way to a breathtakingly ambitious offensive strategy—to “*establish and protect a new world order.*”

Even before the 2000 presidential election, we *know* that Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld (CFR) commissioned a “*blueprint for maintaining global U.S. pre-eminence*” along with his future deputy, Paul Wolfowitz (CFR), and future-Vice President Cheney (CFR), as well as President Bush’s brother, Florida governor Jeb Bush. The report, titled, ***Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategies, Forces, and Resources For a New Century***, written by the neo-conservative think tank Project for the New American Century spelled out the genuine rationale for a war on Iraq.

The document declared that the U.S. would have to assume military control of the Persian Gulf region, whether or not the Iraqi regime posed a threat. (<http://www.newamericancentury.org>)

It stated: *“The United States has for decades sought to play a more permanent role in Gulf regional security. While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein.”* An unnamed British member of Parliament was quoted as saying of the report: *“This is a blueprint for U.S. domination--a new world order of their making.”*

Control of the Gulf and its oil resources, the document added, was necessary *“for maintaining global U.S. pre-eminence, precluding the rise of a great power rival, and shaping the international security order in line with American principles and interests.”*

The report advocated “regime change” in China, North Korea, Libya, Syria, and Iran. The report also complained that the changes it recommended were likely to take a long time, *“absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.”* Who needs conspiracy theories when elite machinations are clearly described in public documents like these?

This has become known as the “Bush Doctrine,” that is, targeting any country which harbors or supports terrorists as an enemy of the U.S. and a threat to her national security. *“Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists.”* All of these sweeping pronouncements occurred within days of September 11, well before Bush could have gauged the prospects of securing allied support for such a grand complex effort—unless the plans had already been laid. Nor had Bush consulted with Congress about the global implications of his “war on terror.”

On September 14, 2001, by a vote of 98 to 0, the Senate passed S. J. Resolution 23.

## Section 2: AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) In General.—*That the President is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorists attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons.*

That resolution, although carefully and specifically tied to the September 11 attacks, did include nations, as well as organizations or persons connected to the attacks. A look at subsequent White House actions reveals how the President can simply ignore restraint by taking moderate language and putting it to radical ends.

As early as the day after the attacks, Bush was making vociferous remarks about “evil” and “evil doers”. Nobody doubts that those words aptly describe the nature of the attacks, but presidents must measure their words and look past such simplicities. For one thing, the notion of evil and evil doers tends to set one faith against another, and indeed could be seen as a slur on the Islamic faith. This is divisive language to say the least; not the words of a statesmen, especially in a time of great tragedy and despair.

In the run up to the Iraqi war, we *know* the Bush administration not only proffered, but *insisted* that Saddam Hussein had huge stockpiles of WMD’s, a burgeoning nuclear capability, and direct ties to al Qaeda and the attack on 9/11. By now, it is evident that none of those claims were true. The troubling question remains: What was Bush’s real reason for starting the unprovoked war?

*“It somewhat puzzling, I think, that you can have 100% certainty about the (WMD’s) existence and zero certainty about where they are.”*

—Hans Blix

On March 30, 2003, at the height of the war, Rumsfeld had said of a search for weapons of mass destruction: *“We know where they are. They’re in the area around Tikrit and Baghdad and east, west, and south and north somewhat.”* That is just about anywhere, seems to me.

### **The United Nations Debate on the War on Iraq**

President Bush Sr. in a nationwide television address on January 16, 1991, stated: *“When we are successful, and we will be, we have a real chance at this **new world order**, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.’s founders.”*

It should be understood that the UN’s founders were not decent, principled men like those who won our national independence and created our constitutional republic. The architects of the UN were men who advocated “peace” through world tyranny. The UN’s founders included many figures from the aforementioned New York-based private organization called the Council on Foreign Relations. In 1939, two years before Pearl Harbor thrust America into World War II, the CFR began laying the groundwork for the UN, which, like the League of Nations, was intended to be a framework for world government.

Knowing the background of the United Nations is essential to understanding the true threat the organization represents. It is inaccurate to look upon the organization as a foreign entity seeking to invade and conquer the United States. Instead, the UN should be viewed as another vehicle through which corrupt, power-seeking elites in this country and elsewhere intend to acquire power over the entire world. The CFR is the most visible part of this international Power Elite, and by studying the published materials and public actions of the CFR we can understand the tactics that are being used to undermine our national sovereignty.

By slowly sapping our country's sovereignty, collectivists can achieve the objective of empowering the UN to act as a world government without attracting a great deal of public opposition. But, as you have read, there is an alternative approach: Using sudden crises, such as wars, disasters, terrorism, or similar threats, to scare the public into accepting a "*new world order*." In 1962, CFR member Professor Lincoln P. Bloomfield of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology published a report entitled, *A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations*. This document, which was commissioned and paid for by the U.S. State Department, outlines a global political system in which the UN has the means to impose its will upon the entire world. While the report acknowledges that creation of such a new world order may take decades or more to build, it also points out that there is "*an alternative road*" that could bring about results much more quickly. The alternative approach to world government "*relies on a grave crisis or war to bring about a sudden transformation in national attitudes sufficient for the purpose*," wrote Bloomfield. "*According to this version, the order we examine may be brought into existence as a result of a series of sudden, nasty, and traumatic shocks.*"

America has never undergone a shock as sudden, nasty, or traumatic as the attack of September 11th—and the CFR quickly moved to capitalize upon the atrocity. Three days after the attack, we know the Washington Program for the Council on Foreign Relations convened a meeting in Washington organized around the U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century. The Commission, which was a joint creation of former President Bill Clinton (CFR) and House Speaker Newt Gingrich (CFR), was co-chaired by former senators Gary Hart (CFR) and Warren Rudman (CFR). Given the commission's origins it should come as no surprise that it insisted that the terrorist attack on our nation is an illustration of the need for a New World Order. Thus 9/11 lies in a broad context of "*Look what they've done to us*" scenarios.

Few if any Americans gave thought to the fact that the September 11th attack upon our nation occurred on the date designated by the United Nations as the "International Day of Peace." Those who were aware of this tragic coincidence were probably inspired to reflect bitterly upon the uselessness of the UN as a means of achieving the peace that all decent people seek.

The U.S. (Council on Foreign Relations) and their British counterpart the (Royal Institute of International Affairs) said the UN must act on Iraq now or be rendered irrelevant, perhaps permanently. This argument ignored the fact that the UN was already acting, principally through the inspections process. What they really meant was that if the UN did not deliver the outcome they wanted, they would ignore it. And they did. George Bush's clear message is that if and when such disputes arise in future, the U.S. might just bypass the UN altogether once more.

In their corner, French and German officials argued the opposite—that the UN will only remain relevant and effective if the previously agreed Iraq policy of coercive disarmament and, more broadly, traditional Security Council procedural and legal norms are upheld. This is entirely reasonable, up to a point.

But what they and other opponents fail to address, at least in public, is the more fundamental dilemma of how best to co-opt or contain one UN member—the U.S.—that is uniquely and disproportionately powerful. This problem has been brewing ever since the U.S. emerged as sole superpower. But it has taken a rogue U.S. administration ideologically antipathetic to multilateral restraints as typified by the UN and by international treaties to bring the problem to a head. In this wider context, Iraq is but a harbinger of things to come. For this reason, it is a watershed event.

In early September 2002, Bush spoke before the United Nations. In that speech, Bush claimed that “*Saddam Hussein attacked Iran in 1980 and Kuwait in 1990. He’s fired ballistic missiles at Iran and Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Israel. He has gassed many Iranians, and forty Iraqi villages.*” The audacity to make such a statement in front of such an august body was jaw-dropping. It is well known that during the Iraq-Iran war, we provided him with financing, support, and delivered him chemical weapons—and then stood by while he gassed his own people in the late 80’s. Amazing.

### **The Euro vs the Dollar**

How had the U.S. government come up so quickly with such a comprehensive and coordinated response to the attack of 9/11? How had they decided within hours that an extended “War on Terrorism” was the appropriate action? Why was the current administration willing to expend *so much* domestic and international political capital in order to pursue the Iraq war? Critics of the administration insist that this is a war for oil profits, but the situation is actually more complicated and can be understood only in the light of two crucial factors not widely acknowledged.

The first is that the continued strength of the dollar is in question. For the past half-century, the U.S. dollar has been the international currency of account for nearly all nations, and it is the currency with which *all* oil-importing nations *must* pay for their fuel from the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

Imagine this: You are deep in debt and have very little money in the bank. But every day you write a check to cover your expenses. Your checks are worthless but they keep buying stuff because those checks you write never reach the bank. You have an agreement with the oil merchants (OPEC) that they will accept *only* your checks as payment for one thing everyone wants, and must have—*oil*.

This means everyone must hoard your checks so they can buy the oil they need. Since they have to keep a stock of your checks, they use them to buy other stuff too. You write a check to buy a TV, the TV shop owner swaps your check for oil, that seller buys some vegetables at the fruit shop, the produce man passes it on to buy bread, the baker buys some flour with it, and on it goes, round and round—but never back to the bank where it would bounce. You have generated a huge debt on your books, but so long as your checks never reach the bank, you don't have to pay. In effect, you have received your TV for free!

This is the position the U.S.A. has enjoyed for 30 years—it has been getting a free world trade ride for all that time. It has been receiving a huge subsidy from everyone else in the world. And as our debt grew, we printed more dollars (wrote more checks) to keep trading.

Then one day, one of the oil merchants—let's say Iraq—says he is going to accept another person's checks—the euro—and a couple of others think that might be a good idea, too—let's say Iran and North Korea. If this spreads, people are going to stop hoarding your checks and they will come flying home to the bank. Since you don't have enough in the bank to cover all the checks, you are going to be in big trouble! But you are big, tough and very aggressive. You don't scare the other guy (European Union) who can write checks (euros), he's pretty big too, but given a “legitimate” excuse, you can beat the tar out of the oil merchant and scare him and his buddies into taking *only* your checks again. And that, in a nutshell, is what the U.S. military is doing right now with Iraq.

Bottom line, foreign demand for the U.S. dollar funds the U.S. federal budget deficits. Foreign investors flush with dollars typically look to U.S. treasury securities as a means of secure investment. With a large reduction in such investment, the country could potentially go into default. For example: If you owe your bank \$10,000 and you can't pay it back, you've got a problem. But if you owe your bank \$3.5 trillion and can't pay it back, then the *bank* has a problem. In finance, at least, size does matter. Things could turn very bad, very quickly. Investment money would flee the country, real estate values would plummet, and Americans would shortly find themselves living in Third-World conditions. We'll be like the monarch used to riding around in an extravagant litter, only to find ourselves dropped to the ground with no hands to carry us.

So in the end, central bankers face a choice: let the dollar sink (stop taking our checks), or pump up their domestic money supply making credit easier to obtain. The latter option, of course, tends to be politically popular. Who doesn't like easy money? But it can have a disastrous effect on homegrown banking systems—as the Asian countries discovered, much to their sorrow, in 1997 and 98. Excessive dollar purchases led to excessive money creation, which led to rampant speculation, asset price bubbles and—eventually—a full-blown financial panic, which in turn led to the tech stock bubble crash in 2000.

The irony of this may have been lost on Americans (most of whom were oblivious anyway) but not on the Asians: In trying to prop up the dollar, they blew up their *own* banking systems, causing a massive run on their *own* currencies, forcing *them* to go hat in hand to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for emergency loans of, yes, *dollars*.

Now do you understand why the rest of the world doesn't like us very much? As I discussed earlier in the book, the numbers are simply growing too enormous; either American living standards will have to be adjusted downward, imperial ambitions will have to be curbed, *or* America's foreign creditors will, by default, have a de facto say in the way we run our country—a relinquishment of our sovereignty.

For U.S. geo-strategists, the prevention of an OPEC switch from dollars to euros must therefore seem paramount. An invasion and occupation of Iraq would effectively give the U.S. a voting seat in OPEC while placing new American bases within hours' striking distance of Saudi Arabia, Iran, and several other key OPEC countries.

For much of Saddam Hussein's regime, possession of U.S. dollars was a crime punishable by the amputation of a hand. But nowadays the greenback is the hottest item in Baghdad. Since the U.S. led war in Iraq, dollars, either looted from banks or handed out by U.S. administrators, have flooded the currency market. The \$100 bill, or the "waraq," Arabic for paper, has become the preferred trade tool in the city of 5.5 million. *"Iraqis see the military in the streets, and they go to shops where many goods are priced in dollars. They can't help but wonder if the dollar will be the main currency,"* said Dr. Yosra al-Samarai, professor of finance at Baghdad University. Their most frequent complaint is the lack of dinars, which haven't been printed since Saddam's fall.

Currently, if any country wishes to obtain dollars with which to buy oil, it can do so only by selling its resources to the U.S., taking out a loan from a U.S. bank (or the World Bank – functionally the same thing), or trading its currency on the open market and thus devaluing it. The U.S. is in effect importing goods and services virtually for free, its massive trade deficit representing a huge interest-free loan from the rest of the world. If the dollar were to cease being the world's reserve currency, all of that would change overnight. So, in a nutshell, it is not about oil, but about which *currency*—the euro or the dollar—is used to buy and sell oil. President Bush did promise to protect the American way of life. This is what he meant.

On November 6, 2000, Iraq announced that it would cease to accept dollars for its oil, and would accept instead only euros. At the time, financial analysts suggested that Iraq would lose tens of millions of dollars in value because of this currency switch; in fact, over the following two years, Iraq *made* millions. If OPEC were to switch to the euro as the standard for oil transactions, it would have serious ramifications for the U.S. economy. Oil-consuming economies would have to flush the dollars out of their central bank holdings and convert them to euros. France and Germany are the EU leaders with the vision of a resurgent, united Europe taking its rightful place in the world and using its euro currency as a world trading reserve currency and thus gaining some of the free ride the United States enjoys now. They are the ones who initiated the euro oil trade with Iraq.

Some economists estimate that with the market flooded, the U.S. dollar could drop up to 40% in value. As the currency falls, there would be a monetary evacuation by foreign investors abandoning the U.S. stock markets and dollar-denominated assets. Imported products would cost Americans a lot more, and the trade deficit would be magnified. It is estimated that over \$50 billion dollars in \$100 bills have been squirreled away in Russia alone in mattresses and coffee cans, and that many more billions were counterfeited—thus, the real motivator behind the new anti-counterfeiting measures taken by the U.S. Treasury.

The USA's real economic condition is about as bad as it could be; like I said earlier—it is the most debt-ridden nation on earth, owing about \$25,000 U.S. for every single one of its 290 million men, women and children. It is worse than the position of Indonesia when it imploded economically a few years ago, or more recently, that of Argentina. Iran (#2 on the “axis of evil” hit list) has already converted the majority of its central bank reserve funds to the euro, and has hinted at adopting the euro for all oil sales. On December 7, 2002, the third member of the “axis of evil,” North Korea, officially dropped the dollar and began using euros for trade. Venezuela, not a member of the axis of evil yet, but a large oil producer nonetheless, is also considering a switch to the euro. They are the 4th largest oil producer, and have been cutting out the dollar by bartering oil with 13 Latin American nations including America's arch enemy, Cuba, who, in exchange for oil, is providing health paramedics to set up clinics in rural Venezuelan villages. Hitler did this type of bartering with Argentina with enormous economic success, exchanging locomotives for food.

President Hugo Chávez Frias nationalist leanings and his pledges to prevent privatization of Venezuela's government oil company have fueled worries among some U.S. policymakers about U.S. reliance on the Venezuelan crude. In August 2000, adding to these worries, Chávez became the world's first democratically elected head of state since the Gulf War to visit Saddam Hussein.

In April 2002, the Bush administration quickly endorsed the military-led coup of President Chávez, an outspoken critic of Bush's imperialistic policies. Although the coup collapsed after 2 days with Chavez being restored to power, various reports suggest the CIA and a rather embarrassed Bush administration approved, and may have been actively involved with the civilian/military coup plotters. Venezuelan's ambassador Francisco Mieres-Lopez apparently floated the idea of switching to the euro approximately one year before the failed coup attempt. Furthermore, there is some evidence that the U.S. is still active in its attempts to overthrow the democratically elected Chavez administration. On July 21, 2004, the Venezuelan government said it may suspend oil shipments to the United States in case of an eventual conflict with the U.S.": *“In case of an aggression, that option would be considered.”*

At its April 14th, 2002 meeting in Spain, OPEC expressed an interest in leaving the dollar in favor of the euro. In May 2004 an additional 10 member nations joined the European Union. The EU now represents an oil consumer 33% larger than the United States. In order to mitigate currency risks, the Europeans will increasingly pressure OPEC to trade in euros, and with the EU at that stage buying over half of OPEC oil production, such a change seems likely.

On August 17, 2004, Venezuelans voted overwhelmingly to keep President Hugo Chávez in office, dealing a crushing defeat to a splintered opposition that waged a long and bitter campaign to oust him. Stunned opposition leaders immediately claimed fraud, but former U.S. President Jimmy Carter and the Organization of American States endorsed the results of Sunday's vote, which saw one of the biggest turnouts in Venezuela's history.

There are reports of phony election results on Venezuela television and rigged exit polls by the same organization that supported the failed coup attempt funded by our government through the National Endowment for Democracy. The NED awarded a significant \$53,400 grant to the Venezuelan group, Súmate, in September 2003, for the sole purpose of promoting a campaign for a recall referendum on President Chávez's mandate. Súmate was established solely with the objective of removing President Chávez from office prematurely through a recall referendum, and has no credentials or history to evidence its accomplishments or democratic ideals. Nevertheless, the NED willingly handed Súmate the money needed to fund the entire referendum campaign and to develop propaganda to encourage Venezuelans to vote against Chávez. There is no question that a covert operation is in process to overturn the legitimate Venezuelan government. Uruguayan congressman, Jose Nayardi, made it public when he revealed that the Bush administration had asked for Uruguay's support for Venezuelan white collar executives and trade union activists "*to break down levels of intransigence within the Chávez Frias administration.*" The process, he noted, was a shocking reminder of the CIA's 1973 intervention in Chile which saw General Pinochet lead his military coup to take over President Allende's democratically elected government in a bloodbath.

### **The End of Cheap Oil**

The second factor likely weighing on Bush's decision to invade Iraq is the depletion of U.S. energy resources and the consequently increasing American dependency on oil imports. The oil production of all non-OPEC countries, taken together, probably peaked in 2002. From now on, OPEC will have ever more economic power in the world. Moreover, *global* oil production will probably peak within a few years. Alternatives to fossil fuels have not been developed sufficiently to permit a coordinated process of substitution once oil and natural gas grow scarce. The implications—especially for major consumer nations such as the U.S.—will eventually be ruinous.

On April 18, 1977, President Jimmy Carter called for a new energy policy in America, and likened it to "the moral equivalent of war." That ominous warning has slid into obscurity along with 55 mph speed limits, smaller vehicles, conservation, and a move towards renewable energy.

I am reminded of the story of a South American Indian tribe that devised an ingenious monkey trap. The Indians cut off the small end of a coconut and stuffed it with sweetmeats and rice. They tethered the other end to a stake and placed it in a clearing. Soon, a monkey smelled the treats inside and came to see what it is. It could just barely get its hand into the coconut but, stuffed with booty, it could not pull the hand back out. The Indians easily walked up to the monkey and captured it. Even as the Indians approached, the monkey screamed in horror, not only in fear of its captors, but equally as much, one imagines, in recognition of the tragedy of its own lethal but still unalterable greed. The monkey cannot properly evaluate the relative worth of a handful of food compared to its life. It chooses wrongly, catastrophically so, dooming itself by its own short-term fixation on a relatively paltry pleasure.

America has its own hand in a coconut, one that may doom it just as surely as the monkey. That coconut is its dependence on cheap oil in a world where oil will soon come to an end. The choice we face (whether to let the food go or hold onto it) is whether to wean ourselves off of oil—to quickly evolve a new economy and a new basis for civilization—or to continue to secure stable supplies from the rest of the world by force—because soon—like everything else—demand will exceed supply. We're dealing with a cultural problem—200 years of exponential growth culture. Were we a rational society, a virtue of which we have rarely been accused, we would husband our remaining supplies and institute a program comparable to the Manhattan Project.

To date, we have chosen the second alternative: to secure oil by force which will almost certainly destroy the economy and doom America's short experiment in democracy. The evidence of its consequences is all around us. They include the titanic U.S. budget and trade deficits funding a gargantuan, globally-deployed military, and the Patriot Act and its starkly anti-democratic rescissions of civil liberties. There is little time left to change this choice before its consequences become irreversible. As the price of oil goes up, demand will drop but so will production and new discoveries. This does not mean that the world is running out of oil—although almost half of all recoverable has been taken from the earth—it means that we are running out of the *cheap* easily accessible oil that has fueled the economic development of the 20th Century. The world is now losing more than a million barrels of oil a day to depletion—twice the rate of two years ago—according to a new analysis published in August, 2004, in *Petroleum Review*.

The production of oil from any given field follows a bell curve. After discovery of the field, production increases as more and more wells are opened. Increasing production by drilling more wells only works until the field is covered, beyond which point adding more wells only leads to diminishing returns. Because of this, there is a point where the production of any particular field is maximized. This is the peak of the production curve. In many oil fields it now takes as much or more energy to pump the oil than can be extracted from the oil. At this point the wells are closed and the field ceases production, *forever*. This is the trend for *every* oil field *ever* discovered: increasing production, peak production, and declining production. This reality will not change.

After the energy crisis of the 1970's, prices went down not because the world found new sources of oil, but because we found ways to make do with less, through the use of more fuel-efficient cars, better insulation in homes and so on. In the United States, oil consumption didn't regain its 1979 level until 1997. It turns out that America's love affair with gas guzzlers, shortsighted as it is, is not the main culprit: the big increases in demand have come from booming developing countries. China, in particular, still consumes only 8 percent of the world's oil—but it accounted for 37 percent of the growth in world oil consumption over the last four years. Lately we've been hearing a lot about competition from Chinese manufacturing and Indian call centers. But a different kind of competition—the scramble for oil and other resources—poses a much bigger threat to our prosperity.

Petroleum geologists have known for 50 years that global oil production would “peak” and begin its inevitable decline within a decade of the year 2000. Moreover, no renewable energy systems have the potential to generate more than a fraction of the power now being generated by fossil fuels. By the end of the year the world will guzzle over 82 million barrels of oil a day. The International Energy Agency recently forecast demand to reach 119 MBD by 2020, an increase of over 48%. With the Saudis pumping like crazy, we are at our production peak limit today at 81 MBD—some estimate it could reach 90MBD.

But additions to proven reserves have virtually stopped and it is clear that pumping at present rates is unsustainable. Any excess oil has long since disappeared down the maw of surging economies in China and India and a recovering one in the United States. Estimates of the date of “peak global production” vary with some experts saying it already may have occurred as early as the year 2000. New Scientist magazine recently placed the year of peak production in 2004. Virtually all experts believe it will almost certainly occur before the end of this decade. The situation is especially critical in the U.S. With barely 4% of the world’s population, the U.S. consumes 26% of the world’s energy. But the U.S. produced only 9 MBD in 2000 while consuming 19 MBD. It made up the difference by importing 10 MBD, or 53% of its needs.

By 2020, the U.S. Department of Energy forecasts domestic demand will grow to 25 MBD but production will be down to 7 MBD. The daily shortfall of 18 MBD or 72% of demand will all have to be imported. Drilling in the Alaskan wilderness would only put a small dent in the demand, and it would take ten years to see the first drop. If the U.S. economy is not to grind to a halt under these circumstances, it must choose one of three alternate strategies: dramatically lower its living standards (something it is not willing to do); substantially increase the energy efficiency of its economy; or make up the shortfall by securing supplies from other countries. President Bush’s National Energy Policy published in March 2001 explicitly commits the U.S. to the third choice: Grab the Oil.

Except for the Middle East and the Caspian Sea Basin, the rest of the world has already peaked, and most oil producing regions are now in decline. The Middle East and Caspian Sea regions are not expected to peak for at least several years to come. More could be said about natural gas, which is also expected to decline in production in the next decade. Likewise, the coal resources within the U.S. will be exhausted in another fifty years at most. And coal alone will never meet our current, much less projected, energy demand. With the passage of time, all countries will vie with each other for the oil of these regions, vying for the survival of their civilization. And whoever controls the oil production of the Middle East and Caspian Sea regions will control the world. The governments of Russia, China, Germany, France, and other countries are keenly aware of these factors—hence the shifting alliances, the veto threats, and the back-room negotiations at the UN leading up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Even the Saudis have a saying, *"My father rode a camel. I drive a car. My son flies a jet-airplane. His son will ride a camel."*

Even if you don't believe the events of the past year were intentional, that does not change the picture of the future before us. We stand at the dusk of oil-based civilization, and the U.S. is preparing for the approaching night by extending its military might throughout the world and instituting a police state at home.

Upon entering office, Dick Cheney, chair of the White House Energy Policy Development Group, commissioned a report on “energy security” from the Baker Institute for Public Policy, a think-tank set up by former U.S. Secretary of State James Baker (CFR). The report, “Strategic Energy Policy Challenges For The 21st Century,” issued in April 2001, concludes: *“The United States remains a prisoner of its energy dilemma. Iraq remains a de-stabilizing influence to... the flow of oil to international markets from the Middle East. Saddam Hussein has also demonstrated a willingness to threaten to use the oil weapon and to use his own export program to manipulate oil markets. Therefore the U.S. should conduct an immediate policy review toward Iraq including military, energy, economic and political/ diplomatic assessments.”*

These problems are of overwhelming urgency. Bush’s Iraq strategy is apparently an offensive one designed to enlarge the U.S. Empire, but in reality it is primarily defensive in character since its deeper purpose is to forestall an economic cataclysm. It is the two factors of dollar hegemony and oil depletion—even more than the hubris of the neo-conservative strategists in Washington—that are prompting an overall de-emphasis of long-standing alliances with Europe, Japan, and South Korea; and the increasing deployment of U.S. troops in the Middle East and Central Asia. So, as you can see, it’s not just oil profits that are driving U.S. military and national security policy.

Global oil is peaking; in a few years we will no longer be able to produce enough oil to meet the needs of our oil civilization. All the while, people are being diverted from seeing that we have just enough energy resources left that we could build a true ecological democratic republic where all of us could lead freer, healthier, more fulfilling lives. We need bottom up democracy. We need small-scale economies, and small-scale technologies powered by renewable energy. We need smaller communities, structured to be self-sufficient, all tied together by efficient mass transit. We need gardens and parks in our cities instead of cars. We need social halls, not shopping malls. And we have enough energy remaining to do this, if we start now.

We can hope to soften the shock, but unless there is a general awakening and decisions at the planetary scale to bring radical change in the domain of energy, civilization will confront the most acute and no doubt most violent upheaval in recent history. Possibly the greatest single problem resulting from all this will be the failure of modern agriculture. Without petroleum-based fertilizers and pesticides, experts predict that world agriculture will only be able to comfortably support a population of two billion. The current world population is over six billion. This unavoidable prophecy is being universally ignored, denied, or underestimated. Rare are those who realize exactly how close and how great is its advent.

## The War on Drugs

The public facade of U.S. policy toward Colombia has long been the war on drugs. U.S. officials say the aim of Plan Colombia, a \$1.3 billion aid package signed into law on July 13, 2000, is for fighting “narco-guerrillas” and eradicating coca crops. But that’s just part of the agenda. Plan Colombia is also about *oil*. Colombia’s petroleum production today rivals Kuwait’s on the eve of the Gulf War. Contrary to what you might think, the United States imports more oil from Colombia and its neighbors Venezuela and Ecuador than from *all* Persian Gulf countries combined. In June of 2000, Colombia announced its largest oil discovery since the 1980s. The Colombian government and transnational oil companies are eager to secure their exploration and production activities with U.S. military might. Major investors in Colombian oil have included Exxon, Shell and Elf Aquitaine. The transnationals have helped boost the nation’s oil production almost 80 percent over the last decade. Most of the exports have gone to the United States, putting Colombia among the top eight U.S. oil suppliers.

Many of these companies have led the fight for U.S. military aid to Colombia, the world’s third-largest recipient of U.S. security assistance. In 1996, BP Amoco and Occidental joined *Enron* Corporation, a Houston-based energy firm, and other corporations to form the U.S.-Colombia Business Partnership. Since then, backed by hefty oil-industry donations to political candidates, the partnership has lobbied hard for increased aid. Lawrence P. Meriage, Occidental’s public-affairs vice president, not only pushed for Plan Colombia in 2000 but urged a House subcommittee to extend military aid to the nation’s north to “*augment security for oil development operations.*” The firms have allies in the U.S. national-security apparatus. In 1998, Gen. Charles Wilhelm, then head of the U.S. Southern Command, told Congress that oil discoveries had increased Colombia’s “strategic importance.” In April 2000, Sen. Bob Graham (D-Florida) and former National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft warned in a *Los Angeles Times* editorial that Colombia’s reserves would “*remain untapped unless stability is restored.*”

Since 1986, according to Colombian government sources, the country’s guerrilla groups have bombed oil pipelines more than 1,000 times and have kidnapped hundreds of oil-company executives and employees. Using these operations as leverage, the guerrillas have generated roughly \$140 million per year in ransoms and extortion payments. They also squeeze “taxes” from local contractors working for the companies. In all, the oil revenue rivals conservative estimates of guerrilla earnings from the cocaine and heroin trades.

Some U.S. military officials harbor no illusions about their role in Colombia. Stan Goff, a former U.S. Special Forces intelligence sergeant, retired in 1996 from the unit that trains Colombian anti-narcotics battalions. Plan Colombia’s purpose is “*defending the operations of Occidental, British Petroleum and Texas Petroleum and securing control of future Colombian fields,*” said Goff, quoted in October 2000, by the Bogotá daily *El Espectador*. “*The main interest of the United States is oil.*”

Petroleum is also playing an important role as the Colombia 50-year guerrilla war expands into southern Venezuela. In February 2002, the Bush administration asked Congress for \$98 million in the 2003 budget to train, arm and provide Black Hawk helicopters for Colombian troops to defend the Cano Limon oil pipeline which snakes almost 500 miles across northern Colombia. This move marked a shift from the previous covert U.S. policy of providing military aid under the guise of anti-narcotics operations, to a blatantly overt one of outright military intervention. President Chávez of Venezuela has barred U.S. “counternarcotics” flights over its airspace, calling them a violation of national sovereignty.

The top source of cash for George W. Bush’s presidential and Texas gubernatorial bids was Enron and its employees, including CEO Kenneth L. Lay, according to the Center for Public Integrity. Enron, one of the companies that led lobbying for Plan Colombia, owns Centragas, a 357-mile natural gas distribution system in northern Colombia.

### **The Rush to War with Iraq**

The implementation of such a far-reaching policy of military aggression and imperialist conquest, long advocated by the most right-wing sections of the U.S. ruling elite—and instinctively opposed by the vast majority of the American people—was conceivable only under extraordinary conditions of mass trauma, fear and patriotic fervor. September 11, 2001 provided these conditions. The events of that day were seized upon by the Bush administration as the pretext for setting its neocolonial plans into motion. To the contrary, in his foreign policy debate with Al Gore, we *know* Bush pointedly advocated a more humble foreign policy, a position calculated to appeal to voters leery of military intervention and imperialism. He criticized Clinton’s use of our military and the whole idea of “nation building.”

Ask yourself this question: Are you willing to send your sons and daughters to war to fight over the last few barrels of oil?

In the summer of 2001, when security agencies were regularly warning of a catastrophic attack by al Qaeda, we *know* Defense Secretary Rumsfeld’s office “sponsored a study of ancient empires—Macedonia, Rome, the Mongols—to figure out how they maintained dominance,” according to the *New York Times*. The answer: instill fear in the population and take what you need from wherever it lies.

Hours after the 9/11 attacks, we *know* Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (CFR) was given information that three of the names on the airplane passenger manifests were suspected al-Qaeda operatives. The notes he composed at the time asserted that he wanted the “*best info fast. Judge whether good enough hit S.H. [Saddam Hussein] at same time. Not only OBL. [Osama bin Laden] Go massive. Sweep it all up. Things related and not.*” Now, nearly three years later, there is still no evidence Iraq was involved in the Sept. 11 attacks. But if these notes are accurate, that didn't matter to Rumsfeld.

He presented the idea to Bush the next day. Counterterrorism Chief Richard Clarke later wrote in his book *Against All Enemies*, “At first I was incredulous that we were talking about something other than getting al Qaeda. Then I realized with almost a sharp physical pain that [Defense Secretary] Rumsfeld and [Assistant Defense Secretary] Paul Wolfowitz (CFR) were going to try to take advantage of this national tragedy to promote their agenda about Iraq.” Immediately following 9/11, we know Wolfowitz submitted a plan (referred by Pentagon insiders as “**Operation Infinite War**”) that called for the bombing of Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon.

“Before 9/11, this group could not win over the president to this extravagant image of what foreign policy required,” said Ian Lustick, a Middle East expert at the University of Pennsylvania. “After 9/11, it was able to benefit from the gigantic eruption of political capital, combined with the supply of military preponderance in the hands of the president. And this small group, therefore, was able to gain direct contact and even control, now, of the White House.” “This group, what I call the tom-tom beaters, have set an agenda and have made the president feel that he has to live up to their definitions of manliness, their definitions of success and fear, their definitions of failure.”

George W. Bush is called a “buffoon” and an “idiot extraordinaire” by his critics. His ineptitude is supreme. This too, we know. These people couldn’t have found a more gullible and more willing person than George Bush (“a sheep in Wolfowitz clothing”). Doesn't this give you a new perspective on the Florida hanging-chad debacle, and how all the stops were pulled out to make sure Bush won?

“I don't know whether I'm going to win or not. I think I am. I do know I'm ready for the job. And, if not, that's just the way it goes.”

—George W. Bush—Des Moines, Iowa, Aug. 21, 2000

Now we know why there was such a rush to war, and why the intelligence was flawed. They didn't care if it was flawed. This revelation gives you a head-nodding understanding of the continuous shift by the Administration on why we went to war. The administration was compelled to lie about its motives for invading Iraq because the real reasons would have provoked overwhelming popular opposition. The administration most likely was able to respond so quickly...because it simply had to pull the plans *off the shelf*. While Bush readily admits that he does not read, one of his handlers must have read Mein Kampf. This administrations unrelenting campaign propaganda attempting to tie Saddam Hussein to al Qaeda shows some knowledge of the fine art of persuasion.

“But the most brilliant propagandist technique will yield no success unless one fundamental principle is borne in mind constantly and with unflinching attention. It must confine itself to a few points and repeat them over and over. Here, as so often in this world, persistence is the first and most important requirement for success.”

—Adolf Hitler in Mein Kampf

Once the Bush administration's march to war had begun, the CFR controlled media fell in line. According to media analyst Andrew Tyndall, of the 414 stories on Iraq broadcast on the three major television networks—NBC, ABC, and CBS—all but 34 originated at the White House, Pentagon, or the State Department. Mere coincidence? Not likely. Perhaps if American viewers had seen the real picture of war as broadcast on Arab TV Al Jazeera, there would have been more shock and less awe. War is death; blood; maimed young men and women; grief-torn families; children without parents; and untold thousands of innocents killed by our bombs.

Presidents used to stand at attention on the runway at Dover Air Force Base, paying the nation's respects to those coming home in flagged draped coffins. A day before the Iraq war began, President Bush issued a directive to all military bases: "*There will be no arrival ceremonies for, or media coverage of deceased military personnel returning to or departing from Ramstein Air [in Germany} or Dover base, to include interim stops.*" President George W. Bush, as late as January of 2004, had attended no funerals for soldiers killed in action during his *entire* presidency. May those brave men and women rest in peace.

We *know* that all the reasons stated for war with Iraq had no credence. In fact, on August 2, 2004, during a Rose Garden appearance, Bush readily admitted as much while defending his pre-emptive imperialistic policy,"*Knowing what I know today we still would have gone on into Iraq. The decision I made is the right decision. The world is better off without Saddam Hussein in power.*" This chilling statement leads me to believe he would readily do it again. Where else does he plan to take our country to war?

The very best that can be said on President George W. Bush's behalf is that he used the Cliffs Notes version of intelligence information about Iraq as the basis for a poorly planned and rushed invasion of Iraq. But even the lazy student's version of anything is at least an *accurate* summary. Rep. Henry Waxman has a detailed report and accompanying searchable database on his website that identifies 237 specific misleading statements about the threat posed by Iraq made by Administration officials. It is entitled, ***Iraq on the Record***. <http://www.house.gov/waxman>

The *Washington Times* reported Wednesday, April 16, 2003, that Richard Perle (CFR), a member of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board called for the U.S. Congress to pass a "**Syrian Liberation Act**" modeled on the 1998 law that made regime change in Baghdad official U.S. policy. This is an effort to fully implement the Syrian phase of **A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm** with U.S. armed forces.

Only hours after the September 11 attacks, the administration installed a "shadow government" of about a hundred senior "executive" branch officials to live and work secretly outside Washington at two East Coast locations, reportedly run from the White House. White House Chief of Staff, Andrew Card directs the shadow government from the White House, where he is *immune* from giving testimony to Congress.

In early March 2002, another classified Pentagon document, known as the *Nuclear Posture Review*, was leaked to the *Los Angeles Times*. It orders the military to plan for the use of “smaller nuclear weapons” as a more effective deterrent against terrorist attacks. The review says the U.S. must be ready to use nuclear weapons against China, Russia, Iran, Iraq, North Korea, Syria and Libya. It then identified four areas where the U.S. should be prepared to press the button: In an Arab-Israeli conflict, in a war between China and Taiwan, in an attack by North Korea on South Korea and in an attack by Iraq on Israel or another neighbor. Additionally, the weapons could be used against targets able to withstand conventional attack and in retaliation for the use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons.

On Sept 20, 2002, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* was released. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html> The administration has promulgated this new strategic doctrine (Bush Doctrine) that the United States will arrogate the right to pre-emptively attack any state which, in its view, might threaten its security at some indeterminate time in the indefinite future, which also happens to be a long standing Israeli military doctrine. The same language in this report can be found in the *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategies, Forces, and Resources for a New Century* written by neo-conservatives that served as a sort of administration-in-waiting during the Clinton years. Upon his election in 2000, Bush immediately surrounded himself with this same group of CFR geopolitical strategists—Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, and Richard Perle—who had developed international policy for the first Bush administration.

Maybe Michael Moore's movie Fahrenheit 911 isn't that far off base. After all, we *know* American soldiers immediately secured Iraq's oil fields, while major cultural artifacts were left unguarded to be looted and destroyed. “*America, declared Paul Wolfowitz, must be ready to go to war, and many should be prepared to die.*” “*No threats to our “global dominance” will be tolerated - that will be the “dominant consideration underlying the new regional defense strategy and requires that we endeavor to prevent any hostile power from dominating a region whose resources [oil] would, under consolidated control, be sufficient to generate global power.*”

A Western journalist, Thomas Friedman, had some perceptive thoughts on postwar occupation of Iraq a few days before the start of the war on March 19, 2003: “*Then we will know if the hawkish dreamers of the project [Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle] have indeed taken over U.S. foreign policy. How they remake free Iraq will tell us whether they plan to remake the world. It's after victory that the most enduring impact will be felt, whether it be a hated U.S.-led occupation, sparking a fresh round of global terrorism, or the sudden release of Iraq's lethal, internal tensions which Saddam has kept pent-up for 35 years. Kurds could fight Turks for their own state in the north; Shias might team up with Iran for control of the south; everyone may turn on the hated Saddamite Ba'athists in a frenzy of revenge. Iraq will not be like 1940s Japan and Germany, the occupations fondly remembered by the U.S. commentariat. Those were coherent nations; Iraq is an artificial fusion of antagonistic tribes. Victory may be rapid and easy - but that's when the real troubles could start.*”

As the Red Cross and the United Nations prepared to scale back in Iraq because of shocking attacks by Saddam Hussein loyalists, and as the death toll of Americans and Iraqis climbed ever higher, day by painful day, Bush's remarkable assurance that great progress is being made in Baghdad has made even Republicans nervous. Highway 8 leading to Najaf is one of the worst in Iraq. Westerners are murdered there. It is littered with burnt-out police vehicles and American trucks, and reminds you of the road leading out of Kuwait city during the Gulf War. When suicide bombers ram their cars into hundreds of recruits outside police stations, how on earth can anyone hold an election next January?

But with many American schools crumbling and many Americans jobless, his questionable premise that the Iraqi schools and economy are rapidly being improved by American money seems risky for a man who is facing a close re-election battle with less than half the voters thinking he's doing a good job. Of the \$87 billion dollars Congress authorized of the war in Iraq, \$20 billion was for reconstruction. It came as no surprise that Bush wanted no strings attached to the money, so that he, or one of his people, could dole it out as they saw fit. As Senator Robert Byrd observed in his book, *Losing America*, "*A cool \$20 billion, spent far from prying eyes, could make a heady stew of mischief.*" Definitely an affront to the Constitution, as the power to appropriate money is vested in Congress, *along with* the oversight power on how it is to be spent.

President Bush's adamant insistence that Iraq is halfway rebuilt instead of halfway torn apart is reminiscent of a story Ronald Reagan once told about a boy, a pony, a pile of manure, and being optimistic. Optimism is an essential ingredient of a president's arsenal of public relations tools. But too much optimism without a reasonable basis for it is a bad thing. And Bush is bumping up against the limit.

### **The Pony in the Manure Story**

A family had twin boys whose only resemblance to each other was their looks. If one felt it was too hot, the other thought it was too cold. If one said the TV was too loud, the other claimed the volume needed to be turned up. Opposite in every way, one was an eternal optimist, the other a doom & gloom pessimist. Just to see what would happen, on the twins' birthday their father loaded the pessimist's room with every imaginable toy and game. The optimist's room he loaded with horse manure. That night the father passed by the pessimist's room and found him sitting amid his new gifts crying bitterly.

"Why are you crying?" the father asked. "Because my friends will be jealous, I'll have to read the all these instructions before I can do anything with this stuff, I'll constantly need batteries, and my toys will eventually get broken," answered the pessimist twin. Passing the optimist twin's room, the father found him dancing for joy and digging in the pile of manure. "What are you so happy about?" he asked. To which his optimist twin replied, "There's got to be a pony in here somewhere!"

## Why Are We Hated in the Islamic World?

George W. Bush, in an address to a joint session of Congress, shared with them, as well as all of us somewhere over the Beltway, his profound knowledge of Islam's wiles and ways: “*They hate what they see right here in this chamber.*” A million Americans nodded in front of their TV sets. “*Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms: our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other.*” At this plangent moment what American's patriotism for his country was not fed? But, beyond such shallow responses as “*They hate us because we are democratic, rich and free.*” Well, why don't “they” hate the far richer and freer Scandinavians.

Understandably, Osama bin Laden dislikes the United States as symbol and as fact. But when the Saudi Royal family allowed American troops to occupy the Prophet's holy land, Osama bin Laden named the fundamental enemy, “the Crusader-Zionist Alliance.” Thus, in a phrase, he defined himself and reminded his critics that he is a Wahabi Muslim, a puritan activist not unlike our Falwell-Robertson [Christian fundamentalist] zanies, only serious. He would go to war against the U.S., “the head of the serpent.” Even more ambitiously, he would rid all the Muslim states of their western-supported regimes, starting with that of his native land. The word “Crusader” was the giveaway.

In his first released tape after 9/11, Osama bin Laden stated that he carried out the attacks for three reasons: 1) to drive U.S. military forces from Saudi Arabia, the most sacred place of Islam; 2) to avenge the deaths of over half a million Iraqi children killed, according to UNICEF, as a result of the U.S.-sponsored embargo of the 1990s; and, 3) to punish U.S. sponsorship of Israeli oppression against the Palestinian people.

In the eyes of many Muslims, the Christian west, currently in alliance with Zionism, has for 1,000 years tried to dominate the lands of the Umma, the true believers. Ordinary Americans have consistently refused to read, think, or even speak about foreign affairs for the past decade. Yet, everyone knew that the United States complained far more about the anti-democratic policies of indebted Kenya than it did about the far nastier anti-democratic policies of oil-rich Saudi Arabia. Everyone knew that the United States put sanctions on India and Pakistan for possessing nuclear weapons, but not on Israel.

Many have argued that the hypocrisy of America partly explains the hatred of America, particularly in the Muslim world. This is especially true since the United States government, under the control of the collectivists, has provided covert funding and training for just about every terrorist regime in the world, including Osama bin Laden, the Taliban, and Saddam himself. We are not fighting thugs, evil doers, and foreign invaders, but rather a religious ideology just as strong as our own. We *know* we were attacked on 9/11 because the Islamic fundamentalists not only despise our current administration, but more *importantly*, they *hate* our foreign policy, our economic dominance with the almighty dollar, and—not to mention—our infidel presence on holy soil.

Rather than being a “compassionate humanitarian,” George W. Bush has become the most divisive international figure I can recall in recent history, whose actions and words are creating havens and breeding grounds for terrorism. In fact, by invading the second most holy land in the Middle East (Iraq), we have thrown gasoline on an already raging inferno. While this is not another Vietnam, what is immediately comparable to Iraq is that the logic for being in Vietnam proved false. It is not the size of the casualties in Iraq so far that weighs on us so much as the prospect of a century of unending terrorist acts that we do not know how to terminate by military force. When asked recently if he believes his administration is responsible for fueling the recruitment of al Qaeda through some of its policies, particularly the invasion of Iraq, Bush responded, *“It is a ridiculous notion to assert because the more the United States is on the offense more people want to hurt us.”*

This statement alone underscores Bush’s ignorance of the depth of Arab nationalism and the subtle zephyrs that blow through the region. In the words of one Iraqi exile, *“Getting rid of Saddam Hussein is one thing...but you won’t find any self-respecting Iraqi prepared to cooperate with an American puppet regime.”* When we were attacked on 9/11, we had the world’s support against a common enemy. We have now turned sympathy into suspicion, and we are quickly losing friends who fear our new aggressiveness. And when your friends fear you, you are in deep, deep trouble.

George Bush reminds me of George Armstrong Custer: an arrogant, opinionated, headstrong fool who spurned all warnings, boldly and resolutely leading his command to disaster on the Little Big Horn.

*“Our enemies never stop thinking about new ways to harm our country and our people, and neither do we.”*

—George W. Bush August 5, 2004...speaking to Pentagon officials.

Any leader whom one can imagine as President on September 11 would have declared a “war on terrorism” and would have ended the al Qaeda sanctuary in Afghanistan. Almost any President would have increased domestic security and international intelligence gathering. What was unique about George Bush’s reaction to terrorism was his selection as an object lesson for potential state sponsors of terrorism, not a country that had been engaging in anti-U.S. terrorism, but one that had not been, Iraq. It is hard to imagine another President making that choice. But one thing we know they would not have done is to inflame Islamic opinion and further radicalize Muslim youth into heightened hatred of America in the way that invading Iraq has done.

One would have thought that it was a obvious high priority to improve U.S. relations with the Islamic world, in order to dry up support for the deviant variant of Islam that is al Qaeda. After all, al Qaeda had their own sophisticated propaganda machine trying to influence millions of Muslims to act against America. To defeat the enemy and prevent it from achieving its objectives, we needed to do more than just arrest and kill people.

Much has been written in the West since the fall of Baghdad about how wrong were the predictions of those who questioned America's Iraq war policy. But among pro-Western Arabs the only prediction that had been repeatedly made was that the war could simplify the recruitment of suicide bombers, increase Muslim resentment against America's perceived hegemonistic foreign policy, and produce "a hundred bin Ladens." The president may feel comfortable swimming in the shallows of these policies, but in the end he will find that he clearly knew nothing about rip tides.

*"Although peaceful political change by elections rather than coups, and peaceful merger of adjoining countries by plebiscite rather than invasion might be a nice way to go, it's not the way things have been done in this part of the world—ever. A country that has suffered the Mongols is not afraid of Americans; George Bush is no Tamerlane. We suffered under Saddam and we hate him, but we would put him in our hearts ahead of a Christian or a Jew - because he is a Muslim. We are a warrior people, and you forget that only at your peril. We have the stomach for mass violence. Do you?"*

—Ahmed, an Iraqi insurgency leader on the prospect of democracy.

To be safer in America, we *know* we need to have more friends than enemies. We need to make a drastic change in our approach to foreign policy, along with a rebuilding of the bridges Bush has burnt behind him in his arrogance. You can not defeat terrorism with just pre-emptive war and increased security at home. Israel's lifestyle of constant terrorist threat is exactly what Americans want to avoid. And yet the United States is gradually following the path of successive Likud Party governments, trapped in a vicious circle of repressing terrorism, and then being terrorized anew by the scourge this repression is meant to exterminate. Rather than war, I would like to think that the *best* thing we could do to prevent another attack, would be to reduce this animosity towards America by examining what Muslim extremists are complaining about, what arguments al Qaeda's recruiters are using—and what can be done to destroy their arguments and cut the ground from under the fundamentalists.

Muslim societies are also increasingly resentful of our efforts to induce them to adopt our values, so we must also move away from the assertion that our values are "universal," while standing by our commitments to human rights and democracy. They see the export of our pop culture through the media and the Internet—which the Muslim world views as "nasty"—as a direct affront to *their* religious values.

Yet faith in military force and an arrogant belief that American values *are* universal values still mold our foreign policy nearly a century after Woodrow Wilson, reelected with a promise of keeping America out of World War I, broke faith with the people by engineering a declaration of war within weeks of his second inauguration. George W. Bush's 2000 campaign supposedly rejected Wilsonian foreign policy by articulating both the historic Republican critique of foreign aid and explicitly criticizing Bill Clinton's nation-building. Although there were some individual successes, the promotion of democracy in the world—by example—will now be remembered as a failure, and is now being replaced with mind-boggling rapidity with the new paradigm, the War on Terror—the New New World Order.

Just like the Cold War, the War on Terror puts us in bed with some extremely unpleasant regimes. What worries me about the New New World Order is something different: how cleanly and easily it explains the world. Like the Cold War, the War on Terror will tell us everything about Abroad that we need to know: Who are our friends, who are our enemies, and where our priorities must lie.

Like the Cold War, the War on Terror seems to appease both the idealism of Americans—we are, after all, fighting to rid the world of an evil—and the realism. No intellectual contortions are required to explain why the fight against Osama bin Laden is well within the sphere of America's national interest.

Today, the administration insists we can be safe only by *compelling* other nations to implement its vision of democracy. This used to be called imperialism. Empires don't come cheap; worse, “global democracy” requires just the kind of big government conservatives abhor. When the *Wall Street Journal* praises the use of American tax dollars to provide electricity and water services in Iraq, something we used to call socialism, either conservatism has undergone a tectonic shift or the paper's editors are disingenuous.

This neo-conservative policy rejects the traditional conservative notion that American society is rooted in American culture and history—in the gradual development of American institutions over nearly 230 years—and cannot be separated from them. Instead, neo-conservatives profess that American values, which they define as democracy, liberty, free markets and self-determination, are “universal” rather than particular to us, and insist they can and should be exported to ensure our security.

This is nonsense. The qualities that make American life desirable evolved from our civil society, created by millions of men and women using the freedom created under limited constitutional government. Only a fool would believe they could be spread overnight with bombs and bucks, and only a fool would insist that the values defined by George W. Bush as American are necessarily those for which we should fight any war at all. Bush misled the American people and the Congress, peddled falsehoods to the UN, and most definitely miscalculated the ease of making democracy flourish in a country endemic with religious and tribal hatreds—and abysmally empty of any experience with such concepts as individual rights, equality, and the freedom of religion—for centuries!

### **The Loss of Civil Liberties**

There are many Americans who feel that the awesome physical damage Bin Laden and company did to us on Dark Tuesday is nothing compared to the blow to our vanishing liberties through the Patriot Act of 2003. Once alienated, an “inalienable right” is apt to be lost forever, in which case we are no longer even remotely the last best hope of Earth, but merely a seedy imperial state whose citizens are kept in line by Swat teams and whose way of death, not life, is universally imitated. Whoever becomes president in the 2004 election could nominate as many as four Supreme Court justices in the next few years.

The 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, for all intents and purposes, is now repudiated: there is no longer any reasonable security of persons and their effects. King George's notorious and resented Bills of Attainder gave no more powers than those now assumed by every highway patrolman and airport guard. Perhaps one of the most striking aspects of this development is the lack of public discussion.

### **The Patriot Act**

The *Patriot Act* is a case study in that most dependable of all instances, war, to alter the attitude of people who “*would be willing to give up things they cherish in return for the desperate need and desire for security against a deadly enemy.*” The bill came to Congress on Sept 19, only *eight days* after the attacks. The Senate passed its version by a vote of 96 to 1 on October 11, one month to the day following the attacks. The House followed the next day.

Consider Section 218 of the Patriot Act. Under it, an officer of the law need not find *probable cause* to pry into someone's private life as long as a claim can be made that such prying has even the tiniest link to “foreign intelligence” activities. Having been a Federal law enforcement officer with the NPS, I see obvious opportunity for abuse.

In his book, *Losing America: Confronting a Reckless and Arrogant Presidency*, senior Senator from West Virginia (D), Robert C. Byrd writes: “*Little by little, inch by inch, this administration bores into the walls built by the framers, walls with foundations going back to antiquity.*” It is an important must read for all Americans by one of the country's longest serving and most respected legislators; one who does not shrink from warning the people of the sinister agenda of a power-seeking White House.

What the Senator is alluding to here is this: Every bit of legislation is carefully written, with all attempts to avoid obfuscation, and import accurate legal distinctions. This is what they mean by “*the letter of the law.*” Inasmuch as one word, a “shall” or a “whereas,” can change the meaning—and most importantly—the lengths to which that law can be applied. The Patriot Act does this in spades, removing certain legal distinctions in order to give more power to the government, while taking some of our civil liberties in the process. Citizens should look out for [Patriot II](#), a broader and more invasive sequel or a stealth version broken up and camouflaged in other legislation to avoid being a target for criticism.

The U.S. has traditionally prided itself on its Constitution and Bill of Rights, and one would think that the final passing of a sacrosanct right would at least be noted in the press. But “public discussion” is limited to whatever the “media” chooses to feature. Look at how much media attention this “Swift Boat” controversy has sparked. Are we being properly served? I think not.

*“They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.”*

— Benjamin Franklin

The first thing our founding fathers did once in power was pass the Bill of Rights to protect the people they were governing. Fresh in their minds was the memory of the British violation of civil rights before and during the Revolution. Attacking the proposed Constitution for its vagueness and lack of specific protection against tyranny, Patrick Henry asked the Virginia convention, “*What can avail your specious, imaginary balances, your rope-dancing, chain-rattling, ridiculous ideal checks and contrivances.*”

*“These restrictions, I think, are so guarded as to hinder evil only. However, if we do not have them now, I have so much confidence in my countrymen as to be satisfied that we shall have them as soon as the degeneracy of our government shall render them necessary.”*

—Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, 1789.

I cannot help but find those words (“*degeneracy of our government*”) somehow very prophetic, especially in the light of recent events. Leading this assault on our civil liberties is John Ashcroft, U.S. Attorney General. The U.S. attorney general is no minor official. He is the chief law enforcement official of the United States. Under his supervision falls the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the INS, the Bureau of Prisons, the Office of the U.S. Attorneys and U.S. Marshals, and he represents and supervises the representation of the U.S. government in the Supreme Court.

Born in 1942, Ashcroft grew up the dutiful child of a roving Assemblies of God minister. The Assemblies of God is the largest Pentecostalist denomination in America, with 2.3 million members in the United States and 30 million worldwide.

Pentecostals believe that every child of God should be his own minister, imbued directly with the Holy Spirit and the gift of speaking in tongues. He’s a religious man at loggerheads with the dominant culture; a politician who has mostly been (despite surface appearances) a failure; and an attorney general who may be turning into something worse than his enemies anticipated—though perhaps not in the way they assumed.

While a devout Pentecostalist, he is better known, however, for his vigorous upholding of fundamentalist Christian values on abortion, gay rights, states rights, gun rights, and other issues that split the American public opinion right down the proverbial middle.

After a bitter debate in the Senate Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the Senate, John Ashcroft was confirmed on February 1, 2001, by the U.S. Senate by 58 to 42 votes, the narrowest vote on a presidential Cabinet nominee in over a decade and a half, and the most votes cast against any nominee for attorney general since the Senate defeated Calvin Coolidge's candidate in 1925. It was a show of strength, a “shot over the bows” in the words of New York Senator Chuck Schumer, which demonstrated that the Democrats in the Senate had the ability to mount a filibuster against the nomination of a person of Ashcroft's views to the Supreme Court of the United States. It takes 41 votes to maintain a filibuster.

Ashcroft is thus that most derided figure on the American religious landscape, the Holy Roller—an actual, serious one. (The notorious Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart, icons of ridiculous religiosity, were both Assemblies preachers.) In short, it's the sort of religion that scares cosmopolitan secularists witless. Especially given the immense power he's holding in post-9/11 America.

Indeed, Ashcroft is a man at war not simply with Muslim extremists, but with secular America. He's staunchly opposed on religious grounds to drinking, gambling, and even dancing. So he is probably unlikely to screw any interns, accept bribes, gamble, or, God forbid, dance. Of course, that is the least important kind of integrity to expect from a politician. Central to any consideration of him is his religion, which was also one of the reasons, rightly or wrongly, that he was hated and feared by the left long before 9/11. John Ashcroft has said, "*Islam is a religion in which God requires you to send your son to die for him. Christianity is a faith in which God sends his son to die for you.*" This is not only a horrible distortion of Islam—it betrays a deep bigotry that does not do honor to the Department of Justice. He once vowed that were he ever to become president, he would publicly kneel and pray for divine guidance while being sworn in. Once, while speaking to the Christian magazine *Charisma*, he let slip that "*I think all we should legislate is morality.*" That's the sort of statements that make centrist liberals, hardcore lefties, and the odd atheistic right-winger fear Ashcroft as much as he fears God.

In 2000, Ashcroft famously suffered what is surely one of the most humiliating political defeats in American history. Not only did he fail to get re-elected to the Senate—something 80 percent of incumbents pull off—but he lost to a dead man, Democratic Gov. Mel Carnahan.

George W. Bush evoked Thomas Jefferson at his inauguration. But the words addressed to the 3rd president of the United States that the 43rd chose to cite on January 20, 2001, did not reflect the secular opinions of the most secular of America's past leaders. President Bush used Jefferson to introduce a religious analogy in a civic ceremony opened and closed by two clergymen. Each explicitly called down the blessings of Jesus Christ about whose divinity in fact the highly unorthodox Jefferson was quite skeptical, being more Unitarian than Trinitarian in his private religious opinions. Jefferson was after all a man of reason more than faith, and like the enlightened savant he aspired to be, believed received wisdom and authority should be challenged by scientific experiment and free debate. He did not wear religion on his shirt sleeves.

As he told John Adams in 1817: "*say nothing of my religion. It is known to my god and myself alone. Its evidence before the world is to be sought in my life.*" No one noticed: but George W. had used words spoken to Jefferson, not words Jefferson had himself uttered: "*After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to Thomas Jefferson: ``We know the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?''*"

The likelihood that President Bush might make one or two appointments to the Supreme Court in the near future, thereby tipping the court's balance to the right on many social questions, only emphasizes the concern of many over the loss of civil liberties. Not least of these of course is legalized abortion, upheld by the Supreme Court now by a slim majority. Opposition to legalized abortion is a matter of deep religious conviction for many, just as how for many others who favor abortion it is a fundamental issue of *civil liberty*.

It is this philosophy which made the separation of Church and State the first great assertion of civil liberties contained in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution: "*Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.*"

Yet it is precisely to permit "faith-based" (in other words, religious) organizations to bid for federal tax revenues that Bush now proposes, by establishing a new White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. And in remarks reported in the Wall Street Journal (Feb. 1, 2001; p. A24) that were picked up by reporters who the new president did not know were listening to him, George W. linked his faith-based social services initiative to his goal of curtailing abortions."See, *this faith-based initiative really ties into a larger cultural issue that we are working on,*" President Bush said, "*It begins to affect the life issue... When you're talking about welcoming people of faith to help people who are disadvantaged... the logical step is also those babies.*" As one Democratic Senate aide cited by The New York Times put it, President Bush by choosing John Ashcroft has "*wacked a hornets' nest.*"

John Ashcroft had shown also an odd affection for the old Confederacy, along with Bush appointee Gale Norton, the new Secretary of the Interior. The Department of Interior is also no minor office. It is responsible for the management of close to a half billion acres of federal lands, mostly in the western regions of the country, including the National Park System, as well the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Norton had told the Independence Institute in Denver in 1996 that "we lost too much" when the South was defeated. Since Colorado was not a state at the time (it didn't join the Union until 1876), it is not clear who the "we" she is referring to is. But as we *know*, the issue over which the southern states were fighting the federal government was the perpetuation and expansion of *slavery*.

Ashcroft's immediate response to the attacks of 9/11 was to sink into a dark Orwellian morass of secret detentions, warrantless wiretaps, and eavesdropping on lawyers. Meanwhile, he instructed his charges at the Department of Justice to do whatever was legally possible to ignore and stonewall Freedom of Information Act requests. In prepared statements—not unscripted press conference bluster—Ashcroft famously warned his critics that they are essentially traitors. "*Those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty,*" he inveighed before Congress, "*your tactics only aid terrorists.*"

He needed only to add “and comfort” to his statement to charge dissenters worried about infringements on civil liberties with the constitutional definition of treason. Now, Ashcroft didn’t exactly say that anyone who questions the government is wrong, let alone a traitor. Sure—and calling someone a “long-eared, slow, patient, sure-footed domesticated mammal” isn’t the same as calling him an ass either. In other words, protest against the government—the singular right without which America would not even exist—is now being defined as trying to overthrow the government.

The following are some of the Department of Justice Orders, issued since September 11, 2001

- Limited disclosure of public documents and records under the Freedom of Information Act.
- Section 412-Removal of the requirement to obtain judicial permission before federal prison officials may monitor conversations between attorneys and their clients. (6<sup>th</sup> Amendment)
- Section-213-Allows the FBI to secretly use “sneak and peek” warrants to search a citizen’s *home* and to seize property.
- Section 218-An officer of the law need not find *probable cause* to pry into someone’s *private* life as long as a claim can be made that such prying has even the tiniest link to “foreign intelligence” activities.
- Executive branch will conduct investigations without Congressional oversight.
- Section 206-Expands the use of “roving wiretaps” and other surveillance equipment to permit monitoring of telephones, e-mail, and other devices without naming the *individual* targeted.
- Requires most immigrants to be jailed *indefinitely* without bond when “national security” risks exist.

And who can trust any law enforced by John Ashcroft, who single-handedly transformed a two-bit hubcap thief like Jose Padilla first into a threat to national security and then, through his insistence that Padilla, an American citizen, could be held without charges, into a Constitutional crisis? Padilla was arrested by the FBI on May 8, 2002, at Chicago O’Hare airport on a material witness warrant. He has been accused of conspiring with al Qaeda to obtain material to construct a “dirty bomb.”

President Bush designated Padilla an “enemy combatant” on June 9, 2002, and Padilla has since been held in a navy prison in South Carolina. He has not had access to a lawyer until March 2004, and he has never been charged with a crime. A writ of Habeas Corpus was filed in New York Federal Court where he was ordered released. On appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court, the ruling by the appeals court was overturned, saying that the writ should have been filed in South Carolina.

On July 2, 2004, a new writ was filed in South Carolina Federal Court asking for relief on violations of Padilla’s 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> amendment rights under the Constitution, as well as violation of the Non-Detention Act 18 U.S. 4001 (a). As of this writing, he is still in custody in the Navy brig.

If Jose Padilla can be held without criminal charges, strictly on the say-so of the President, then any American can be. That is tyranny. James Madison, in Federalist No. 47, put it succinctly: *“The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands ... may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.”*

*“With the crew we have in charge right now, we would not be able to ratify the Bill of Rights,”*

—Senator Patrick Leahy , July 27, 2004

### **A Case in Point**

The establishment of the World Trade Organization by the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade marks a watershed in international trade regulation. For the first time an attempt is being made to regulate virtually all aspects of trade between nations by a organization having both judicial and regulatory authority. To date, one of the greatest weaknesses that has plagued the WTO has been its Director’s—General, Renato Ruggiero—insensitivity to the fears held by many member regarding the loss of national sovereignty under the WTO. Ruggiero made comments in a speech to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) stating that the WTO is *“no longer writing the rules of interaction among separate national economies. We are writing the constitution of a single global economy”* Such talk of “constitutions” is a red flag to many around the world who fear WTO hegemony much more than they fear trade restrictions. Russia, the largest economy that is not yet a member of the 144-nation world trade body, has said it is preparing for the next stage of talks and draft laws to bring its trade practices into line with WTO rules go before parliament early this year.

Both individuals and institutions fear that the WTO will gradually overcome the sovereignty of their nation. While this fear has been associated with the United Nations for many years, the UN is not nearly intrusive in the internal affairs of the average member state as is WTO.

The World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle in November of 1999 is a fading memory for many, but it left quite a legacy: Protestors of this obvious and glaring move towards a “One World Order” arrived in Seattle from around the world to voice their dissent. Seattle suffered more than \$2.5 million in damage, more than 500 protesters were arrested, the opening WTO ceremonies were canceled and eventually trade talks collapsed. The headlines continued well into the new millennium.

Police arrested hundreds of WTO protesters in 1999 and carted them to a temporary lockup at the Sand Point naval station, where many complained they were not allowed to talk to lawyers or get aid for their injuries. The ACLU filed a federal lawsuit on behalf of seven people, claiming the zone violated free-speech, assembly and due-process rights. Additionally, the right to be free of unreasonable searches and seizures was also violated. The city agreed to pay three of the plaintiffs \$5,000 each, plus legal costs.

As more and more people are made aware of the implications of this orchestrated move towards a New World Order, you will see more demonstrations and more violations of civil liberties. Our Constitutional right to free speech and free assembly are going to be seriously eroded and denied—all in the name of the War on Terrorism.

And in the cold hard light of the facts, even the government's "war on terror" seems disingenuous. There is a total collapse of trust in American intentions abroad and it's only gotten worse over the past year, especially in light of the systematic and illegal abuse of detainees at Abu Ghraib prison, not to mention, the continuance of people being detained without charges—*indefinitely*—at Guantanamo Bay.

Since January 11, 2002, the U.S. government has sent over seven hundred people picked up from around the world to Guantanamo. Currently some 660 are in detention, including an undisclosed number of children. As the detention camp begins its third year, the public still does not know who the detainees are, what they have allegedly done, and whether and when they will be charged with crimes or released. There have been no hearings to determine the legal status of detainees and no judicial review—in short, no legal process at all.

The Bush Administration has attempted to turn the forty-eight square miles of its naval base at Guantanamo Bay into territory beyond the reach of any law and outside the jurisdiction of any court. In its treatment of the detainees at Guantanamo, it has been unwilling to fully apply international humanitarian law (often called the laws of war), has flouted international human rights standards, and has fought hard to block judicial review by U.S. courts of the legality of its detentions. If the U.S. government fails to provide for fair trials, the military commissions will produce verdicts that will not be seen as legitimate in the eyes of a world already deeply skeptical about the long-term detentions at Guantanamo.

This policy has put out that bright beacon of light that the people of the world used to look up to as a vision of hope. Now there are more terrorists than ever. We seem to soon forget the consequences of our actions. What better people we would be if we could put Abu Ghraib in our pocket, and be reminded of it at least once a day, whenever we have our wallets out. Because, trust me, the Muslim world *will not* soon forget those pictures. George Bush said he was exporting democracy to Iraq, but he seems to have exported a much uglier aspect of American public policy—some of the most sadistic practices employed in the U.S. prison system.

When people hate, resent, and *fear* the United States far more than they dislike bin Laden, how can you possibly succeed in winning a war on terror?

*"The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion, but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact, non-westerners never do."*  
—Samuel P. Huntington, Historian.

## **The Return of the Draft**

This is not an irrational war. It is an icily rational war, given that the alternative is to relinquish control of the world's economic future—which would be disastrous for collectivist elites in the United States, because our entire economy, under their direction, is now a house of cards built on an international treasury-bill standard that forces the rest of the world to give loans to the U.S. that it never intends to pay back. Control of the world's peaking energy supply is absolutely essential for the U.S. state to maintain its economic arm-lock on China and Europe to enforce their continued complicity in this international extortion racket. The Bush administration has not the slightest intention of ever leaving Iraq.

There are two principle geo-strategic reasons for the occupation: control of petroleum production and establishment of permanent bases in Iraq from which to project military force throughout the region as necessary (These two reasons are interfused.). The capacity of the U.S. armed forces as currently constituted is insufficient to continue the occupation and to consolidate it enough to maintain politically viable bases as well as regenerate oil production to something approaching former levels.

Ergo, the inevitable choice will be between abandoning the occupation—which this administration may find politically impossible—or massively increasing the occupation forces—which means massively expanding personnel numbers throughout the armed forces. Barring some abrupt change of direction in foreign policy, someone is about to get *drafted*.

WASHINGTON—”The chief of the Selective Service System has proposed registering women for the military draft and requiring that young Americans regularly inform the government about whether they have training in niche specialties needed in the armed services. The proposal, which the agency's acting Director Lewis Brodsky presented to senior Pentagon officials just before the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, also seeks to extend the age of draft registration to 34 years old, up from 25.”

“The Selective Service System plan, obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, highlights the extent to which agency officials have planned for an expanded military draft in case the administration and Congress would authorize one in the future. *“In line with today's needs, the Selective Service System's structure, programs and activities should be reengineered toward maintaining a national inventory of American men and, for the first time, women, ages 18 through 34, with an added focus on identifying individuals with critical skills,”* the agency said in a Feb. 11, 2003, proposal presented to senior Pentagon officials.”(The Seattle Post-Intelligencer May 1, 2004.)

To further contextualize the overstretch of U.S. military forces, we need to look at military operations outside Iraq. There are ongoing large operations of over 4,000 troops in former Yugoslavia and 8,500 in Afghanistan (and more coming in a ramp-up for a Spring offensive), and that the U.S. is maintaining 37,000 troops in Korea and 71,000 in Europe—mostly Germany. Of the 480,000 people in the U.S. Army, over 300,000 are now deployed overseas.

But the U.S. is also involved militarily in training the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), with 3rd Special Forces Group—supplemented on a variant basis with Marines—operating in Liberia, Ghana, Uganda, Nigeria, Senegal, Malawi, Ethiopia, and Mali. 1st Special Forces is expanding operations in the Philippines, also using Marines, and maintaining their base in Okinawa. 7th Special Forces is almost running the Colombian military at this point in the civil war there. 10th Special Forces and 5th Special Forces have been busy in the Republics of Georgia, Azerbaijan, Ukraine, and Kazakhstan.

While Selective Service hasn't been reinstated yet, there is a draft. Under the Selective Service draft, conscripts who have no prior military service are legally press-ganged into the armed forces. But there is a draft in place now that forces people who have *already* served their time as volunteers to stay in past their discharge dates. This program is called, in typically homely military diction, Stop-Loss.

On September 14, 2001, three days after the World Trade Center's twin towers crumbled, George W. Bush signed Executive Order 13223, delegating authority to both the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Defense to exercise unprecedented discretion. Within that order, the Defense Secretary was authorized, at his own discretion, to initiate Stop-Loss orders. These orders were implemented last year as the Bush administration's triumphal wine turned to vinegar in its mouth, and Iraq became a grinding, unmanageable.... I can think of no better term...quagmire. By New Year's Day 2004, one service, the Army, had blocked over 40,000 troops from discharge or retirement on their appointed dates.

On his visit to South Korea on June 1, 2003, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz announced Washington's intention to "*reposition*" *some of its military forces stationed in South Korea . . . The redeployment would entail moving those forces farther south . . .*" (Stars and Stripes, June 3, 2003)

Why is the Bush administration proposing to abandon the long-standing tripwire function of U.S. forces in South Korea? There is one unsettling possibility: The administration is considering a preemptive military attack on North Korea's nuclear installations and wants to move American troops out of harm's way. Here's North Korea's response to the redeployment announcement:

*SEOUL (Reuters) – "A U.S.-South Korean plan to transfer American troops away from the border with North Korea is designed to set the stage for a pre-emptive strike on the communist state, Pyongyang's ruling party daily said Friday . . . North Korea's Rodong Sinmun, the official mouthpiece of the ruling party, said the long-term redeployment plan was "a very dangerous military move which should not be overlooked." "The U.S. imperialists are applying a war method based on high-tech with main emphasis put on missile strikes and air raids rather than land attack in carrying out their war of overseas aggression,"* it said.

In the well-known words of Paul Harvey, "*Stand by for news!*"

## Epilogue

It is an article of faith that there are no conspiracies in American life. Yet, a year or so ago, who would have thought that most of corporate America had been conspiring with accountants to cook their books since—well, at least the bright dawn of the era of Reagan and deregulation.

A lawyer friend of mine recently wrote me the following: *”The whole situation is a good illustration of how a small number of people with a strong ideology and agenda are capable of hijacking the government while everyone else is engaged in “business as usual.” It is especially easy when the President has no substantial knowledge of history, no intellectual curiosity, no fully-formed principles relating to international relations and the use of American power, but does have an astoundingly huge ego and no self-doubt whatsoever. . . .”*

The most troubling matter surrounding the war is not that the Bush administration has failed to uncover super weapons in Iraq; it is that the American public did not say “no” to the war even when the war rationale by Bush administration officials was contradicted publicly by their own intelligence community. We don’t seem to care that the administration twisted the intelligence and lied to hype the threat from Iraq in order to garner support for a questionable war.

In fact, as long as a victory was won, the slumbering public doesn’t care much about why we went to war in the first place, as long as we can “beat our chests,” and revel in the military trouncing our superpower juggernaut gave to the armies of tin-pot despots in the relatively poor developing world. Those are good kids that we’re sending into the shooting gallery called Iraq, and unless you have the conviction of a Bush or a Rumsfeld or a Bechtel or a Halliburton, you have to be nursing the sick feeling that each death is a tragic waste, and that this conflict is as much of a fool’s errand as the war in Vietnam.

*“Until we go through it ourselves, until our people cower in the shelters of New York, Washington, Chicago, Los Angeles and elsewhere while the buildings collapse overhead and burst into flames, and dead bodies hurtle about and, when it is over for the day or the night, emerge in the rubble to find some of their dear ones mangled, their homes gone, their hospitals, churches, schools demolished — only after that gruesome experience will we realize what we are inflicting on the people of Indochina...”*

— William Shirer author 1973

This public acceptance of the war is even more curious given the sordid history of presidential lying to the American people about wars in the past that I have outlined in this book. In all those cases, however, Americans trusted their government and later found such trust to be misplaced. The alarming thing about Iraq War II is that the American people had plenty of evidence before the war—from the president’s own intelligence chief—that the Bush administration was exaggerating the threat. In a republic, aren’t the people ultimately responsible for the policies their government adopts in their name?

*“Of all the enemies to public liberty, war is, perhaps, the most to be dreaded because it compromises and develops the germ of every other. As the parent of armies, war encourages debts and taxes, the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the executive is extended . . . and all the means of seducing the minds, are added to those of subduing the force, of the people . . .”*

—James Madison

Most people still think they are living in sovereign nations and link the term ‘New World Order’ to right-wing conspiracy theories. The problem with the tidy little formula is that the same folks who decide where to intervene are the ones who run the global system that intentionally creates the conditions which are destabilizing societies globally and making pretexts for intervention plentiful.

If you seek alternative sources of information, then you know ethnic repression is going on all over the world, including within staunch American allies such as Turkey and Israel, and Most-Favored-Nations such as China. Look what is going on in the Sudan today, yet we hear little of it on the news. But when the mass media gets around to “revealing” such circumstances, then you know you’re being prepared for a sooner-or-later potential intervention.

*“The People cannot be safe without information. When the press is free, and every man is able to read, all is safe.”*

Those words by Thomas Jefferson embody the unfortunate state of affairs that have beset our nation.

Most of the public seems to revel in its willingness to allow the U.S. government—like the empires of old—to conduct “patriotic” wars of conquest for glory. I think what troubles me the most is not so much George W. Bush and his policies, but the overwhelming support this cretin receives from the public, not just in ideology but in his outward appearance to the world.

Blind faith is fine for religious beliefs, but when it comes to matters of war and peace we need to constantly question the government’s “higher powers.” The Founders of our nation—who realized that foreign wars lead to many ill-effects, both domestically and abroad—would find this current misguided conception of “patriotism” very troubling indeed.

*“Patriotism is supporting your country all the time and your government when it deserves it.”*

—Mark Twain

Theodore Roosevelt, that most virile of presidents, insisted that, *“To announce that there should be no criticism of the president, or that we are to stand by the president, right or wrong, is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American people.”*

It's time now to enter the reality zone. It's time to put doubt and denial behind us. Behold the grand deception. The war on terrorism is a war on freedom. It is the final thrust to push what is left of the free world into global government based on the model of collectivism. Its purpose is to frighten us into abandoning our freedoms and traditions in exchange for protection from a hated and dangerous enemy. As you have read, this ploy has been used many times before. Each time it moved us closer to the final goal, but was not sufficient to achieve it in full. This time it is expected to be the final blow.

We have allowed this to happen because we have been denied the knowledge of our own history, and so it seems that we are doomed to repeat it. But all that can be changed. In the twilight zone from which we have emerged, it is said that knowledge is power. But in the reality zone, we know that is a myth. Men with great knowledge are easily enslaved if they do nothing to defend their freedom.

For the next half-century there will be just enough energy resources left to enable either a horrific and futile contest for the remaining spoils, or a heroic cooperative effort toward radical conservation and transition to a post-fossil-fuel energy regime. The next century will see the end of global geopolitics, one way or another. If our descendants are fortunate, the ultimate outcome will be a world of modest, bio-regionally organized communities living on received solar energy. Local rivalries will continue, as they have throughout human history, but never again will the hubris of geopolitical strategists threaten billions with extinction.

*"In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."*  
—John Fitzgerald Kennedy

Knowledge by itself is not power, but it holds the potential for power if we have the courage to use it as such, and therein lies our hope for the future. If we act upon this knowledge, it is an opportunity, not just to know about history, but actually to change its course. Since we only have two real choices in this election of 2004, and we know that the current administration must go; we are left with the alternative. Will it change the current course of history, or just merely slow it down—that remains to be seen. The collectivists have been at this for a *long* time.

It still remains unclear whether or not Bush will lose the 2004 election, steal it again with the help of the Supreme Court acting like a Republican Robin Hood, or be replaced via an impeachment effort after a win. Americans who will vote are narrowly divided, something along the lines of 46% or 47%. Neither party has to woo these voters. Liberals will have no problem voting for John F. Kerry, but a lot of conservatives will have to hold their nose when they pull the lever for George W. Bush. They are outraged with the horrendous federal deficit and Bush's imperialistic, hegemonistic foreign policy. That, and many people know what I know. Now you do. Just remember, democracy is not a spectator sport.