

The Grand Deception (2nd edition)

A Second Look at the War on Terrorism

© 2002 by G. Edward Griffin

The concepts I would like to share with you today were set to paper three days after the terrorist attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. I printed about a dozen copies and gave them to family and friends. Since then I have added historical data, but *the concepts and the message remain unchanged*. Many of the predictions I made have already come to pass; but any pride I might have in being right is far offset by the grim substance of those predictions.

After completing [*The Creature from Jekyll Island*](#), I felt that I still had one more book to write and that it would be called *The Freedom Manifesto*. I also knew that I would need a dramatic issue in the first chapter to capture attention. Well, the terrorist attack on September 11 was certainly that – and more.

I told those on my email list that I would send them my expanded report, but then I became bogged down in gathering material for the book. By that time, the report had become huge and had to be divided into chapters. All of that took about four weeks. So, what started out to be a four-page report on terrorism metamorphosed into components of what I call *The Grand Deception*, which I anticipate will become Part One of the book. The first edition of *The Grand Deception* was put on the Internet in November of 2001. The second edition, which includes expanded historical information, was released on January 8th, 2002.

At first, it was my intent to keep the material up to date with late-breaking events: but then it occurred to me that it might have more value in its *original* form than if it were continually updated. Writing about news events after they happen is not difficult, but writing about them *before* they happen is another matter. So, with the exception of expanding historical data and adding epilogues to the thirteen predictions at the end of this report, I decided to let the overview stand exactly as conceptualized on Friday, September 14, 2001. This is that report.

KNOW THE ENEMY

In the year 500 B.C., a Chinese general and philosopher by the name of Sun Tzu wrote a treatise called *The Art of War*. It has been translated into just about every language in the world and has become a classic of military and political strategy. In it, Sun Tzu said:

If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle.¹

It is now three days after the attack, and I am haunted by the words of Sun Tzu. America has declared war, but her leaders are not even sure who the enemy is. Is it a man called Osama bin Laden? Is it Afghanistan, the nation that shelters him? Is it the Taliban that rules Afghanistan? Is it a terrorist group called al-Qaeda? Is it Muslim Extremism? We commit to war but do not know the enemy.

The meaning of the war on terrorism is far more complicated than the surface facts would indicate. On the surface, we have a group of people in the Middle East who hate America and have pledged themselves to inflict severe punishment on her, even at the sacrifice of their own lives. If that is as far as we care to look, then the meaning is simple. It is them against us; we are at war; they are the bad guys; we are the good guys; and we must destroy the enemy.

That is the meaning that was given to the American people by their leaders. President Bush summarized it well when he told the nation on 9/11 that the attack was an act of cowardice and that America was the target because it was a beacon of freedom. If that is the correct meaning of the event, the logical consequences are that we must fight back; we must defend freedom; and we must not stop until the cowards are wiped off the face of the earth. That is the path of war, retaliation, and, of course, *counter-retaliation*.

There is, however, a deeper understanding of this event, and it has to do with the maxim: *actions have consequences*. To come to that understanding, we must do the unthinkable in moments of crisis. We must ask questions.

LOYALTY AND PATRIOTISM

Asking questions is not popular with some people. When a nation is at war, there is a tendency for its citizens to rally behind their leaders without questioning the wisdom of their actions. For them, the test of patriotism is conformity. Those who ask questions are called unpatriotic. Life is simple for the conformists. All they want to know is “What side are you on, anyway?”

After reading this book in its entirety, there should be no doubt in anyone’s mind about *my* patriotism or which side holds my loyalty; but, along the way, I definitely will be asking some hard questions about the wisdom of American foreign policy.

Although I may be critical of our politicians and their policies; I want it clearly understood that I totally support our men and women who will be sent into combat as a result of those policies. When we find ourselves in a shooting war, regardless of how we got into it, at that point we have no choice. We must put all that we have into the fight. But, the other side of that coin is that we must fight to *win*. Our goal must be *victory*, not stalemate – and we should achieve it as quickly as possible to minimize casualties on both sides. That does *not* mean fighting a protracted conflict in which something *other* than victory is the goal. That is what our politicians forced us to do in Korea and Vietnam and Desert Storm and the Balkan War. After the fighting was over, the tyrannical regimes were still there. We left them in place. Some of them are now supporting the terrorists who have attacked us.

In the days ahead, we must be clear on the difference between loyalty and patriotism. The spirit of loyalty compels us to support and defend our country even when she is wrong. That is necessary in time of war, but patriotism is a higher ideal. It compels us, not only to defend our country when she is wrong, but also to do everything within our power to bring her back to the side of right.

When it comes to patriotism, there is no one who has a greater love for country than I do. That is easy to *say*; but when you hear someone make that statement, you have a right to know where is the evidence? My evidence is my life. I did not purchase our family’s flag on Tuesday. It is very old and weathered. We have proudly displayed it on every holiday for more than forty years. Often, it was the only flag in the neighborhood. I did not need a terrorist attack to remind me to honor my country and my heritage.

Displaying the flag is important, but patriotism requires much more than that. I have devoted almost the entirety of my adult life trying to mobilize my fellow countrymen to the defense of America from her enemies outside her borders and within. Since 1960, I have left behind me a long paper trail and a mountain of audio and videotapes extolling the virtues of the American system, her culture, her Constitution, and her people. I love America and all that she has stood for in days gone by, but I am saddened beyond words at what has been done to her within my lifetime – and what I fear is *yet* to be done in the days ahead.

There are those who may say that I am anti-government, but that is not true. I am *not* anti-government; I am anti-*corrupt* government. I will do everything possible to defend my government from those who would violate their oaths of office, tear apart the Constitution, or use their positions of trust to oppress our people. *To oppose corruption in government is the highest obligation of patriotism.*

WHY DO THEY HATE AMERICA?

The first question we need to ask is *why?* Why do the terrorists hate America?²

I am reminded of the story of a young man in medieval times who wanted to become a knight. He obtained an audience with the king and offered his services, explaining that he was an excellent swordsman. The king told him that the realm was at peace, and there was no need for a knight. Nevertheless, the young man insisted that he be allowed to serve. To put an end to the discussion, the king finally agreed and knighted him on the spot. Several months later, the young knight returned to the castle and requested another audience. When he entered the throne room, he bowed in respect and then reported that he had been very busy. He explained that he had killed thirty of the king's enemies in the North and forty-five of them in the South. The king looked puzzled for a moment and said, "But I don't *have* any enemies." To which the knight replied, "You do *now*, Sire."

Do Muslim terrorists hate America because of its religion or culture? Is it because they are envious of America's wealth or that American women wear short skirts? Is it because they really do hate freedom?

There are several passages in the *Qur'an* that, indeed, create the impression that Muslims are told to kill non-believers as a matter of religious faith. For example, in chapter 9, verse 5, we find: "Slay the idolaters wherever you find them." In 9.14 it says: "Fight them; Allah will punish them by your hands and bring them to disgrace." In 9.123 we find: "Fight those of the unbelievers who are near to you and let them find in you hardness." Chapter 2, verse 191 says: "Kill them wherever you find them, and drive them out from whence they drove you out."

On the other hand, there are other passages that seem to contradict this theme. Muhammad says repeatedly that killing is only justified in self-defense or in retaliation – only after the enemy strikes first. For example, in chapter 60, verses 8 and 9, he says: "Allah does not forbid you respecting those who have not made war against you on account of [your] religion, and have not driven you forth from your homes, that you show them kindness and deal with them justly.... Allah only forbids you respecting those who make war upon you on account of [your] religion, and drove you forth from your homes." Chapter 9, verse 13, says: "What? Will you not fight a people who broke their oath and ... attacked you first?" Chapter 22, verse 39, says: "Permission (to fight) is given to those upon whom war is made because they are oppressed." Chapter 47, verse 4, says: "So when you meet in battle those who disbelieve, then smite their necks until you have overcome them. Then make

[them] prisoners and afterwards either set them free as a favor or let them ransom themselves until the war terminates.”

So, what is going on here? Which concept are we to believe?

To unravel this mystery, we must look beyond the words themselves and view the historical events that were unfolding at the time the words were written, which was around 620 AD. The key to understanding is in the last phrase of the previous quote: “... until the war terminates.”

What war?

THE BIRTH OF ISLAM

After Muhammad revealed that he had been chosen as a prophet of Allah, it took many years for him to attract a large following. In the earlier days of his proselytizing, he often entertained Christians and Jews in his own home and counted many of them among his personal friends. He clearly did not think of them as enemies who should be killed on the spot. In those days, “un-believers” were simply those who were not convinced that he had spoken to the angel Gabriel or really had been ordained by Allah to lead mankind. The most prominent of these unbelievers were members of the Quraysh tribe who worshiped multiple gods represented by seven idols located within the shrine called Kaaba, in Mecca. When Muhammad finally began to attract a following, the leaders of the Quraysh plotted against him and attempted to abort his movement by harassing and even torturing his followers. He was forced to flee the city to avoid assassination. When Muhammad used the word “idolaters” in the *Qur’an*, he was referring to the Quraysh.

This is important because, while the *Qur’an* was being written from the oral teachings of Muhammad, and while his followers became embroiled in many deadly conflicts with the Quraysh, they were often in relative harmony with Christians and Jews. Shortly after becoming the religious and civil leader of Medina in 622 AD, Muhammad openly accepted friendship and trade with the Jews there. To clarify their relationship, he drew up a concordat that proclaimed:

The Jews who attach themselves to our commonwealth shall be protected from all insults and vexations; they shall have an equal right with our own people to our assistances and good offices; they ... shall form with the Muslims one composite nation; they shall practice their religion as freely as the Muslims.

Unfortunately, this tranquility did not last. By 623, Muhammad and his followers, in order to obtain food and other necessities, were regularly raiding caravans passing nearby, many of them belonging to Quraysh merchants from Mecca. This led to retaliation by the Quraysh who returned to Medina with 900 men intent on annihilating the Muhammadan community, but their attack was repelled.

Before long, Jews and Muslims in Medina became bitterly divided over doctrinal and economic disputes. Armed conflict broke out between the two groups, and the Jews were ordered to abandon the city and leave their possessions behind. But Muhammad was not to enjoy his supremacy for long. Early in 625, the Quraysh arrived from Mecca with an army of 3000 men and routed the Muslims from Medina. Muhammad was severely wounded in the battle. The previously ousted Jews returned to their homes. Six months later, after Muhammad recovered from his wounds, he returned to the city and attacked the Jews, accusing them of aiding the Quraysh. Once again they were driven from the city.

In 626 AD, the Quraysh and the Jews combined forces and, with an army of 10,000 men attacked the Muslim stronghold at Medina. Muhammad knew he could not defeat such a force in open battle and chose, instead, to protect the city by digging a deep trench around it. Fortunately for him, extreme wind and rain kept the invaders at bay. After an unsuccessful 20-day siege, the Quraysh abandoned the effort and returned to Mecca. Muhammad at once led an army of 3000 men against the remaining Jews who were overpowered. He gave his prisoners a choice of death or accepting Islam.

By this time, Muhammad had become an able and experienced military leader. He planned sixty-five campaigns and raids and personally led twenty-seven. In 630, he led an expedition against Mecca, which surrendered without a fight. Arabia was finally entirely under his control. Parts of the *Qur'an* read like military stratagems because that is exactly what they were.

PUTTING THE *QUR'AN* INTO HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The reason for going into all of this is to clarify that, while the *Qur'an* was being written, there was a war going on. Those passages that direct the faithful to kill unbelievers were not motivated by religious intolerance but by the passions of warfare and the necessity of survival against an enemy. It was a question of kill or *be* killed. This fact becomes clear when we recall that, after the fighting was over, and Muhammad finally became the undisputed master of all Arabia, the Christians were allowed to remain and enjoy full liberty of worship. If he had wanted unbelievers killed solely because of their religion, they would have been slaughtered. However, the only limitations placed upon them were that they pay a modest tax and refrain from charging interest on loans.³

When passages from the *Qur'an* are taken out of historical context, it may seem that Muslims are instructed to kill innocent people whose only crime is that they do not believe in Islam. However, when they are understood in terms of the events that were unfolding at the time the *Qur'an* was written, that notion cannot be supported.

There are those who would divide us today along religious lines and manipulate us into fearing and hating and killing each other. They rely on us not to know this history. They take passages from the *Qur'an* out of historical context – just as they do with passages from the *Bible* and the *Torah* – to prove whatever point they wish.

Islam is not a unified faith with a hierarchy of control to establish doctrine. There is no single leader or council to make pronouncements about how to interpret the *Qur'an*. The spiritual leader of each congregation can offer guidance and scholarship; but, ultimately, each person is free to make his own interpretation. Consequently, many Muslims since Muhammad's time have used Scripture to justify aggression, and some of the radical sects of today are continuing to put their own hate-twist to the message, but we must realize that this is not an intrinsic part of the Islamic faith. Exactly the same pattern is seen in the history of other religions as well.

The Middle East is not the only place with this problem. In the Balkans—and many other places in the world – there may be obvious differences in religion or ethnic origin between the combatants, but these are not the real causes of the conflict *today*. The hatred between them stems from a history of armed conflict in which each side perceives itself as the victim of aggression and cruelty from the other. Religious or ethnic differences may have played a part at the origins of these conflicts, but in their modern context, they are grudge

wars. That is the reason different tribes *within* Islam often fight among themselves just as fiercely as they do against unbelievers.

Throughout history, the *Qur'an*, the *Torah*, and the *Bible* have all been used by cunning leaders to justify their wars; but that is not the fault of mainstream Islam or Judaism or Christianity, it is the fault of cunning leaders.

Even without history and logic as our guide, the fact remains that Islamic terrorists today are not attacking non-Islamic countries at random. They are attacking only those that previously have launched military campaigns against them. Clearly, their motivation today does not come from religion. To them, it is a grudge war. It comes from a desire for *revenge*.

So, the next question is: revenge for what?

AMERICA BECOMES WORLD POLICEMAN

Ever since the end of World War II, America's politicians have viewed themselves as *global* leaders with a responsibility to manage the affairs of the *world* that outweighs or at least equals any obligation to their own country. For over five decades, the nation's universities and media have extolled the virtues of internationalism. The old tradition of avoiding foreign entanglements was sneeringly called *isolationism*. We were conditioned to think that the old way was stupid. The wave of the future was shown to us, and it was a *New World Order*. Over the years, we watched with approval as our leaders increasingly entangled our once sovereign nation into a world community called the [United Nations](#). Treaty by treaty, we watched and approved as we became increasingly subject to international edicts and played the role of world policeman.

It is in that role that our military began to wage wars against populations far removed from our shores and even further from our national interests. To justify those wars, we were told that we were defending victim groups against their despotic neighbors or ridding the world of drug lords; but, after the smoke of battle cleared, we discovered that there were hidden agendas that were much less noble. More often than not, the real purpose of the war was to control oil fields, pipelines, ports, mineral resources, or military supply lines – or even to distract voters from thinking about scandals in the White House. If you roam around the globe shooting and bombing people, and aligning yourself politically with others who do the same, you cannot expect your victims to like you very much. Some may even be willing to die for revenge.

A MOMENT OF TRUTH IN MEDIA

On Wednesday evening (September 12), Henry Sigman, reported on Nightline: “The U.S. is seen as a sort of an insensitive hegemony with arrogance that seeks to impose its own values on the rest of the world. It is seen as an uncritical supporter of the State of Israel in its conflict with the Palestinians, and the combination of the two does not make for U.S. popularity in that part of the world.”

Adding to this theme was Magnas Raisdorff, who also appeared on Nightline while Ted Koppel, the show's host, was speaking from London. Raisdorff, a reporter in the London branch of CBS, and an expert on terrorism, agreed with Sigman. He said:

Many in the Arab world regard the U.S., not as an honest broker, but as protecting and shielding Israel over very important political as well as religious issues. Among these issues are: Israel's control over holy Islamic sites, like the Dome of the Rock;⁴ the presence of U.S. troops near Islamic religious places such as Mecca

and Medina; the sanctions the U.S. has placed on Iraq are mostly depriving children of drugs and food they desperately need; and, most importantly, Israel's attacks on prominent Palestinian militants are using equipment, like helicopter gun ships, provided by the U.S.

Then Jim Ruden, also in London, came on the program to summarize Raisdorff's report saying: "And *that* is why what happened yesterday, happened, *not* because 'America is the world's brightest beacon [of freedom].'"

At the time of the terrorist attack in September, the United States had a quarter of a million soldiers stationed in 141 countries around the world. Since the end of World War II, it has launched military strikes against Panama, Kosovo, Albania, Bosnia, Serbia, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Haiti, Granada, Afghanistan, and Somalia – all in the pursuit of stopping drugs, defending freedom, or resisting Communism. In the great majority of cases, these objectives were *not* achieved. The only measurable result has been the creation of hostility toward America. That is what I call the Oops Factor that has been a dominant feature of U.S. foreign policy for over five decades.

Politicians never admit that they have made a mistake – especially a big one. To do so would imply that they are not qualified to lead. No matter what errors they make, they find something or someone to blame. Their standard excuse is that they didn't have enough money or large enough staff or enough authority. If only we will increase their budget and give them more power, everything will be corrected. Typically, they already have spent too *much* money, hired too *many* people, and exercised too *much* authority, so their proposed solution is more of exactly what created the problem in the first place.

In the case of terrorism, the politicians who create U.S. foreign policy cannot be expected to tell the world they made a mistake. It will be a chilly day in Hades when they announce that they, themselves, have any responsibility for these acts. They will not want the American people contemplating the possibility that Tuesday's attack might have been related to an interventionist foreign policy. They will try to single out a *person* and then demonize him so he will become the central focus of anger and retaliation. That person probably will be Osama bin Laden, so, let us see what *he* has to say about this. (Please remember that these words were written just three days after the attack of September 11 and, at that time, bin Laden had not yet been firmly declared as the responsible party.)

FROM THE MIND OF BIN LADEN

In May of 1998, ABC reporter John Miller interviewed bin Laden at his camp on a mountaintop in Southern Afghanistan. This is what he said:

The Americans impose themselves on everyone. ... They accuse our children in Palestine of being terrorists. Those children who have no weapons and have not even reached maturity. At the same time, they defend ... with their airplanes and tanks, the state of the Jews that has a policy to destroy the future of these children. ... In the Sabra and Shatilla massacre, ... houses were demolished over the heads of children. Also, by testimony of relief workers in Iraq, the American-led sanctions resulted in the death of more than one million Iraqi children. ... We believe that the biggest thieves in the world and the terrorists are the *Americans*. The only way for us to fend off these assaults is to use similar means. ... So, we tell the Americans as a people, and we tell the mothers of soldiers, and American mothers in general, if they

value their lives and those of their children, find a nationalistic government that will look after their interests and ... does not attack others, their lands, or their honor.⁵

I am not quoting bin Laden because I think he is a nice guy or that I want to exonerate him in any way. In my view, there is never any excuse for terrorism. I include his words only to emphasize what I stated earlier. He and his followers are *not* motivated by hatred of freedom or religious zeal but by a desire for revenge. In the days ahead, as we contemplate how to put an end to terrorism, we had better be clear on that. As long as we follow a foreign policy of interventionism, we will create new enemies faster than we can track down the old ones and we will never be able to erect anti-terrorist measures capable of stopping them all. If we retaliate against populations or geographical areas, we could unite all of Islam in a holy war against us and light the fire of hatred in the hearts of a billion Muslims whose primary passion in life will be to seek revenge. Religion will have little to do with it.⁶

The Constitution provides a much better solution. When the nation is attacked by another nation, the logical response is to declare war. But when it is attacked by an individual or private group that is not acting on behalf of another nation, then Congress is authorized to issue what is called a Letter of Marque and Reprisal. That is an authorization to a private citizen or organization to pursue and eliminate the threatening party. In the early days of the country, Letters of Marque were issued against pirates on the high seas and against notorious bandits. The people who were called upon for these assignments were professional bounty hunters who were exceptionally efficient in their work. They had no interest in starting a war or killing a lot of innocent people. They had a single target and they did not get paid unless they were successful.

If Congress really wants to eliminate bin Laden and his terrorist organization, issuing Letters of Marque and Reprisal would be a much more effective solution than blanketing the Middle East with an armada of planes and tanks and ground forces – and it would be exceedingly more humane as well.⁷ We do not need to launch war against the Muslim world to eliminate terrorist organizations within their borders. We will not accomplish that by joining forces with the Leninists in Moscow and Peking who sustain those terrorists. And we certainly do not need to scrap the Constitution and Bill of Rights to be protected at home. You cannot defend freedom by destroying freedom.

Using laws that were in place long before the terrorist attack on 9-11, the FBI already had extensive information about terrorist groups within the U.S. and in fact, had arrested hundreds of suspected terrorists and frozen millions of dollars of funds belonging to al Qaeda. The problem was not a lack of authority to do these things, but that the authority was selectively *not* used when it should have been. Although relatively harmless people were rounded up, the heavy hitters were actually protected.

BIN LADEN PROTECTED BY U.S.

On January 7, 2002, *The Australian* reported that President Clinton had rejected at least three opportunities to eliminate bin Laden – even after the U.S. State Department had labeled him as “the greatest single financier of terrorist projects in the world.” The first opportunity was when Sudanese officials offered to extradite him from Khartoum in 1996, but the offer was turned down flat. *The Australian* said:

A second offer to get bin Laden came unofficially from Mansoor Ijaz, a Pakistani-American millionaire who was a donor to Mr. Clinton’s election campaign

in 1996. On July 6, 2000, he visited John Podesta, then the president's chief of staff, to say that intelligence officers from a Gulf state were offering to help extract bin Laden.... The deal fell through when, according to Mr. Ijaz, the US sent a senior counter-terrorism expert to the United Arab Emirates to check the authenticity of the offer. Mr. Ijaz said the US's "front door" approach had rendered that impossible.⁸

A third opportunity came when the intelligence services of Saudi Arabia offered to place a tracking device in the luggage of bin Laden's mother who was planning to take a trip to visit her son in Afghanistan. This would have allowed the CIA or a team of Special Forces to pinpoint bin Laden's exact whereabouts, but they declined the offer.

On November 7, 2001, the London *Guardian* reported that they had obtained FBI documents showing that investigation of members of the bin Laden family in the U.S. had been stopped upon orders from the White House. The FBI file, which had been coded as a national security issue, revealed that Abdullah bin Laden, who lived in Washington, had been under investigation because of his relationship with the World Assembly of Muslim Youth – a suspected terrorist organization. According to *The Guardian*:

The FBI files were closed in 1996 apparently before any conclusions could be reached on either the bin Laden brothers or the organization itself. High-placed intelligence sources in Washington told the *Guardian* this week: "There were always constraints on investigating the Saudis," They said the restrictions became worse after the Bush administration took over this year. The intelligence agencies had been told to "back off" from investigations involving other members of the bin Laden Family, the Saudi royals, and possible Saudi links to the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Pakistan.⁹

Terrorism in the United States is not a problem of needing more laws to restrict personal freedom but a problem of corruption in government. It is insanity to give government agencies the power to tap everyone's phone and computer, the right to make arbitrary arrests in the name of national security, and the power to try anyone they wish in secret. It is not that government lacked enough authority in the past to act against terrorism, but that it ignored and abused the authority it already had. Increasing authority without eliminating corruption is a prescription for tyranny.

SAGE ADVICE FROM THE PAST

For the past few days, I have found myself thinking about George Washington. At first, I didn't know why. Then it dawned on me. Hadn't Washington warned about all this just before leaving office as first President of the United States? So I dug out a copy of his Farewell Address and, sure enough, there it was. This is what he said:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. ... Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. ... So, likewise, the passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, ... betrays the former into participation in the quarrels and the wars of the latter. ... Europe has a set of primary interests which to us

have none or very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the cause of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. ...

Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

One cannot read those words of wisdom without sadly realizing how far we have drifted from our nation's moorings. In retrospect, the so-called isolationism of our forefathers is now looking very good.

PERPETUAL WAR

In the meantime, we are told that we are fighting *terrorism*. But, as stated previously, terrorism is not the enemy. It is a *strategy* of the enemy. That is like saying the enemy is hand-to-hand combat or air raids or missile attacks or espionage. Since terrorism is not the enemy, a war on terrorism cannot be won. It is doomed to drag on forever – just like the war on drugs and the war against crime. It might as well be a war against sin.

Shortly after World War II, George Orwell wrote his classic novel entitled, *1984*. It was a satirical commentary on what the world might be like in the future if governments continued to expand their power as they were then doing, eventually, they would evolve into a global police state. He described the methods that would be used to keep the masses from rebelling. Thought control was the primary method, but one of the ways they accomplished that was to be constantly at war. In time of war, the populace will accept any hardship and make any sacrifice to defend the homeland. However, to have war, it was necessary to have an enemy, and that enemy had to be despicable in the eyes of the homeland defenders. Atrocities had to be committed and many lives had to be lost. But it was equally important to avoid *winning* the war – otherwise, the hardships imposed by the state would no longer seem reasonable to its subjects.

The world was divided into three geographical areas called Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia, and the rulers of these regions agreed to war against each other but never to seek outright victory. The object was perpetual war. Orwell described it this way:

In one combination or another, these three superstates are permanently at war and have been so for the past twenty-five years. War, however, is no longer the desperate, annihilating struggle that it was in the early decades of the twentieth century. ... This is not to say that either the conduct of the war, or the prevailing attitude toward it, has become less bloodthirsty or more chivalrous. On the contrary, war hysteria is continuous and universal in all countries. ... But in a physical sense war involves very small numbers of people, mostly highly trained specialists, and causes comparatively few casualties. The fighting, when there is any, takes place on the vague frontiers whose whereabouts the average man can only guess at. ... In the centers of civilization war means no more than a continuous shortage of consumption goods, and the occasional crash of a rocket bomb which may cause a few scores of deaths. ... It does not matter whether the war is actually happening, and since no decisive victory is possible, it does not matter whether the war is going well or badly. All that is needed is that a state of war should exist. ... War, it will be seen, is now a purely internal affair ... waged by each ruling group against its own subjects, and the

object of the war is not to make or prevent conquests of territory, but to keep the structure of society intact.¹⁰

AN ICON FOR EVIL

One of the most powerful images created by Orwell in his novel was the ritual called “Two Minutes Hate.” All members of the ruling bureaucracy were required each day to assemble before a television screen and view a two-minute propaganda program designed to arouse fierce hatred toward the enemy. Since there was no real enemy, the state had created a media substitute. An actor was selected to look and speak in such a way as to invoke fear and revulsion. The object was to distract the populace from thinking about their miserable condition and keep them constantly filled with the emotion of hatred. Hatred of the enemy made all things tolerable; but, to be effective, it had to be directed at a person, a face, an icon for evil. The face was given the name of Emmanuel Goldstein. Orwell wrote:

The next moment a hideous, grinding screech, as of some monstrous machine running without oil, burst from the big telescreen at the end of the room. It was a noise that set one’s teeth on edge and bristled the hair on the back of one’s neck. The Hate had started.

As usual, the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the People, had flashed onto the screen. There were hisses here and there among the audience. The little sandy haired woman gave a squeak of mingled fear and disgust. ... Goldstein was delivering his usual venomous attack against the Party. ... He was abusing Big Brother, he was denouncing the dictatorship of the Party, he was demanding the immediate conclusion of peace with Eurasia, ... And all the while, lest anyone should be in any doubt about the reality which Goldstein’s specious claptrap covered, behind his head on the telescreen there marched the endless columns of the Eurasian army—row after row of solid looking men with expressionless Asiatic faces, who swarmed up to the surface of the screen and vanished, to be replaced by others exactly similar. The dull, rhythmic tramp of the soldiers’ boots formed the background to Goldstein’s bleating voice. ...

In its second minute the Hate rose to a frenzy. People were leaping up and down in their places and shouting at the tops of their voices in an effort to drown the maddening bleating voice that came from the screen. ... The dark haired girl behind Winston had begun crying out “Swine! Swine! Swine” and suddenly she picked up a heavy Newspeak dictionary and flung it at the screen. It struck Goldstein’s nose and bounced off; the voice continued inexorably. ... The horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was, not that one was obliged to act a part, but that it was impossible to avoid joining in. Within thirty seconds, any pretense was always unnecessary. A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current turning one even against one’s will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic. ...

The Hate rose to its climax. The voice of Goldstein had become an actual sheep’s bleat, and for an instant the face changed into that of a sheep. Then the sheepface melted into the figure of a Eurasian soldier who seemed to be advancing, huge and terrible, his submachine gun roaring and seeming to spring out of the

surface of the screen, so that some of the people in the front row actually flinched backwards in their seats. But in the same moment, drawing a deep sigh of relief from everybody, the hostile figure melted into the face of Big Brother, ... full of power and mysterious calm, and so vast that it almost filled up the screen. Nobody heard what Big Brother was saying. It was merely a few words of encouragement, the sort of words that are uttered in the din of battle, not distinguishable individually but restoring confidence by the fact of being spoken. Then the face of Big Brother faded away again, and instead the three slogans of the Party stood out in bold capitals: WAR IS PEACE. FREEDOM IS SLAVERY. IGNORANCE IS STRENGTH.¹¹

THE HIDDEN AGENDA

When we look at the facts surrounding the war on terrorism – particularly the lack of a defined enemy and the impossibility of victory – we cannot miss the striking parallels to Orwell’s satire. His only serious error, it seems, was choosing the wrong year for the title of his book.

Orwell’s story, of course, is fiction; but, when it comes to war as a means of controlling or altering society, the real world is not much different. Imagine, for example how “fictional” it would seem to be told that American involvement in World War I was eagerly pursued by an organization supposedly dedicated to world peace. Yet, that is exactly what transpired at the Carnegie Endowment for Peace.

The source of this information is a man who was in a unique position to know. In 1954, Norman Dodd had been the staff director of the Congressional Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations. I conducted a video interview with him in 1982, and the program was released as [*The Hidden Agenda*](#). Mr. Dodd described how a member of his staff, Catherine Casey, spent several weeks examining the minute books of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace and read important passages, word-for-word, into a Dictaphone. She started with the minutes of the very first meeting of the board of trustees after the Endowment was created in 1909. This is what Mr. Dodd said:

In that year, the trustees, meeting for the first time, raise a specific question which they discuss throughout the balance of the year in a very learned fashion. The question is: “Is there any means known more effective than war, assuming you wish to alter the life of an entire people.” And they conclude that no more effective means than war to that end is known to humanity.

So, then, in 1909, they raise a second question and discuss it, namely: “How do we involve the United States in a war?” ... And, finally, they answer that question as follows: “We must control the State Department.” And then, that naturally raises the question of how do we do that. And they answer it by saying: “We must take over and control the diplomatic machinery of this country. And, finally, they resolve to aim at that as an objective.

Then, time passes, and we are eventually in World War I. At that time, they record in their minutes a shocking report in which they dispatch to President Wilson a telegram cautioning him to see that the war does not end too quickly.¹²

We will return to Norman Dodd in later chapters, because he has much more to tell regarding how tax-exempt foundations, such as the Carnegie Endowment, the Rockefeller

Foundation, and the Guggenheimer Foundation, conspired to alter the substance of American history books. But, for now, the topic is war.

THE REPORT FROM IRON MOUNTAIN

No discussion of the hidden agendas of war would be complete without reference to a think-tank study released in 1966 called the *Report from Iron Mountain*. Although the origin of the report is highly debated, the document itself hints that it was commissioned by the Department of Defense under Defense Secretary, Robert McNamara and produced by the Hudson Institute located at the base of Iron Mountain in Croton-on-Hudson, New York. The Hudson Institute was founded and directed by Herman Kahn, formerly of the Rand Corporation. Both McNamara and Kahn were members of the CFR.¹³

The self-proclaimed purpose of the study was to explore various ways to “stabilize society.” Praiseworthy as that may sound, a reading of the Report soon reveals that the word *society* is used synonymously with the word *government*. Furthermore, the word *stabilize* is used as meaning to preserve and to perpetuate. It is clear from the start that the nature of the study was to analyze the different ways a government can perpetuate itself in power, ways to control its citizens and prevent them from rebelling.

The report concludes that, in the past, war has been the only reliable means to achieve that goal. It contends that only during times of war are the masses compliant enough to carry the yoke of government without complaint. Fear of conquest and pillage by an enemy can make almost any burden seem acceptable by comparison. War can be used to arouse human passion and patriotic feelings of loyalty to the nation's leaders. No amount of sacrifice in the name of victory will be rejected. Resistance is viewed as treason. But, in times of peace, people become resentful of high taxes, shortages, and bureaucratic intervention. When they become disrespectful of their leaders, they become dangerous. No government has long survived without enemies and armed conflict. War, therefore, has been an indispensable condition for “stabilizing society.” These are the report's exact words:

The war system not only has been essential to the existence of nations as independent political entities, but has been equally indispensable to their stable political structure. Without it, no government has ever been able to obtain acquiescence in its “legitimacy,” or right to rule its society. The possibility of war provides the sense of external necessity without which no government can long remain in power. The historical record reveals one instance after another where the failure of a regime to maintain the credibility of a war threat led to its dissolution by the forces of private interest, of reactions to social injustice, or of other disintegrative elements. The organization of society for the possibility of war is its principal political stabilizer. ... It has enabled societies to maintain necessary class distinctions, and it has insured the subordination of the citizens to the state by virtue of the residual war powers inherent in the concept of nationhood.¹⁴

A NEW DEFINITION OF PEACE

The report then explains that we are approaching a point in history where the old formulas may no longer work. Why? Because it may now be possible to create a world government in which all nations will be disarmed and disciplined by a world army, a condition that will be called peace. The report says: “The word peace, as we have used it in the following pages, ... implies total and general disarmament.”¹⁵ Under that scenario,

independent nations will no longer exist and governments will not have the capability to wage war. There could be military action by the world army against renegade political subdivisions, but these would be called peace-keeping operations, and soldiers would be called peace keepers. No matter how much property is destroyed or how much blood is spilled, the bullets will be “peaceful” bullets and the bombs – even atomic bombs, if necessary – will be “peaceful” bombs.

The report then raises the question of whether there can ever be a suitable substitute for war. What else could the regional governments use – and what could the world government itself use – to legitimize and perpetuate itself? To provide an answer to that question was the stated purpose of the study.

The conclusion was that, if a suitable substitute for war is to be found, then a new enemy must be found that threatens the entire world, and the prospects of being overcome by that enemy must be just as terrifying as war itself. The problem arises from the fact that, if traditional war between nations is to be ruled out, then the war must be waged against something *other* than a nation. It must be something less tangible, yet still terrifying. The report is emphatic on that point:

Allegiance requires a cause; a cause requires an enemy. This much is obvious; the critical point is that the enemy that defines the cause must seem genuinely formidable. Roughly speaking, the presumed power of the “enemy” sufficient to warrant an individual sense of allegiance to a society must be proportionate to the size and complexity of the society. Today, of course, that power must be one of unprecedented magnitude and frightfulness.¹⁶

The *Report from Iron Mountain* analyzed many alternative “enemies” that could be created to make a war effort credible. It considered a war on poverty, a war against aliens from outer space, and a war against pollution of Mother Earth. The war against environmental pollution was considered to hold the most promise, but even that would lack sufficient emotional fire to match the hysteria of a real war. The Report concluded:

When it comes to postulating a credible substitute for war ... the “alternate enemy” must imply a more immediate, tangible, and directly felt threat of destruction. It must justify the need for taking and paying a “blood price” in wide areas of human concern. In this respect, the possible substitute enemies noted earlier would be insufficient. One exception might be the environmental-pollution model, if the danger to society it posed was genuinely imminent. The fictive models would have to carry the weight of extraordinary conviction, underscored with a not inconsiderable actual sacrifice of life. ... It may be, for instance, that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species. Poisoning of the air, and of the principal sources of food and water supply, is already well advanced, and at first glance would seem promising in this respect; it constitutes a threat that can be dealt with only through social organization and political power. ...

It is true that the rate of pollution could be increased selectively for this purpose. ... But the pollution problem has been so widely publicized in recent years that it seems highly improbable that a program of deliberate environmental poisoning could be implemented in a politically acceptable manner.

However unlikely some of the possible alternative enemies we have mentioned may seem, we must emphasize that one must be found of credible quality and magnitude, if a transition to peace [world government] is ever to come about without social disintegration. It is more probable, in our judgment, that such a threat will have to be invented.¹⁷

In 1966, international terrorism was still in its infancy, and the possibility of inventing it as a global “enemy” did not occur to those who drafted the *Report from Iron Mountain*. Had they thought of it, there can be little doubt that it would have been at the top of their list. Everything about the war on terrorism perfectly fits the template for a new and credible enemy so necessary for the so-called “stabilization of society.”

THIRTEEN PREDICTIONS

It is always dangerous to make predictions – especially if they are put into print. If they prove to be wrong, they can haunt you for the rest of your life. Nevertheless, here are thirteen predictions I made three days after the terrorist attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. I said then that I fervently hoped they would *l* be wrong. Unfortunately, most of them have already come to pass. Nevertheless, here they are exactly as conceived on September 14, 2001.

1. The first prediction is that we will not be given genuine options regarding the war on terrorism. We will have only two choices, both of which are disastrous. It will be similar to the Vietnam War in which Americans were expected to be either hawks or doves. Either they supported the no-win war or they opposed it. They were not given the option of *victory*. Their choice was between pulling out of the war and turning the country over to the Vietcong quickly – or doggedly staying in the war and turning the country over to the Vietcong slowly – which is the way it turned out. Likewise, in the war on terrorism, we will be asked simply to choose sides. Either we are for freedom or for terrorism. The wisdom of U.S. interventionism will not be allowed as a topic for public debate.

Epilogue: On October 8, 2001, President Bush announced the beginning of military strikes against Afghanistan and said: “Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every Nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground.”¹⁸ On the day that Congress approved the first \$20 billion to finance the war on terrorism, Senator Hillary Clinton said that the government should make it clear “to every nation in the world, you’re either with us or you’re not, and there will be consequences.”¹⁹ Even so-called conservative spokesmen have succumbed to the party line. On October 31, The Young America’s Foundation, based in Hendon, Virginia – an organization that promotes conservative issues on the nation’s college campuses – found it alarming that some professors were questioning the wisdom of U.S. interventionist policy. One professor was quoted as saying such a horrible thing as “We need to think about the resentment all over the world felt by people who have been victims of American military action.” Another professor is quoted as saying “You can’t plant hatred and not expect to reap hatred.” Such statements are not acceptable to the Young America’s Foundation which views them as offensive and harmful to the war effort.²⁰

2. Most American political leaders are now committed to world government, so the second prediction is that they will crow about how America will not tolerate terrorism, but

they will not act as Americans. Instead, they will act as internationalists. They will turn to the UN to lead a *global* war against terrorism. They will seek to expand the capacity of NATO and UN military forces. Although American troops will provide the backbone of military action, they will operate under UN authority.

3. The third prediction is that the drive for national disarmament will be intensified. This will *not* lead to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, but merely to the *transfer* of those weapons to UN control. It will be popularized as a means of getting nuclear and bio-chemical weapons out of the hands of terrorists. The internationalists promoting this move will not seem to care that many of the world's most notorious terrorists now hold seats of power at the UN and that the worst of them will actually control these weapons. This will be documented in Chapters Four and Five.

Epilogue: On October 20, 2001, Former Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, announced that nuclear and chemical disarmament should become a top priority in the war on terrorism.²¹ On November 13, 2001, US President Bush and Russian President Putin announced that, as a means of fighting global terrorism, they agreed to cut their nuclear arsenals by two-thirds.²² These reductions will be monitored by the UN. Russia has broken every similar agreement in the past, so there is no reason to expect that pattern to change. It must be remembered that Putin is a former high-ranking officer of the Soviet KGB, which created most of the international terrorist organizations.

4. The fourth prediction is that, if any terrorists are captured, they will be brought before the UN World Court and tried as international criminals. This will create popular support for the Court and will go a long way toward legitimizing it as the ultimate high tribunal. The public will not realize the fateful precedent that is being established – a precedent that will eventually be used to justify bringing citizens of any country to trial based on charges made by their adversaries in other countries. Anyone who seriously opposes the New World Order could then be transported to The Hague in The Netherlands and face charges of polluting the planet or committing hate crimes or participating in social genocide or supporting terrorism.

Epilogue: On November 14, 2001, President Bush announced that terrorists could be tried by U.S. military courts, so it is possible that this prediction may be wrong. But the play is not yet over. The entire team that sets U.S. policy in this regard is in favor of expanding the authority of the UN World Court, and the possibility of using captured terrorists as a means to that end must be very tempting to them. We shall see.

5. The fifth prediction is that the FBI will be criticized for failing to detect an attack as extensive and well coordinated as this. In reply, we will be told that the FBI was hampered by lack of funding, low manpower, and too little authority. Naturally, that will be followed by an increase in funding, additional manpower, and greatly expanded authority.

6. The sixth prediction is that, eventually, it will be discovered that the FBI and other intelligence agencies had prior warning and, possibly, specific knowledge of Tuesday's attack; yet they did nothing to prevent it or to warn the victims. This will be a repeat of what happened at the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City six years previously. Why they failed to do so is the topic of Chapter Four.

Epilogue: The first inkling of prior knowledge came a week after the attack when it was learned that an unusually large amount of money had been placed into the stock market to acquire puts for American and United Airlines stocks. Puts are bets that the value of a stock will decline. When the market value of those stocks plummeted after the attack, those who held puts had their investment increase by eight-hundred percent.²³ The FBI closely monitors the stock market to detect precisely this kind of unusual pattern. However, the FBI had much more to go on than that.

On January 6, 2002, the *Orlando Sentinel* (in Orlando, Florida) reported that a prisoner in the local county jail had tipped off the FBI a month before September 11 that he had information about a pending terrorist attack in New York City and other targets. Walid Arkeh was an American citizen who previously fled to England to avoid prosecution on charges of dealing in stolen goods and slapping his child. He had been arrested in Britain and sent back to the United States after spending ten months in prison there. During that time he became friendly with three Muslim inmates whom he identified as Khalid al-Fawwaz, Adel Abdel Bary, and Ibrahim Eidarous. They had been imprisoned because of their involvement in the 1998 bombing of the American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Tanzania.

Arkeh told the FBI that the terrorists confided to him that something big was about to happen in New York. He said he would provide additional details if they would help him reduce his jail sentence. He was not exactly a model citizen, to be sure, but at least he was trying to alert authorities to the planned attack. He said: "I didn't want to be a terrorist. I wasn't working for them, but I became a part of them." He thought the FBI would be eager to have this information, but such was not the case. As reported by the *Orlando Sentinel*:

[Arkeh] said the FBI agents didn't appear impressed, and one stood with his hand in his pocket impatiently asking, "Is that all that you have? That's old news."

Arkeh went on to explain that, after the attack on September 11, FBI agents returned to his cell and threatened that he could be charged with co-conspiracy if he told anyone that he knew about the attacks ahead of time. The impact this had on him is evident in the *Sentinel's* report:

When pressed by the *Sentinel* about whether he knew about the Sept. 11 hijacking and targets ahead of time, Arkeh, a compact and muscular man, paused a long time and looked down at the ground. Then he raised his head and smiled: "No. If I did, that would make me a co-conspirator."²⁴

Shortly after that, Arkeh was moved to an undisclosed location by the authorities, and his name, his photograph, and all traces of his presence in the system disappeared from the Department of Corrections web site. To the outside world, he ceased to exist.

(The author is currently compiling information about government foreknowledge of terrorist training in U.S. flight schools, receiving tips from intelligence agencies in France, ignoring the boasts of earlier terrorists involved with the first bombing of the World Trade Towers, etc. These items will appear in future editions of this report.)

7. The seventh prediction is that much of the war on terrorism will be waged against Americans inside their own country. New laws, international treaties, and executive orders will severely restrict travel, speech, privacy, and the possession of firearms. Americans have consistently rejected these measures in the past, but there will be much less opposition when they are presented in the name of fighting terrorism. Government agencies will demand to know everything about us, from our school records, our psychological profiles, our buying habits, our political views, our medical histories, our religious beliefs, the balances in our savings accounts, our social patterns, a list of our friends – everything. This will not be unique to America. The same program will be carried out in every nation in what is left of the free world.

Epilogue: In October, 2001, Congress adopted so-called “anti-terrorism” legislation that was a classic example of Doublespeak right out of Orwell’s *1984*. In Orwell’s world, “war is peace, freedom is slavery, and ignorance is strength.” In our real world, Congress passed a bill to expand the federal government into areas forbidden by the Constitution and unblinkingly called it the Patriot Act. In addition to putting the government in charge of all airport security – which many Americans think is a good idea – it also requires private citizens to inform on each other. Any person engaged in a trade or business is now required to file a report with the government if any of their customers spends \$10,000 or more in cash. That is just the beginning. The bill easily can be amended in the future to require a report of *any* “suspicious” or “anti-government” activity.²⁵

In this regard, Canada appears to have taken the lead. On November 8, 2001, the Canadian parliament passed a bill allegedly to control money laundering related to terrorism. It was similar to a law that existed in Nazi Germany requiring all lawyers to inform the government of suspicious anti-government activity on the part of their clients. The Canadian law goes much further. Instead of involving only lawyers, it also requires bankers, realtors, investors, and other financial agents to report whenever they suspect a client may be involved in money laundering. Money laundering is defined by most governments today as any financial transaction that is not reported to the tax collector, including cash sales, tips, and barter. With that definition, literally everyone can be suspected of money laundering. If people fail to inform on each other, they are subject to a fine of \$2-million and a five-year jail sentence.²⁶

On November 24, it was revealed that the Canadian National Defense Act was amended in response to the terrorist attack against the U.S. and now gives the Canadian government power to close off any geographical area, to forcibly remove people from their homes inside that area, and to be exempt from any obligation to compensate them for their loss. The justification for doing so need not be for national security. The government can act in the name of furthering “international relations.” That means, of course, that there are no definable limits on this power.²⁷

Back in the United States, the FBI now is free to place wiretaps on telephones without a court order. On November 21, 2001, the FBI announced its new eavesdropping operation called “Magic Lantern” that allows it to secretly plant a program into anyone’s computer so that every stroke made on the keyboard will be reported back. That means the government now can capture a record of everything

you create on your computer, including private passwords, encrypted files, and even deleted files.²⁸

While the government clamors to prevent citizens from having any secrets whatsoever, it moves in the opposite direction for itself. President Bush issued Executive Order 13223 that forbids public access to presidential papers, even those belonging to previous administrations. The only researchers who now have access to these important sources of historical data are those who are deemed to have a “need to know” – which means only those who support the government’s spin on important issues. Even Congress is now outside the “need-to-know” category. White House briefings to Congressional leaders on military operations in the Middle East have been greatly curtailed and now contain little more than what is given to the press. In typical Orwellian fashion, we are told that, if America’s elected representatives were to know what the President is doing as Commander-in-Chief, it would be a threat to national security.

In mid-November, 2001, President Bush issued an executive order authorizing terrorists to be tried in secret military tribunals without any of the due-process legal protections afforded in civilian courts. At the end of World War II, even Nazi war criminals were tried in public, but now, anyone deemed to be a terrorist can be tried in secret, even when the death penalty is involved.

Who will be classified as terrorists? The disturbing answer to that question was given by Congressman Ron Paul as he addressed the House of Representatives on November 29, 2001. He said:

Almost all of the new laws focus on Americans citizens rather than potential foreign terrorists. For example, the definition of “terrorism,” for federal criminal purposes, has been greatly expanded. A person could now be considered a terrorist by belonging to a pro-constitutional group, a citizen militia, or a pro-life organization. Legitimate protests against the government could place tens of thousands of other Americans under federal surveillance. Similarly, internet use can be monitored without a user’s knowledge, and internet providers can be forced to hand over user information to law-enforcement officials without a warrant or subpoena.²⁹

By the end of November, approximately 1,200 people had been arrested as terrorist suspects or as sources of information regarding terrorism. Formal charges were not brought against them. They were not allowed to have legal representation. They were not brought before a judge or given a hearing or trial. They were simply arrested and imprisoned without any Constitutional authority to do so. Furthermore, no one outside of government even knows who they are. Their names have been kept secret. This, allegedly, was to protect their privacy. Incredible! These people were thrown into prison and denied due process of law; yet we are expected to believe that the government is concerned about their *privacy*?

All of these encroachments against freedom have been high-agenda items among government agencies for many years – long before September 11. Most of them were originally conceived as instruments for punishing tax evasion and controlling political dissent. Practically no one seriously believes that these measures

would have prevented the September attack. Only the hopelessly naive can fail to see that the war on terrorism has merely provided an excuse to put them into effect.

8. The eighth prediction is that those who speak out against these measures will be branded as right-wing extremists, anti-government kooks, or paranoid militiamen. The object will be to isolate all dissidents from the mainstream and frighten everyone else into remaining silent. It is always possible to find a few genuine crackpots; and, even though they will constitute less than one percent of the movement, they will be the ones selected by the media to represent the dissident view point. A little bit of garbage can stink up the whole basket. In spite of that, responsible dissenters will still be heard. If they begin to attract a following, they will be arrested on charges of hindering the war effort, committing hate crimes, terrorism, tax evasion, investment fraud, credit-card fraud, child molestation, illegal possession of firearms, drug trafficking, money laundering, or anything else that will demonize them in the public mind. The mass media will uncritically report these charges, and the public will assume they are true. There is nothing quite so dramatic as watching someone on the evening news being thrown against the wall by a SWAT team and hauled off in handcuffs. TV viewers will assume that, surely, he must be guilty of *something*. His neighbors will shake their heads and say "... and he seemed like such a nice person."

9. One of the few remaining obstacles to the New World Order is the Internet, because it allows the public to bypass the mass media and have access to unfiltered information and opinion. Therefore, the ninth prediction is that laws will be enacted to restrict the use of the Internet. Child pornography has long been the rallying cry to justify government control. Now, the specter of terrorism and money laundering will be added to the list. The real object will be to eliminate the voices of dissent.

Epilogue: The Public Safety and Cyber Security Enhancement Act of 2001 automatically classifies any "cyber crime" as an act of "terrorism." (Check this out. It comes from James Yaeger.)

10. The tenth prediction is that the war on terrorism will be dragged out over many years or decades. Like the war on drugs after which it is patterned, there will be no victory. That is because both of these wars are designed, not to be won, but to be *waged*. Their function is to sensitize the population with fear and indignation, to provide credible justification for the gradual expansion of government power and the consolidation of that power into the UN.

Epilogue: On October 21, 2001 (37 days after this prediction) General Richard B. Myers, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: "The fact that it could last several years, or many years, or maybe our lifetimes would not surprise me."³⁰

11. The eleventh prediction is that it will take a long time to locate Osama bin Laden. A TV reporter can casually interview him at his mountain stronghold, but the U.S. military and CIA – with legions of spies and Delta forces and high-tech orbiting satellites – they cannot find him. Why not? Because they do not *want* to find him. His image as a mastermind terrorist is necessary as a focus for American anger and patriotic fervor. If we are to wage war, there must be someone to personify the enemy. Bin Laden is useful in that role. Of course, if his continued evasion becomes too embarrassing, he will be killed in military action or captured – if he doesn't take his own life first. Either way, that will not put the matter to rest, because bin Laden is not the *cause* of terrorism. He is not even the *leader* of

terrorism. He is the *icon* of terrorism. If he were to be eliminated, someone else would only have to be found to take his place. So it is best to give each of them as much longevity as possible. That is why terrorists like Arrafat, Hussein, Qadhafi and Khomeini, not only are allowed to remain in power, but receive funding and military aid from the U.S. government. They are the best enemies money can buy.

If that sounds far-fetched, consider the words of Fareed Zakaria, former editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the official journal of the Council on Foreign Relations. (The goal of the CFR is the creation of world government, and virtually all U.S. foreign-policy planners – from the President on down – belong to it.) In the September 16, 1996, issue of *Newsweek* magazine, Zakaria said, “If Saddam Hussein did not exist, we would have to invent him. He is the Linchpin of American policy in the Mideast. ... [The end of Hussein] would be the end of the anti-Saddam coalition. Nothing destroys an alliance like the disappearance of the enemy.” This issue will be covered in Chapter Five.

Epilogue: On November 15, 2001, *USA Today* reported: “Several hundred Army commandos have been posted at road blocks outside Kandahar to help prevent Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters from escaping. The U.S. soldiers are interviewing captured Taliban commanders and setting up surveillance gear, such as radar, heat detectors and cameras. ... Teams of two to 12 men are searching abandoned caves, tunnels and buildings for maps, documents or computer disks that could lead to bin Laden, officials said. From the skies, pilots are using heat detectors to locate warm bodies in cold Afghan caves. CIA agents are using cash to bribe sources for information about bin Laden’s whereabouts, officials said.”³¹

On November 26, the first strong signal was given from the White House that, eventually, bin Laden might be replaced by Saddam Hussein as the media icon of terrorism. “Saddam is evil,” said President Bush, and he hinted that, after the conquest of Afghanistan, the war on terrorism may be carried to Iraq.³² Meanwhile, bin Laden remains the preferred icon.

On December 19, 2001, *USA Today* reported: “One defense official claimed a bin Laden escape could benefit the war on terrorism because popular support for continued military action in other regions would remain strong.”³³ Please re-read that statement.

12. The twelfth prediction is that, when the Taliban is toppled in Afghanistan, a new government will be established by the UN. Like Kosovo before it, a so-called UN “peacekeeping” military force will remain behind, and the country will not be independent. There will be talk about how it will represent the Afghan people, but it will serve the agendas of the internationalists who will create it. The sad country will become just another pin on the map showing the location of yet one more UN province.

Epilogue: Even before the Taliban had been toppled in Afghanistan, the wheels were set in motion for a coalition government to be organized under UN supervision. On November 28, on the first day of the UN-sponsored negotiations to that end, representatives of the Northern Alliance agreed to most elements of the UN plan. Even at that early date, UN spokesmen announced that they intended to install a multi-national military force, under its control, after the fighting is over.³⁴ After nine days of negotiations, representatives of the various Afghan factions agreed to the UN

blueprint. The agreement specifically specified a multinational “peacekeeping” force to be stationed in Kabul and provided for its future expansion into the rest of the country.³⁵

On December 19, it was learned that a dozen countries were preparing to contribute military forces to a UN “peacekeeping” force in Afghanistan.³⁶

13. The thirteenth prediction is that, while all this is going on, politicians will continue waving the American flag and giving lip service to traditional American sentiments in order to placate their constituency who must never be allowed to know that they are being delivered into slavery.

Yes, actions have consequences, and the long-range consequences of this act of terrorism are even more devastating than the loss of life and property that has been the focus of the media so far.

Behold the Grand Deception: The action is in the *reaction*. *The war on terrorism is a war on freedom.*

That is the end of Part One, as it will appear in *The Freedom Manifesto*. I cannot predict how long it will take to complete the remaining chapters, but I can tell you that I have made this a high priority project. If you would like to be notified when it is published, I suggest that you visit our web site and request to be added to the mailing list. If you are on line as you read this, [click here](#) to register. If you are not on line, then log on to our web site registration page at www.realityzone.com/ourcrusade/html.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

In the meantime, the crucial question is what can be done *now*, especially considering the lateness of the hour. This is where it can really get depressing. At the present time, there is nothing that men and women of good conscience can do to alter the forces of destruction that have been unleashed against them. As long as the nations of the world are controlled by politicians with a globalist and collectivist mindset; as long as they use every problem and crisis as an excuse to expand the power of government; as long as the great majority of our fellow passengers on this spaceship called Earth are unaware of these ploys, then absolutely nothing can be done. But notice I said “as long as.”

The “as-long-as” part of the equation contains two elements that underlie all of our problems: (1) We have put the wrong people into government and (2) the public has been denied vital information – which is *why* we put the wrong people into government. Therefore, any realistic plan for eliminating terrorism and recapturing freedom must have two objectives: (1) We must put the *right* people into government and (2) we must see that the public gets the information it has been denied. The political objective is important, but it cannot be reached without first achieving the educational objective, so that is where we must begin.

A WAY TO BYPASS THE MASS MEDIA

The first step is to mass distribute copies of this report. For that purpose, they now are available free from the Reality Zone web site. You can either print them from your computer to be used as handouts and envelope enclosures or you can send emails to your friends inviting them to visit the [Reality Zone](#) and read the report on line. That is so simple it can be

done with a click of the mouse. At the bottom of the report is a form that reads: TELL A FRIEND. While you are on line, you can enter the names of those you would like to read this report. The Reality Zone will do the rest.

I urge you to send this report to everyone you know. *Everyone*. Don't worry about how they will react. Some have been so sheltered from reality that they will not be able to accept the validity of this information, no matter how much documentation is provided. After all, they are not getting any of this from the mass media. Besides, people don't want to hear bad news. But, as events unfold and as the predictions become historical facts, our friends eventually *will* come on board.

It is my intent to make the [Reality Zone](#) a cyberspace information hub where people from all over the world can come for reliable information on the global crusade for freedom. In addition to this report, you will be able to get a [printed transcript](#) of the [video documentary](#), *No Place to Hide; The Strategy and Tactics of Terrorism*. Many other items will be added as we expand. Anyone who wants to translate these materials into a language other than English is encouraged to do so and send it to us for posting. It is our goal to have the documents available in every major language of the world.

With the capacity to send electronic documents over the Internet, we finally have a way to bypass the mass media. Just imagine what would happen if everyone of the 5000 people on my email list would forward a copy of this Report to everyone on their email list. And then imagine that ten or fifteen percent of those would do the same. It would be theoretically possible to reach every person with an email address on the entire planet within a few months.

A GLOBAL FORCE FOR FREEDOM

This is no longer an issue just for Americans. It is now a global battle that cuts across all lines of nationality, race, religion, language, culture, economic status, and level of education. This is a battle in which we are all united by common cause. That includes Christians, Jews, Muslims, Americans, Afghans, Iraqis, Russians, Chinese, Mexicans, Somalians, Croatians, Serbs, Australians, Canadians – literally everyone in the world who seeks freedom. I am not talking about governments. I am talking about *people*.

We must not be tricked into pitting Christians against Muslims or Muslims against Jews, or Jews against Christians, or any other combination of religion against religion. No matter how we may differ over theology, the one thing on which we agree is that it is God's plan for all men to be *free*. That is our common cause, and that is the rallying cry that will bring millions into our ranks. We will not be able to defeat the global force of despotism without building a global *counter-force* for freedom.

We are now engaged in world War III, a war involving every nation and every human being on the planet. You and I are involved whether we like it or not. We cannot escape. There is no place to hide. The only question is when will we commit to battle. If we wait until there is no longer any controversy and all of our friends clearly see that the war on terrorism is a grand deception, then we will have waited too long. The time to step forward is *now*.

G. Edward Griffin

The following items relating to this report are available from The Reality Zone

- ◆ Free printed transcript of this report: www.realityzone.com/granddeception.html
- ◆ Video documentary, *No Place to Hide*: www.realityzone.com/noplacetohide.html
- ◆ Free transcript of *No Place to Hide*: www.realityzone.com/noplacetohide1.html
- ◆ Video interview, *The Hidden Agenda*: www.realityzone.com/hiddenagenda.html
- ◆ Audio version of *The Hidden Agenda*: [Audio Archives Volume II](#)

Reality Zone, P.O. Box 4646, Westlake Village, CA 91359

Web site home page: www.realityzone.com Telephone: (800) 595-6596

If you want to distribute copies of this report, the only restriction is that they must be given, not sold, and nothing may be added or deleted. *The report must be printed in its entirety, including these comments.* It may not be used to promote or imply my endorsement of any group, business venture, or individual without written permission.

G. Edward Griffin

End of report

¹ Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1983), p. 18.

² Five days after I wrote these words, *USA Today* carried an eye-witness report from Pakistan echoing the same sentiment. It said: "In Pakistan this week, thousands have demonstrated. They've burned American flags, raised clenched fists, and held aloft banners telling the world what they think of the USA. One, written in English, asked a stunning question: 'Americans, think! Why does the whole world hate you?'" See "Extremists' hatred of U.S. has varied roots," *USA Today*, Sept. 19, 2001, p. 1.

³ The preceding historical synopsis is drawn from Will Durant, *The Age of Faith*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp.155-174; also *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, 3rd edition, p. 1397; also "The World of Islam," by Don Belt, *National Geographic*, Jan. 2002, pp. 76-85.

⁴ Although the Dome of the Rock presently has a Muslim mosque built upon it, the Jews and Christians also regard it as a holy site. It is the location where, according to Scripture, Abraham was tested by God to see if he would obey God's command, even to the extent of sacrificing his only son, Isaac.

⁵ See <http://www.abcnews.go.com>, John Miller Interviews Bin Laden (May 1998), Sept. 27, 2001.

⁶ By the end of the December, 2002, more civilians had been killed in the military action against Afghanistan than in the terrorist attack against the World Trade Towers and the Pentagon – and the war on terrorism was just beginning, we were told, soon to be taken to other countries. See "Afghanistan's civilian deaths mount," *BBC News*, Jan. 3, 2002, http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/english/world/south_asia/newsid_1740000/1740538.stm.

⁷ On October 10, 2001, Congressman Ron Paul introduced the September 11 Marque and Reprisal Act of 2001, which would embody this proposal. So far, the bill has not received wide support.

⁸ "Clinton's bin Laden gaff," *The Australian Sunday Times*, Jan. 7, 2002, http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/common/story_page/0,5744,3545934%5E2703,00.html.

⁹ "FBI and US Spy Agents Say Bush Spiked bin Laden Probes before 11 September," by Greg Palast, *The Guardian*, Nov. 7, 2001, <http://www.gregpalast.com/printerfriendly.cfm?artid=103>.

¹⁰ George Orwell, *1984* (New York: New American Library/Signet, 1949), pp. 153-164.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp.15-17.

¹² *The Hidden Agenda* video is available from The Reality Zone, P.O. Box 4646, Westlake Village, CA 91362, phone (800) 495-7596 or from the Internet: www.realityzone.com.

-
- ¹³ For an analysis of the authenticity of the *Report from Iron Mountain*, see Chapter 24 of the author's *The Creature from Jekyll Island: A Second Look at the Federal Reserve*, 3rd edition (Westlake Village, California: American Media, 1998). Available from www.realityzone.com.
- ¹⁴ Leonard Lewin, ed., *Report from Iron Mountain on the Possibility and Desirability of Peace* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1967).pp. 39, 81.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67, 70-71.
- ¹⁸ "In this conflict, there is no neutral ground," *USA Today*, Oct. 8, 2001, p. 5A.
- ¹⁹ "Congress ready to pay the price to hit culprits," by William M. Welch and Kathy Kiely, *USA Today*, September 13, 2001, p. 5A.
- ²⁰ "Professors blame U.S. for terrorism," by Jon Daugherty, *WorldNetDaily.com*, Article_ID=25137, October 1, 2001.
- ²¹ "Gorbachev: Anti-Terror Coalition Should Become Coalition for New World Order," Associated Press, October 20, 2001, *FOXNews.com*.
- ²² "U.S., Russia to sharply cut arsenals" by Laurence McQuillan, *USA Today*, Nov. 14, 2001, p. A1.
- ²³ "Suspiciously timed bets against airlines expire today," by Greg Farrell, *USA Today*, Oct. 19, 2001, p. 1B.
- ²⁴ "Inmate says he told FBI about danger to New York," by Doris Bloodsworth, *Orlando Sentinel*, Jan. 6, 2002, <http://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/local/seminole/orl-asecterror06010602jan06.story?coll=orl%SD>.
- ²⁵ "New Federal Patriot Act Turns Retailers into Spies against Customers," by Scott Bernard Nelson, *The Boston Globe*, www.bcentral.com, Nov. 20, 2001.
- ²⁶ Ottawa approach akin to Nazis, judge charges," *National Post*, November 9, 2001, p. A4.
- ²⁷ "Anti-terror law gives military too much power: experts," by Ian Jack, *National Post*, www.nationalpost.com, Nov. 24, 2001.
- ²⁸ "FBI develops 'Trojan horse' software for better eavesdropping," by Ted Bridis, AP, *Sacramento Bee*, www.sacbee.com, Nov. 21, 2001.
- ²⁹ "Keep Your Eye on the Target," by the Honorable Ron Paul, *Congressional Record*, November 29, 2001. (www.house.gov/congrec2001/cr112901.htm.)
- ³⁰ "U.S. war may last decades," by Karen Masterson, *Houston Chronicle Washington Bureau*, Oct. 21, 2001, 11:48PM, *HoustonChronicle.com*.
- ³¹ "Bin Laden hunt escalates as U.S. aid workers freed," by Barbara Slavin, Jonathan Weisman and Jack Kelley, *USA Today*, Nov. 15, 2001, p. 1A.
- ³² "Bush turns America's fury towards Saddam," by Stephen Robinson, *News Telegraph*, <http://news.telegraph.co.uk>, Nov. 26, 2001.
- ³³ "Bombs halted; search continues," by Jonathan Weisman, *USA Today*, Dec. 19, 2001. p. 1A.
- ³⁴ "Deal near in Afghan talks," by Elliot Blair Smith, *USA Today*, Nov. 28, 2001, p. 1-A.
- ³⁵ "Afghan factions sign landmark deal," *BBC News*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/world/south_asia/newsid_1692000/1692695.stm, Dec. 5, 2001.
- ³⁶ "Bombs halted," *op. cit.*