

# Regime and Culture Change Unmasked

© Copyright 2003, Joseph B. Ehrlich. All Rights Reserved.

The criticized American policy and agenda embodied in President Bush's *National Security Strategy* is one aimed at not only regime change *but also culture change* in the Middle East, which little-emphasized dynamic answers those scratching their heads in Washington why many throughout the world are opposed to the U.S.'s "war against terrorism."

What is also overlooked is that President Bush's attitude toward regime and culture change was in place as a matter of covert U.S. policy since the presidential term of his father, George H.W. Bush ("Bush 41"). It was witnessed when the United States stood back when a coup in Russia uprooted Mikhail Gorbachev, *Time Magazine's Man of the Century*, from office. While Mr. Gorbachev was instrumental during the Reagan years in the dissolution of the Soviet Union and removing the former Soviet Empire as a global threat, he was seen by the Bush 41 administration as soft on eviscerating all remaining threatening elements of Communism, having his own political roots therein, and a more compliant Boris Yeltsin replaced him in the manner recorded by history.

The current President Bush ("Bush 43") deployed a similar modus operandi in the spring of 2002 when a coup took place in Venezuela to uproot Hugo Chávez from power. Industrial and oil powers within Venezuela, with ties to U.S. interests, initiated a military coup, which not only failed but resulted in the type of criticism applicable to President Bush's drive to bring democracy to the Middle East. The wide criticism spewed forth by

the entire spectrum of Latin and South American leaders put a black eye onto Bush administration tactics and hypocrisy. When the Bush administration's preferred oil industry aligned replacement, Pedro Carmona, immediately dissolved Venezuela's National Assembly and Supreme Court, thereby assuming dictatorial powers, these actions were opposed across the board by Latin American democracies. When 48 hours later Chávez regained power, Bush National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice publicly warned Chávez to "...respect constitutional processes," further undermining U.S. credibility in the entire region. Since the invasion of Iraq, it has become crystal clear to the world that democracy and open and free elections are part of the Bush administration's noble agenda and goals in Venezuela, Iraq and soon elsewhere (according to Bush 43 rhetoric against Syria, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Egypt), as long as the candidates, and certainly the winning candidate, meet its approval.

Israelis should consider whether they have been subject to regime and culture change under policies that arose under the Bush 41 administration, post the success in seeing Gorbachev replaced by Yeltsin. Ariel Sharon ultimately was elected to reflect Israeli dissatisfaction with the policies of Shimon Peres and Ehud Barak. Within hours of his election, Ariel Sharon offered Barak the position of Minister of Defense and Shimon Peres the position of Foreign Minister. This all reflected US foreign policy first carved for the Bush 41 agenda by Jim Baker, preemptively intervening in foreign states and promoting democratic principles as long as election results allow the continuation of covert approved policies for that foreign state and nation.

Now, the State of Israel, as a natural result of Bush 41 preemptive policies put into place, finds itself supporting Bush 43 policies that have effectuated culture change within the U.S. itself, allowing the U.S. to put aside, under the cover of 9-11, its own Constitution to promote the Patriot Act and a continuing string of laws abrogating basic freedoms and protections, allowing a foreign policy where anyone can be assassinated or invaded under an executive level perception that a person or foreign state represents a current or future threat to U.S. interests; changes in culture that openly promote and allow corruption and cronyism, thus lending support to a de facto attitude of benign authoritarianism. Has Israel allowed itself to become a willing victim of Bush policy of both regime and culture change, thereby serving, as an invaluable needed ally to legitimize globally recognized wrongs and wrongdoings in the Middle East?

The Arab/Islamic nations want to be free from U.S. intervention as to what serves the best interests of their own populations, and preclude regime and culture change promoted under the banner of bringing both technological advancement and democracy to those nations. The Arab/Islamic nations have the right to honor, protect and live under their own heritage and culture without outside intervention. Israel has to understand the consequences of culture change for it, especially in terms of how it views and acts toward its Arab/Islamic neighbors.

The biblical and religious heritage of Israel attests that Israel never had enemies when the Jewish people occupied the holy land. Those that did historically arise, the Assyrians, Babylonians and the Romans, were all the creation of the reality that the Jewish people

accepted a change to its culture. The Jewish people remember their mistake in accepting inappropriate culture change through memorializing it through a day of mourning each year (“Tish'aB'Av”). The Jewish people thus should understand that accepting culture change, one arguably with a strong nexus to Bush 41’s covert policy for regime and culture change for Israel, precludes their continuation in Israel, when submission to it, especially under the current Bush administration’s painted picture for the new Middle East, would operate to defile God’s gift and name. Thus, the Jewish people recognize that biblical and religious history attests that they were cast out of Israel not because of enemies but because enemies arose to effectuate the required consequence of their own failings in accepting culture change.

Similarly, it is important for the U.S., founded on Judeo-Christian precepts and principles, to recognize that it is accepting culture change, reflected best when a mainstream media outlet, America-on-Line, posits, on its opening page, whether Americans any longer find God and religion relevant. The implications of this culture change are onerous when one sees Tommy Franks, former chief of the Central Command, who led the war against Iraq, who like the President grew up in Midland, Texas and attended high school with Laura Bush, stating that in the event of a WMD attack, "our form of government would go out the window. The Western world, the free world, loses what it cherishes most, and that is freedom and liberty we've seen for a couple of hundred years in this *grand experiment* that we call democracy. (Emphasis added)"

This type of talk is massaging the public to expect the installation of a military government and control in the United States (especially under unabated Cheney rhetoric that one has been imminent since 9-11) and compels the American people to think long and hard whether current policies of this presidential administration were in place way before the Project for the New American Century and even far before Bush 41 assumed the presidency in 1988 or before he nearly assumed the presidency in 1981: for the Bush family was aligned with one world government a long time ago, as noted by the *Dallas Morning News*, many years back, when it connected Senator Prescott Bush to H. Neil Mallon and the Dallas Council on World Affairs. The *Dallas Morning News* wrote:

“In fact, the one-world views of Mr. Mallon, close friend of U.S. Sen. Prescott Bush of Connecticut and financial patron of Mr. Bush's son George's entry into the Midland oil industry, even became suspect as Dresser's sales leaped the Iron Curtain and the McCarthy era found fertile soil in Big D.”

There were very good reasons the founding fathers created documents finding policies in pursuit of regime and culture change anathema to what this country represented. It is time to protect and find the Constitution of the United States of America again relevant, to unmask policies of regime and culture change as treacherous to the fundamental defining principles and ideals of this nation.

End