

BUSH'S MISSION

EXPECTING THE SECOND PLATFORM OF MORAL OUTRAGE

BY: JOSEPH B. EHRLICH

© COPYRIGHT 2003, JOSEPH B. EHRLICH. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

BUSH'S MISSION: EXPECTING THE SECOND PLATFORM OF MORAL OUTRAGE

The debate in early 2003 as to whether to proceed militarily against Iraq evidenced rifts in transatlantic relations between the United States (“U.S.”) and the European Union (“EU”). **The first question to confront is whether the rifts were real or by mutual consent.** To raise the question suggests an agenda in play far beyond the specter of an invasion to remove Saddam Hussein and to capture Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction (“WMD”) to spare the world the “imminent” threat the U.S. claimed Saddam and his WMD represented.

Particularly noteworthy accordingly is the admitted absence of a U.S. strategy in dealing with post war Iraq. A Pentagon and State Department that plans for nearly every contingency had no plans in play in how to deal with post war Iraq. Thus, this suggests the **second question as to whether there were plans for a wide array of post-war contingencies, but the post war Iraq that did in fact materialize was one unanticipated and if so the reasons it evolved as it did contrary to U.S. planning expectations.**¹

The **third question** raised is one that lays a foundation to answer the first two questions posited above: **who had more to gain from Iraq’s use of WMD?** The U.S. clearly believed and relied upon intelligence that Saddam had WMD. Thus, one must channel into U.S. planning to grasp the degree of confidence U.S. planners carried regarding the certainty that Saddam would use WMD, resulting in their devising a schematic showing how Saddam’s anticipated use of WMD could prove beneficial to long-term U.S. interests.

The invasion of Iraq served three different plateaus of support: those aiming to stem the loss of influence of the United States in the Middle East; those seeking to control Middle East oil through privatization; those seeking to secure the next critical phase in multi-polar world government.

FIRST PLATEAU

Regarding the first plateau, it was generally recognized that during the Clinton term the U.S. lost a great deal of influence and control over the Middle East. China under the leadership of Jiang Zemin made great inroads into the Middle East and those inside the government assigned to such oversight

¹ It would be specious to suggest that the United States fully relied on the argument that the Iraqi people would simply welcome U.S. invading forces with open arms.

noted the re-emerging trend of a movement to undermine the U.S. dollar.² During the Reagan Presidency, Vice-President George H.W. Bush (“Bush 41”) who had originally applauded Japan for its support of U.S. policy in the early to mid 80’s to reduce historically high U.S. interest rates to platform the U.S.’s ability to revitalize the U.S. economy, ultimately witnessed that Japan never accepted the premise that it lost World War II, and waged an attack on the United States in covertly moving to undermine the U.S. dollar,³ an attack that came to a head in the spring and summer of 1995,⁴ during the Presidency of Bill Clinton, where Japan had no reservations about engaging the U.S. in a trade war.⁵ The end result was that Japan succumbed, with the U.S. gaining

² Ambrose Evans-Pritchard writing for the *Telegraph* filed the following on January 7, 2002: **CHINA BACKS EURO AT DOLLAR’S EXPENSE**: “The Chinese government gave the euro its much-coveted seal of approval yesterday, announcing that it would switch part of its vast dollar reserves into the world’s emerging “reserve currency.”” This seemingly innocuous event no doubt had major repercussions in Washington for the reasons discussed, *infra*.

³ Such hostility was made no secret from the media. The *New York Times* on January 10, 1992, reported: **BUSH’S PAINFUL TRIP**. There was no specter of nuclear war, of course. But negotiators seemed to realize that if the huge and growing trade deficit between Japan and the United States was not brought under control, it could drive Tokyo and Washington apart, hurt their economies and damage Mr. Bush’s re-election prospects....It was too early to discern the American political effects of the Tokyo talks. But the widespread view in Japan was that the negotiators’ efforts would not help the American economy or Mr. Bush’s political fortunes, and indeed that they could lead to even deeper Japanese-American antagonism.”

Japan was noted in the above *New York Times* article as a “rival superpower to the U.S. in the post cold-war area.” What riled Bush 41 and the United States was that the U.S. in its pursuit of assistance was treated as a welfare case, seeking sympathy of foreign governments. The *New York Times* wrote: “All week, Prime Minister Miyazawa appealed to Japanese and to Japanese auto companies to make some sacrifice for the United States *out of sympathy or compassion* (emphasis added). At a news conference at the Shinto shrine of Ise, he tried to stir sympathy for the American condition but sounded, to some Americans, very patronizing.” This picture of pathos was only further embellished under the fact that just prior to these statements calling for “sympathy” President Bush collapsed at a state dinner. The *New York Times* reported, “{Japan} was being asked to respond from a position of strength to help what the Prime Minister called ‘a friend in need.’” All that occurred came to a head ultimately in 1995, confirming that what was in play was a covert plan to undermine the U.S. dollar as the international reserve currency and thereby the U.S. economy and the U.S. Tantamount to the Palestinian suicide bombings on Israel, the true target was the U.S. economy. See footnote 7, *infra*.

⁴ In the Spring of 1995, on ABC’s *This Week with David Brinkley*, Democratic Sen. Bill Bradley of New Jersey and former Trade Representative Carla Hills, warned that America could get hurt by playing hardball with Japan. Last minute intense negotiations were taking place in Geneva. As negotiations approached the June 28th deadline, Japan opened personal attacks against U.S. lead negotiator, Mickey Kantor. Japan’s chief negotiator, Ryutaro Hashimoto, was someone who was an open foe of the United States. He, as chairman of the Japan War Bereaved Families Association, fiercely opposed apologies for Japan’s wartime actions. He represented Japan in U.S. trade negotiations. He gave up nothing. So when Kantor presented Hashimoto with a kendo bamboo marital arts sword as a gift, Hashimoto, according to the news reports, “brandished the sword, known as a shinai, under Kantor’s nose with a broad smile, he then handed it to an aide....” If this wasn’t insult enough for Kantor and the U.S., Hashimoto told the world media that “...arguing with Kantor is “more scary than even my wife when I come home drunk.”

⁵ The *New York Times* noted the consequence of the covert agenda against the U.S. dollar when on March 8, 1995, it noted that Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin “was forced to spend hours on the telephone today with finance ministers around the world amid growing concern in Washington that

historical political influence in Japan where it thereafter assured that the Japanese leadership was one compliant with New World Order interests. However, the memory of the way Bush 41 was treated in Japan during his trip to Tokyo in January 1992, with the Japanese parading a monkey in the streets of Tokyo to reflect their sentiment toward the President, and then his keeling over during a dinner, was never far from the memory of the Bush family. Now, after allowing China to prosper under a major policy of appeasement, to prepare them economically to join the new world order foray, the United States saw Iraq take the first step in a new effort to undermine the U.S. dollar, where Saddam Hussein would only accept euros in payment for Iraqi oil.⁶ Now, the campaign began to spread to where both Iran and Venezuela were prepared to follow the same course followed by Saddam. Thus, the United States concluded that China, under Jiang Zemin's steerage, would gain undeserved power and prestige in the Middle East, effectively locking out historical U.S. influence in the region, and something had to be done to preclude an attack on the U.S. economy via the U.S. dollar and thus on the U.S., resulting in the type of mayhem and damage witnessed by Israel.^{7 8}

further instability might threaten both the nation's prestige and the dollar's position as the pre-eminent reserve currency." By April 19, 1995, concurrent with the deteriorating relationship between the U.S. and Japan the dollar was in a near crisis status. The *New York Times* on that date noted: " More traders and analysts worry now that the weak dollar is at last beginning to pull down stocks and bonds with it. While no steep fall of all three markets together has yet occurred, the fear that the dollar's weakness could sour other much healthier markets makes analysts and Government officials concerned that its fall could precipitate a crisis."

⁶ On October 27, 2000, in a small blurb carrying enormous implications, The *New York Times* noted: "**EURO RISES.** The euro rose on speculation that Iraq's demand that its oil exports be sold for euros rather than dollars will bolster the currency. In New York, the euro settled at 82.96 cents, up from 82.81 cents on Wednesday. The euro currently trades well above par with the U.S. dollar. The Bush administration made it clear that it carried no historical reservation about the techniques it would deploy to quiet this danger, made manifest in its support in 2002 for regime change in Venezuela. See footnote 13, *infra*. However, now it becomes clearer day-by-day that brutal tactics and techniques tend to backfire. Not only was Bush 43 unsuccessful in regime change in Venezuela, not only did he fail to complete the true covert scope of the mission in waging war against Iraq, but on April 15, 2003 the *Wall Street Journal* reported: "According to Ibrahim Ado-Kurwa, an independent Nigerian Muslim scholar and writer from Kano, many Muslims think that the antidollar, pro euro campaign must continue beyond the Iraq war. He argues that pressing for adoption of the euro is the only way ordinary people can fight the U.S. 'Muslims, as we can see, don't have a fighting chance in a military campaign against America.' Said Mr. Ado-Kurwa. "So our fight must be economic and it will take time." The same *Wall Street Journal* article further noted: "Still, the common European currency has presented the first real competitor to the dollar in world markets since the modern system of international exchange was adopted in 1944. If the euro maintains its strength over time, big oil producers could begin denominating their sales in euros, or at least away from dollars, toward a basket of other currencies without suffering much, if any, economic pain, say some economists. Over the long term, "It would be a great mistake not to treat the threat seriously," saying Robert Mundell, a Columbia University professor whose research provided much of the theoretical foundation for the establishment of the euro."

⁷ When Israel first encountered the escalation in 2002 in suicide bombings, it was first remiss in realizing that the strategic goal was to compromise the Israeli economy. By curtailing tourism, committing Israel to call up reserve troops, and demoralizing the nation with a generalized state of fear, it could undermine the state by damaging its economy. As a net result, Israel once identifying the true agenda, enlisted additional financial assistance from the U.S. to counter the strategy. Naturally, the U.S., if faced with the same agenda via an attack on the U.S. dollar to extirpate its role as the international reserve

SECOND PLATEAU

Regarding the second plateau, the President of the United States was surrounded after his controversial Presidential victory with a dominating cabal of advisors, aligned with the oil and defense cartels, who admitted after the war that as far as they were concerned they wanted to cajole the U.S. to attack prior to the events of 9-11⁹, admitting that their plans required a 9-11, thus supporting the brazen proposition proffered in the President's post 9-11 [National Security Strategy](#) ("NSS", September 20, 2002), calling for pre-emptive actions against any country or party *perceived* to be a present or future enemy of the United States (especially it seemed against those sitting on dominant world oil reserves).¹⁰

currency, could not enlist similar relief from any other source. Therefore, it had to deal head on with the perceived attack, as it ultimately did with Japan. Here the U.S. moved against Iraq, and also as discussed herein, set its sights on Iran.

⁸ Ironically, contrary to the help Bush 41 did not get from Prime Minister Miyazawa, Prime Minister Koizumi attempts to offer help to Bush 43: "Some analysts even suggest that Mr. Koizumi is politically shrewd for trying to weaken the yen now - Japan has spent a record 13 trillion yen (\$119 billion) buying dollars this year - rather than in 2004, when Mr. Bush will have to face voters on the campaign trail. If Japan's strategy succeeds and a broader economic recovery takes hold, then Mr. Koizumi will be able to back off on exchange rates next year, giving Mr. Bush some political breathing room." *New York Times*, **IN JAPAN, BUSH FACES TOUGH SELL ON THE DOLLAR**, October 15, 2003.

⁹ Thomas Friedman as cited by [Haaretz](#) in April 2003 declared: "It's a war the neo-conservatives marketed. Those people had an idea to sell when September 11 came, and they sold it. Oh boy, did they sell it. So this is not a war that the masses demanded. This is a war of an elite."

Therefore he eloquently expressed the change in attitude in the current administration from any administration before it by writing on March 9, 2003, in the *New York Times* as follows: "I went to President Bush's White House news conference on Thursday to see how he was wrestling with the momentous issue of Iraq. One line he uttered captured all the things that are troubling me about his approach. It was when he said: "When it comes to our security, we really don't need anybody's permission." The first thing that bothered me was the phrase, "When it comes to our security . . ." Fact: The invasion of Iraq today is not vital to American security. Saddam Hussein has neither the intention nor the capability to threaten America, and is easily deterrable if he did. This is not a war of necessity. ***Because if Mr. Bush acts unilaterally, I fear America will not only lose the chance of building a decent Iraq, but something more important -- America's efficacy as the strategic and moral leader of the free world. A story. In 1945 King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia met President Franklin D. Roosevelt on a ship in the Suez Canal. Before agreeing to meet with Roosevelt, King Abdul Aziz, a Bedouin at heart, asked his advisers two questions about the U.S. president: "Tell me, does he believe in God and do they [the Americans] have any colonies?" The real question the Saudi king was asking was: how do these Americans use their vast power? **Like the Europeans, in pursuit of colonies, self-interest and imperium, or on behalf of higher values? That's still the most important question for U.S. national security.** ***Think about F.D.R. He had just won World War II. **America was at the apex of its power. It didn't need anyone's permission for anything.** Yet, on his way home from Yalta, confined to a wheelchair, F.D.R. traveled to the Mideast to meet and show **respect** for the leaders of Ethiopia, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. Why? Because he knew he needed them not to win the war, but to win the peace (emphasis supplied)."

¹⁰ The escalation of Chinese influence in the Middle East caused real US concern when China forged a new relationship in Venezuela after the failed coup. The following news article, **CHINESE PREMIER MEETS VENEZUELAN FOREIGN MINISTER**, shows the reasons for concern: " December 3, 2002: China and

Venezuela have seen frequent exchanges of high-level visits, enhanced trade and economic cooperation and closer consultations and coordination in international affairs in recent years, Chinese Premier Zhu Rongji said Monday. Zhu made the remark in a meeting with Venezuelan Foreign Minister Roy Chaderton Matos, giving high evaluation of the development of bilateral relations since China and Venezuela forged diplomatic ties. He mentioned in particular the visits between Chinese President Jiang Zemin and Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez in April and May last year, which defined a strategic partnership for common development for the two nations in the new century. China values its relationship with Venezuela, and pledges continued efforts to further friendly ties, Zhu said. Chaderton praised China's achievements since his last visit 21 years ago, saying the country is building its future in line with its magnificent blueprint. He said Venezuela attaches importance to developing relations with China, and the two countries' long-term friendship and strategic partnership will benefit both peoples. Chaderton conveyed President Chavez's greetings to Zhu, who asked to send his regards to the president, and also expressed condolence on the casualties caused by a blaze in Venezuela's capital Caracas last night.

The source of the article suggests a message to U.S. authorities: **People's Daily Online** --- <http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/> , especially so since China to the knowledge of the U.S. made similar inroads in Iran, Syria, Lebanon and Egypt.

China had already cited its displeasure with the NSS as follows: Xinhua: September 23, 2002, **MILITARY SUPREMACY AT CORE OF US SECURITY GOALS WASHINGTON: Now it is final: The Cold War strategy of deterrence is dead, the United States can take pre-emptive action against hostile states or terrorist groups when it sees fit.** This aggressive strategy and the clear target of maintaining US military supremacy in the world were at the core of the first national security strategy adopted by the Bush administration. The White House released the strategy document on Friday. In the 33-page document, Bush said the task of defending the United States against its enemies - "the first and fundamental commitment of the Federal Government" - has changed dramatically since the country now faces a new type of threat. **In the past, enemies needed great armies and great industrial capabilities to endanger the United States, the document said. "Now, shadowy networks of individuals can bring great chaos and suffering to our shores for less than it costs to purchase a single tank."** The grave danger the United States faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology, the document said. Therefore, the United States should seek to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and adopt a new strategy in the new security environment. "Traditional concepts of deterrence will not work against a terrorist enemy" who is "stateless and targets innocents," the document said. To forestall or prevent hostile acts by the enemies, "the United States will, if necessary, act pre-emptively," it said. It was widely believed that Bush's strategy of pre-emptive strikes was shaped by the September 11 terrorist attacks. **The international community has cast doubts over the concept of pre-emption, saying it contradicts the concept of self-defence defined by the United Nations Charter and would encourage other countries to take actions against their rivals without clear threat.** Nowadays, the world is nervously watching the intensified debate in the United States about a possible "pre-emptive" strike against Iraq, which Washington accuses of seeking weapons of mass destruction. **The consequence of such a strategy has yet to unfold.** *In its national security strategy, the Bush administration shows no desire to hide its intention of consolidating a unipolar world by maintaining its military superiority. "The United States must and will maintain the capability to defeat any attempt by an enemy - whether a state or non-state actor - to impose its will on the United States, our allies, or our friends," the document said. "Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equalling, the power of the United States."* Compared with the last national security strategy published by former US President Bill Clinton at the end of 1999, the new US strategy shares the goal of maintaining the US position as the only superpower in the world, but adopts different approaches. While the Bush administration pinpointed terrorism as the biggest threat to the United States, the former Clinton administration regarded global economic problems as the biggest threat facing the country. Although the Clinton strategy stated that the United States "must always be prepared to act alone," it did not use the word pre-emption. Another sharp difference lies in the attitudes of the two administrations towards international treaties. The Clinton administration saw international treaties including those on arms control and nonproliferation as "essential elements" of the national security strategy. But the Bush strategy dismisses most of those efforts, arguing that the nonproliferation effort has failed and celebrating the administration's withdrawal from the Antibalistic Missile Treaty last year (emphasis supplied).

Richard Perle de facto declared on *Meet the Press*¹¹ that that while there was overseas terrorism prior to 9-11 and there were plans of continued terrorism, the Bush administration could not go forward with the extreme agenda espoused by the National Security Strategy, which Perle thought the President should have had the courage to undertake prior to 9-11, until there was an incident of major DOMESTIC terrorism. Ipso facto, there was a group in the administration who were waiting, plans in hand, for successful implementation of major domestic terrorism to allow them to push forward an agenda in contravention to U.S. precedent, to wit: **preemptive regime and culture change against countries perceived to be a current or future threat**. The real giveaway however is that when implementing a campaign against terrorism, the United States had no reason to contravene its historical and constitutional mandate by asserting to the world through the NSS and the President of the United States that it intended to pursue both regime and culture change. In fact, this brazen course initiated itself with Bush 41, who, once seeing the Soviet Union dismantled, sought someone more compliant with the New World Order agenda than Gorbachev. Thus Bush 41 stood by, as Bush 43 sought to do in Venezuela, when a coup effectuated regime change in Russia, replacing Gorbachev with a more compliant Boris Yeltsin. This regime change allowed Bush 41 to extirpate Communism from Russia, and likewise now Bush 43, seeking to follow in his father's footsteps, moves for regime change in several states in the Middle East to eradicate Islamic fundamentalism.

The neo-conservatives desired to control, for national security interests, as defined by the NSS, *the entire Middle East region*¹². Thus, without

¹¹ NBC transcript excerpt (February 23, 2003): MR. PERLE: Excuse me, the lesson of September 11 was that you shouldn't have been voting on September 12 because we should have acted against al-Qaeda before that. We saw the camps. We heard the communications. We knew that they were planning additional acts of terror as they had undertaken previous acts of terror. **And we waited**. We failed to take action in a timely manner and the congressman is now saying that we have to wait. REP. KUCINICH: Are you saying that to be critical of President Bush? Is that what you're saying? MR. PERLE: **I'm critical of the failure to recognize the threat** that Osama bin Laden posed before— everything we did after September 11 could have been done before September 11. But if we had proposed doing that, I have no doubt the congressman would say, "There's no evidence. There's no imminent threat (emphasis added)."

¹² The following article by Margo Kingston on September 22, 2002, reflects the global critical perspective to what they read in the National Security Strategy ([Manifesto for world dictatorship](#)):

"Now we know. The Americans have spelt it out in black and white. There will be a world government, but not one even pretending to be comprised of representatives of its nation states through the United Nations. The United States will rule, and not according to painstakingly developed international law and norms, but by what is in its interests. In declaring itself dictator of the world, The United States will have no accountability to non-United States citizens. It will bomb who it likes when it likes, and change regimes when and as it sees fit, it will not be subject to investigations for war crimes, for torture, or for breaches of fundamental human rights. When it asks the United Nations to move against Iraq, it is not demanding agreement to a strong case for action. It now admits it has no evidence that Iraq is preparing to use weapons of mass destruction against any other country. The Americans have stopped pretending,

equivocation, the anticipated use of WMD by Saddam would provide a required *second platform of moral outrage* to move against Syria and Iran under the unilateral precepts of the National Security Strategy.¹³

and now demand outright capitulation to its hegemony. The world will be policed in American interests. Full stop. So now American history screams from background discussion to the forefront of debate. The Americans - despite their promises to be a benevolent dictatorship, do not aim to build, stabilise, and promote democracies. They aim to impose puppets, and agree to Faustian deals which brutalise and disempower citizens. They pay no heed to the disastrous results of such dictatorships when imposed in the past. Australia's choice is to become a non-enfranchised satellite state of the United States - and thus responsible for its aggression and a legitimate target for those fighting to win back countries the Americans take by force, or to fight like hell to save the United Nation's dream of world government by negotiation. The United Nations itself - the dream of multilateral solutions to problems only the world acting together can solve, is on the brink of collapse. This could be one hell of a debate, and I can't see Labor going for American unilateralism and the crushing of the UN. Yes, it's true, much of the sentiment against United State's behaviour is anti-American. It's also pro-Australian, French, or whatever country you feel you belong to. The stunning New York Times scoop - publishing President Bush's new national security strategy, to be given to Congress - is a frightening document. But as David Plumb said in *The Crusade's progress*, "It is time to stop being outraged by the directness and aggression of realpolitik". What can the rest of the world do? "

¹³ President Bush despite no use of WMD still moved to enlist support for a campaign against Syria and Iran. He argued that there was a need to assure democracy in the Middle Eastern countries, and he included Egypt in the scope of the discussion. See footnote 23, *infra*. This controversial inclusion suggested the same dynamic Bush 41 faced in the dissolution of the Soviet Union. While Mikhail Gorbachev was instrumental in its collapse, regime change was needed to obtain a leadership that would better play into the new world order agenda. *The excuse is nearly always the need to quickly bring democracy, but the Bush administration's legerdemain in deploying the argument was made evident in the way he supported regime change in oil-laden Venezuela.* Andrew Redding who directs the Americas Project of the World Policy Institute in New York wrote on April 19, 2002 for the *Pacific News Service*: "None of these {Latin American} Presidents has much sympathy for Chavez. Most would love to see him removed from office at the ballot box. But they all understand there is something far more important at stake - development of respect for democracy and the rule of law in a region long vulnerable to military over throws of elected governments. **By aligning himself with a failed coup, President Bush has done incalculable damage to long-term U.S. interests in Latin America.** He has made it seem that ensuring a steady supply of Venezuelan oil means more to Washington than the future of constitutional government in Latin America. **Once again, U.S. support for democracy in Latin America is seen as hollow: only in cases where its friends are elected does support materialize.**"** Like Bush himself, Pedro Carmona, the interim president who was backed by the White House, is a former oil executive. Until recently, he headed the country's most prominent big business lobbying organization. Carmona lent substance to the worst caricatures of the United States - and President Bush in particular - as an ally of wealthy foreign elites with despotic tendencies. In just one day in power, Carmona suspended the constitution, dismissed Congress and the supreme court, and dispatched security forces to arrest cabinet members and members of Congress. **In other words, he did more harm to the constitutional order in one day than Chávez had done in years (emphasis added).**

In an editorial entitled [W'S VENEZUELA DISGRACE](#), the hypocrisy of claims of democracy to pursue militaristic preemptive solutions explained the new levels of disrespect for the U.S.: "The Bush administration disgraced the USA's commitment to democracy and also bungled relations with one of our top oil suppliers when it embraced the April 12 military/business coup against Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez. Congress must step up to investigate what role the Bush administration played in the abortive coup that tried to replace the populist Chávez with a business-oriented dictator more palatable to the Bush White House."** The irony that Bush, who was put in office by the Supreme Court in 2000 after he lost the popular vote, would lecture Chávez, who was overwhelmingly elected in 1998, is not lost on other nations who are used to self-righteous rhetoric from the norteamericanos."** On the day Carmona claimed power, Reich summoned ambassadors from Latin America to his office. When the representative from Brazil said his country could not condone a rupture of democratic rule in Venezuela, Reich reportedly responded that the ouster of Chávez was not a rupture of democratic rule because he had resigned and was "responsible for his fate." Reich said the US would support the Carmona

Unfortunately for this cabal of planners, their plans were uprooted when the statistically improbable and then, to their minds, impossible occurred on the primary and back up dimensions. *On the first dimension, Saddam did not use WMD. On the secondary back up dimension, no WMD could be found inside Iraq.*

The one scenario the Pentagon could not factor correctly was the one seen, an impotent Iraq, sitting defenseless, *not deploying WMD* and in the worse case scenario *having none to be found*. The plans of the neo-conservatives aligned with the oil cartel fell to the wayside, only able to secure Iraqi oil after seeing their attempt for regime change in Venezuela, fail.¹⁴ Thus, the U.S. in its initial panic to justify the platform it laid to the world for unilateral U.S. action, shifted from focusing on the use of WMD, to its discovery, to, in the last resort, allowing the President of the United States to take a position with legerdemain before the world that the one thing he is certain about is that Saddam had WMD programs, not stating that the truth of this assertion was that it was connected to a far earlier time.¹⁵ Moreover, in

government and other Latin American countries "had to support the new government," a diplomat told the New York Times. **But while 19 Latin American heads of state denounced the coup as a violation of democratic principles, only the Bush administration in the name of the USA endorsed the military action.** *Newsweek* reported in its April 29 issue that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was investigating contacts between US officials and the Venezuelan military officers involved in the botched takeover. Among those suspected of financing the plot is Gustavo Cisneros, a media tycoon and fishing buddy of former president George H.W. Bush. (Cisneros denies any role, *Newsweek* said. But Pedro Carmona, the president of Fedecámaras, the main national business confederation, who was sworn in as Chavez's replacement on April 12, was seen coming directly from Cisneros' office.) **After Chavez's reinstatement, US National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice warned Chávez to "respect constitutional processes (emphasis added)."**

Due to the failure of Iraq to deploy WMD, the Middle East leaderships now clearly know the full scope of the Bush design, and his Rose Garden remarks and NSS doctrines now turn to bite the Bush administration badly, the threat of a move to supplant the dollar with the euro increasingly real and sinister. Thus the Bush administration is desperate for the completion of the full scope of the mission, or else its failure will have dire implications for the U.S. and could unravel the New World Order agenda.

¹⁴ The fact that the U.S. moved immediately to guard and protect the oil fields, while allowing children to languish and die because hospitals were left unguarded and unprotected, with the concurrent destruction of historical Iraqi artifacts, did little to diminish the argument that the U.S. was out for the oil. The hypocrisy and true character of the Bush mission is also seen by oil company and U.S. complicity in Equatorial Guinea (see footnote 23, *infra*).

¹⁵ Tom Brokaw in an NBC television interview with President Bush in on April 24, 2003 had the courage to highlight the administration's deceit: BROKAW: One of the reasons you justified this war was that he {Saddam} posed a real threat to the U.S. If he couldn't defend his own country -- and we have not yet been able to find the WMD, which were not even launched in defense of Iraq, (President Bush: "Right"), was that threat overstated? PRESIDENT BUSH: "No, not at all." The consequence of the legerdemain was that both North Korea and Iran moved to augment their nuclear weapons program. These countries no doubt saw how the US manipulated Iraq into standing as a militarily inept nation, and Saddam's reward for compliance with UN mandates was to see Iraq subject to the devastation of "shock and awe" attacks, in what history can only record as an invasion.

this very regard, in the midst of war, on or about March 27, 2003, President Bush summoned British Prime Minister Tony Blair to Washington. It was clear that President Bush and his cabal of advisors were surprised, if not shocked, when Iraq did not deploy WMD at the most opportune moment of the campaign¹⁶, and one cannot stand blind that the Bush-Blair love fest cooled considerably since the time of this very trip. Moreover, it is also noteworthy to highlight that Prime Minister Blair subsequent thereto was subject to unrelenting attacks at home, all which could have been allayed, had at least WMD been discovered in Iraq.¹⁷

FROM TRANSCRIPT POLISH TV INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT BUSH ON MAY 31, 2003:

Q: But, still, those countries that didn't support the Iraqi Freedom operation use the same argument, weapons of mass destruction haven't been found. So what argument will you use now to justify this war? THE PRESIDENT: **We found the weapons of mass destruction. We found biological laboratories.** You remember when Colin Powell stood up in front of the world, and he said, Iraq has got laboratories, mobile labs to build biological weapons. They're illegal. They're against the United Nations resolutions, and we've so far discovered two. **And we'll find more weapons as time goes on. But for those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong, we found them (emphasis added).**

BUSH VOWS TO FIND WMD CRAWFORD, Texas (**May 3**) - President Bush said Saturday it is a matter of when - not if - weapons of mass destruction will be found in Iraq while suggesting that task is getting little help from Saddam Hussein's captured confederates. "We'll find them," Bush said of Iraq's suspected chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. "It'll be a matter of time to do so." Iraq's alleged possession of such weapons was Bush's main rationale for war, but none has been found since Saddam's government fell more than three weeks ago.

In discussing the third plateau, *infra*, the door is still open for the President under policies and techniques shown under the realm of this administration to still find them, especially in light of his visit in mid-November 2003 to England, but the dynamic will always be open, in contravention thereto, that if Saddam Hussein had such weapons, what purpose did they have if they were not deployed in defense of his country?

In another blow to the President, on [November 16, 2003](#), Anthony Cordesman, a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, reported that he found no evidence that Saddam Hussein tried to transfer weapons of mass destruction to terrorists.

¹⁶ See full discussion, pages 19-24, *infra*.

¹⁷ [BLAIR ADVISOR ADMITS THAT US AND UK WENT TO WAR FOR THE OIL](#), MAY 14, 2003: "International Development Secretary Clare Short quit the Cabinet Monday with a House of Commons speech lambasting Blair for a "control-freak style" that was concentrating power "into the hands of the prime minister and an increasingly small number of advisers who make decisions in private without proper discussion." "Increasingly those who are wielding power are not accountable and not scrutinized," she added. Blair and a group of young colleagues took leadership of the fractious Labor Party in the mid 1990s, jettisoned many of its long-held left-wing policies and led it to power in 1997 after 18 years in opposition. Criticisms of Blair's obsession with image have flourished ever since. His chief spin doctor, Alastair Campbell, is a household name and a satirists' favorite. Blair employs a raft of "special advisers" -- his office would not disclose how many -- among the 190 staff in his 10 Downing St. office. "The premiership in Britain has become much more presidential," said Anthony Seldon, editor of "The Blair Effect," a book about the prime minister. "No. 10 is 10 times bigger than it was 25 years ago."

How far was the Bush administration ready to go to implement its preferences for the Middle East as brazenly outlined by President Bush in his Rose Garden remarks on June 24, 2002?¹⁸ In view of the open affiliation between the

[BRITISH EX-PM MAJOR LAUNCHES FIERCE ATTACK ON BLAIR "SPIN"](#) October 24, 2003: "Former British prime minister John Major launched a stunning attack on his successor Tony Blair, accusing him of eroding the trust of the people and undermining parliament. In his first significant political intervention since retiring from parliament two years ago, the former Conservative leader denounced the Labour prime minister's manipulation of the media as "the pornography of politics". In a pamphlet published in Friday's right-wing Daily Telegraph, Major said Blair's apparent indifference to the views of parliament and cynical news management had "done immense damage to politics". "It is fatal to the conduct of policy if the word of any government is disbelieved until proven beyond doubt to be true," Major said. "The erosion of trust has now reached the point where it is undermining the ability of the government to call on the trust of the people," said Major, who was prime minister from 1990 until the Conservatives lost 1997 general elections to the Labour Party led by Blair. Major has up until now resisted requests for interviews since he retired from active politics. But in the pamphlet titled "The Erosion of Parliamentary Government", Major said: "Spin is the pornography of politics. It perverts. It is deceit licensed by the government." "Statistics massaged. Expenditure announced and reannounced. The record reassessed. Blame attributed. Innocence proclaimed. Black declared white: all in a day's work." Over the last year polls have shown voters losing trust in Blair especially over the war in Iraq, while his office has been accused of manipulating the media and obsessing over news management. In August, top aide Alastair Campbell stepped down as Blair's director of communications after becoming embroiled in a feud with the BBC over allegations the he "sexed up" a government dossier on Iraq and weapons of mass destruction."

¹⁸ President Bush's Rose Garden remarks on June 24, 2002, foreshadowed his intent to mold Arab/Islamic regimes to his perceived ideal for otherwise sovereign states, to allegedly modernize them within the ambit of the President's concept of democracy, while diluting democracy at home, with his National Security Strategy, inferring the US Constitution a putative impediment and irrelevant for this day and time. The Islamic world, it appears, wants to rid itself of US bullying even more than any thought of ridding itself of Israel, since the latter is not and never has been a tangible threat, and no threat whatsoever to Middle East culture.

Ron Paul in Congressional newsletter noted the following indicating the arrival of the "New America" (see also footnote 25, *infra*). "When the Constitution is called "irrelevant" during a televised hearing with 'gavel-to-gavel' coverage on C-SPAN, and the proceedings are also being recorded by the committee itself, yet neither the live broadcast nor the separate video record contain this statement due to "technical difficulties" - you can see why reasonable people believe in conspiracies. Just remember, it is the system that is so diabolical; good men and women too easily get caught up in it. That is why the Founders, in their inspired wisdom, put constitutional restraints not only on the central government, but also on our elected leaders - who can become intoxicated with their own power, as history is teaching us again.*** I'm going to tell you the full story behind the "no-longer-relevant-Constitution: statement that is so offensive. The proof of what happened is in the official transcript of the hearing where certain statements could not get "lost" due to "technical difficulties." The offensive comment is one of an increasing number of open assaults on the rule of law by those with the kind of ambition and agenda the Constitution was written to restrain. In one way, I'm glad it is out in the open. The televised hearings began on October 2nd. The subject was the resolution on the use of military force in Iraq. After a ten-day campaign to bring public opinion to bear the chairman of the International Relations Committee (IR) relented and agreed to have a hearing on the controversial resolution the White House wanted Congress to approve. In committee, I was determined to call a spade a spade. This "resolution to use military force" is a decision on whether or not to go to war. Of course everyone already knew that, but they just didn't want to be on record voting for an unpopular war. Ducking the responsibility with a resolution allowing the president to use force was politically appealing. There is always support for a popular war. But Members lack political courage to call an invasion of Iraq what it is - a war - with all the ugly images and consequences war invokes. After all, the election was right around the corner...

President's family and the oil industry, it appears quite far¹⁹. The Congress, media and manifestly the public accepted proffered administration

The proposed resolution on the use of force mentioned the United Nations 25 times. That was considered safe. Not once did it mention the Constitution. I do not look to the UN to find the authority for this sovereign nation to defend herself. I look to the U.S. Constitution. Article I, section 6, gives Congress (and only Congress) the authority to declare war. The "war power" may not, and should not, be transferred from the "people's house" to the president - the very transfer the White House's resolution attempted to achieve. Under U.S. law, the president, as commander-in-chief, has the authority to execute a congressionally declared war. It was almost noon on October 3, the second day of the hearings, when my turn came. Under the harsh glare of television lights, I offered a substitute amendment, that is, new language to entirely replace what was currently in the resolution to use force. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a clear-cut declaration of war." In the hush that fell over the room, I added that I was depending on the Chair to "make sure" my amendment "doesn't pass." Both the Chairman and the Ranking Member assured me they would do their best to defeat it. I reminded the committee of the words of James Madison, who in 1798 said, "The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in legislature." It was after that when the Chair stated that declaring war is "anachronistic, it isn't done anymore..." It was a jaw-dropping admission...but there was more.

The Chair went on to say that the Constitution has been "overtaken by events, by time" and is "no longer relevant to a modern society."

The Ranking Minority Member called the declaration of war "frivolous and mischievous." At least it was out in the open. Now surely the display of such disdain for their oath to "support and defend the Constitution" would light up Capitol Hill switchboards with angry callers!

1. Little did I know that no one watching the hearings over C-SPAN - not a single person of what statistically is an audience of several million Americans - even heard those inflammatory comments.
2. When my staff called C-SPAN to get a copy of the video record to document these outrageous statements, we were told "technical difficulties" prevented that portion of the proceedings from being recorded.
3. ...and that same portion of the proceedings was also the only part missing on the internal record the House makes of such official hearings. It was a thought it never happened. The Constitution is "irrelevant" in Washington in 2002? Not to this congressman and many millions of Americans!

19 Jonathan Steele writing for *The Guardian* proffered in March 2003: "The US has mounted numerous coups in the Middle East to topple regimes in Egypt, Iran and Iraq itself. It has used crises, like the last Gulf war, to gain temporary bases and make them permanent. In Lebanon it once shelled an Arab capital and landed several hundred marines. But never before has it sent a vast army to change an Arab government. Even in Latin America, in two centuries of US hegemony, Washington has never dared to mount a full-scale invasion to overthrow a ruler in a major country. Its interventions in the Caribbean and Central America from 1898 to 1990 were against weak opponents in small states. Three years into the new millennium, the enormity of the shift and the impact of the spectacle on Arab television viewers cannot be over-estimated. Is it an image of the past or future, they ask, a one-off throw-back to Vietnam or a taste of things to come? Blair sensed Arab suspicions about the fate of Iraq's oil when he persuaded Bush at their Azores summit to produce a "vision for Iraq" which pledged to protect its natural resources (they shrank from using the O word) as a "national asset of and for the Iraqi people". No neo-colonialism here. Unfortunately, the small print is different, as could be expected from an administration run by oilmen. Leaks from the state department's "future of Iraq" office show Washington plans to privatise the Iraqi economy and particularly the state-owned national oil company. Experts on its energy panel want to start with "downstream" assets like retail petrol stations. This would be a quick way to gouge money from Iraqi consumers. Later they would privatise exploration and development."

arguments, but albeit acquiescence the administration did undermine the fabric of the nation,²⁰ raising the serious specter of whose interests were now paramount to this Presidential administration: the interests of the United States as a sovereign country or the best interests of the New World Order, one world government?²¹

Thus this plan had to have a reach by necessity far beyond Saddam Hussein and WMD; far beyond the reach of occupying Iraq and securing a government by choice to the approval of the Bush administration. The initiation of war against Iraq – **had Iraq deployed WMD** -- would give the cabal the second platform of moral outrage to enter and occupy all Middle East countries declared to be covert and overt plotters and planners in supporting terrorist access to WMD to wit: Syria and Iran. So anxious was this cabal to move to satisfy the true scope of its plan and design that after the war, albeit no use of WMD or discovery thereof, they engaged in war mongering against Syria and Iran, with criticism arising globally against these provocative insinuations as a

Senator Byrd in Senate Floor remarks on or about May 21, 2003, poignantly detailed the following realities: “What has become painfully clear in the aftermath of war is that Iraq was no immediate threat to the U.S. Ravaged by years of sanctions, Iraq did not even lift an airplane against us. Iraq’s threatening death-dealing fleet of unmanned drones about which we heard so much morphed into one prototype made of plywood and string. Their missiles proved to be outdated and of limited range. Their army was quickly overwhelmed by our technology and our well trained troops.***Meanwhile, lucrative contracts to rebuild Iraq’s infrastructure and refurbish its oil industry are awarded to Administration cronies, without benefit of competitive bidding, and the U.S. steadfastly resists offers of U.N. assistance to participate. Is there any wonder that the real motives of the U.S. government are the subject of worldwide speculation and mistrust?”

The Senator previously that day relayed: “Regarding the situation in Iraq, it appears to this Senator that the American people may have been lured into accepting the unprovoked invasion of a sovereign nation, in violation of long-standing International law, under false premises. There is ample evidence that the horrific events of September 11 have been carefully manipulated to switch public focus from Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda who masterminded the September 11th attacks, to Saddam Hussein who did not. The run up to our invasion of Iraq featured the President and members of his cabinet invoking every frightening image they could conjure, from mushroom clouds, to buried caches of germ warfare, to drones poised to deliver germ laden death in our major cities. We were treated to a heavy dose of overstatement concerning Saddam Hussein’s direct threat to our freedoms. The tactic was guaranteed to provoke a sure reaction from a nation still suffering from a combination of post traumatic stress and justifiable anger after the attacks of 911. It was the exploitation of fear. It was a placebo for the anger.”

²⁰ The willingness to a. wage war b. change regimes c. mold cultures d. create the predicate for a police state (Patriot Act with further provisions already in place) e. contradict the U.S. Constitution (preemptive attacks on states perceived to be a threat) f. offer the appearance of a conflict of interest (awarding contracts to political friends and cronies without competitive bidding) g. and engage in a broad range of propaganda to initiate and service the war (Jessica Lynch), suggests that the U.S. Congress, media and public should not have been or be tolerant of such dynamics.

²¹ Drudge Report, September 26, 1999: NEXT CENTURY, AMERICA WILL NOT EXIST IN CURRENT FORM, 'ALL STATES WILL RECOGNIZE A SINGLE, GLOBAL AUTHORITY.' Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott believes the United States may not exist in its current form in the 21st Century -- because nationhood throughout the world will become obsolete! *This critical admission is amplified in discussion of the third plateau, infra.* Strobe Talbott was a key figure in government involved in all facets of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Communism.

prelude to further attack.²² The Bush administration ultimately declared that it had no intent to militarily enter or engage these countries albeit the Bush administration thereafter continued to mount new claims and efforts to support doing so, including the need to bring democracy to the Middle East regardless of the U.S.'s current relationship with the current regime, **putting both Saudi Arabia and Egypt into play under the NSS**,²³ the President

²² The UK Mirror on April 15, 2003 reported: "Lawrence Eagleburger, Secretary of State under George Bush Senior, said American public opinion would not tolerate action against Syria or Iran.***Washington hawks are spoiling for a fight with Syria and Iran following the collapse of the Iraqi regime.*** "If President Bush were to try it now, even I would feel he should be impeached. You can't get away with that sort of thing in a democracy." Tony Blair on April 4th announced that the U.S. carried no plan to attack Syria or Iran and on April 15, 2003, Bush, according to a *Guardian* report, confirmed Blair's posture to the press.

²³ November 6, 2003: WASHINGTON (Reuters) - **President Bush on Thursday challenged Iran and Syria and even key U.S. ally Egypt to adopt democracy and declared past U.S. policy of supporting non-democratic Arab leaders a failure.** *** Speaking to the National Endowment for Democracy, where President Ronald Reagan spoke on global democracy 20 years ago, Bush said U.S. policy spanning 60 years in support of governments not devoted to political freedom had failed and Washington had adopted a new, "**forward strategy of freedom in the Middle East.**" *** It was Bush's latest attempt to justify the invasion of Iraq as necessary to foster democracy in the region at a time when he is under fire for mounting U.S. troop casualties. He singled out Iran and Syria for particular criticism. The United States believes Iran's Islamic government is holding back a democratic movement and has been trying to build a nuclear weapon. Washington considers Syria a terrorist state. ***"**The regime in Tehran must heed the democratic demands of the Iranian people or lose its last claim to legitimacy,**" **Bush said.** *** Of Egypt, whose president, Hosni Mubarak has been a vital Middle East interlocutor for successive U.S. presidents, Bush said: "The great and proud nation of Egypt has shown the way toward peace in the Middle East and now should show the way toward democracy in the Middle East."

The US therefore is following a path deployed in Russia where Gorbachev served the purpose of peace, and then puppet Boris Yeltsin was deployed to serve the purpose of democracy, code word for regime and culture change outside the parameters of popular vote or opinion. President Bush thus confirms that the original scope of the mission was way beyond what he declared and consistent with both his National Security Strategy and Rose Garden remarks. This compels one to conclude that the agenda is far beyond a war against terrorism but one more than hinted at in the National Security Strategy, an agenda for world domination and control.

The cover of democracy has been transparent for some time as most recently displayed by CBS's 60 Minutes in a production entitled **THE KUWAIT OF AFRICA** -- Despite the tiny population and vast oil reserves, Equatorial Guinea is still a poor African country whose rulers are charged with being corrupt and repressive. West and Central African Catholic Bishops united in Equatorial Guinea have denounced the flagrant discrepancy between the oil wealth in several of the region's countries and the human misery experienced by the majority of its inhabitants. The bishops blame this on the "complicity" between oil companies and politicians in the region. The US quest for control of oil properties in Equatorial Guinea have been subject to many scathing assessments. See for example: [The Curious Bonds of Oil Diplomacy](http://www.gvnews.net/html/DailyNews/alert2778.html). <http://www.gvnews.net/html/DailyNews/alert2778.html>.

President Bush has given the oil cartel in Iraq coverage even beyond that enjoyed in Equatorial Guinea by allowing it by Executive order to do whatever it pleases under an absolute umbrella of protection. [See Executive Order Protecting the Development Fund for Iraq and Certain Other Property in Which Iraq Has An Interest](http://www.reclaimdemocracy.org/weekly_2003/oil_corporations_iraq_immunity.html) (EO 13303, May 22, 2003). One of the many criticisms of it can be read at: http://www.reclaimdemocracy.org/weekly_2003/oil_corporations_iraq_immunity.html and, regarding the legal facets thereof, at <http://www.earthrights.org/news/eo13303memo.shtml>.

seeking to complete the covert mission seeing himself on the eve of the next Presidential election in the quagmire he is in Iraq, which would not be the case had he been able to move against Syria and Iran had he had in hand a second platform of moral outrage.²⁴

Had WMD been deployed, the entire focus of the global community would have been on the horrific massive deaths suffered by U.S. troops. Before the dust settled from its use, hand selected new leaderships would have been in place in Iraq, Syria and Iran, without any global intervention and without the need to engage in the war mongering against Syria and Iraq witnessed since the time of the invasion that resulted in no use of WMD. Had any of the Middle East countries attacked Israel, causing death, destruction, and devastation to her, it would only have given the U.S. additional justification and opportunity to legitimize what everyone now can glean as the true scope of its agenda and mission in waging war against Iraq. This free ticket for instant regime changes would be the consequence of two recorded historic acts of declared terrorism against the U.S. The U.S. thereby could have circumvented completely any argument that it was an aggressor and would have postured itself as a multiple victim of terrorism. Moreover, none of this introspection would have seen the light of day, or if it did, it would have been summarily dismissed. **That Iraq did not use WMD and no WMD were to be found was the strategic defense to short circuit the full scope of the Bush administration's intended invasion.**

²⁴ Without the cover that the use of WMD would have provided, the truth of the invasion could unpeel. On May 20, 2003, the [New York Times](#) reported the following, revealing that Iraqis committed to the U.S. saw that the true scope of the U.S. agenda was far more than Saddam's removal or detection and confiscation of WMD:

BAGHDAD, Iraq, May 20 — Iraq's main political groups said tonight that they were drafting a formal statement of protest to the American and British authorities over their plans to declare an occupation authority in Iraq, which would delay the rapid turnover of sovereignty to an interim Iraqi government.*** Hoshyar Zebari, who was speaking for Massoud Barzani, the leader of the largest Kurdish faction, told Mr. Manning that the allies needed "a political partner" in Iraq, but warned that failure to fill the political vacuum with a functioning Iraqi government could incite a strong backlash in the Iraqi population and interference from neighboring states seeking to move into the void. Several speakers warned that the allies, in delaying the formation of an Iraqi government, would provide ammunition to former Baath Party supporters of Mr. Hussein who might contend that the worst fears of Iraqis were being realized: a takeover of Iraq and its oil by Western powers.*** But he also issued what seemed to be a warning that failure to create a sovereign government would backfire. "We do not want to make your presence here an issue," he said. Meanwhile, several former Iraqi opposition groups meeting in Berlin echoed their counterparts' complaints, saying they feared that the occupation authority could evolve into an open-ended ruling mandate. "If we don't give Iraq the sovereignty they need, this will create instability in Iraq and that instability will run through to the whole region as well," said Ali Bayati, the London representative for the Supreme Council for the Islamic Revolution in Iraq."

Thereby, the planned mission and agenda did not evolve or unravel, giving the U.S. the problems it faces in Iraq, without an exit strategy. Moreover, with the failure to achieve the second platform of moral outrage, allowing invasion of Syria and Iran, President Bush's Rose Garden remarks and his NSS have come full circle to bite him, and bite him badly, on the near eve of election, when troops are dying daily in Iraq.

THIRD PLATEAU

Regarding the third plateau, it is apparent that when the U.S. Congress, the media, and thereby the public at large, sit quietly when an administration creates the foundation for a police state, engages in a broad range of now admitted propaganda, seeks war, seeks to change the regimes and cultures of foreign countries, and also dilutes the relevancy of the Constitution by forging ahead with a preemption doctrine in contravention thereof; not to say allows itself to flaunt conflicts of interest and give patronage to its friends and political and business allies, that the United States of America has adopted and accepted a "New America."²⁵ The position reflecting the "Old America" can be seen at footnote 13 and by reading the other poignant addresses on the Senate floor by the Senator from West Virginia, Robert Byrd (offered in full on his web site).²⁶ When no wall of opposition arose under the legitimate "Old America" premises Senator Byrd offered, then America changed right then and there.

²⁵ Miami Herald, March 20, 2003: [WAR MARKS THE END OF AMERICA WE KNEW](#): "Because these events represent more than just the end of peace. **They are also the end of the America we have known. For better or for worse, a new nation will be born here. And it will be different from the one it supersedes.** For the first time in its history, the United States has claimed for itself -- and now puts into action -- a doctrine of preemption, the right to hit first any nation we suspect of hostile intent. *** It's a compelling argument, yes. But it has frightening implications, for it frees any nation to strike any other on the grounds that it perceives a threat. Indeed, it can be argued that the new doctrine gives thug nations an incentive to strike American interests first -- to preempt our preemption, in other words. But the new nation being born here is not just a product of the Bush Doctrine. It's also the product of Washington's recent taste for unilateral action. **As the old order passes,** it evidently takes with it any inclination on America's part to embrace a role of constructive leadership as part of the community of nations. Truth is, we have been rejecting that role since well before the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001.*** The country for which the world wept in September of 2001 is now the country much of the world fears. For many people, the most dangerous man on the planet is not Hussein, but Bush.***But beneath the veneer of normalcy we watch and wait and pray that Washington knows what it is doing. We need for George Bush to be right and those of us who are doubtful to be wrong. We need this for the sake of over 200,000 American servicemen and women who stand ready for war in deserts far from home. **And for the sake of a nation that stands more isolated than it has in generations.** Time will tell. In the meantime, bombs fall. Missiles fly. And in the thunder of their explosions, **the old** America passes. Those of us who loved her watch and weep from the doorstep of change. (Emphasis added)"

The argument that America is being held subservient to the best interests of the global community is adeptly discussed at **HOW TO DESTROY AMERICA** <http://sandiego.indymedia.org/en/2003/11/101793.shtml>

²⁶ http://byrd.senate.gov/byrd_speeches/byrd_speeches.html

Thus, the nation by its appointed representatives, committing itself to the new course, has supported a President that has irritated and alienated the rest of the world and thus now the U.S. has no choice, particularly under the first plateau, but to continue on to Syria and Iran. Should it not, it is highly problematic that it can prevail, even over time, in a war of attrition in Iraq. The religious commitment of those within Iraq, with the clandestine support of Syria and Iran, not to discount Saudi Arabia, assures no success for the Bush team and agenda. Thus, this would undermine those supporting the war under the second plateau. Moreover, here in the third plateau, it would prove a devastating blow to the deep commitment made for multi-polar central world government. Without control over OPEC oil pricing, and with the handwriting on the wall that one day the U.S. would leave Iraq, the predicate would exist for all those seeing themselves the target of Bush's NSS to move on the first plateau and immediately undermine the dollar by shifting their nation's wealth into the euro and enlisting payment for oil in the euro. Moreover, in doing so, they would only attest to other nations, even friendly nations, that there was no future for the dollar, and then two major events would lie ahead a. devaluation and b. removal of the dollar as the international reserve currency. Without control of the oil and with a successful sabotage of the U.S. dollar, New World Order globalization aims would be severely compromised and therefore if President Bush does not move for regime change in Syria and Iran, there is no way he can find genuine support for a second term from his new world order backers, and his failure in the mission will have dealt a serious blow to their agenda.²⁷

Thus, there was no surprise when the Congress, aside from granting the administration the \$87 billion it requested for Iraq, at the time of the finalization of this paper, passed the *Syria and Lebanese Accountability Act*, again giving the President another foundation to ultimately move against Syria and Iran.²⁸ Now, with his trip in mid-November 2003 to England, President Bush will unquestionably seek to convince Prime Minister Blair again of the importance of "finding" WMD. The Bush administration at this point is willing to take its chances. Finding WMD, even with the suspicions that will arise, is better than continuing on without finding it at all.

²⁷ This is of course aside from the reality that continued casualties in Iraq would pose an independent major problem for him in facing re-election in 2004. Thus, President Bush welcomed UN intervention after the war and now seeks to create a large local Iraqi police presence to shift the target from US troops to hopefully perceived benign local and UN personnel, to soften the growing political consequences to him.

²⁸ In an AFP report dated November 12, 2003, Senator Byrd said that he feared the *Syria Accountability and Lebanese Sovereignty Act* would be used to justify future military action against Damascus. "Such insinuations can only build the case for military action against Syria, which unfortunately is a very real possibility because of the dangerous doctrine of preemption created by the administration," he said.

However, it does appear that the Bush administration and now the country wish to buck heads with both biblical and secular history. While Rome, after seeing its own heyday pass, came to the conclusion that global conquest served the best interests of Rome's future, no doubt history clearly attests that such policy, enmeshed openly, as today, in corruption and cronyism,²⁹ is doomed to failure, after running a course of death and devastation.

Similar to the time of Rome, there appears, as part and parcel of a policy of global conquest, a need to separate people from God³⁰ and to look for solutions in an all powerful omniscient, omnipresent and unchallengeable central/universal government.

The problems faced by the U.S. today in Iraq and elsewhere do not connect to a war against terrorism, but a war against changing the culture of the region, part and parcel of the perceived movement to separate the region from its biblical roots and foundation. To show equal application of guiding principles, this agenda also applies to the U.S. and other countries incorporated by choice or otherwise into the new world order realm³¹.

²⁹ Source: Bill Moyer's NOW, [Public Broadcasting Network](#): "[Representative Henry Waxman \(D-CA\)](#) has complained that "USAID is refusing to provide basic information to members of Congress" while "the agency is portraying itself in public as fully cooperating with any and all requests for information."

On November 6, 2003, President Bush signed the \$87-billion emergency spending bill, but several provisions demanding increased transparency and accountability that were added as amendments (proposed by members of both parties) along the journey of the bill were dropped by House and Senate negotiators before it was finally passed into law. As explained by the nonpartisan citizens' lobbying group [Common Cause](#):

- "The Senate originally voted 97 to 0 to have the [General Accounting Office](#) conduct audits of the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) in Iraq. That provision was stripped in the conference committee on a party line vote."
- "Responding to the uproar about non-competitive bidding in Iraq, the House passed an amendment requiring competitive bidding on oil contracts. But that was also removed during a conference committee vote."
- "Congress in its final Iraq spending bill did not even include language offered by Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) to penalize war profiteers for defrauding American taxpayers. The Senate Appropriations Committee unanimously approved a provision to ensure that contractors who cheated the American taxpayer would face fines of up to \$1 million and jail time of up to 20 years. Senators of both parties supported the provision, but Republican House negotiators refused to include the language in the final bill."

³⁰ President Bush invokes the name of God to carry forth the policies and agenda herein described. Many find his and his cohorts casting his agenda, particularly one that seeks to separate the Islamic nations from their religious affiliations, due to the argument that such religiosity connects to terrorism, obscene, when one considers the agenda that has moved forward to separate Americans and Israelis from the same Judeo-Christian historical tenets, which more than coincidentally provided the foundation for true democracy, including the U.S.'s Bill of Rights.

³¹ Ambrose Evans-Pritchard writing for the *Telegraph* on October 23, 2003 noted:

"The European Union's elite are determined to destroy Europe's Christian heritage, Italy's reform minister, Umberto Bossi said yesterday. He described the elite as "filthy pigs" who wanted to "make paedophilia as easy as possible". Mr Bossi, leader of the Northern League, said Brussels was "transforming vices into virtues" and "advancing the cause of atheism every day"."

The following headline would have been impossible to imagine only a generation ago. **CANADIAN HATE-CRIMES BILL SPARKS BIBLE, KORAN ROW OTTAWA**, May 16 (Reuters) - An attempt to broaden Canada's hate-crimes laws to include protection for homosexuals has sparked a fierce debate in Parliament *over whether the Bible and the Koran could be branded as hate literature* (emphasis added).

The public assertion that the bible could represent hate literature in succinct fashion highlights the change in culture effectuated by the new world order design including the USA as adeptly portrayed by the following graphic and its contents from America-on-Line:



If the modus operandi of the new world order agenda could implicate religion as an impediment to its design in the U.S. who could argue with its legitimacy in doing so in the Middle East? Its design already has been implemented against the State of Israel, as noted on August 31, 2003, by Avraham Burg, speaker of Israel's Knesset from 1999 to 2003, in writing as follows regarding the biblical regression of his country: **"Our Jewish minds are as sharp as ever. We are traded on the NASDAQ. But is this why we created a state? The Jewish people did not survive for two millennia in order to pioneer new weaponry, computer security programs or anti-missile missiles. We were supposed to be a light unto the nations. In this we have failed."**

The new world order agenda that operates under the cover of claimed movement of states to democratic principles, highlighting the need for open elections, fails to highlight its covert design that such process is only acceptable to it when all the candidates running for office are approved and to the favor of those behind the agenda. See footnote 13, *supra*. Thus elections in Iraq are fine as long as the US approves of the candidates. To show again the fairness in the application of this standard, it appears to also apply in the United States, where those out of line with the new world order standard face severe obstacles in receiving support. When Bill Clinton won the Presidency from Bush 41, he was a failed President in his first 100 days in office, and thereafter when furthering the new world order design, his popularity and success as a President soared, until he faced the scandals that compromised his Presidency.

The key issue however is to confront the claim of the Bush administration that it seeks to bring the Middle East into the new millennium, to save it from falling behind the technological progress achieved and brought to the rest of the world; that their customs and cultures are oppressive to the type of freedoms and rights enjoyed by those aligned with the new world order track.

This raises the question whether the children of Rome were better off because of their advancements than the children of less fortunate cultures? The truth of the matter is that the children of the U.S. have under the influence of the new world order been inundated with negative messages and lifestyles. Agnosticism and hedonism are on par with Rome in keeping people focused on the rewards and message of government. Religious cultures inculcate hope and future opportunity, equality and justice,

The consequences of accepting the current course leading to the “New America” can be gleaned in looking more deeply into the facets of the Bush failing in Iraq. It defies description or understanding that a claimed advanced and educated population would want to stand oblivious to a government that represents ultimately an oppressive if not a failed future for them and their descendants.

The failure in the Bush plan is attributable to one reason and one reason alone: the failure in the interpretation that Saddam in the first instance would use WMD and in the worst-case scenario, if not, that WMD would be found. To his credit, Prime Minister Blair to date has resisted finding a solution outside the pale of democratic leadership, highlighting the need to identify and question the policies, tactics, techniques of the current administration, rejected by history, and which lead to heightened levels of abuse and corruption, and ultimately failure for all those involved and concerned.

News reports concurrent with the imminent and actual invasion were replete with stories of the anticipated use of WMD and how the Pentagon had prepared troops accordingly. No doubt the cabal anxious to initiate the second platform of moral outrage provided President Bush on March 19, 2003, with intelligence where he authorized the launch of thirty six missiles and two bunker buster bombs to take out the Iraqi leadership, said to include Saddam’s two sons, before the US commenced ground troop movement.³²

By next morning, Washington time, President Bush learned that the missile strikes did not pay off as anticipated. However, what is important to focus upon is that within thirty five minutes of the strike, Iraq commenced a military response, and U.S. troops, remaining static and dormant in Northern Kuwait for some 24 hours after the war commenced, needed to don on and off protective gear numerous times. U.S. troops were thereby sitting targets, without any standing order to move against Iraq. What is thereby manifest is that the launch on March 19th encouraged Iraq to respond militarily, when US troops were clustered in Northern Iraq. After Iraq eviscerated itself militarily in complying with US influenced UN mandate to do so, the **fourth question**

attributes that never served Rome and that seemingly are inapposite to the agenda described and in play.

³² On March 19th at about 3:00PM Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz, Myers, at the Pentagon, were said to receive intelligence, reliable intelligence, that Saddam Hussein was at an identifiable location in Bagdad. Between 3:30 and about 6:30 PM the war council, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Powell, Rice, Card and Myers discussed whether to depart from the planned coordinated military plans to start the war. At 7:12 PM Bush gave the order to launch. *The Guardian* wrote on March 21, 2003, **SHORT CUT MOVE FAILS**: “It was a difficult call to make. The US war plan depended on striking multiple targets simultaneously in an attempt to reduce the chances of President Saddam responding by blowing up oil fields **or mounting missile attacks on US-led forces gathered over the border in Kuwait.**” The attack commenced at about 9:00PM Washington time. He addressed the nation at 10:15 PM. At 6:00 AM Conodoleezza Rice told him the big gamble had not come off.

arises: what assets did Iraq have to counter the US invasion?³³ The Bush administration all along attested to the anticipated, the expected, deployment of WMD by Iraq, and thus what were U.S. troops sitting there to think when they are directed to repeatedly go into a “MOPP-2” level” requiring them to put on a gas mask, charcoal-lined jacket and pants, rubber boots and rubber gloves in the scorching desert heat, awaiting word of their purpose in sitting there stagnant and stationary after war commenced?³⁴ Televised field interviews with lower level commanding officers in Northern Kuwait showed them mystified why they were kept sitting there putting on and removing several time a day considerable gear to deflect WMD, with what they themselves saw as the commencement of war.

When a government uses its military in such a horrid fashion³⁵, and has no good reason to explain why troops are kept as sitting ducks for Iraqi response

³³ April 15, 2003: **WHAT DID THE WAR ACCOMPLISH?** “In the midst of the jubilation that greeted the downfall of Saddam Hussein (or at least of his statue) and the smug triumphalism that enveloped Washington as U.S. troops marched through the Iraqi capital, Americans might be well advised to sober up and take a harder look at what their government has already done and what it may soon do — in Syria, Iran, or other countries that the war party is already itching to clobber. The war party, of course, is composed of American Likudniks in the Bush administration and neo-conservative media, as well as a good many citizens who can't spell Likudnik but are inclined to confuse chest-thumping about military victories over third-rate Third World armies with real patriotism. After spreading what apparently were just plain lies about Saddam's "weapons of mass destruction" — not a one of which has yet surfaced either in combat or afterwards — the armchair warriors are now claiming that Iraq has been "liberated." Certainly the brutal rule of a tyrant, Saddam Hussein, has ended, but even if he had possessed and used weapons of mass destruction, could the carnage have been any greater than what we have already inflicted on Iraq? The New York Times last week reported that the "Number of Iraqis Killed May Never Be Determined," as its headline read. In Basra alone, local hospitals report handling "between 1,000 and 2,000 corpses in three weeks of war." A Marine officer reported that the Baghdad Division of the Iraqi army was reduced to "zero percent fighting strength." That means, presumably, it was wiped out — some 10,000 soldiers. Those are just combat deaths. There are also deaths from bombing and artillery, and not all are dead, merely crippled for life. What was the purpose of unleashing this kind of savagery against a country that had never attacked the United States or harmed any American? "The principal reason for going after Hussein," Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, the administration's Likudnik in Chief and probably the main architect of the war, told the Washington Post last week, "was the direct threat the Iraqi leader posed to U.S. national security through his possession of weapons of mass destruction." “What "threat"? When did Saddam ever utter any such threat? And what weapons? This weekend, Iraqi general and chief scientist Amir Saadi said after surrendering that Iraq has no such weapons, which is what he said before the war. Maybe there are some even he doesn't know about, but there's no trace of them so far, **and why didn't Saddam use them against U.S. forces in his last stand, to save his life or his power? If he was unwilling to unleash mass destruction against an invading army, why would he have wielded it against this country? (Emphasis added).**

³⁴ **ON THE FRONT LINES**, *Atlanta Constitution*, March 21, 2003, “The American soldiers stationed in the Kuwaiti desert are eager for the wait to be over...as Iraq retaliated with some missiles of its own.”

³⁵ The author addressed the following point on July 4, 2002, *some eight months before the start of the war*: “While we achieve the stated goal of eliminating the threat of the use of nuclear and biological agents in battle, if the regimes are overthrown per US efforts, *the replacement regimes will secularize the subject countries diluting Islam*. This is an intended or unintended end, which the Qu'ran proscribes and demands, unbridled resistance. Thus, the US quagmire. However, from US statements since 9-11 **it has become clear that part of the US agenda is to mold the Islamic world to its perception of its place**

after it encourages Iraqi military response, *when the government itself is expecting the use of WMD*, as attested to by the training given the troops and directives to put on and take off protective gear in such regard, it leads many to focus on the reality that despite promises by President Bush for a full investigation of 9-11 that none was ever truly forthcoming,³⁶ with those in

in the new world order. Thus, we continue to fear the worst. The United States and Israel stood deliberately aloof for a decade while under the protection of the Oslo process Arafat instilled hatred for Jews and Israel into the Palestinian people. The United States knew that to uproot the recent peace initiative where it was moving to claimed success that it would only take one major terrorist deed to undermine it. As it were, it took two sequential Jerusalem bus bombings. Since it was -- in accord with our analysis -- so easy to uproot the recent US peace process, **the only conclusion is that the US knew it was easy to uproot, expected it to be uprooted, and WANTED it to be uprooted.** The only reason therefor was to escalate the Middle East to promote terrorist groups and cells to move against Americans and American targets. **Why? Again, if a massive terrorist deed is committed against Americans and/or American interests, Bush can forge ahead with moral outrage to take out the current regimes in Iraq, Syria and Iran, and possibly Saudi Arabia."**

The author, on February 23, 2003, one month prior to the war, declared, from extrapolating the current administration's willingness to pursue government behavior rejected by history, that troops in fact may prove to be essential pawns to effectuate a second plane of moral outrage: "If you see massive deaths of America's youth in the military, trained to the highest standard, acclaimed and applauded by those sending them to face the open portal of bioterrorism, just remember how in the past those slaughtered were misdirected as they were sent to their own deaths as part of their victimization, if not outright slaughter for some. These soldiers are cleansed with the brush of patriotism, believing that if there was anything wrong with the President's orders and course that there are those in Congress and in the civil population that would speak up! While the process is much cleaner today, the elitist centrix gaining in sophistication and improving their techniques for implementation of their design, showing tremendous patience and discipline in implementing their course and design, the consequence is the same: **here the putative decimation of the US military, by either death or demoralization, or both, as a critical step to the weakening of the United States of America."**

On October 29, 2003 UPI reported: "[SICK SOLDIERS WAIT FOR TREATMENT](#) FORT KNOX, Ky., Oct. 29 (UPI) -- More than 400 sick and injured soldiers, including some who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom, are stuck at Fort Knox, waiting weeks and sometimes months for medical treatment, a score of soldiers said in interviews. **The delays appear to have demolished morale -- many said they had lost faith in the Army and would not serve again** -- and could jeopardize some soldiers' health, the soldiers said.

Further signs of a campaign of demoralization: **SICK, WOUNDED U.S. TROOPS HELD IN SQUALOR** FORT STEWART, Ga., Oct. 17 (UPI) -- Hundreds of sick and wounded U.S. soldiers including many who served in the Iraq war are languishing in hot cement barracks here while they wait -- sometimes for months -- to see doctors. **NO MORE MEAL BILLS FOR HOSPITALIZED TROOPS** From Jamie McIntyre CNN Washington Bureau WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Wounded service members in U.S. military hospitals will no longer be presented with a bill for meals upon discharge, the Pentagon said Wednesday. [US SOLDIERS TO AMERICA: BRING US HOME NOW](#) 13 October 2003, 10:29 am US Soldiers to America: "Bring us home now; we're dying for oil and corporate greed!"

³⁶ From Joel Skousen's World Affairs Brief (<http://www.JoelSkousen.com>). *World Affairs Brief* September 26, 2003 **THE MEACHER REVELATIONS:** "Michael Meacher, a former British Minister of the Environment, made dramatic claims two weeks ago that, "Wars against both Iraq and Afghanistan were planned in advance of Sept. 11." This is a fairly brave statement for a former member of the British governing establishment, one that may cost him his political career in the UK. In an article published in the Guardian, Meacher claimed that the US had foreknowledge of the plot but deliberately allowed it to go forward to advance a strategic agenda related to the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), involving promoting future US dominance in world affairs. [As my readers know, it is my opinion that PNAC was a carefully crafted front for the larger, more secret global agenda to take down US sovereignty and replace it with world government. Meacher said that incompetence is only a cover, that it is "clear

Washington complaining often that the Bush administration was the impediment in chief to moving forward to full and complete discovery.³⁷ Thus,

the US authorities did little or nothing to pre-empt the events of 9/11...[A]t least 11 countries provided advance warning to US intelligence agencies.”

³⁷ Toronto Star **BARBS ASIDE, 9/11 QUESTIONS AREN'T GOING AWAY** May. 18, 2003. **Barbs aside, 9/11 questions aren't going away** Few of us doubt that murderous Saudi Arabian terrorists executed this massacre. But I wanted to know more. Why did the U.S. military, with the most powerful arsenal in world history, fail to prevent or at least try to stop a series of hijackings and crashes that went on for nearly two hours? Where was the Air Force? If President Bush and his cabinet were not, at this very moment, still trying to censor, suppress and delay the publication of the Joint Congressional Inquiry into 9/11, if there had been honest disclosure and straight stories from the beginning, perhaps all these "dark questions," as the Post puts it, would never have arisen. The great majority of people, sickened and overwhelmed by the horror of the attacks, unquestioningly accepts the White House version. Many thousands, however, are patiently stitching together the documented evidence and noting the huge holes in the fabric of that official story. Just ask yourself how the United States, with its vast intelligence establishment and spy power, could have been caught unawares in such a drastic state of unpreparedness on Sept. 11. President Bush, or, as he delights to call himself, the commander-in-chief, must certainly have been briefed about the ominous drumbeat of terrorist threats that were accumulating over the spring and summer of 2001. According to the report by Eleanor Hill, staff director for the Joint Inquiry, there had been "an unprecedented rise in threat" during that summer. U.S. government agencies had been warned by the intelligence community that there was a high probability of "spectacular" terrorist attacks by Al Qaeda "designed to inflict mass casualties. ... Attacks will occur with little or no warning." The warnings included the possibility that airplanes would be used as weapons. There was even an April, 2001, intelligence report that terrorists planned "a spectacular and traumatic attack" like the first World Trade Center bombing, as well as an earlier report a group of Arabs planned to fly a plane into the World Trade Center or CIA headquarters. According to Hill, these warnings went to "senior government officials" whom she was not allowed to name. On that fateful morning, the first pictures of the burning tower were broadcast at 8:48 a.m. By then, according to a carefully documented timeline at <http://www.cooperativeresearch.net>, the Federal Aviation Administration, NORAD (joint U.S.-Canada air defence), the Pentagon, the White House and the Secret Service all knew that three commercial passenger jets had been hijacked. Here begins the obfuscation and deceit, in small matters and large, that permeate the official narrative. Disinformation was spewing all over the place that week after Sept. 11. Serious newspapers actually reported that one hijacker's passport fluttered down from the roaring inferno to be found in the rubble by sharp-eyed intelligence officers. The key question to me was one of air defence. There are, after all, standard procedures in the event of airplane emergencies. The FAA and NORAD have clear rules about any plane that suddenly loses radio contact with the tower or veers more than 15 degrees from its course. Once the air traffic controller detects an emergency, he or she must inform aviation officials who alert NORAD. Fighter jets are then sent up to check out the straying plane, signal to it with dipped wings, escort it back on course or even force it down. "We scramble aircraft to respond to any potential threat," said Marine Corps Maj. Mike Snyder, a NORAD spokesman, in an interview with the Boston Globe. But it didn't happen that way on Sept. 11. The first reports from authoritative sources (NORAD's Snyder, Vice-President Dick Cheney and, most significantly, Air Force Gen. Richard B. Myers) all stated that no jets took off until it was too late. Just two days after the catastrophe, on Sept. 13, Gen. Myers was confirmed as the new chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. On that day, he told the Senate Armed Forces Committee that no Air Force jets got into the air until after the attack on the Pentagon. On Sept. 15, The Boston Globe reported on a strange contradiction. The Globe quoted NORAD spokesman Snyder, who insisted that "the command did not immediately scramble any fighters even though it was alerted to a hijacking 10 minutes before the first plane ... slammed into the World Trade Center." He said the fighters remained on the ground until after the Pentagon was hit at 9:40 a.m. But The Globe also expressed puzzlement over the new official story that had just emerged. Now Americans were being told that fighter jets roared up from Cape Cod and from Virginia, but just didn't make it in time. Furthermore, no explanation was ever offered for the bizarre fact that Andrews Air Force base, whose job it is to defend the U.S. capital just 19 kilometres away, had no fighter jets ready to go into action — despite the months of serious warnings of impending terrorist attacks. And these are the people we're to trust with a missile defence system? They can't even get their stories straight, let alone defend their air space. According to The Post and to some of their hot-eyed followers, to ask these questions is to indulge in "poisonous delusions ... that do not belong in a mainstream newspaper." I'm not sure they're the proper arbiters of mainstream journalism, but I'm willing to be "unintentionally comical" in pursuit of understanding.

the foundation is there to explain the “New America” as one possibly carrying more reason to worry about than the one in Rome.³⁸

Moreover, Americans should better understand that the EU nations are prime beneficiaries of the current and potential future oil confiscations/privatization and that the U.S. currency, its military and its economy must be compromised to make the nation compliant to accepting the eventual invitation to relinquish its historic independence and sovereignty. The EU has always been married to the US leadership since Bush 41, in pursuit of the new world order agenda. In the waging of a war for occupation, control and national treasures, there was no need to implicate unnecessary and unneeded parties, as long as the mission was allowed to proceed. Once it succeeded, hand selected leaderships in Iraq, Syria and Iran would ultimately assume high profile roles at the United Nations, including the Security Council, to move forward the agenda to the next plateau. With the mission failing, this is not possible and the EU is far better positioned than otherwise, albeit it is clear that they have been cooperative in allowing the Bush administration to control Iraq, including the oil, albeit the failure of the premises given for war.

CONCLUSION

President Bush has no intent to leave Iraq. Further if he fails to effectuate regime and culture change in Syria and Iran, the new world order agenda is not only stayed but stymied, allowing China to resurface again to take paramount control of the Middle East³⁹ with Middle Eastern regimes ready to move against the U.S. dollar.⁴⁰

³⁸ Suffice it to add that the Secret Service did not follow Secret Service Protocol on September 11, 2001 in allowing the President to remain at a known facility and premises and to give a televised statement to the nation to boot from that facility.

³⁹ Outside the scope of this paper, a conflict arose in the Spring of 2003 between Hu Jintao and Jiang Zemin. China made it appear on or about May 28, 2003 that Hu Jintao controls. It is important to emphasize that Jiang Zemin, as part and parcel of the transition of power from himself to Jintao, stacked the government with his people. Thus, there was no way Hu Jintao could have rendered Jiang Zemin impotent without his concurrence. More important to appreciate is that Hu Jintao saw the Bush administration’s conduct and demeanor regarding Iraq, and unless he is in unquestioned service to the new world order mission, the Bush administration’s behavior and conduct, would compel Hu Jintao to quietly respect the known anti-Bush posture of his predecessor. As far as the U.S. was concerned, it only wanted to learn that a solution to SARS would reveal itself, which it did, and that China, at least publicly, was following the course set out for it by those affiliated with the new world order. In this regard, China is officially assisting in reigning in North Korea. However, there is no doubt that Bush’s failing in his mission has provided China with unheralded opportunity, strategic and otherwise, should Bush have to abandon the mission and pull his troops back home.

⁴⁰ While it seems apparent that part and parcel of the U.S.’s own absorption into the new world order stream ultimately would require it to submit to a new world currency, thereby requiring the U.S. dollar to be eventually supplanted as the international reserve currency, the improper timing of it, however, carries the clear potential to blow up and undermine the entire globalization agenda. The U.S. may have considered that this in fact was the intent of SARS and thus a bio-weapon intentionally released by China’s military aligned with Jiang Zemin, in response to Bush’s Middle East war agenda.

Thus, President Bush's need to complete the mission is more important today than before he launched against Iraq. Once hand picked governments are installed in Iraq, Syria and Iran, then authority should shift to the UN to legitimize the next wave of actions and events to bring the world to a central world government. In the interim, there was no need to taint the true beneficiaries of the campaign, the EU, married to the U.S. leadership, since Bush 41, in the one world government platform. Without doubt, all those responsible for giving the current President Bush the incorrect underpinnings for the strategy devised are in the woodshed. Thus, all the more incentive for them to make certain that there are no such major failings again in the mission and campaign. Now having included Saudi Arabia and Egypt in the platform for change and democracy, the President has put enormous tension into the Middle East, compelling current regimes to band together in an offset that the Bush administration only hopes translates into another platform for him to move forward militarily to fulfill fully his original mission under his NSS.

The real basis of the war is connective with the refusal of the Arab/Islamic nations to be cooperative participants in the new world order agenda. In this regard they follow their biblical mandate,⁴¹ whereas Israel seemingly has gone the path of contravening its biblical mandate, showing the willingness to join the new world order to be a nation among nations. Thereby, many students of bible and history find the current conflict and situation to be one where under biblical mandate the Arab/Islamic nations are hard pressed to lose regardless of the absence of comparative military prowess. In this regard, noting the dismal economic status of Israel, and noting the abysmal failure of the Bush team to complete their full mission, due to the unexpected, it behooves all of us to watch how events unfold. It would appear, before seeing them unravel, that the "Old America" was a treasure to honor and defend, before allowing the type of influences that could so readily cause Americans to discard it for what replaced it.

Joseph B. Ehrlich
Hewlett Harbor, New York
November 19, 2003

⁴¹ The bible shows the Angel of God telling Hagar, mother of Ishmael, regarding her descendants: "I will greatly multiply your descendants so that they will be too many to count. He will be a wild donkey of a man, His hand will be against everyone, And everyone's hand will be against him; And he will live to the east of all his brothers." (Gen 16:7-12). Also see Judges 2:21-22: "I also will no longer drive out before them any of the nations which Joshua left when he died, in order to test Israel by them, whether they will keep the way of the Lord to walk in it as their fathers did, or not". In the biblical context, Israel should be a nation making God central to its existence and daily lifestyle, one honoring Him before the nations of the world accordingly, and also out there protecting the Arab/Islamic nations and peoples from efforts to remove Allah as central to their own lives and cultures.