

Cui Bono:
The Looming Contradiction Between Empire and Democracy

HONORS THESIS

Presented to the Honors Committee of
Texas State University—San Marcos
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation in the
Mitte Honors Program

By

Ryan Jeffery Forrest

San Marcos, Texas

cui bono (kw^ē' b^ō' n^ō) *n.*-Utility, advantage, or self-interest considered as the determinant of value or motivation.

[From Latin **cui bon^ō (est)**, *for whom (it is) of advantage* : **cui**, dative of **quⁱ**, *who* + **bon^ō**, dative of **bonum**, *advantage*.]
American Heritage College Dictionary, 3rd Ed.

During the last five years, America has embarked on its final trek to global domination. The anxiously anticipated final trek began with acts of terror committed on American soil that brought about drastic changes in domestic security, set precedent for preemptive, preventative, or precautionary warfare, and reinvigorated the movement to dominate space. The motif of the acts of terror was exploited to garner fear and brandish power by haughtily making vulnerable an American working population. In the dawn of the twenty-first century, America fought wars of global domination. Though officially fought for liberation and the furtherance of democracy, the wars paradoxically stunted both. The leaders of empire, after the deaths of three thousand people in New York City, glutted their public with liberty-defying legislation and smothered disruptive protectorate states with carpet and saturation bombing, realizing imperial objectives without achieving the publicly pronounced aims of the wars. The trek to global domination was not an inevitable consequence of democratic pluralism, but rather the product of two and a quarter centuries of imperial ambition. This brief text will give a between-the-lines historical analysis of double-standard imperial policy coupled with shrewd North American statesmanship from the early seventeenth century to the present-day.

Colonialism to Revolution: Shrewd Statesmanship

British hegemony in North America began in 1607 with the conquering of the American natives in much the same fashion as the Protestant-Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland in the mid-sixteenth century; plantations were built to insulate British planters from the savagery of the non-Protestant Irish and Indian tribes; the conquests displayed mercilessness in their sheer disregard and plunder of the conquered peoples; the terror of Indian barbarism, the savagery of the Irish, and British superciliousness provided the pretext for wars of domination. Just as the Crown pillaged and burned villages in Ireland, Indian tribes were subjected to the same sword and flame. The tribes in the areas of British North American conquest, unlike those in the Spanish domain of Mexico and Central America, were not sedentary and resisted enslavement, whereas those peoples conquered by Spain more readily accepted enslavement. British colonists were unable to enchain or subsist with the Indians, and systematically removed them. What remained a necessity then was labor on the rich-soiled plantations annexed by the wealthy British traders. By 1619, the poverty-ridden and imprisoned within Britain emigrated as indentured servants along with African slaves to constitute the working force and minority classes on the newly conquered land. New World profiteering provided Britain with the necessary resources to expand her realm of domination to all corners of the globe; the wealth of the American colonies set the groundwork for British imperial conquest.

The Age of Enlightenment of the eighteenth century brought profound redefinition to the worldview of much of the Western world, and spurred revolution in the united American colonies, then in France, Haiti, and the Spanish colonies of Latin America. To incite mutiny among the working class, the leaders of the Revolution exploited the resentment of British American colonists toward the great disparity of wealth in favor of the British traders and landowners, shrewdly diverting attention from their own estates. Collectively rousing the British colonists in the United States, the Declaration of Independence condemned the terror and conspiracy of George III, a tyrant. Thomas Jefferson wrote: “Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed — That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it ...[A]ll men are created equal...endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights...But *when a long train of abuses and usurpations...evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to*

provide new guards for their future security.” The Revolution was incited and fought by aroused British colonists beside French, Prussian, black, and Indian warriors, and from the debris of war, an American aristocracy was born anew.

Though Revolution was notionally fought in the interest of all men, those who would assume power in the aftermath of Revolution, the American Forefathers, were those that most capitalized on the new freedom from the Crown. The equality of protection and representation under the law was extended only to the self-made man of property; excluded were the propertyless, women, and colored folk of whichever stripe. Jefferson wrote of a “natural aristocracy;” Hamilton and Madison believed government to be the “guardian of elite values,” in which “legislators...would be chosen from the ranks of ‘gentlemen;’” (Judis, 26) John Jay said that the people that own the country ought to run it. Though promoting a polity of equality, the slaver founders saw to it that the ante-bellum caste system was maintained. Independence from Britain was but a nominal transition of the aristocracy joint with the invention of liberty and certain unalienable rights.

Independence to Civil War: Callow Imperial Statesmanship

After independence was won, among the chief aims of the new country was commercial and territorial expansion. War Chief Washington, the “Town Destroyer,” set out in 1779 against the savage Iroquois along the Great Lakes to “extirpate them from the country.” (Mintz, 76) Jefferson, who wrote after Independence that “America has a hemisphere to itself,” (LaFeber, 22) broadened the domain of democracy in 1803 with the Louisiana Purchase from Bonaparte in the largest single expanse of American territory: 828,000 square miles for \$1 million. Though no rationale was given for the financing of Bonaparte’s Terror in Europe, the incorporation of the French, blacks, and Creoles of Louisiana into the Union without their consent was also a banal matter of expansionist policy; Jefferson told Madison that the Creoles were “as incapable of self-government as children...the less we say about constitutional difficulties respecting Louisiana the better, and what is necessary for surmounting them must be done *sub silentio*.” (Paterson, 60)

Whereas the Virginia dynasty and the Northern Federalists first dominated American politics in the early days of the democracy, Judis writes, “[p]olitical parties and elections *first* became important during the 1820s,” when “states eliminated property tests for voting, [and] the parties became local and national organizations.” (5; emphasis added) These parties were powerful enough that they “doled out government jobs through patronage and controlled local newspapers.” (6) This party system, born in the 1820s, reigned until the Civil War. This half-century brought about invention and industry, an ever-expanding commercial capacity, and the pride of democracy, capitalism, and the labor force that fueled it, grew and required expansion.

Shrewd statesmanship won the Floridas from Spain by way of the Adams-Onís treaty of 1821, which also extended US territory to the Pacific. In 1823, President Monroe claimed hemispheric hegemony with his annunciation of the Monroe Doctrine, without the power to enforce it. For example, European creditors, England and France, brought armed force on the Falkland Islands and Mexican ports in the 1830s, but US policymakers did nothing. In any event, the doctrine had been set down in 1823 to be invoked in future interventions in order to preserve and insure US interests across the hemisphere, and eventually beyond.

Andrew Jackson, president and war hero, was cheered for playing shepherd on the Trail of Tears, when he transmigrated thousands of Indians from their land in Florida. Of course estimates of mortality along the Trail differ, but a reasonable estimate would approximate 100,000 Indians

transported, and perhaps a third who died on course. With this translocation, the US had expanded and exterminated along the entire eastern seaboard, ever broadening the domain of democracy. President Polk in the 1840s brought about an even wider expanse of democracy. In 1845, Polk invoked the Monroe Doctrine to claim US rights to Texas, California, and Oregon, but only after a fabricated event on Mexican soil that had been orchestrated by the Polk Administration. The event, instigated by US provocateurs on then-Mexican territory, was deliberately misconstrued as involving militant Mexicans on US soil; it was a lie. The US public was plunged into an enormous and unconstitutional land grab by the hands of a self-confident American elite, which brought the death and theft of people, land, and resources, while continentally expanding US influence and democracy by way of an illegally instigated act of war, which served as a false-flag pretext for the intervention of the US military. The expansion of slavery that the post-war annexation of Mexican territory could have provided created an uneasy atmosphere in Washington, and in all events the Mexican War served as at least partial catalyst for the Civil War, which was also incited by instigated provocation.

In the North, slavery was abolished for its lack of necessity. Factory work and artisanship dominated the North and gave jobs to a white population; blacks were free but consigned to grisly living conditions and brutal racism. Slavery was a necessity of the Southern agricultural elite; free labor made Southern planters more successful than their wage-paying northern countrymen, and more, the population of nonvoting laborers gave considerably more power to Southern white representatives in Congress. The expansion of national territory gave potential to a wider disproportion of representation by leaders of slave states, and thus threatened the standing influence of those northern elites that had enjoyed prior leverage of majority influence in policymaking. Arguments in Washington were brought up against slavery in the new territories, and in response, slave states argued for the power of states' rights over federal power. The Civil War was less about the freedom of slaves than the freedom of states vis-à-vis the federal government. Emancipation excluded Missouri, Kentucky, Delaware, and Maryland, along with Tennessee and parts of Union-controlled Louisiana and Virginia, for they had not defied the Northern command and had not attempted secession. Abolition of slavery was a mid-wartime measure aimed at suffocating Southern labor and wartime potential and at recruiting blacks to fight on the side of the North, though the blacks were frequently rejected and lynched even by Union soldiers for their various inferiorities. Missouri, Kentucky, Delaware and Maryland were

allowed to keep their slaves for some years before Congress ruled the matter too antithetical to the unity of one nation under a Constitution. Emancipation, though, was an act of war, not morality.

The Civil War was incited as leaders from both sides announced to a largely apathetic public that policy now officially chided the previous fraternity of the states: the unity of “we.” Thousands were stirred from their everyday life to murder their compatriot. Over 630,000 were killed from battle and disease and over 1,000,000 were injured in what ended in a varied form of political and economic control over a white and black labor force; unshackled, slaves were transposed from one form of slavery to another and the poor whites held their lot. Leaders of industry profited well in wartime, and learned of the gainful nature of garnering war sentiment and large-scale war.

The Second American Revolution, as the Civil War is often called, is a fitting description of the War, or the putting down of rebellion, as Lincoln termed it, though he certainly acted as a war president. During the War, the North was able to convert its industry and agriculture to meet wartime demands, so much so that the Union actually had surplus in each to send overseas. The Civil War also marked a revolution in naval technology; the most stunning of achievements were the new ironclad war boats that even the British envied. Lincoln revolutionized the presidency in his executivization of power in among other things his setting of precedent in declaring martial law in the United States (most notably in Maryland). Perhaps one of the most important revolutions wrought by the Civil War was the shift in view and reality of what the United States really was. Whereas before the Civil War the United States were seen as a collection of autonomous entities—*these* United States—after the War, they were seen as *the* United States, under a powerful central government.

National unity was found again in armistice. People found their way back to the fields, factories, and shops after real carnage, and the social order was maintained much as before, but emerging was an Industrial Revolution that was to consolidate political and economic power in unprecedented terms. After the Civil War, writes Judis, “[m]uch of what the national government and local and state governments did was dictated by the growing power of wealthy merchants, bankers and industrialists,” who could “buy off politicians, and sometimes entire state legislatures and the US Congress,” bringing death to the party system of the 1820s. (6) Newspapers were still elite-run and vast means of opinion regimentation, and voting turnout

was often very high after the Civil War. The swelling of the polls, though, “didn’t necessarily reflect public involvement in government debate. National campaigns were like sporting events;” (6) attention to public issues was emotionally based: “parties commanded loyalty rather than intellectual conviction,” Judis writes. “A Chicagoan might be a Democrat rather than a Republican in the same spirit that he later was a Cubs rather than White Sox fan.” (6) For the blood of the Civil War, relevant public discourse was still no more than an abstraction, nearly a century into the democratic experiment, in a new form, different from that of the early rule of the New England and Virginian elite, which was followed by the national party leadership beginning in the 1820s. Democratic politics continued with shrewd design as the average voter was more aficionado than participant, cajoled by slogans and other emotionally poignant symbols that substituted for active and relevant public political participation. Henry Adams reflected on the American electoral discourse in 1884: the “amusing thing is that no one talks about real interests.” (31)

More devastating perhaps than the lack of relevant public discourse, and a more important component of post-Civil War America than the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th incorporative amendments, was the rise of the corporation, which rose to superpower specifically via the 14th amendment, by which it gained the rights of a person, though not the right to hold office or vote. Hawken writes: “By invoking freedom of speech, corporations achieve precisely what the Bill of Rights was intended to prevent: domination of public thought and discourse.” (108) Industry took hold of the nation as never before, monopolizing everything, especially from within the walls of Congress, whose members were often representatives of Industry, else clients or beneficiaries, and in any case, sharers of worldview; Industrialists and their governmental counterparts largely exploited the same labor force as their fathers and their fathers (descendents of the emigrated peasants, prisoners, and slaves, along with hordes of jobless immigrants) in the areas of capital goods, mining, steel production, which gave way to the final completion of a transcontinental rail network, the setting up of trade posts at junctions and river junctures, and the funneling of national capital into even fewer hands; the nation began to take its current face. Industry vertically integrated, aligning all the steps of production under one management for maximum profit. Wealth became further removed from those that labored.

Industrial Revolution to the Cold War: Industry and Propaganda

Wartime experience with the Mexicans in the 1840s and within our borders in the 1860s was an exercitation, a dress rehearsal, for the Spanish-American-Cuban-Filipino War at the end of the nineteenth century, by way of organizing popular sentiment and indignation; the overlapping birth of the factory also gave way to the capacity to produce arms, among many other things, with mass efficiency. After the mysterious and pretext-providing explosion and sinking of the US Battle Ship *Maine* in 1898, blamed on the Spanish in Havana Harbor, which ignited the “formidable inflammability of our multitudinous population,” (Paterson, 200) President McKinley brought the US into a short three-month skirmish of a war that gave the States world power status, attaining our first overseas territories in the Philippines. Also gained were the “protectorate” position of the island of a long-envied Cuba and pride in defeat over the faltering power of imperial Spain. President Theodore Roosevelt, coming to office in the wake of the seldom-discussed assassination of McKinley in 1901, added his Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine in 1905 in his proclamation of international police power over the hemisphere in an era of much self-confidence on the part of our nation’s elite. Brooks Adams, grandson and great grandson of American presidents, said the War of 1898 was “the turning point in our history...I do believe that we may dominate the world, as no nation has dominated it in recent time...The first taste of power is always the sweetest.” (LaFeber, 40, 1993)

LaFeber typifies Progressive political ideology: “Interests and imperial rivalry, not morality and consistency, drove US policies.” (39) In competition primarily with British and German entrepreneurship, the US State Department kept busy in foreign affairs. In 1903, Roosevelt the 26th irreverently labeled Latin Americans “Dagoes” for their incapacity of self-governance, and pushed Panama to break from Colombia to begin the construction of a long-anticipated isthmian canal, which would, of course, be protected by US military police. Roosevelt’s Big Stick Policy set precedent by deploying the armed forces to insure US interests. Secretary of State Philander C. Knox of the Progressive Taft Administration was fond of armed intervention, absurdly insisting on “the moral value” of naval power. (LaFeber, 39) Between the Spanish-American War of 1898 and World War I, the State Department landed troops in Puerto Rico, Minnesota (against the Chippewa at Leech Lake), Nicaragua five times, Idaho, Oklahoma, Panama, Honduras four times, the Dominican Republic, Korea, Cuba twice, Mexico, Colorado in 1914, Haiti, and China. So busy was the US State Department, the “US marines entered the

Caribbean region no fewer than twenty times between 1898 and 1920.” (81) LaFeber writes that in 1906, Elihu Root, “perhaps his generation’s shrewdest analyst of the new corporate America,” told a convention of industrialists: “As in their several ways England and France and Germany have stood, so we in our own way are beginning to stand and must continue to stand toward the industrial enterprise of the world.” (36, 1993) Empery was in ascension.

A stray example of dead-serious US diplomacy: in 1910, US private interests owned forty percent of Mexican land at a time when Mexico was the world’s third leading oil exporter. Talks of expropriating of these treasure-bearing lands and improving the lot of the average Mexican became audible as a reform-minded government, under President Francisco Madero, was elected in 1911, when Mexicans had finally overcome the strong-arm rule of Porfirio Díaz. In 1913, an overzealous group in the US State Department had Madero assassinated in order to secure US business interests and to preserve the muddled social order by locksafing the tumultuousness and preventing the real national growth of Mexican politics with a debilitating civil war and ensuing long-term civil turmoil. In retarding Mexican development or progress, US interests went largely preserved as they kept proprietorship of their lands, by dividing Mexicans among themselves, and conquering.

Meanwhile, an imperialist war of domination was intensifying in Europe. As Howard Zinn writes: “The advanced capitalist countries of Europe were fighting over boundaries, colonies, spheres of influence; they were competing for Alsace-Lorraine, the Balkans, Africa, the Middle East.” (359) But the war found an American public largely apathetic. By this time, “it was widely recognized by the elite sectors in the US and Britain that within their societies, coercion was a tool of diminishing utility.” (Chomsky, 2003, 6-7) Mimicking the Ministry of Information in England, which aimed “to direct the thought of most of the world,” President Wilson devised the Committee on Public Information and the Creel Commission, which, within months, “turned a pacifist population into raving hysterics who wanted to destroy everything German to save ourselves from Huns who were tearing the arms off Belgian babies.” (Chomsky, 2002, 64) The “propaganda successes” of this campaign “inspired progressive democratic theorists and the modern public-relations [propaganda] industry.” (Chomsky, 2003, 8)

Propaganda has long been propagated, but until the twentieth century, it was never so sophisticated. The twentieth century introduced the world to brand new fields of science in the schools of psychology and social psychology. In *Hegemony or Survival*, Chomsky writes, citing

Progressive policymakers Walter Lippman and Edward Bernays, that public opinion and concerted action was driven by the “manufacture of consent,” or the “engineering of consent,” of the public through the elite’s means of “control of opinion and attitude,” through a “revolution in the art of democracy.” (6, 2003; 14, 2002) Bernays, a nephew of Freud, wrote, “As civilization has become more complex, the technical means have been invented and developed by which opinion may be regimented.” (Judis, 44) Chomsky, in his pamphlet on *Media Control* writes, “Propaganda is to a democracy what the bludgeon is to a totalitarian state.” (20)

Behavioral theorist Harold Lasswell wrote in 1935 that the extolling of public opinion, the dissemination of propaganda, is a matter of choosing symbolisms “capable of eliciting the desired concerted acts. There is incessant resort to repetition or distraction.” (38) “Propaganda, when successful, is astute in handling: Aggressiveness, Guilt, Weakness, Affection.” (39) Social conjugation is achieved when enough verifying elements exist to create a system of unification, or a *we*, a sense of relation or common ground among the population. War fever is stirred by demonizing an enemy (a *they*) and propagating “symbols of the collective ‘we,’” to give the nation a sense of vulnerability and thence the need for protection; “the symbol of the nation is redefined as infinitely protective and indulgent, powerful and wise.” (41) This annotated history of American statecraft will see this formula utilized occasion after occasion in the pursuit of global domination.

Progressive President Wilson led America in World War I “with God on our side.” American soldiers, mostly teenagers, were induced to fight for “democracy” around the world. They were goaded into fighting with all sorts of pro-war advertising; ads used sex in their illustrations and proclaimed that soldiers were fighting to protect women at home and abroad; ads drew in conscripts from all over the country, convincing men that enlisting was the “manly” thing to do. Former “racketeer for capitalism,” Major General Smedley Darlington Butler, who earned his reputation in the War of 1898, wrote *War is a Racket* in 1935 condemning US interventions as means of territorial and economic annexation, means of expanding monopoly. Up to WWI, writes Butler, “Boys...were made to feel ashamed if they didn’t join the army.” Ads animated an angry Uncle Sam rolling up his sleeves preparing to fight against an “immoral” enemy, the Hun. “Even God was brought into it...our clergymen joined in the clamor...it is His will that the Germans be killed.” (Butler: 17)

But the propaganda was intensified in 1915, under President Wilson, as a German

submarine torpedoed the English passenger ship *Lusitania*, and the American media portrayed these acts of war “uncivilized” to easily engage the US in the war. Advantageous it was, as public opinion was in favor of Britain even before misconstruing German wartime action. By British Admiralty regulation, any ship that was unrelated to war was to zigzag its path as an international signal to hold fire. The *Lusitania* failed to zigzag and was struck by German torpedoes. As a possible pretext for American enjoinment in the war, the German Kaiser averred that the captain of the ship had intentionally failed to swerve path, and “had thus invited the sinking of his own vessel to inflame American opinion against Germany.” (Johnson, 49)

In the period between the Spanish-American War and the closing of the First World War, American manufacturers squandered a twenty-five billion dollar war debt from the national treasury, creating at least “21,000 new millionaires and billionaires...in the United States.” (Butler, 1, 4) “No one told them [the American public] that their going and their dying would mean huge war profits.” (Butler, 18) WWI marked a radical change in American global status. At the outset of the War, America had shed its century and a half history of being a debtor country and became for the first time an international creditor. Already the sphere of influence of the States had been felt by the underdeveloped plantation states of Latin America for scores of decades. But by the time of WWI, the advanced Western European countries would feel the sphere of US influence as well. The imperial prognoses of Brooks Adams and Elihu Root were materializing.

The same propaganda methods before WWI came back after the War to bring about the Red Scare, which rationalized intervention in the Soviet Union, destroyed labor unions and organized strikes, and aggrandized the merits of corporate capitalism. Of course the media, the schools, the church and the business establishment egged on the Red Scare. Businessman Roger Babson summed up the achievements of the political cant of the era: “The war taught us the power of propaganda. Now when we have to sell anything to the American people, we know how to sell it. We have the school, the pulpit and the press.” (Judis, 44)

A world power out of WWI, the US armed companies were kept active after the War, sent to protect the National Interest in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Russia five times between 1918 and 1922 in attempts to suppress the Bolsheviks, Panama twice, Honduras twice, Guatemala, West Virginia to ward off a miner strike, Turkey, China twice, El Salvador, and even Washington DC to stop a WWI veteran bonus protest, all before WWII. Seeing that intervention

is a means of protecting and advancing investment, it is clear that the US had indeed become a reckonable force in international relations in the wake of the First Great War, altering and disrupting policy across the world with military intimidation. In tandem with the hyper-adventurousness of US armed forces, American industry boomed even through the Depression and up to WWII, when production hit a new record peak.

More than providing the world with peacetime supplies and munitions through the Depression, the US heads of industry were preparing for a war of their own. In early 1934, capitalist racketeer General Smedley Butler was approached by the leaders of industry with the charge of leading a coup on the New Deal government. Biographer Hans Schmidt writes that in November of 1934, Butler exposed

an alleged plot by Wall Street interests to topple President Roosevelt and establish a dictatorship. The story broke in the *New York Post* and *Philadelphia Record* under the banner headline 'GEN. BUTLER CHARGES FASCIST PLOT,' and revealed what purported to be Butler's testimony to a closed session of the House of Un-American Activities in New York. Financiers led by broker Grayson M. -P. Murphy and Singer sewing machine heir Robert Sterling Clark had raised \$3 million, with more in the offing, and approached Butler to lead an army of 500,000 veterans to overthrow the government in a bloodless coup. (223)

The plans included high promotion for Butler and a lead role in the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, seemingly not unlike the camps being constructed in Nazi Germany, sponsored by the same Big Business interests. Butler of course did not lead the coup, and the episode in American democracy was pretermitted down the Memory Hole.

American business, reported *The Corporation*, a 2005 documentary that exposes the ominous contradiction between corporate capitalism and democracy, reigned supreme in the years of the Depression and WWII, churning billion dollar revenues, maritime and otherwise. Other enterprises involved in the Fascist plot on FDR were GE, Standard Oil, US Steel, Coke-Fanta, Ford, and IBM. These corporations dominated in part because of their leading banking connections, and in fair part to trade, with the rising Nazi super-state. US industry provided Hitler the means to erect his (potentially global) empire with concrete, computer systems, and "millions of dollars of gold, fuel, steel, coal and US treasury bonds...both *feeding and financing Hitler's* build-up to war." (The Guardian, 9/25/04; emphasis added) IBM is recorded as having supplied Hitler the technology of numerical categorizing systems for surveilling and giving agenda to the

prisoners of the concentration camps. The various minorities held in the camps were assigned “treatment” by way of age, sex, height, weight, working capacity, and other attributes.

As Germany came to be defined as an official enemy, most US trade with the Nazi regime was cut, but some enterprises, including the banking institutes of Brown Brothers Harriman and Union Banking Corporation, both connected to one Herbert Walker and son-in-law Prescott Bush, and the partial sources of the modern Bush family fortune, continued trade with the enemy state well into the war, which was going to be fought in any event, according to the *Guardian Unlimited* and the US National Archives: “they didn’t care about the Nazis any more than they cared about their investments with the Bolsheviks.” The US entered the war in late 1941 as Japan bombarded the American naval base in the US territory of Hawaii, in what was again an anticipated and desired attack, reports even the History Channel, and another prime example of premeditated violence eliciting a pretext for war entry. Corporate America quickly rallied troops to the Allied cause, destroying the Nazi regime, capturing the Gestapo and dividing its leaders and lieutenants amongst the American and Soviet intelligence communities, and notoriously pioneering nuclear holocaust against the demented Japanese would-be world power.

The Cold War: “Largely a Fraud”

The years following the Second Great War gleamed of opportunity for an imperially ambitious United States, and, much like after WWI, an instant enemy was made of the Communist Soviet Empire. Though the North American super-state boasted of hemispheric economic and military hegemony since the TR administration, when the Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine “announced in 1905 that henceforth the United States would act as the policemen to maintain order in the hemisphere,” it was not until after WWII that even “Western Europe was as utterly dependent on the United States as Central America had been before the war.” (LaFeber, 1993, 38) The US found itself militarily unscathed and exercised after the War, reaping the wealth of huge wartime profits, and, flaunting “unchallenged supremacy in the air and on the oceans, the United States stood unrivaled as the most powerful nation in history.” (LaFeber, 87)

The settling of WWII brought about new governmental institutions of security—the Department of Defense, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Central Intelligence Agency—but simultaneously found a lack of security quandaries fiscally disappointing and physically boring for the leaders of industry and state. Military production was exorbitant anticipating and during the War, but afterward, the “great military production machine briefly came to a halt.” (Johnson, 55) The leaders of production and statecraft thus faced a temporary divestment of arm and other wartime sales, and meanwhile newborn policing forces were in need of an agenda; a cold war was in demand so as to proffer another booming wartime atmosphere to activate our factories and agencies, and a real but realistically unthreatening force was found in the ideological and economic presence of a crippled communist Russia, who lost over 20 million in the war effort.

International relations morphed into a binary structure: Capitalism v. Communism. Communism threatened the United States not in the bodily but more in a pecuniary sense of national interest. That is, the development of communism, or any other form of polity which would encourage actual national growth, would entail the foreclosure and expropriation of American private property abroad, not cutting the US from the market necessarily, but cutting into the direct profits and operational control of the global economy of the North American power. Thereafter, reform minded regimes in developing countries were more than often branded communist and pounced upon by US-devised ouster coups in our combat-inclined *novus ordo seclorum*, and what followed was a global parading of intervention with the American flag with

the intent to suffocate the threat of Soviet Russia by *controlling satellite marketplaces*, the *raison d'être* of all imperial war; Communism was pretext for the disallowance of expropriation and altering of the social order within the client states; the wars were fought in furtherance of empire.

To gain public support for such a front and license to arms as the Cold War, a wave of propaganda convinced America of an impending nuclear holocaust and the continuing threat of subversion to the homeland by domestic communist espionage. As Schreker writes, “The Cold War transformed domestic communism from a matter of public opinion to one of national security.” (16) It was a time when “party labels don’t mean anything anymore...on one side are the Americans and on the other are the Communists and Socialists.” (Halberstam, 10) It was a time of exaggeration in furtherance of capitalist elite interest; Schreker shows that the “tactic of Red-baiting made it possible to confront unions without having to address economic issues,” (10) the prominent means by which the *muchedumbre* was managed and guided. It was a time most of all of blatant fear mongering; the Red Menace was an unpredictable and ubiquitous force for reckoning; it included “any group that challenged the established social, economic, or racial order.” (Schreker, 11) Making a formidable foe of communism and a hero out of an abusive capitalism, an elite class transformed an exploitative system into that of the most pious. Even those that did not profit from the capitalist establishment feared the influence of godless communism. It was a time when many “considered nonconformity to be as dangerous as communism...a dualistic view of the world in which anyone who disagreed with them [the *Superior Class*] was an enemy.” (Schreker, 11) Senator Millard Tydings, one of many state officials who lost office to the Cold War witch-hunting brigade, stamped it precisely; the threat of internal communism was a “hoax and a fraud...an attempt to inflame the American people with a wave of hysteria and fear on an unbelievable scale.” (Halberstam, 56)

Conventional History has us remember a staunchly anticommunist Uncle Sam—sleeves rolled up, valiantly upholding the world morale, protecting mankind from nuclear holocaust and the crimson ideological threat, meanwhile developing an overwhelming nuclear stockpile, and planting his feet deep as the “fulcrum of the international economy.” (Paterson, 386) Our polity had become a corporatocracy*—the triplicate iron grip of business, banks, and government armed with sheer physical force—or less directly, the leading class of industrialists was “closely allied” with “the forces of law and order—private detective companies, local and state police, and later,

* John Perkins, *Confessions of an Economic Hit Man*, 2004.

federal agencies like the FBI and military intelligence.” (Schreker, 10) So the pretext, or the misnomer as we will see, of Communism paved the path for a corporate state and myriad “violations of civil liberties,” that “*could not have taken place without the collaboration of the nation’s political and social elites*, the men and women who ran the federal government and the nation’s most important public and private institutions.” (Schreker, 2; emphasis added) The US was not reluctant to bring force in securing the national interest, control of raw materials and favorable balances of trade, and the hindrance of reform-minded regimes that menaced US capital investments.

The Truman Doctrine of 1947 professed to the world the need of the US to contain communism worldwide, and the US not lightheartedly nor infrequently intervened to uphold such cause. Political scientist Robert Higgs asserts, “To convince the public, and thereby Congress, of the need for additional defense spending to implement the proclaimed Truman Doctrine of containing communist expansion around the world, the administration needed a more visible crisis.” (Higgs, 1994) So, with public ado, in 1948, a communist inspired *Vanguardia Popular* party was claimed by US state department officials, in accordance with United Fruit Company (UFCO) interests and anxieties, to be on the brink of rule in Costa Rica. Without hesitation, “US troops were placed on alert in the Canal Zone.” They were to curb the communist regiment before it could consolidate power and to assure the promotion of US interests, the insurance of US investment. The threat proved to be a false alarm, but the arm of empire was flexed and showed that “unilateral US intervention was no mere abstraction.” (LaFeber, 1993, 104)

During the early 1950s, as the US boosted its defense budget to secure raw materials in Korea, Iran, and Guatemala, it found itself fueling another colonial war in Indochina for the French. Though the French had occupied the area since the nineteenth century, revolt had led to clear hardship for the French forces, who were desperate for US aid: “Between 1950 and 1954, the United States provided \$1.2 billion in aid to the French effort in Indochina, and by 1954 was paying for 70 percent of the French military budget,” (LaFeber, 160, 1972) and our war machine was to be in full throttle in Indochina for the next two decades, so long as the US was owed the spoils of the war.

The anti-communist and overt Korean War (1950-1953), “the worst of American postwar interventions, the most destructive, far more genocidal than Vietnam,” (Cumings, 1990) brought “the first and most significant peak in weapons purchases” (Johnson, 56) in US history, as shown

in the 233% increase in defense spending in the three years of the war before 1953. (Higgs) It should be noted, though, that a large portion of the increased expenditure did not go to the funding of the war in Korea. The majority went to nuclear development and to the fortifying of US military bases around the planet, otherwise called NATO bases; the current age of imperial militancy was underway. Though ending in a stalemate, US wartime spending and profit soared during the Korean War, communism was halted in foot, and US interests remained intact.

As the budget was set for overt action, it synchronously invited disbursement of funding for covert State Department sponsored endeavors. One of the first covert coups of the Cold War was arranged in Iran against the democratically elected Mohammad Mossadegh in the late summer of 1953. The nationalist movement pushed by Mossadegh “undercut the power of the [repressive] shah, and proceeded to nationalize the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company” and in so doing Mossadegh found himself charged a communist. LaFeber writes, “In August the Shah staged a successful coup to regain power. The United States provided the guns, trucks, armored cars, and the radio communications for the Shah’s forces.” (1972, 155-156) The ouster coup, staged by the US and UK, and absent the forces of either, proved a shrewd and spendthrift means of reinstating order among those that did not align, or cooperate, with the global capitalist system, and “returned to power a more pliable figure, the Shah Reza Pahlavi.” (Gilderhus, 147) Importantly, “Mosadeq in Iran was neither a Marxist nor a Leninist, since he opposed the Iranian communist parties on any number of issues and principles,” and further typifying the insincerity of democratic Cold War rhetoric: “the democratic USA was urged to overthrow the elected Mosadeq by the democratic United Kingdom.” (Forsythe, 386)

“[T]he easy success of the coup in Iran was a powerful inducement to the Eisenhower administration to run more covert operations,” (Halberstam, 369) and arrangements were made in Guatemala the following year for the ouster of yet another democratically elected president. President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was actually the first leader in the history of Guatemala to be elected and have taken office without prior bloodshed. As Arbenz advanced Guatemala with an array of reforms that began with his constitutional predecessor, he thus offended *La Frutera*, or UFCO. No sooner had an Agrarian Reform bill been passed than an ouster coup was in the planning. The CIA orchestrated this coup in which US forces again were to be absent; “as Allen Dulles reported to President Eisenhower, the success of the venture depended more on the ‘psychological impact’ rather than actual military strength.” (Gilderhus, 149)

Commenting on preliminary planning and implementation of American *golpes*, or coups, Forsythe writes, “Covert interventions, by their very nature, are difficult to pinpoint in time, place, and detail; when carried out by the United States, however, some facts usually become public knowledge eventually.” (385) Steven Van Evera, in 1990, charged the US with having been involved in the covert ousters of twelve democratic governments since 1945. A half dozen were violent, with or without the use of US troops, and others with sheer economic or political pressure. A new era in empire had begun.

The first covert intervention in the sphere of influence of the Monroe Doctrine, that has publicly surfaced, was that in Guatemala in 1954. The man discharged was Jacobo Arbenz (1951-1954), a reform-minded and pragmatic Guatemalan president, following in the stead of Juan Jose Arévalo (1945-1951), the ‘spiritual socialist.’ By way of a *golpe*, ousting the previous US-installed dictator of the thirties, Jorge Ubico, in which the spiritual socialist Arévalo did not participate, having been exiled to Argentina, Arévalo came into power in 1944 with a mind to aristocratize his filthy and poverty-stricken state. Reform began at once; Arévalo “extended voting rights to all adults, abolished forced labor, instituted minimum wages and collective bargaining for workers, redistributed small amounts of land confiscated from Germans during the war, established a social security agency and launched a literacy campaign.” (Gilderhus, 145) Guatemala had ranked among the world’s lowest in human rights and living standards through centuries of exploitation; Arévalo dramatically changed the systemic structure “for the first time in 400 years.” (LaFeber, 1993, 119)

Arbenz came to lead in Guatemala after serving as Secretary of War for Arévalo, under whom Arbenz had despoiled over thirty anti-revolutionary coup attempts; it was plain that interests from without were discontented with the socially-inspired reforms. And after a long, sad history of US-sponsored dictatorships and disaster from as early as the 1870s, between 1944 and 1954, the US grew evermore apprehensive and paranoid of a communist takeover. Arévalo and his counterpart, Arbenz, who had begun one of the greatest societal reconstructions in all of history, began a series of reforms that wrought benefit to over 500,000 poverty-ridden Guatemalans, 100,000 families, but one reform in particular offended US corporate/national interest. Arbenz launched the Agrarian Reform Bill of 1953, or Degree 900, with support from the newly legal and vastly growing labor unions. Degree 900 was a piece of legislation that was aimed at expropriating and nationalizing uncultivated land from large landholders to be

redistributed to the aboriginal *campesinos* to free them from the dictates of the coffee and banana planters. The bill would ultimately seek to expropriate sections of the 300+ million acres, of which only 139,000 of the UFCO's strategically owned and fertile land were cultivated. (La Feber, 1993, 120) An(other) ouster coup was due, and the CIA funded and trained a fraternity of an army (which would become a Western intelligence trademark around the world, seen in the creation of Hamas, Hezbollah, the Real IRA, Al Qaeda, etcetera, and within the US at the terrorist training camp called the School of the Americas, at Ft. Benning, GA, and in Panama, among other places, whose trainees have become dictators and stability-keepers in Latin America) on a UFCO plantation in neighboring Honduras, consisting of one hundred fifty men led by Guatemalan exile Castillo Armas, and supplied three antiquated aircraft for the farcical covert war that was to ensue. "Even without the hazy prospect of a communist takeover of Guatemala...Arbenz posed an intolerable challenge. In the heart of the American sphere of influence, in an upstart banana republic, there stood...a president [whose] agrarian reform was proceeding well, the [communist party] was gaining popular support, and basic freedoms were being upheld. It was an intolerable challenge to America's sense of self respect." (Gleijeses, 365-6)

With psychological warfare tactics derived from the Germans after the recently extinguished mass murder of WWII, the CIA planted multiple portable radio stations in neighboring countries with false broadcasts and a false counter-Arbenz, pro-Armas revolutionary movement while blocking the national stations. Anti-Arbenz propaganda also fell from the sky in the form of millions of leaflets leading up to the psychological coup dethroning Guatemalan democracy and an under-armed Arbenz regime. The *blitzkrieg* attack stratagem was to be swift, precise and unruly. While the radio announced an escalating war and Arbenz-loyalist defeats in the countryside, the Armas *armadita* invaded the capital, and planes from above bombed strategic locations, radio stations, arms storages, and other supply centers. Arbenz fled, influenced by fright and drink, and was readily replaced with a dictator more compatible with the inhibitions of the power to the north and more in line with the despotic tradition of Guatemalan history.

"The Guatemalan intervention in 1954 closed down Franklin Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy for keeps," (Gilderhus, 147) and what followed consequently was a rebellion instigated by one that witnessed the CIA coup and the revolutionary, truly equitable, democracy it squashed, 'Che' Guevara. Fleeing north from the despotism and endless executions of the CIA-installed

Armas in Guatemala, Che made the acquaintance of Dr. Fidel Castro in Mexico. With an irregular militia driven by guerilla military techniques developed by Che, Fidel came to power speedily with his Lieutenant Colonel Che and the armed backing of the peasant populace. Reform in expropriation and nationalization of foreign industry/agriculture on the island began immediately. As Castro explained in 1960, “when the Revolutionary Government began to pass laws to overcome the advantages obtained by the monopolies, difficulties arose. Then we began to be called communists; then we began to be painted red.” (LaFeber, 1969, 129) Agrarian reforms were the measures needed to advance the Cuban community and to dispel those who institutionalized dire poverty among the miserable masses of *cubanos*. Moreover, the “public services...all belonged to the US monopolies and a major portion of the banking business, importing business, oil refineries, sugar production, the lion’s share of arable land and the most important industries in all fields in Cuba belonged to North American companies.” (LaFeber, 1969, 128) And so, by design, the expropriating land reforms in “1959 and 1962 effectively destroyed the foreign and national entrepreneurs who controlled Cuba’s agricultural economy” (Immerman, 653).

The US, expectedly disenchanted with the turn of events, as its control and monopoly of Cuban sugar mills, oil refineries, public utilities and banks suddenly vanished, planned a reactionary coup on the newly communist Cuba. Because of the success in Guatemala just five years back, and Castro’s seeming similarity to Arbenz—the resemblance of “both leaders as puppet-like creatures of the monolithic Communist conspiracy”—US warmongers felt the previous coup “could be to a large extent duplicated in Cuba” (Immerman, 650). Castro’s regime, though, was not inexpert on the failures of the Arbenz administration—it immediately gave power (and arms) to the people, unlike Arbenz—and immediately seized the power from those who gained so greatly from the institutionalization of exploitation of the indigent Cubans.

Of utmost interest is a document written by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Lyman L. Lemnitzer. In this recently declassified document, ‘Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba,’ otherwise known as Operation Northwoods, Lemnitzer confides that “the ultimate objective [in Cuba] is overt military intervention” (6), publicly backed, rather than another covert involvement like those in Iran and Guatemala. “Since it would seem desirable to use legitimate provocation as the basis for US military intervention in Cuba,” the US could reasonably “Start rumors (many). Use clandestine radio...Start riots...Sabotage ship in harbor;

large fires - - naphthalene...Conduct funerals for mock victims...A ‘Remember the *Maine*’ incident could be arranged...Casualty lists in US newspapers would cause a helpful wave of national indignation” (7-8). “Harassment of civil air, attacks on surface shipping and destruction of US military drone aircraft...would be useful as complementary actions,” but in so doing, “[h]ijacking attempts against civil air and surface craft should appear to continue as harassing measures condoned by the government of Cuba...the passengers could be a group of college students off on a holiday or any grouping of persons with common interest.” There would be no need for either an actual flight or the physical body of a hijacker, though, and this should be quoted at length:

An aircraft at Elgin AFB would be painted and numbered as an exact duplicate for a civil registered aircraft belonging to a CIA proprietary organization in the Miami area. At a designated time the duplicate would be substituted for the actual civil aircraft and would be loaded with the selected aliases. The actual registered aircraft would be converted to a drone.

Take off times of this drone aircraft and the actual aircraft will be scheduled to allow a rendezvous south of Florida. From the rendezvous point the passenger-carrying aircraft will descend to minimum altitude and go directly into an auxiliary field at Elgin AFB where arrangements will have been made to evacuate the passengers and return the aircraft to original status. The drone aircraft meanwhile will continue to fly the filed flight plan. When over Cuba the drone will be [sic] transmitting on the international distress frequency a “MAY DAY” message stating he is under attack by Cuban MIG aircraft. The transmission will be interrupted by destruction of the aircraft which will be triggered by radio signal. This will allow ICAO radio stations in the Western Hemisphere to tell the US what has happened to the aircraft instead of the US trying to ‘sell’ the incident. (10-11)

The coup that followed is consensually called the Bay of Pigs, and usually a *fiasco*. The staunchly brash men in the State Department that carried out the coup failed to recognize the differences between the two leaders (Arbenz and Castro) in terms of contrasting military potency, and likewise failed miserably in their ouster attempt. The coup was carried out both within and outside Cuba under Kennedy, though it was originally planned under the Eisenhower administration. Outside of Cuba, Ike sought to establish “a responsible and unified Cuban opposition to the Castro regime,” and to develop “a paramilitary force outside of Cuba for future guerilla action.” Inside of Cuba, Ike authorized the spurring of “a powerful propaganda offensive,” and “the establishment of a ‘covert action and intelligence organization.’” (Gilderhus, 169)

Succeeding “the greatest military man in America,” Kennedy took on the task of facing off with Castro under the same stage managers and planners as in the Eisenhower administration. The coup was designed to drop paramilitary men at the Bay of Pigs, isolated by some eighty miles of marshland, and to gather anti-Castro Cubans to confront and expel the Castro squad. The North Americans, though, underestimated the power of Castro’s 225,000 regular troops as opposed to the 1,500-man Castro resistance force that they had assembled within Cuba. Castro’s forces quickly suppressed the coup as they “pinned down the invaders on the beach, killed about two hundred, and captured the rest.” (Gilderhus, 178) Though the coup is now considered a debacle, imperial US policymakers did not lose hope in their propensity to gain global hegemony and influence.

Along with dissatisfaction of President Kennedy’s direction came his assassination by the behind-the-scenes network of Northwoods authors and sponsors, though Oswald is still the official lone-assassin. Kennedy had rejected the Northwoods document and fired Lemnitzer as head of the Joint Chiefs and fired Allen Dulles as CIA Director, who later worked in the Warren Commission to investigate his death, to produce the notorious whitewash that our government still stands by. Kennedy also wanted to end the space race and nuclear competition with the Russians for cooperation and he had wanted to de-escalate the war in Vietnam, just a few of the things reversed that Kennedy had envisioned before being shot in Dallas. In Kennedy’s absence the imperial strategists held free reign over the direction of the States and the world. Most especially noteworthy in this context is the Gulf of Tonkin incident of 1964, in which President Johnson, Southwest Texas alumnus, pronounced the sinking of a US vessel by the North Vietnamese along their eastern shore, which unsurprisingly sparked a *helpful wave of national indignation* among the American public. Immediately thereafter, more bombs were dropped on Vietnam than in all of the Second World War. The North Vietnamese countryside shook to incessant carpet-bombing for their misbehavior regarding the sinking of the vessel, which they may have regretted. They may have regretted their actions had they committed them. As history unravels, documents, phone recordings, and Robert McNamara himself, have admitted that the event was a total fabrication, which led to the holocaust of some 1.5 million Vietnamese and 58,000 dead Americans; just over a 25:1 kill ratio, in another example of mock pretext for war.

“As staunch anti-communists, Eisenhower officials displayed no equivalent devotion to democracy and human rights;” (Gilderhus, 143) “under Eisenhower and Dulles, Washington

developed a foreign policy that equated Third World non-alignment with evil;” (Forsythe, 388) the anti-communist “rivalry with the Soviet Union espoused a permanent role for the United States as world policeman.” (Higgs) The elite who instigated Cold War fraudulence sum up the plot and scheme most acutely. As far as market creation via intervention, according to Leo Crowley of the Truman Cabinet: “If you create good governments in foreign countries, automatically you will have better markets for ourselves;” (Doctorow, 234) Bipartisan Senator-Statesman Vandenberg drops the scheme for public adherence: “We’ve got to scare the hell out of the American people;” (Doctorow, 238) and Dulles reaches with a spoon through the gleaming tube: “Guatemala. It is the scene of dramatic events. They expose the evil of the Kremlin to destroy the inter-American system, and they test the ability of the American States to maintain the peaceful integrity of this hemisphere.” (LaFeber, 118; 1969) Voila, you have fueled and given direction to a commercially hungry war machine. The illegitimacy of the Cold War surfaces as it is realized that “never in the counsels of the Truman Cabinet did anyone seriously regard Russia as a military threat—even after they got their bomb.” (Doctorow, 237) The ignominy of the Cold War was a predatory stab in the neck of a docile mass, in which the injured were kept pinned, entrapped, and yet distracted to contentment at the level of the martyr of the modern workforce, all by way of the damning of an ideology and those who are or had at any time adhered to it, the Communist scapegoat. *The superstructure is a lie and the foundation is a huge quaking fear.* The \$10 trillion spent in the Cold War was “enough money to replace the entire infrastructure of the world, every school, every hospital, every roadway, building and farm.” (Hawken, 58) Who benefited? In the words of Michael Collins Piper, “it is vital to now face the sad and uncomfortable truth: the Cold War was largely a fraud... While the average American was being told to fear the Soviet Union, America’s biggest bankers and industrialists were engaged in extensive trade and other lucrative deals with the Communist Party bosses. And the US government itself was making vast amounts of technology and other data available to our purported rival. So yes, the Cold War was very much a fraud.”

Conservatism and Big Business: Imperial Interest Intensified

The concentration of business-bank-government power is the force that made America the colossus that it is today, run by a conservative sect of enormously wealthy individuals and corporations in Washington, referred to as K Street. Judis describes the ascension of conservative/business interests; he shows that conservatism developed circa mid-1950s, and came to dominate politics in the very late elections of the 1970s. Before the “coherent movement began to emerge” in the ’50s, conservative thought lay disunited over various anti-something groups: “anti-Semites, libertarians, fascists, racists, anti-New Dealers, isolationists.” Led initially, says Judis, by the *National Review* and Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater, the group opposed the New Deal, Social Security, compromise with Soviet Communism, and stood for massive defense budgets and operations; corporate free-handedness backed by the military where need be. (142)

During the vast ‘encroachment’ on white liberty of the national Civil Rights movement in the 1960s, traditionally conservative Democrats in the North and South made their transition to the Republican Party in response to desegregation, and the conservative “political base immeasurably widened.” (143) The conservative call for less government interference domestically (supply-side economics) and the value of moral tradition (Protestant gospel) brought both big business and big church to back the ‘right’ with capital and emotionally, not intellectually, won over followers. Democracy domestically continued illegitimately following tradition with neo-conservatives gaining ground, even while allowing certain public concessions; as Dunn and Woodard write, “one can be of a conservative temperament and not possess a philosophical or intellectual understanding of conservatism” (33).

The conservative party pushed considerable political influence, even on a Democratic President Carter, though they had originally had some trouble passing business-friendly legislation in the 1970s. Carter was first reluctant, but eventually caved in. He deregulated prices in the energy program, and “lowered the effective tax rate on capital gains from 49 to 28 percent, preserved business tax exemptions, and lowered corporate tax rates.” (Judis, 142) The triumph of conservatism came largely from business checkbooks in the 1978 elections, when “Republicans picked up 319 state legislative seats, six governorships, 12 House seats, and 3 Senate seats...during the last six weeks of the elections, as the potential for Republican upsets loomed, corporate PACs gave 72 percent of their money to Republicans, particularly to those challenging Democratic incumbents.” (Judis, 149) From 1979 to the 1980 elections, business

supported Republicans two-one generally over Democrats, but by the last week of campaigning, the Republicans in the Senate had surpassed Democrats twenty-five to one in terms of private contributions. (Judis, 150) Business bought pliable legislators into office. As Democrats, or otherwise ‘progressives,’ had led by huge numbers in preceding presidencies, the business-powered and gospel-inspired Republicans made and held their dominating position in the government starting in the very late 70s, marking their triumph.

Within the Reagan administration, the conservative/business lobby was directly operating government. Reagan was less a president than a face for government policy. His team was comprised of very powerful names in industry. Oilman (baron), owner of the exploitative United Fruit Co., ex-ambassador to the UN, and ex-CIA Director, “a man with ambitions,” George H.W. Bush held office as Vice President. (Perkins, 73) Among other administration officials, *that will have directly controlled our country for twenty of twenty-eight years*, were Dick Cheney, a powerful oilman, Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz, the enormously influential Pentagon authorities. To add to Reagan’s key appointments, “two outspoken opponents of the environmental movement...were put in charge...of the Interior Department and the Environmental Protection Agency.” (Judis, 151) So his cabinet was led by war hungry, resource thirsty, and environmentally apathetic businessmen that fought major, simultaneous theatre wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran, Nicaragua, and sent troops, planes, or other intimidation, into Libya, El Salvador, Honduras, Lebanon, Grenada, Bolivia, the Virgin Islands, the Philippines, Panama, Liberia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Los Angeles, CA, Somalia, Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Haiti, and staged a coup on a Venezuelan democracy in 2002. Clinton, too, considered himself conservative and his military policy deviated little from the neo-conservative presidencies that sandwiched his eight-year term.

This faction of conservatism, neo-conservatism, is certainly the most influential, and more mild conservatives around the country follow this sect in step. Republican conservatism came to be a force in the late 1970s, when HW ran the CIA and the world opium market moved from Southeast Asia to Afghanistan, but came to dominate when HW became the Vice President. Reagan’s inauguration marked not only his presidency but also the triumph of neo-conservatism. This conservatism is intent on global dominance; they have secured and seek to secure further their global domination. As Lasswell says, coercion comes from the manipulation of goods, symbols, and violence, and our leaders have had all these at hand. Fear mongering had always

been sport in Washington, every war had pretext, never completely valid, but rationalization for US genocide in the 1980s turned the sport of instigating war into science. The same people that staged Reagan's War on Terror have been staging Bush II's War on Terror. The same war and construction companies provide for the same buyers. *Some* names have changed but the game remains the same. In the Reagan-Bush tradition, their preferred economic policy, "trickle-down," (supply-side economics) was of obstinate detriment to the average American in the 1980s, and this economic policy lives yet with Bush II planners.

The Rich Land of Afghanistan

The region commonly referred to by industrialized states as Central Asia has long been of immense interest to these “civilized” nations. Afghanistan has been of prime interest in terms of profitable resources, especially oil, opium, and transportation routes, but “the combination of rugged terrain, a population of well-armed ‘martial tribes,’ and a deep Islamic faith that encouraged *jihād* against Western invaders made the roof of southern Asia impervious to conquest.” (Haq, 1996: p.946) “Opium’s commercial potential” has been in sight of imperial eyes at least since the mid-seventeenth century when Dutch merchants were involved in the shipments of “more than 50 tons a year after 1650.” (McCoy, 1991: p.4) The British East India Company later monopolized the opium market, marking the beginning of the opium trade’s modern era in 1773. “British commerce had transformed opium from a luxury good into a bulk commodity of the same proportions as chemical stimulants—coffee, tea, and cacao.” (McCoy, 4-5) During the Romantic Age of the nineteenth century, imperial Britain attempted invasion twice, defeated in 1838 and 1878, “suffering humiliation and heavy casualties in both attempts.” (Haq, 946) British invasion did, however, mark the beginning of future imperialistic policy, as they practiced their infamous “butcher and bolt” tactics, whereby colonial soldiers would “march into the offending village, butcher the available citizens and bolt before the tribe’s warriors could retaliate.” (Davies, 26-28)

Opium exports from Afghanistan were relatively insignificant during the twentieth century, as the leading exports from the Burma-Laos area dominated the European and American markets. This began to change in the late 1970s, as Alfred McCoy notes in *The Politics of Heroin*, when a drought in the Burma area assisted the Pak-Afghan opium merchants to take over the market by 1980, (McCoy, 445-7) coinciding with CIA aid which came in July of 1979. American interest and intervention in the region surfaced *publicly* (outside of America) in 1979, before the Soviet invasion came later the same year (of which the American public was made well aware), the year Afghanistan was “the largest single source of illegal opium.” (Stork, 12) As Soviet interest grew in Afghanistan, so did American anti-communist attention. In 1979, when the USSR saw economic potential from oil, opium and trade routes in Afghanistan, the United States, represented by the CIA, saw means to create a force to stop the potential “domino effect” of communist influence. This was marked by “the CIA’s aid to the Afghan *mujaheddin*,” or freedom fighters, which, “throughout the 1980’s expanded opium production in Afghanistan,” although

the “Western press had maintained a public silence on the origins” (Haq, 945) of the source of the overly abundant narcotic, mind you, in the midst of the war on drugs. This “liberation” army is a prime example of US sponsored proxy-terror drug-running cells that serve as faceless extensions of US policy.

The Seattle Times explains that “Afghanistan was a key Cold War battlefield in the 1980s;” (Oct. 2, 1996: pA16) the Soviet invasion in late 1979 marked the beginning of the historical superpower war from 1979-1989. The CIA was active in sparking this Soviet intervention though; “the first covert CIA aid to the Afghan resistance fighters” came “fully six months before the Soviet invasion—in July 1979,” (Cooley, 19) anticipating and planning for a sure Soviet strike in coming months. National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski spoke for the Carter Administration and the rest of America to a French paper saying, “We didn’t push Russians to intervene, but we consciously increased the probability that they would do so.” (Cooley, 19) A present-day Alcibiades, Brzezinski was involved in the maneuvers of the CIA, headed by the “only one CIA director [who] was also a member of Congress: former President George H.W. Bush.” (MSNBC; Aug.11, 2004) Bush Sr. headed the CIA through the 1970s, and strengthened his power significantly as Vice President through the eighties to the early nineties as he succeeded Reagan as Commander-in-Chief of the world’s lone superpower after the fall of the USSR. Bush Sr. was, and still is, aligned with dominant companies around the board such as the Carlyle Group, Arbusto International, Amoco, Unocal, and Enron.

CIA funding pushed by the interests of Bush, Brzezinski and other runners in oil and arms was not made public until President Carter in July of 1979 “signed the first directive for clandestine aid” (Cooley, 12). One of the most potent actors was Brzezinski, “who had been stage managing US covert” financing to the “moujahidin,” (Cooley, 19) with capital and arms purely as a means “to induce a Soviet military intervention,” as Brzezinski exulted *before* the Soviet invasion of late 1979. (Dale, 30) “In September 1979, Brzezinski writes, he ‘consulted with the Saudis and the Egyptians regarding the fighting in Afghanistan,’” (Stork, 12-3) seeing prospective enormous revenues in the region. The USSR, recognizing US power in the Middle East rising, sought to cripple American force by “attacking imperialism at its weakest link,” (Khalilzad, 1979-1980, 8) (Zalmay Khalilzad was a future Unocal (Union Oil of California) consultant, and is President G.W. Bush’s present ambassador to Afghanistan and “the chief liaison with the Kurds and anti-Saddam exiles in Iraq” (Johnson, 228).)

The haze of “President Reagan’s campaign to fund the Nicaraguan contras has distracted public attention from the much larger covert war operation in Afghanistan” (Stork, 12). Explicating the hegemonic and frivolous state of mind of the US oligopoly sponsoring and orchestrating the war, was the Carter Doctrine of January 1980: “An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America.” (Scott, 30) Arming Afghanistan was the buying of alliances in a *provoked* ten-year duel in Afghanistan between capitalism and communism. General Motors’ US Representative Charles Wilson of Texas, “Good Time Charlie,” who shared in the adventurous war sentiment circulating among US leaders, rationalized intervention thus in 1986; “There were 58,000 dead [Americans] in Vietnam and we owe the Russians one and you can quote me on that” (Stork, 12).

As aid in capital and arms grew increasingly into the 1980s, “mujaheddin clients used their new CIA munitions to capture prime agricultural areas inside Afghanistan.” Insurgent control of the opium-prime areas marked a “doubling of the country’s opium harvest to 575 tons between 1982 and 1983,” according to the Bureau of International Narcotics Matters, under the US Department of State in 1984. (Haq, 954) As a matter of fact, CIA aid in munitions during the ten-year conflict totaled over \$2 billion in light weapons, “including Stinger antiaircraft missile launchers, and offered instruction in how to use them against the Soviet forces occupying Afghanistan.” (Johnson, 139) US armaments were used to slaughter Russkies and contain the power in Afghanistan to US-friendly clientele, the mujaheddin; US armaments gave rise to the vast expansion of opium in one of the world’s most fertile opium terrains; and the opium produced under these arms created a market out of addicted Soviet soldiers, serving doubly as a diversionary and an anesthetic drug.

The ten-year Afghan war was an intensely bloody conflict prompted by the imperialistic motives of the US and USSR, another chapter of the courageous Cold War. One estimate cites that “at least 14,453” (Grau, Jorgensen, 1998) Soviets died in the war, omitting Afghan casualties. Another source estimates that the Russians had a ten to one kill ratio, (Wars in Peace, 1995) perhaps one hundred and forty-four thousand dead Afghans. Though Afghan-Online insists that the “[e]xperts agree that at least 40,000-50,000 Soviets lost their lives in action,” still omitting Afghan deaths; according to Russia’s own estimates (ten to one kill ratio), Afghan deaths could have been as many as 500,000 in the ten-year stretch. Brzezinski, *the* epitome of the American

Forrest

expansionist/anti-communist personage, rationalizes these deaths thus; “What is the most important to the history of the world, the Taliban or the collapse of the Soviet empire? Some stirred up Moslems or the liberation of Central Europe and the end of the Cold War?” (Dale, 35)

End of the Cold War: Continuance of Neo-Colonialism

Though most Americans are convinced that the US is responsible for the demise of the Soviet Union, some scholars would argue differently. Chalmers Johnson, president of the Japan Policy Research Institute and professor emeritus at the University of California, San Diego, writes that it is indeed a “dangerously misleading conclusion that the United States caused the Soviet Union’s collapse and therefore ‘won’ the Cold War.” (16) Johnson shows that President Mikhail Gorbachev’s idealism caused the “fall” of the evil empire, as Russian leaders earnestly wanted to “become members of the ‘common European house,’” and to be recognized internationally as a “normal” state. (19) Nonetheless, American “triumphalists” remain certain that capitalist pride and prowess caused the Communist downfall. Johnson’s book ascertains at length that our modern empire is an empire of global military bases, and shows expansion of these military bases through the interventions of the past hundred and fifty years.

Afghan relations in the nineties evolved from covert CIA involvement to covert US corporation involvement with the very groups that the CIA had created and sponsored throughout the seventies and eighties. SOCAL (Standard Oil Company of California), who was aligned with Pakistan, speculated the development of a “trans-Afghan pipeline from Central Asia to the Indian Ocean,” (Cooley, 146) as a means of extracting more simply the raw petroleum for shipment from the oil-rich Central Asian basins. Unocal in 1996 developed relations with the Taliban, who had taken control of ninety percent of Afghanistan in September of 1995 when they captured the capital of Kabul. This victory mirrored the Soviet-Afghan war of the eighties, in that our highly trustworthy leaders in office sponsored the mercenaries with Defense dollars. Upon the Taliban’s takeover, oil companies in America had standing relations with the repressive new government in power. This “support for a Taliban government in Afghanistan,” as Chalmers Johnson sees it, was basically just “a way to obtain gas and oil pipeline rights for an American-led consortium,” (226) as “the new government” was “Unocal’s best hope for ‘stability.’” (179)

On the morning of August 7, 1998, truck bombs were used against American embassies in simultaneous explosions in East Africa. The sites hit were Nairobi, Kenya and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and over 5,000 were injured and killed in both cities. Bin Laden and his cronies in his US-sponsored al-Qaida terrorist group were immediately suspected. The attacks on our embassies temporarily overshadowed Clinton’s alleged perjury in his public-distracting sex scandal. “Infinite Reach” was our retaliatory attack in which cruise missiles struck al-Qaida training

camps almost two weeks later on the twentieth. Bin Laden himself was absent from the ballistic reprisal brought by the States, but it was later said, “The United States was aware of his absence. It deliberately chose not to kill him...because a dead bin Laden would greatly enhance his already legendary charisma among violent Islamic [groups] everywhere. He would become a historic martyr whose death would stir his supporters to more frenzied acts against” the US. (Cooley, 220) US bombing and occupation continued in Afghanistan well into the new millennium, without an American cease-fire to this day, but bin Laden remains an impending threat.

Bin Laden had to this point been a well-known and wanted terrorist in several countries. The Clinton administration inexcusably passed up his incarceration on several occasions according to the *LA Times* in December of 2001. The Sudanese had been trying regularly to aid the US in the capture of bin Laden and his colleagues, but “US authorities repeatedly turned the data away,” twice in 1996, once in 1997, “and finally in February 1998, when Sudan’s Intelligence Chief, Gutbi al-Mahdi, wrote directly to the FBI;” either from lack of interest or certainty of superfluity the information was refused, more likely the information was disgorged for its surveillance of US-sponsored operations. Clinton had another chance to extradite bin Laden in July 2000, “but senior Clinton officials sabotaged the offer.” It was obvious, wrote the *LA Times*, “[r]adical Islam, for the administration, was a convenient national security threat.” By way of attention-diverting acts of terror, public discourse could be curtailed by Islamic arson a hemisphere away.

The second Bush administration did not just pass up chances to detain bin Laden, for example the ignored warnings from the same Taliban, (BBC, 9/7/2002) but actively, with legislation, blocked federal agencies from his capture. The legislation was entitled W1991 WF213589, and it pulled FBI agents away from investigating terrorist cells, most especially WAMY. The World Assembly of Muslim Youth is a group that has been expelled from several countries, active in at least fifty-five, including the US, where they are located in the suburbs of Washington, D.C., and the group harbored four of the supposed 9/11 hijackers months before the attacks. WAMY also has ties to the bin Laden family and Saudi royal families; the US founder is ABL—Abdullah bin Laden, Osama’s nephew. The Bushes and bin Ladens had “held a stake in Carlyle,” “one of America’s biggest defense contractors, but the bin Laden family sold just after September 11.” (BBC, 11/6/01; see also *Armed Madhouse*, Greg Palast) The Carlyle group pockets literally one half of the US defense budget annually and a bill that passed in the House of

Representatives allowed for a \$388 billion discretionary defense bill for the 2005 fiscal year.

In March 2001, the Russian Permanent Mission at the UN offered “an unprecedentedly detailed report,” including “a listing of all bin Laden’s bases, his government contracts and foreign advisors.” It was sufficient information to extradite the most wanted terrorist in America, “[b]ut the Bush administration took no action.” (Griffin, 76) The administration took no action; more than haughty neglect of the information from the Russkies, it was a matter of not detaining one’s own agents, especially in preparation for the impending September spectacles, which would require feasible flunkies as basis for dashing military reprimand, in the pre-designated geostrategic hotspots in the Middle East in particular, which the Project for a New American Century had drawn out no later than September of 2000, to be discussed below.

In all events, in 2000, Taliban leader Mullah Mohammad Omar placed a complete ban on opium production in Afghanistan, and as *Jane’s Intelligence Review* reports, this “resulted in some 70% of the world’s opium ...being wiped out virtually at a stroke.” Professor Peter Dale Scott, writing in 2000, noticed this ban and predicted a large-scale, overt, American attack in Afghanistan in coming months. While he was still writing his book in 2001, *Drugs, Oil, and War*, hijackers flew planes into the heart of capitalism, the signature buildings in the World Trade Center. Naturally, the US immediately responded with military force to eliminate the evil scourge in Afghanistan. Behind US war aims was an American public blood-lusty for revenge against the terrorists. The US, in connivance with the Northern Alliance, an internationally known drug surrogate, defeated the Taliban in a few months and still occupies the chaotic region, where the Northern Alliance has fully reinstated the cultivation of opium, but fighting continues nonetheless. As Scott predicted, opium production is back at its peak in the fertile region of Central Asia. Scott, a distinguished scholar on US foreign intervention, has written nine books critiquing US foreign policy. In *Drugs, Oil, and War* (2003), he writes that between the four major US wars after WWII, the Korean War, Indochina, Vietnam, and Afghanistan, each “involved reliance on proxies who were also major international drug traffickers,” and “were fought in or near significant oil-producing areas.” (27) Principal in these wars has been “oil companies and their own ad hoc lobbying groups in lobbying directly for heightened commitment in Vietnam [and] Afghanistan...whose names were less revealing of economic interest—the American Friends of Vietnam in the 1950s and 1960s, the Committee for a Free Afghanistan in the 1980s.” (4)

Scott goes on to write that another recurring theme in these wars is jeopardy of the world's largest opium-producing country in the opium-fertile grounds of South and Central Asia. In each war, not including Vietnam, the leading opium production has faced direct threat, and US intervention has always led to the assurance of opium in the region where the fighting has taken place. The Chinese threatened Korean opium production in the late 1940s following the Chinese "fall" to communism. Communism again threatened the production of opium in Indochina, and the Taliban, under Mullah Mohammad Omar, had placed a complete ban on the largest producer of opium in 2000. In each, the *US intervened, opium cultivation was fully restored, and future oil rights were guaranteed to American companies indefinitely*. To exemplify this further, on 19 November 2004, "The UNODC's (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime) Afghanistan Opium Survey 2004 found that opium cultivation had increased by 64 percent compared to 2003 in the Central Asian state, with a mammoth 131,000 hectares (323,708 acres) devoted to poppy farming." (Jang's Group) How could this be with continued US military occupation?

Not only was the vast reestablishment of opium under the rule of the Northern Alliance a publicly unforeseen consequence of the War on Terror, but on 10 October 2001, "the US Department of State had informed the Pakistani Minister of Oil that 'in view of recent geopolitical developments,' Unocal was ready to go ahead with the pipeline project." (Griffin, 92)

Imperial Forces Behind 9/11

In 1997, neo-conservatives that were, according to *American Free Press*, “closely tied to Persian Gulf oil and weapons and defense industries,” (4/12/2004) founded a think tank that pushed for complete military and economic US global dominance. The group founded was that of PNAC, Project for a New American Century. Signers of its Statement of Principles, among other chairmen of the establishment, include Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, and Jeb Bush, Zalmay Khalizad, Dan Quayle, Paul Wolfowitz, I. Lewis Libby, William Bennet, and Steve Forbes; these are men driving the strongest, most advanced war machine in history.

Among the Project’s Principles is the “need to increase defense spending significantly if we are to carry out our global responsibilities today and modernize our armed forces for the future.” PNAC also calls for “a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States’ global responsibilities.” As AFP reports, “the PNAC is part of the New Citizenship Project, whose chairman is also William Kristol, and is described as ‘a non-profit, educational organization whose goal is to promote American global leadership.’” (4/12/2004) In 2000, the group released another statement of principles, this one titled *Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*. The document reads, “The process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor,” (51) reminiscent of the *Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba*, that called for a “Remember the Maine” operation, which would provide the requisite death toll for the manufacturing of a national wave of indignation.

Even as US officials hotly denied any possible foreknowledge of the attacks on 9/11, a defense which has been utterly dismantled by its critics, the US also had plans to invade Afghanistan and Iraq. US war planners in July were making plans to occupy Afghanistan “by the middle of October...before the snows started falling in Afghanistan, by the middle of October at the latest,” according to a report by the BBC, interviewing a Pakistani who had met with senior US officials in Berlin in July 2001. (Griffin, 91-2) The PNAC document, *Rebuilding America’s Defenses*, expressed bluntly the necessity of “Gulf regional security.” The document reads: “While the unresolved conflict with Iraq provides the immediate justification, the need for substantial American force in the Gulf *transcends the issue* of the regime of Saddam Hussein.” (14; cited in Griffin, 91; emphasis added)

The attacks on 9/11 very much provided the pretext, or the trigger, for desirous US officials to wage instantaneous warfare on Afghanistan, with a follow-up war on Iraq (*Operation Iraqi Liberation; OIL*), two places the US had interests and had bombs dropped for years. With such an important role in shaping American foreign policy and history at large, the attacks on 9/11 should be carefully scrutinized.

The 9/11 Commission reports that the North and South Towers were hit at 8:46 and 9:03, respectively. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for hijacked aircraft would have intercepted any potentially hijacked aircraft within ten minutes of the plane flying off course. AA Flight 11 was known to be hijacked at the earliest of 8:21, twenty-five minutes before it struck the North Tower. Theologian and outspoken skeptic of the party-line on events, David Ray Griffin, in *The New Pearl Harbor*, a book that Howard Zinn calls “the most persuasive argument I have seen for further investigation of the Bush administration’s relationship to that historic and troubling event,” cites specific FAA regulation: “Consider that an aircraft emergency exists...when...There is unexpected loss of radar contact and radio communications with any...aircraft...If...you are in doubt that a situation constitutes an emergency, handle it as though it were an emergency.” (4) The official account of 9/11 shows that radio contact was lost at 8:14, and says that “takeover [was] likely.” (32) Fighter jets would have had at least thirty-two minutes to scramble and intercept Flight 11.

With thirty-two minutes to intercept Flight 11 before reaching the North Tower, it would seem that the interceptor jets would, beyond any doubt, have been airborne and patrolling New York airspace by 9:03, the time United Flight 175 struck the South Tower, regardless of the time the radio transponder was reportedly turned off at 8:42, when the plane drastically changed course toward New York City. The non-interception of the flights raises some “disturbing questions,” says Griffin, but “another disturbing feature about this crash, especially to the families of the victims, is that at 8:55, a public announcement was reportedly broadcast inside the South Tower, saying that the building was secure, so that people could return to their offices. Such announcements reportedly continued until a few minutes before the building was hit,” which, with reports of another hijacked plane heading toward New York, would seem to imply “that perhaps someone other than the hijackers was seeking to insure that a significant number of lives were lost.” (7)

Equally striking in the official account as the absence of interceptor flights, is the nature

of the collapse of the WTC. The 9/11 Commission writes that, “at 9:58:59, the South Tower collapsed in ten seconds.” (305) “The North Tower collapsed at 10:28:25,” in ten seconds, in what amounted to the nation’s “largest loss of life—2973—on its soil as a result of hostile attack in its history;” (311) omitting the casualty counts in the incalculable extermination of the American Indians and the 600,000+ deaths in the Civil War. Also omitted is WTC 7, which fell in just six seconds to fires, and was occupied by five government agencies: the US Secret Service, IRS Regional Council, the CIA, the SEC, and the Mayor’s Office of Emergency Management. 11 September 2001 is a date that stands not just for the first attack on American land in the twenty-first century, but also the first time that *any* skyscraper had fallen from uncontrolled fires, when three buildings collapsed within hours due to uncontrolled fires. For such superstructures to fall, the steel frames would have to be severed at every level, which is indeed what happened. But why would, indeed how could, fires from upper floors sever the forty-seven central and 236 perimeter steel columns that erected the towers? And what should be made of the swift, complete and symmetrical nature of the collapses on 9/11, including WTC 7 that was not hit by aircraft and would thus negate the theory that the Towers fell from either the impact of the planes or from the heat of burning jet fuel?

I recently heard Professor Stephen Jones in Los Angeles at the *9/11 Scholars Symposium*, otherwise known as *9/11 + The Neo-Con Agenda: National Education + Research Conference*, the largest exercitation of freedom of assembly with its given intent to date, put on by Alex Jones and Infowars.com. Professor Stephen Jones is a jocund physicist at Brigham Young University, who, among others, noticed some discrepancies between the ‘official’ story and physics. In a manuscript titled “Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Collapse?” Jones offers an “explosive demolition hypothesis” and pleas for more formal and scientific investigation of the attacks, noting specifically, “Scientific inquiry is not or should not be dictated by politics.” (28) Having read all official reports (from FEMA, NIST, and the 9/11 Commission Report) and most articles published on the subject, Jones posits that there is not only a lack of independent investigation into why the WTC collapsed, but that the official story defies science.

Jones begins with the collapse of WTC 7, “which was never hit by a jet.” (1) Footage of the collapse of this building is available over the internet and provides for a very good understanding of his thesis; “reference to web pages is used in this paper due largely to the importance of viewing motion picture clips, thus enhancing consideration of the laws of motion

and physics generally.” (<http://911research.wtc7.net/talks/wtc/videos.html>) From supposedly random fires, the building collapsed rapidly and symmetrically. *Beginning with a crease* in the center of the building, there follows a “sequence and fast timing of observed puffs or ‘squibs’” jetting from the sides of the building. WTC 7 was a 47-story building with “24 huge steel support columns...as well as huge trusses, arranged asymmetrically, along with approximately 57 perimeter columns,” according to the FEMA report of 2002. “On the other hand,” says Jones, “a major goal of controlled demolition using explosives is the complete and symmetrical collapse of buildings.” (3)

In the debris of Ground Zero, molten and partially evaporated steel was found that would not be explained by the damage of impact of the planes nor fires burning engine fuel and office supplies. Yet “molten steel flowed in the pile of ruins” (Penn, 2002) at all three collapse sites. The temperature generated by the burning of the fuel and office supplies would not generate anywhere near enough heat to partially evaporate steel (5000° F). But let us not forget WTC 7, which was not hit by an aircraft, or exposed to diesel fires, and was reported to have had molten steel flowing in the rubble. “However,” says Jones, “thermite, RDX and other commonly-used explosives can readily slice through steel (thus *cutting the support columns simultaneously* in an explosive demolition) and reach the required temperatures,” to produce flowing and evaporated steel. (Jones, 4, emphasis added) The disintegration of the WTC collapse produced flowing and evaporated steel, in time with gravity at near free-fall speed, and the building’s concrete was pulverized into tiny dust particles, impossible results of fire from jet fuel. By the time of the convention in Los Angeles, 24-25 July 2006, Jones had obtained a sample of the WTC debris and verified it as thermate, a chemical used in controlled demolition for its slicing precision. In any event, whether thermate, thermite, or RDX, footage of the WTC 7 can not be reasonably explained without an explosive best guess, and the Towers’ collapses are also bare-witness proof of the explosive-demolition hypothesis; the buildings are blasted from top to bottom with great explosions from above following a synchronized wave of explosions at the core which began with the fall of the antenna (and noticed in the squibs at the side of the building preceding debris, otherwise beyond description, and noted by Jones), imploding the building below the explosive charges above, and the buildings come straight down at free fall speed. Only the absurd could explain the fall of the towers otherwise.

The FEMA report of 2002 recounts footage of the North Tower collapse. Much like the

initial crease in the center of WTC 7, “the transmission tower on top of the structure began to move downward and laterally slightly before movement was evident at the exterior wall. This suggests that collapse began with one or more failures in the central core of the building,” but no hypothesis is given as to why. (chapter 2) The *New York Times*, covering collapse footage, reported that 102 minutes after impact, the “television antenna began to drop a fraction of a second before the rest of the building. The observations suggest that the buildings steel core somehow gave way first,” (Glanz and Lipton, 2002) following the course of routine explosive demolition.

On 9/11, video cameras captured witnesses of bombs in the WTC, many of which can be found on Alex Jones’ films, *9/11 The Road to Tyranny*, *Martial Law 9/11: Rise of the Police State*, and his paramount new release *Terrorstorm*. Stephen Jones cites Fox News reporting “an explosion at the bottom of the building...white smoke from the bottom...something happened at the base of the building! Then another explosion.” (De Grand Pre, 2002) French brothers making a documentary on New York firefighters the morning of 9/11 captured footage in the fire department. Firefighter Edward Cachia described “an internal detonation, explosives, because it went in succession, boom, boom, boom, boom, and then the tower came down...It actually gave at the lower floor, not the floor where the plane hit.” (Dwyer, 2005) The documentary *Loose Change* recalls footage of many national stations on the clear morning of the attacks, which, before the party-line story could be set in the minds of the programmers and spokesmen and their affected public, were what could be called truly uncensored broadcasting. Various explosions are repeatedly reported; people lay torn in the lower floors of the Towers from preliminary, casualty-inflicting detonations, on tape. The authentic pre-censor broadcasts shown in this video and others are unarguable. The broadcasts also reveal that the crash and disappearance of the aircraft in Pennsylvania never occurred. The directors of *Loose Change* found live, local footage showing Flight 93 land safely and unscathed in Cleveland, along with footage showing the WTC strikes not by commercial aircraft, with, again, bare-witness, pre-censor live national broadcast. The directors’ means of presentation are particularly convincing.

Moreover, several prominent members of the American and international communities have spoken out against the official whitewash. Griffin cites several federal agents, in Chicago, New York, Phoenix, Minneapolis and Washington DC, whose investigations were averted only before they were fired from their respective offices. Colleen Rowley and Sibel Edmonds are

among the whistleblowers, for lack of a better term, and have both come forward, daringly in the face of potential federal felony charges on basis of national security. Vermont Governor Howard Dean in 2004 proclaimed himself a 9/11 Truth candidate, citing official complicity of the Bush Administration in the terror attacks of 2001; his campaign was slammed by media vilification, even Dave Chappelle joined in Dean's derision. Recently, Charlie Sheen, who also spoke in Los Angeles, and Ed Asner were interviewed on the Alex Jones Show, broadcast worldwide by Genesis Communications Network (GCN) out of Austin, Texas, saying that they believed there was much need of a renewed investigation into the attacks: specifically, how the hijacked aircraft could have slipped past radar controllers and further past interceptor flights for over two hours; how the buildings could have collapsed without explosive demolition; the circumstances behind the collapse of WTC 7, in which fires inexplicably combusted in Giuliani's fire and dust proof Office of Emergency Management, among other random fires in the building; the situation between the Pakistani ISI and US Intelligence; the curious warnings given to Pentagon and other national officials not to fly the day before September 11th; the dubitable hypothesis that a Boeing 757 actually hit the Pentagon; the reasons for the anti-hunt of bin Laden; among an inordinately long list of other "disturbing questions," as Griffin calls them.

The international community has also borne skeptics of the official account. Russian General Leonid Ivashov, in *Who's Noticing the NATO Danger?*, has written of US imperial ambitions, "controlled by forces which *stand above presidents*;" "the international financial mafia." (emphasis added) In another article, *International Terrorism Does Not Exist*, he has written that it was an impossibility for such an attack as that of 9/11 to be carried out in the most protected land and airspace in the world. He writes: "[If] we analyze what happened on September 11, 2001, in the United States, we can arrive at the following conclusions:

1. The organizers of those attacks were the political and business circles interested in destabilizing the world order and who had the means necessary to finance the operation. The political conception of this action matured there where tensions emerged in the administration of financial and other types of resources. We have to look for the reasons of the attacks in the coincidence of interests of the big capital at global and transnational levels, in the circles that were not satisfied with the rhythm of the globalization process or its direction.

Unlike traditional wars, whose conception is determined by generals and politicians, the oligarchs and politicians submitted to the former were the ones who did it this time.

2. Only secret services and their current chiefs or those retired but still having influence inside the state organizations have the ability to plan, organize and conduct an operation of such magnitude. Generally, secret services create, finance and control extremist organizations. Without the support of secret services, these organizations cannot exist let alone carry out operations of such magnitude inside countries so well protected. Planning and carrying out an operation on this scale is extremely complex.

3. Osama bin Laden and "Al Qaeda" cannot be the organizers nor the performers of the September 11 attacks. They do not have the necessary organization, resources or leaders. Thus, a team of professionals had to be created and the Arab kamikazes are just extras to mask the operation.

The September 11 operation modified the course of events in the world in the direction chosen by transnational mafias and international oligarchs; that is, those who hope to control the planet's natural resources, the world information network and the financial flows. This operation also favored the US economic and political elite that also seeks world dominance.”

In an article from 6 September 2003, “This War on Terrorism is Bogus,” in *The Guardian*, Michael Meacher, British environment minister from May 1997 to June 2003, cites the PNAC “blueprint for US world domination,” saying “it provides a much better explanation of what actually happened before, during and after 9/11 than the global war on terrorism thesis.” He writes in the ~2300 word article “that at least 11 countries provided advance warning to the US of the 9/11 attacks.” He cites *Newsweek* (15 September 2001), reporting that five of the hijackers were trained “at secure US military installations in the 1990s.” He mentions the inaction of US defenses on that morning, the fact that no jets were scrambled to intercept, then he cites, from *Time Magazine* (13 May 2002), that in all of the “US response after 9/11...No serious attempt has ever been made to catch Bin Laden...in November 2001 the USAF complained it had al-Qaida and Taliban leaders in its sights as many as 10 times over the previous six weeks, but had been unable to attack because they did not receive permission quickly enough.” Meacher shows that FDR “used exactly this [the use of terror-borne pretext for war] approach in relation to Pearl Harbor on December 7 1941. Some advance warning of the attacks was received, but the information never reached the US fleet. The ensuing national outrage persuaded a reluctant US public to join the Second World War.” “The 9/11 attacks allowed the US to press the ‘go’ button for a strategy which it would otherwise have been impossible to implement.” He goes on to write:

The overriding motivation for this political smokescreen is that the US and the UK are beginning to run out of secure hydrocarbon energy supplies. By 2010 the Muslim world will control as much as 60% of the world's oil production and, even more importantly, 95% of

remaining global oil export capacity. As demand is increasing, so supply is decreasing, continually since the 1960s.

The official whitewash is further debunked as the BBC reports (23 September 2001) that of the hijacked American Flight 11, skyjackers Waleed al Shehri and Abdul Aziz al Omari were “alive and well;” Waleed Al Shehri had been protesting his innocence from Morocco, and Omari “has also been quoted in Arab news reports.” This article published twelve days after the attack dismantles the Commission Report that was published three years later without marking its year of publication, with the assignment of giving “the most complete account...of the events of September 11, what happened and why.” (xvii) The BBC article also cites the “*Asharq Al Awsat* newspaper, a London-based Arabic daily,” which “says it has interviewed Saeed Alghamdi,” one of the hijackers on the United 93 flight that crashed into Pennsylvania.

Two other notable hijackers include Khalid Almidhar and Nawaf Alhazmi, of American 77 that the Commission reports to have crashed into the Pentagon. The two “lived in San Diego in the fall of 2000 and were taken in by a Muslim man after he met them at a local Islamic center. The landlord had been an informant for the FBI, supplying information about the Islamic terrorist groups Hamas and Hezbollah,” according to a CNN report from 11 September 2002, a year after the attacks. Though the FBI maintains that there was never any knowledge from within its bureau, the CIA reports that it communicated to the FBI that the two men “attended a meeting of known terrorists in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia” in January of 2000. FBI claims no knowledge of the men until August of 2001, despite their connection with the informant and the warnings from the CIA. The point this raises is that terrorists are living in our country, and these two were known by the CIA and linked to the FBI.

Other denials of intelligence and preparation for the cataclysmic events of 9/11 came from NORAD, the North American Aerospace Command. The Commission Report defines the charge of NORAD: “its mission was, and is, to defend the airspace of North America and protect the continent. That mission does not distinguish between internal and external threats; but because NORAD was created to counter the Soviet threat, it came to define its job as defending against external attacks.” (16) “The threat of terrorists hijacking commercial airliners within the United States—and using them as guided missiles—was not recognized by NORAD before 9/11.” (17) *USA Today*, 18 April 2004, reports that, indeed, “in the two years before Sept. 11 attacks,” “NORAD, in a written statement confirmed” that it conducted “exercises simulating what the

White House says was unimaginable at the time: hijacked airliners used as weapons to crash into targets and cause mass casualties. One of the imagined targets was the World Trade Center.” “Numerous types of civilian and military aircraft were used as mock hijacked aircraft,” the statement said. “These exercises tested track detection and identification; scramble and interception; hijack procedures; internal and external agency coordination and operational security and communications security procedures.” But, concludes *USA Today*, quoting General Ralph Eberhart, NORAD commander, “Regrettably, the tragic events of 9/11 were never anticipated or exercised.” The authors and signers of the NORAD statement went unnamed in the article. The truth is even more disturbing. The morning of the attacks, NORAD was carrying out an array of at least fifteen drills, cited in Webster Griffin Tarpley’s *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA*, 3rd ed. (2006). Some of these drills had fighter jet squadrons as far away as Alaska, and others, adding to the chaos of that morning, had superimposed blips on radar screens throughout the American northeast.

NORAD, along with the Central Intelligence Agency, and the various airports that permitted passage of the said terrorists, are toward the end of the Commission Report admitted to having been at fault for negligence and inaction during the attacks, though no one was reprimanded for the inexcusable immobility of the US defense apparatus. Defense measures as such were set for change immediately after the devastating attacks. Government powers were immensely increased, a state of war was called, terrorists were of imminent menace, and Americans were frightened into submission, pacified by the protection of our worldly, power-broking leaders. As Lasswell writes, “The sense of being threatened increases the need for love; hence the symbol of the nation is redefined as infinitely protective and indulgent, powerful and wise.” (41)

The Poisonous Side of Corporate Empire

The worldview of the twenty-first century leaders of society that chose and ordered the direction of humanity was that of a vision of globalization and population subjugation and reduction amidst a continuous thrust toward resource depletion in a parade of massive profit raking. The beginning of the third millennium has been a time of exceptional market piracy, celebrated as a time of a global free market. There was no free market society, nor free market world. The direction of industry and statecraft was based on the manipulation of both supply and demand, and was destructive in most if not all cases to the environment and to the consumer or constituent, and propitious and encouraging to the heads of industry and society (who were for all purposes one and the same).

A ubiquitous example of the selling of a maladaptive product could be seen in the petroleum industry. The demand for oil was made instinctive given the fact that the heads of industry had engineered the marketplace to be oil-dependent—scores if not hundreds of patents had been bought up by the oil, automotive, and insurance industries insuring the non-proliferation of high mileage autos spite the fact that the technology existed that could see an auto travel two-hundred miles per gallon. Aside, however, from the scientifically irrefutable depredatory nature of oil consumption on every level—from the toll taken on the ecosystem, the natural life, at location of drilling, to the infirmity-guaranteeing, carcinogen-carrying workplace at a refinery and thereabouts, to the +23,000 reported mid-oceanic and coastal spills from tankers, (Hawken) to the mis misattributes of excess CO² and carbon monoxide in the immediate stratosphere, to the wide-ranging emphysema-etcetera chronic illnesses that are endemic and epidemic in modern motorized society, to the managed dependency on oil that cost people billions of dollars a year and challenged or destroyed their freedom of choice in the marketplace—heads of industry and their hired expert scientists remained steady in their conviction and protection of the oil-guzzling status quo.

Atop it all, however, was the manipulation of public discourse in all arenas but in this case on the subjects of oil usage, costs of alternatives to petroleum, and, perhaps most misguidedly and disturbingly of all, the sheer amount of oil available in the world and how the oil magnates grabbed and controlled the largest oil reserves. While the “right” argued that war with Iraq was to liberate Iraqis (Operation Iraqi Liberation, later changed to Operation Iraqi Freedom) from the treachery of Husseinian fascism, his role in 9/11, or his possession or

attempted possession of WMD, the “left” argued that the invasion of Iraq was for oil, and both sides were left behind. The reason of the “right” was based on the fallacy of piety and false accusation and that of the “left” was based on the fallacy of ignorance and misdirection of attack stratagem. While we can readily dismiss the in-adroitness of the “right,” we might have asked of the “left” why oil prices continued to soar and shattered price records. The writing was on the wall but public discourse was skewered. The fact was that the leaders of empire sought not to control the oil of Iraq per se, but to control the supply of oil coming out of Iraq, to shut off the spigots, to stimulate artificial scarcity on the market, ever driving up demand and price per unit. Price per barrel was then several times higher than in all of its history and the oil consumers were paying not only for the oil but also for the maintenance of the price of oil in funding the US-conglomerate occupation of Iraqi reserves. In turn, we had a stage-managed and diversionary conflict as to why an Iraqi population slept to the sound of cannon thunder that served as a lullaby for the American herd.

Notwithstanding the distraction and false rationalization of war aims and oil inflation by the prophets at primetime, of “left” or “right” stripes, while the price-gouging oil barons ran away with hundreds of billions of dollars, distracting the public from the nature of the relationship between vendor and consumer, discourse of the nature of energy use then in effect went widely unheeded. These deliberate lapses in discourse were part of the same design, in just this one oily facet of the system. The fact was that the oil addiction was easily eradicable despite the claim that the world had reached the epoch of “peak” oil and that the Anglo-American oil tycoons needed to get their hands on as much of it as possible; not only was the oil not running out, but there was more than there was estimated to be fifty years prior and new reserve discoveries were not irregular.

Fixes to the addiction to oil were found readily in wind energy, hydropower, geothermal power, ever-renewable biomass energy sources, solar hydrogen gas, tidal generators, the highly advanced polycrystalline film and photovoltaic technology, along with a myriad of other energy conservation methods. (Hawken, 87) The fact was that Western nations were addicted to oil by design—not by energy-effectiveness or any particularly convincing rationale—for its disposability and requisite re-sale; oil was a cash cow.

Industry in general was fairly well adept in destruction of all types, not just in the oil arena, whose petro-plastic non-biodegradable goods and usages in food were as ecosystem-

damaging as its fuel products. The agricultural players' role in death, disease and destitution is as noteworthy as that of the oil runners', in just as many respects. Of course the enormous acreages of indigenous land annexed by the colonial powers led to the deracination of millions upon millions of natives from their ancestral soils, but the maintenance of plantation property lines had been kept in effect so as to keep the indigenes poor and dependent upon the wealthier classes, who were their employers or slavers. But that was the New World south of Mesoamerica in the early days. Since, those lands had funneled into fewer and fewer hands, and then Independence in the Spanish colonies brought on a new imperium headed by North American interests. In the United States' area of indigenes population, the natives were simply extirpated as a means of due process. So in this sense the indigenes of the whole of America more resembled weeds than humanoids, and they were rooted accordingly not by hand but by musket. This was among the earliest of crimes of emigrant European planters.

Ag-machinery from the inventiveness of the Industrial Revolution drove even more planters and sharecroppers from their rural communities into cities, requiring the large-scale estates to produce greater and greater surplus, drastically lowering price by sheer over-supply, thereby weeding out more and more small-hand farmers, and creating an irrationally dependent national market in which food came from across the continent rather than from next door. This was the birth of big agriculture and a major boon to the rising industrial state.

Then came the chemical revolution of the beginning of the twentieth century that saw a new rendition of the world coated with chemical compounds. Western powers began to use chemicals in ways not foreseen; chemical warfare tore forces to size, the medicinal industry exploded and new compound-arrangements rained on crop fields to stimulate growth and dissipate parasites. New areas in the science of population-specific targeting arose in just another matter that went rarely discussed. But in this case we are discussing the new innovations of flight-borne crop fertilizers—which disturbingly kindles attention to the chem-trails that laced American skies—which poisoned and killed all corners of the environment and degraded the quality of the food that they were sprayed to protect. In turn, the ecosystem and environs had been torn to bits, planters had to shift operation to fresh soils, not even mentioning the acreage destroyed by the immoderate overgrazing and deforestation for the beef industries, and quality of food suffered to the point of having a toxicity level. But the population had to eat.

As the population was dependent by design, strikingly so in the poisonous cases of oil and food distribution, it is worthwhile to note the enormous line of dependencies that marked everyday life, in so many cases corporate-handed. An astounding congruity in the line of product dependencies that habited lives was the poisonous or pernicious nature of each. Whether oil, agriculture or nuclear and microwave power, chemically-complex public water, the immensely important dissemination of information, or required vaccinations dashed with mercury and other metals, or the wide selection of preventative medicines that required counter-balancing medications that were equally permanent in psychological side-effects, brain damage, or the AIDS-inducing transfusion blood sold by Bayer around the world in the twenty or so years before 2006, the products on the market were tinged with malicious intent. The effects of the new chemical lacing of everything were at first unobvious and unknown. Promptly, the life forms that survived the chemical rebalancing stood living witness to the injurious effects of Industry, but Industry did not swerve; no, Industry accelerated the usage and flushing of the maladaptive, non-biodegradable, ill-intentioned, “synthetic chemicals, which have permeated our work place, our consumer products, our air, our water, produce cancer, annals of birth defects, and some other toxic effects.” (*The Corporation*, 2005) A full-scale war was being waged against the population.

The corporate-governmental bloc was waging war on the population—on all fronts. This was an old pattern, but it had never been so exaggerated. A handful of transnational or multinational corporations teamed with intelligence agencies directed the course of human events. Nothing happened on accident or perchance; earthquakes, wind and storms could be manifest by those with the equipment, see especially Free Press International. (<http://www.freepressinternational.com/wc.html>) John Jay had said that those who own the country should run it, but in the third millennium, those who owned the world ran it.

On the one front, imperial citizens were ruled with stupefying efficacy, losing on so many levels to a mythographing and noxious elite. But on the other front, the world, populations were subjected to more direct rule and oppression. And this was ever-more troubling with the endless outsourcing of manufacturing jobs. Abroad, and unrestricted by challenging labor legislation, imperial companies hired workers at starvation wages, and at the same time claimed that their industriousness was a blessing for the otherwise incapacitated indigenes. But let us not forget that the petro-chemical revolution of the advanced nations also

endangered the poorer nations who served the former as plantation states. The dissemination of deleterious chemicals was no less copious in the undeveloped or “developing” states than in the imperial states where they were created. Populations of seemingly every flag were targets of chemical enrichment in their daily lives. But not just chemically targeted; the undeveloped countries were also targets of capitalist exploitation in areas of manufacturing, whereas they had before been exploited in areas of mining or other retraction of resources, or in the cultivating field of agriculture. As per individual state, the requisite labor in exploitation varied, but the system throughout was largely the same: an oppressive oligarchy favorable to resource-extracting Anglo-American imperialists was maintained by the latter; progressive and secular regimes were disposed of readily to insure resource reliability and to secure regional spheres of influence, wherever that might be, in the new corporate face of balance of power politics. Webster Griffin Tarpley, author of the devastating and paradigm-shifting study, *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA*, which has not received judicious coverage in this text, describing the desirability of various regime choices for Anglo-Americans in the Middle East wrote: “Modernizing secular nationalists are by far the most effective adversaries of the imperialists—they have the potential to score real political, diplomatic and cultural gains for their countries. Theocratic reactionaries are easier to isolate, since their appeal is more circumscribed. In practice, Washington and London have always fostered the rise of fundamentalists, while attempting to eliminate modernizing nationalists.” (390)

By the beginning of the twenty-first century, the Anglo-American oligopoly maintained their preeminence by playing the upper hand in arranging foreign governments, whose chosen leaders were unavoidably unthreatening to the them, and by surreptitiously poisoning and retarding their own publics with an assailment of poisons in food, work, and television, and a steady dose of propaganda rooted in violence, which took the form of false-flag terrorism on the world scene, and rationalized military intervention as being reactionary and, ridiculously in some cases, as humanitarian. Those were the means; enslavement was the end.

Tyranny: Losing to Empire

As empire pursued global and universal hegemony, many were brought to foot the bill. American taxpayers/consumers paid for the arms and technology that pushed economic dominance over client states with violent enforcement. Immediately therein it is seen that the client states subject to foreign rule, clientele of the global capitalist system, were forced to expend their mineral resources and their lifetimes for the profits of the American market bosses. Moreover, it was put to the American consumer to buy the products that their tax dollars helped to bring to, or secure in, the market. In sum, the American taxpayer was paying for and buying into the global capitalist system. The system could not work without both the market and the consumer; the system stood only on the strict regimentation of the populace.

The American ear should have listened more critically to the crafted tales told by the leaders-that-were on the news. Perhaps patchy, this mini-volume has shown that the heroic cant of democracy was no more than shrewd statesmanship, and shrewd means of public enchantment; the American people were never to govern themselves, they were to believe in the benevolence of their form of polity propagated from the nursery to the nursing home; a polity run by “gentlemen,” the “natural aristocracy;” it was to be run by those who owned it. Shamelessly disseminated as the democratic rhetoric was, it was propaganda, in the textbook sense of the word, “capable of eliciting the desired concerted acts. There [was] incessant resort to repetition or distraction;” (Lasswell, 38) unremitting scare mongering that was able to convince the bulk of Americans that cave-based terrorists on lap tops orchestrated the horrendous attacks on democracy in September 2001, *a claim that was never proved*.

The violence and plunder that “terror” had justified was in itself grounds for corporal punishment of complicit American officials, and those that served as accomplices in their mindless party-line alignment. In plain, the official fairytales resulted in the deaths of innumerable persons; in long-term human potential, the numbers were exponentially greater. But the fact that the “terror” was largely manufactured in speech and deed was grounds for still further reprimand. We have seen that American settlers were at first largely peasants, prisoners, and slaves brought over by British corporate interests, and we have seen that from even as far back as the American Revolution, democracy was merely flattering rhetoric for inciting uprising and piety among the British colonists. The speechifying of American grandiosity justified the management of black slaves, the extermination of multitudes of brown indigenous, and

expansionist policy until the frontier was closed in by the Pacific Ocean, at which point satellite states began to be targeted for annexation. This rhetoric was engaged since the birth of our nation, and it would seem that it was time to practice democracy in a more sincere gait.

Dr. Robert Bowman, perhaps the keynote speaker in Los Angeles at the *9/11 Scholars' Symposium*, a charismatic and tide-riding public speaker, is so incredibly credentialed that I quote his resume from his own website for introduction:

Dr. Robert M. Bowman, Lt. Col., USAF, ret. is President of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, Executive Vice President of Millennium III Corporation, and retired Presiding Archbishop of the United Catholic Church. He flew 101 combat missions in Vietnam and directed all the "Star Wars" programs under Presidents Ford and Carter. He is the recipient of the Eisenhower Medal, the George F. Kennan Peace Prize, the President's Medal of Veterans for Peace, the Society of Military Engineers' ROTC Award of Merit (twice), six Air Medals, and dozens of other awards and honors. His Ph.D. is in Aeronautics and Nuclear Engineering from Caltech. He chaired 8 major international conferences, and is one of the country's foremost experts on National Security. (<http://bowman2006.com/>)

Full of decorations, Bowman is also full of relevant rhetoric and inciting cant, and for that he is one of the few figures worthy of thoughtful public support. At the symposium, he charged the US plotters of 9/11 with treason, not incompetence as the fairytale would have the world believe, and he holds that the American people have been robbed of their republic by the mighty corporations and as such are slaves in an entertainment-laden third-world state. I quote his speech at some length:

What do you call a country whose exports are wood pulp and scrap metal, whose principal imports are manufactured goods, and whose fastest growing industry is building and operating private prisons? A third-world country, right? That's what we have become. In its drive to protect the far-flung financial interests of multinational corporations, our government has abandoned our principles and fought wars of aggression against small countries; it has overthrown popularly elected leaders and has installed puppet dictators who have sold out their people to the global robber barons. It has squandered the good will purchased by the blood of our youth in the defense of democracy in World Wars One and Two. In its unilateralist arrogance it has abandoned the ideals championed by our forebears who founded the United Nations. It has violated the legal framework established by our greatest generation at Nuremberg, and in its phony war against the terrorists its own policies have created, our government has overturned the constitutional protections given us by our founding fathers in the Bill of Rights. In its drive toward a corporate New World Order, it has sold out our workers, our families, our environment, our children's

futures and the American dream, and when it needs an excuse for another corporate war, it kills 3000 of our own citizens on 9/11! [applause]

What went wrong? Why are our workers paid such a tiny percentage of their true worth? Why are we the only nation without a national health program? Why are our high school graduates two years behind their counterparts in other countries? Why are we hated by so many around the world? Why do we have hundreds of thousands of troops patrolling foreign lands and supporting foreign dictators? What's going on? The answer is we have lost our republic. Legislators no longer represent the people who elect them, but the corporations who finance them. They answer not to their constituents but to the K street lobbyists who line their pockets and fill their campaign coffers. In return these government officials have undone decades of hard fought victories against the robber barons of the nineteenth century. For years now, through both political parties by the way, the world's billionaires have directed US policy for their own personal profit; this has included agreements like NAFTA, CAFTA and the WTO, falsely portrayed as supporting free trade but in reality promoting free investment, overturning US laws and putting American workers in competition with those in the third world. It has also resulted in a series of wars from Iraq to Bosnia to Kosovo to Afghanistan to Iraq again. Wars that are never in the interest of those fighting them or of the families left behind, wars which only serve the insatiable greed of the global investor class. [applause] And still they don't have enough, so they bring us 9/11. We now have a government, which serves the interests of giant agri-business, giant pharmaceutical companies, giant insurance companies, giant weapons manufacturers, giant oil companies, and all the other global robber barons of the 21st century. Losing out are the rest of us; the increasing number of American families in poverty—even those who work—immigrants working for slave wages, small businesses forced into bankruptcy, seniors unable to afford their medications, especially after part D for disaster, the disappearance of the family farmers, what's left of the dwindling middle class and especially our brave men and women sent around the world to kill Arabs for the oil companies. [applause]

Corporate power, what Alex [Jones] calls the elite, power over our political system, over the media, and over most aspects of our lives, is the greatest danger we face today. Curtailing this power and restoring it to *We the people* is our greatest challenge. Now those of us who dedicate our lives to truth, peace, economic justice and environmental preservation can make little progress in our struggles so long as ultimate power is in the hands of those who profit from deceit, war, poverty, and pollution. [applause] Those are the ones who brought us 9/11, and who want to control every aspect of our lives. We must reassert the sovereignty of *We the people*, over the billionaires and over their hireling bureaucrats and the corporate New World Order.

Bowman forges a very real and volatile enemy in his cant, and resorts like a good speaker to a common past or a common goal with his audience, which would be expected, especially at a venue such as the *9/11 Scholars' Symposium*. But charismatic and rousing as Bowman may be, his calls to revive the golden age of our forebears are largely baseless, or based in myth. As we have seen, American democracy and its exploits are historically synonymous with

fraudulence. Whereas Bowman resorts to many of the shoddy shibboleths of the establishment line in his discourse, his mainline is whelming—our government carried out the attacks on 9/11. He identifies an enemy and later calls for vast social reform to lift the United States back to the first-world status that it has held, at some specific points in the past. His main point of divergence from the rhetoric common on today’s television is his vision of a brighter future that differs from that of the thermonuclear, terrorist future envisioned and threatened by our world leaders.

By 2006, *a long train of abuses and usurpations* has too long reduced the American public and the world at large under *absolute despotism*, and *it is time to provide new guards for future security*. Mark Twain once wrote: “In the beginning of a change, the patriot is a scarce man, and brave, and hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot.” But American democracy cost the timid all along. Every war was bought by American taxpayer dollars—maimed and mangled toddlers and adolescents, at the expense of the American democrat—and the same constituency paid for the products secured in war, without a pang of guilt. Moreover, non-war-secured products proved poisonous on too many occasions to calculate, but the American public consumed on without qualm. The time has come for the people to shake their inveterate, stock-still torpor, to become conscious of the multi-faceted war being waged by the corporate-governmental bloc. As wealth is the means by which the world may be regimented, corporate-governmental boycott seems the most practicable form of resistance, but the population is too loyal to their neighborhood corporations like Wal-Mart and Applebee’s; it is a fealty not unlike the allegiance and dependence of serf to baron in medieval Europe. Barony presides today over the peasants, prisoners and slaves of yesteryear, who churn forth mesmerized and diverted from objectivity, in a world where love is hateful and reality myth. War is not peace; slavery is not freedom; ignorance is not strength—then *cui bono?*

Works Cited

- Achbar, Mark, Jennifer Abbot, Joel Bakan. The Corporation. Zeitgeist Video, 2005.
- Afghanistan Online, Chronological History of Afghanistan. Retrieved November 12, 2004.
<http://www.afghan-web.com/history/chron/index4.html>
- Aris, Ben, Duncan Campbell. "How Bush's grandfather helped Hitler's rise to power." The Guardian Unlimited 9/25/2004.
- Avery, Dylan, Jason Bermas, Korey Rowe. Loose Change 2nd Ed. Louder Than Words, 2005.
<http://www.loosechange911.com/>
- Bamford, David. "Hijack 'suspect' alive in Morocco." BBC News, 9/22/2001.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1558669.stm
- Bash, Dana, Kelli Arena, David Ensor. "Sources: Hijackers' ex-landlord was FBI informant." Cnn.com, 9/11/2002.
<http://archives.cnn.com/2002/US/09/11/ar911.hijackers.landlord/>
- BBC. "Hijack 'suspects' alive and well" BBC News, 9/23/2001.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/1559151.stm
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/1567815.stm>
- Bennigsen, Alexandre, and Marie Broxup. The Islamic Threat to the Soviet State. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983.
- Bollyn, Christopher. "America 'Pearl Harbored'" American Free Press, 4/12/2004.
www.americanfreepress.net/12_24_02/America_Pearl_Harbored/america_pearl_harbored.html
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. The Grand Chessboard. New York: Basic Books, 1997.
- Butler, Smedley D. War is a Racket. New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1935.
- Chomsky, Noam. Hegemony or Survival. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2003.
- Chomsky, Noam. Media Control: The Spectacular Achievements of Propaganda, 2nd Ed. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2002.
- Clark, Kate. "Taleban 'warned US of huge attack.'" BBC News, 9/7/2002.
http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/2242594.stm
- Cooley, John K. Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America and International Terrorism. Sterling, VA: Pluto, 1999, 2000.
- Cumings, Bruce. The Origins of the Korean War. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- Dale, Peter Scott. Drugs, Oil, and War. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2003.
- Doctorow, E.L. The Book of Daniel. New York: Plume, 1996. (Originally published 1971)
- Forsythe, David P. "Democracy, War, and Covert Action." Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 29, No. 4 (Nov., 1992), 385-395.
- Gilderhus, Mark T. The Second Century: US-Latin American Relations Since 1889. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources, Inc, 2000.
- Gleijeses, Piero. Shattered Hope: The Guatemalan Revolution and the Untied States, 1944-1954. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Forrest

- Griffin, David Ray. The New Pearl Harbor, 2nd Ed. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2004.
- Halberstam, David. The Fifties. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1993.
- Haq, Ikramul. "Pak-Afghan Drug Trade in Historical Perspective." Asian Survey, Vol. 36, No. 10, October 1996, p. 945-963.
- Hawken, Paul. The Ecology of Commerce: A Declaration of Sustainability. New York: Harper Business, 1993.
- Higgs, Robert. "The Cold War Economy: Opportunity Costs, Ideology, and Politics of Crisis." Explorations in Economic History. 1 July 1994. <http://www.independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=1297>
- Immerman, Richard H. "Guatemala as Cold War History." Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 95, No. 4 (Winter 1980-1981), 629-653.
- Ivashov, General Leonid. "Who's noticing the NATO danger?" 4/8/2004.
www.american-buddha.com/nato.danger.htm
- Ivashov, General Leonid. "International Terrorism Does Not Exist." 1/17/2006.
<http://www.voltairenet.org/article133909.html>
- Jones, Alex. 9/11: The Road to Tyranny. Austin, TX: Infowars.com, 2002.
www.prisonplanet.tv
- Jones, Alex. Martial Law 9/11: Rise of the Police State. Austin, TX: Infowars.com, 2005.
www.prisonplanet.tv
- Jones, Alex. Terror Storm: The History of Government Sponsored Terror. Austin, TX: Infowars.com, 2006.
www.prisonplanet.tv
- Jones, Stephen. *Why Indeed Did the WTC collapse?* Brigham Young University, 2005. Available online at <http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>
- Johnson, Chalmers. Sorrows of Empire. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004.
- Khalilzad, Zalmay. "The Superpowers and the Northern Tier." International Security. Vol. 4, No. 3 (Winter, 1979-1980): Pages (6-30).
- Komarow, Steven, Tom Squitieri. "NORAD had drills of jets as weapons." *USA Today*, 4/18/04.
- LaFeber, Walter. America in the Cold War: Twenty Years of Revolutions and Response, 1947-1967. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.
- LaFeber, Walter. America, Russia, and the Cold War, 1945-1971. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.
- LaFeber, Walter. Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America. New York: W.W. Norton, 1993.
- Lasswell, Harold. Politics, Who Gets What, When, and How. New York: P. Smith, 1950. (Originally published 1936)
- Lemnitzer, L.L. *Justification for US Military Intervention in Cuba*, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1962.
<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430/northwoods.pdf>
- McCoy, Alfred W. The Politics of Heroin: CIA Complicity in the Global Drug Trade. New York: Lawrence Hill Books, 1991.

Forrest

- Meacher, Michael. "This war on terrorism is bogus." The Guardian Unlimited 9/6/2003.
- Mintz Max M. Seeds of Empire: The Revolutionary Conquest of the Iroquois. New York: New York University Press, 1999.
- Miller, Henry. Tropic of Cancer. New York: Modern Library, 1983. (Originally written 1934)
- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. The 9/11 Commission Report, 1st Ed. New York: WW Norton & Company, undated.
- Palast, Greg. Armed Madhouse. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Paterson, Thomas R. A History of Foreign Relations, Vol. 2. New York: Thompson, 2005.
- Project for a New American Century. *Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources For a New Century*. September 2000.
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/>
- Rubin, Barnett R. "Women and Pipelines: Afghanistan's Proxy Wars." International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-) Vol. 73, No. 2, Asia and the Pacific (April, 1997): Pages (283-296)
- Schreker, Ellen. The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents. Boston: Bedford Books, 1994.
- Schmidt, Hans. Maverick Marine: General Smedley D. Butler and the Contradictions of American Military History. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kectuky Press, 1987.
- Stork, Joe. "The CIA in Afghanistan: 'The Good War'" MERIP Middle East Report. No.141 (July-August, 1986): Pages (12-13)
- Tarpley, Webster Griffin. 9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA 3rd Ed. Joshua Tree, CA: Progressive Press, 2006.
- Van Evera, Stephen. "The Case Against Intervention." The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 266, No. 1, (July, 1990) p. 72-80.
- Zinn, Howard. The People's History of the United States. New York: Harper Collins, 2003.