

# ANOTHER DAY IN THE EMPIRE

May 29, 2005

## Abu Musab al-Zarqawi: Suckering the Great Unwashed

Now we're expected to believe Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is in Iran. "Quoting a senior insurgency commander in Iraq, the Sunday Times said Zarqawi had shrapnel lodged in his chest and may have been moved to Iran. It said his supporters might try to move the Jordanian-born militant to another country for an operation," reports [Reuters](#).

Is it possible this "senior insurgency commander" is an idiot or possibly a rank amateur? If indeed al-Zarqawi is the "leader" of the resistance, it does not make sense for his top lieutenants to be so thoughtlessly loquacious with the media and admit the wounding of al-Zarqawi and reveal where he is. On the other hand, if al-Zarqawi is not connected to the resistance but is instead a U.S. covert intelligence operation designed to discredit the resistance and convince us they are little more than criminals and sadists (to say nothing of idiots), the United States has done an admirable job—that is, an admirable job served up to those of us who do not pay attention, who have abandoned common sense, and believe everything the corporate media feeds us. As Bush and Crew demonstrated when they fed us a passel of implausible lies in the lead up to the invasion of Iraq, the passive and half-witted American news consumer will believe just about anything, so long as some authoritarian character tells him it is true. It matters not that the Abu Musab al-Zarqawi fairy tale is completely over the top, even surrealistic.

"Iran's Foreign Ministry spokesman Hamid Reza Asefi said the report in the Sunday Times newspaper was without foundation," Reuters continues. "'This is an unprofessional kind of fabricating news,' Asefi told a weekly news conference."

Bingo.

It is obviously fabricated news. It is a transparent effort to finger the Iranians—who figure big, as do the Syrians, who are accused of aiding and abetting the resistance, in Bush's Strausscon cooked-up plan to "reshape" (through bunker buster and cruise missile) the Muslim Middle East—and make it appear the Iranians support the hobgoblin Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. It does not matter if this makes absolutely no sense (the Iranians would have to be as stupid as the Iraqi resistance to have anything to do with al-Zarqawi) because facts or corroborating evidence of complicity is no longer needed—all it takes is a few declarations from anonymous "senior administration officials" and the fantasy is firmly established as truth. Never mind the conflicting and illogical nature of the al-Zarqawi in Iran story line—viz., as the corporate media keeps telling us, al-Zarqawi has a thing for killing Shi'ites and Iran is a Shi'a Muslim nation. Is there a reason a killer of Shi'ites is allowed refuge in a country teeming with Shi'ites? Does not compute.

"The United States has accused Iran of harboring al Qaeda militants who



"Another Day is part of a growing body of literature that implicates members of the governing elite in Washington as the true enemies of liberty at home and abroad." --Mark Hand

"Another Day in the Empire is, for the most part, a scathing critique of our un-elected president and the criminals who surround him." --Mickey Z

**240 pages \$17.95**

Support ADE

[Make a Donation](#)

Links

[Buy a photo at Nimmo Design](#)

[Kurt Nimmo's Flickr Photo page](#)

[al-Jazeera](#)  
[Alternative Press Review](#)  
[American Free Press](#)  
[Antiwar.com](#)  
[Apocalypse Now](#)  
[Arlington Reporter](#)  
[Axis of Logic](#)  
[Back to Iraq](#)  
[Beyond the Mainstream](#)  
[Black Commentator](#)  
[William Bowles](#)  
[Break for the News](#)  
[Canadian Spectator](#)  
[Capitol Hill Blue](#)  
[Cassiopaea](#)  
[Center for Cooperative Research](#)  
[Centre for Research on Globalization](#)  
[Chomsky Archive](#)  
[Citizens for a Legitimate Government](#)  
[Consortium News](#)  
[Cost of War](#)

escaped Afghanistan after U.S. troops invaded in late 2001 following the Sept. 11 attacks,” the Reuters report continues. “Tehran acknowledges that al Qaeda members have managed to cross its long and hard-to-police borders with Afghanistan and Pakistan. But it denies providing safe-haven to al Qaeda members and has extradited scores of suspected militants who have fled to Iran in the last four years.”

In other words, since Iran “harbored” al-Qaeda, it can be assumed it is also harboring al-Zarqawi, even though, as Reuters points out, Iran has extradited “scores of suspected militants” (in other words, nobody knows if they are al-Qaeda or simply garden variety terrorists who have problems with the world’s last super-power invading an enervated—through medieval sanctions and premeditated mass murder—Arab country). In regard to Iran’s porous border, look no further than the U.S.-Mexico border as an example of how difficult it is to patrol frontiers. Don’t expect the corporate media to point this out, though.

“A US State Department report noted recently that Al-Qaeda members had found a ‘virtual safe haven’ in Iran, adding that the country’s long rugged borders were ‘difficult to monitor,’” according to the [Sunday Times](#)—that is to say it cannot be satisfactorily verified if al-Qaeda or al-Zarqawi are in Iran or romping at Jojo’s Circus at Disney World.

Of course, as noted above, it does not matter if the entire “virtual haven” story of al-Zarqawi in Iran makes absolutely no sense—to say nothing of the stupidity of the resistance blabbering about its supposed leader in counterproductive fashion, making the egregious (and strategically boneheaded) error of admitting he is wounded—because most Americans, oblivious to reality and enthralled with their dictator (as the German people were enthralled with Hitler—that is until their homes and work places were carpet bombed), will effortlessly swallow it hook, line, and sinker, same as they digested the Saddam and Osama tag team fabrication, or the scary campfire story Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, or the preposterous nonsense that the nine eleven hijackers were Iraqi (in fact, we don’t know who they were, but that’s another story).

Back in 1869, George Hull knew what he was talking about when he declared, “There’s a sucker born every minute.” Hull made the comment in response to the inability of the average person to reason or use logic when confronted with improbable stories—in particular, a hoax perpetuated by Hull and his partner, William Newell, who convinced the public a giant was buried on their land, when in fact the alleged giant was a meticulously constructed statue (Hull sold two-thirds of the interest in the giant for \$30,000 to a syndicate that moved the hoax to an exhibition hall in Syracuse, New York, and charged a dollar a head to see it).

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is our “sucker” giant. If George Bush says he exists, well then, he exists—and like simple-minded lemmings we will march right over the precipice, as did the Good Germans and other people who instinctively buy into the lies of authoritarian sociopaths.

May 27, 2005

[CounterBias](#)  
[Counterpunch](#)  
[Coup 2k \(Lumpen\)](#)  
[Cursor](#)  
[Democratic Underground](#)  
[Disinfopedia](#)  
[Dissident Voice](#)  
[Electronic Intifada](#)  
[Empire Notes](#)  
[Empire Watch](#)  
[Fountainhead](#)  
[Global Gulag](#)  
[Google News Search](#)  
[Guerilla News Network](#)  
[Information Clearing House](#)  
[Information Inquest](#)  
[Information Times](#)  
[Investigating the New Imperialism](#)  
[Iraq Body Count](#)  
[Iraq War: Mirror World](#)  
[Is Bush Wired?](#)  
[Jack Blood](#)  
[Jihad Unspun](#)  
[Juan Cole: Informed Comment](#)

[Just World News](#)  
[Kate/A/blog](#)  
[Left End of the Dial](#)  
[Lew Rockwell](#)  
[Liberty Forum](#)  
[Mathaba](#)  
[MediaLens](#)  
[Mickey Z.](#)  
[Minitrue](#)  
[News Alternative](#)  
[News Insider](#)  
[Occupation Watch](#)  
[Online Journal](#)  
[Orb Standard](#)  
[Orcinus](#)  
[Orwell Today](#)  
[The Peoples Voice](#)  
[Power Skeptic](#)  
[ParaPolitics](#)  
[Peace Palestine](#)  
[Press Action](#)  
[Prison Planet](#)  
[Progressive](#)  
[Progressive News](#)  
[Project for the Old American Century](#)  
[Propaganda Matrix](#)  
[Raed in the Middle](#)  
[Rational Enquirer](#)  
[Remarkz](#)  
[Rense](#)  
[Rigorous Intuition](#)  
[RINF](#)  
[Robert Fisk](#)  
[Schema-root](#)  
[Screamer in the Matrix](#)  
[Selves and Others](#)  
[Serendipity](#)  
[Smirking Chimp](#)  
[Third World Traveler](#)  
[ThomasMc](#)  
[Today in Iraq](#)  
[Today's Alternative News](#)  
[TomDispatch](#)  
[Tricenter](#)  
[Truth Seeker](#)  
[Truthout](#)  
[UnderReported](#)  
[Unjust Media](#)  
[Unknown News](#)  
[Uruknet](#)

## Dershowitz's Smear Machine: Dissing Chomsky, Finklestein, and Cockburn

Over at David Horowitz's blog, [Moonbat Central](#) (attached to his smear portal, Discover the Network), they are having a field day with Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz's attack on the "anti-Israel triumvirate," Noam Chomsky, Norman Finkelstein, and Alexander Cockburn. According to Dersh, Noam Chomsky is the ringleader of an effort to discredit his latest book, *The Case for Israel*. Here's how it works, according to the former celebrity lawyer:

*The mode of attack is consistent. Chomsky selects the target and directs Finkelstein to probe the writings in minute detail and conclude that the writer didn't actually write the work, that it is plagiarized, that it is a hoax and a fraud. Cockburn publicizes these "findings," and then a cadre of fellow travelers bombard the Internet with so many attacks on the target that these attacks jump to the top of Google. Because no one has thus far exposed the pattern, each attack may seem plausible on first impression. But when the pattern is examined and exposed, the entire enterprise becomes clear for what it is: a clear attempt to chill pro-Israel advocacy on university campuses by a form of literary McCarthyism.*

After calling into question the careers and personalities of the "triumvirate," Dersh gets to the meat of the matter: a book by Joan Peters, *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict over Palestine*, a book of "spurious scholarship" and an "academic hoax," according to Finklestein, and a pseudo-tome Dersh leans on to make points in his best-seller. Chomsky makes the following comment on Peters' book (in [The Fate of an Honest Intellectual](#), excerpted from *Understanding Power*):

*How many of you know about Joan Peters, the book by Joan Peters? There was this best-seller a few years ago [in 1984], it went through about ten printings, by a woman named Joan Peters—or at least, signed by Joan Peters—called *From Time Immemorial*. It was a big scholarly-looking book with lots of footnotes, which purported to show that the Palestinians were all recent immigrants [i.e. to the Jewish-settled areas of the former Palestine, during the British mandate years of 1920 to 1948]. And it was very popular—it got literally hundreds of rave reviews, and no negative reviews: the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, everybody was just raving about it. Here was this book which proved that there were really no Palestinians! Of course, the implicit message was, if Israel kicks them all out there's no moral issue, because they're just recent immigrants who came in because the Jews had built up the country. And there was all kinds of demographic analysis in it, and a big professor of demography at the University of Chicago [Philip M. Hauser] authenticated it.... Well, one graduate student at Princeton, a guy named Norman Finkelstein, started reading through the book. He was interested in the history of Zionism, and as he read the book he was kind of surprised by some of the things it said. He's a very careful student, and he started checking the references—and it turned out that the whole thing was a hoax, it was completely faked: probably it had been put together by some intelligence agency or something like that.*

[Village Voice](#)  
[War Without End](#)  
[Warblogs](#)  
[What Really Happened](#)  
[White House](#)  
[Why War?](#)  
[World Independent News Group](#)  
[World Socialist Web Site](#)  
[Xymphora](#)  
[Z Magazine Online](#)  
[ZNet](#)

[Who Links Here](#)

May 2005

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				
<a href="#">« Apr</a>						

But not only did Chomsky and Finklestein criticize the book, so did Dersh's Zionist fellow travelers, such as the [concentration camp apologist](#) Daniel Pipes, who [wrote](#):

*From Time Immemorial quotes carelessly, uses statistics sloppily, and ignores inconvenient facts. Much of the book is irrelevant to Miss Peters's central thesis. The author's linguistic and scholarly abilities are open to question. Excessive use of quotation marks, eccentric footnotes, and a polemical, somewhat hysterical undertone mar the book. In short, From Time Immemorial stands out as an appallingly crafted book.*

Even so, Immemorial is simply too good of a book in defense of the Zionist argument—Palestinians are rank poseurs and nobody should be alarmed if they are ethnically cleansed—but regardless of this “the fact remains that the book presents a thesis,” according to Pipes, that is supposedly irrefutable (this preposterous “thesis” states the Palestinians immigrated to Palestine in first half of the twentieth century). No doubt this is irrefutable if one judiciously selects reviewers—and discounts or ignores the arguments of Chomsky and Finklestein, who are to be dismissed out of hand as little more than self-hating Jews (and “neonazis,” as the Horowitzite Steven Plaut would have it over at Moonbat Central) and a “nasty attack team,” as bitterly characterized by Dersh.

It should be noted that Dersh and Finklestein have spent a lot of time going round and round—making accusations and counter-accusations about each other—and in the process Dersh's argument (the Palestinians have no claim to Palestine because they are undeserving immigrants) gets lost in a lot of silliness about who did or did not write Dersh's book. Naturally, as with most criticism of Israel and its apologists, the argument is sidetracked by Dersh as he makes the sensational claim, echoed by the Zionist economics prof Steven Plaut on Horowitz's blog, that “Finkelstein is a popular speaker at anti-Israel events on university campuses around the world,” as if this is somehow an indictable offense, and the “members of the McCarthyite triumvirate are invited to campuses far more frequently than centrist, moderate pro-Israel speakers,” never mind that the corporate media allows “centrist, moderate pro-Israel speakers” and even unabashed Zionists to rant and rave about the innate evil and homicidal tendencies of the Palestinians on a daily basis. Dersh has appeared across the electronic breadth of the corporate media dispensing his Zionist opinions (for instance, [torture is hunky dory](#)) while Chomsky, Finklestein, and Cockburn are essentially ignored by the corporate media, written off as “far left” and outside the “mainstream” (while William Kristol is part of the so-called mainstream, demonstrating how far to the right the media has shifted).

Dershowitz's paranoia—as echoed by the loonies at Moonbat Central—about a few isolated anti-Israel critics on university campuses aside (practically the last refuge for disenfranchised lefties), it is pertinent to also note that personal smears fall squarely in the province of right-wingers, since they really have few other tools (certainly not fact) to fall back on. Dersh makes a big deal—as does Plaut, albeit with more venom and nastiness—of the fact Norman Finklestein is a “transient academic” who has, by his own account, been “thrown out of every school in New York,” as if this proves he is of unsound

mind and thus his criticism of Dersh and in particular Joan Peters' sloppy book writing and vapid research does not cut the mustard. Of course, this is quite incidental and demonstrates that Dershowitz is desperate to portray his critics as socially maladapted crackpots and thus undermine the argument Peters "body of work" is fraudulent nonsense.

Finally, in regard to Alexander Cockburn, Dersh and Plaut make a big deal over an incident that allegedly occurred while Cockburn worked for the Village Voice. "In 1984 he was fired from the Village Voice for hiding a \$10,000 'grant' he received from an anti-Israel organization," asserts Dersh, citing the War Street Journal as a source (Village Voice Suspends Alexander Cockburn Over \$10,000 Grant, Wall Street Journal, January 18, 1984). Before writing this blog entry, I decided to email Cockburn and get his side of the story. "I got a \$10,000 research grant re press, invasion of Lebanon etc, from Institute for Arab Studies, registered 501c3 in 82," Alex responded. "Told everyone about it, grant was public. Village Voice claimed falsely I hadn't told them, and suspended me as columnist. Rather than accept that I resigned from the Voice and joined The Nation soon thereafter. You'll actually find a supportive editorial in WSJ at the time. Of course all Zionist papers were after my blood," as should be expected considering Cockburn's criticism of Israel and Zionism.

Dersh and Horowitz's wrecking crew of right-wing smear artists will obviously stop at nothing to attack any criticism of Israel, an outlaw state in violation of numerous United Nations resolutions, including a 1975 resolution (by a vote of 89 to 67) declaring that "Zionism is a form of racism." In the current political context, all criticism of Israel's crimes against humanity—and its strident apologists such as Alan Dershowitz—is nothing less than anti-Semitism, tactics that demonstrate how desperate Zionists are to completely shut down the opposition and obliterate criticism.

**May 27, 2005**

## **Keeping the Barbarians from Coming Together: Bush's Fort Apaches**

Since it is impossible to defeat the Iraqi resistance—militarily or through crude propaganda—the Bushcon idea is (and may have been all along) to split the country into three mini-states based on ethnicity and religion, as presaged by the Israelis. Bush and Crew are working dutifully toward this end by unleashing "teams that are completely disguised as terrorists" (as [Seymour Hersh](#) told Amy Goodman) in Iraq, basically a counter-insurgency false flag operation, designed not only to discredit the actual resistance but also agitate for civil war.

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi's Jamaat al-Tawhid wa'l-Jihad (Unity and Holy War) group is a primary example of a variation on the British "pseudo-gang" concept utilized in Malaya and Kenya. In addition, the United States is using "anything goes" (as formulated by [General Edward Geary Lansdale](#)) psychological warfare to muddy the waters and "to keep the barbarians from coming together," as [Zbigniew Brzezinski](#) would have it.

As Iraq devolves into ethnic chaos—driven by covert operations—the United

States will enter a bunker mentality, retreating to high-tech Fort Apaches where they will micro-manage so-called Iraqi forces (now in training but of dubious quality) and continue covert and psychological war operations. “Under [a plan detailed by the [Guardian](#)], for which [a senior US official in Baghdad] said there was no ‘hard-and-fast’ deadline, US troops would gradually concentrate inside four heavily fortified air bases, from where they would provide ‘logistical support and quick reaction capability where necessary to Iraqis’. The bases would be situated in the north, south, west and centre of the country... US officers told the paper that the bases would have a more permanent character to them, with more robust buildings and structures than can be seen at most existing bases in Iraq. The new buildings would be constructed to withstand direct mortar fire... A source at the Iraqi defense ministry said: ‘We expect these facilities will ultimately be to the benefit of the domestic forces, to be handed over when the US leaves.’”

If you believe the U.S. will leave Iraq anytime soon, I have a bridge in the Chihuahuan Desert I want to sell you.

In addition to conducting a dirty covert war against the “vassals” in Iraq, the United States will continue to orchestrate more or less conventional military operations such as Operation Lightning currently underway in Baghdad. “The Baghdad operation will include 40,000 Iraqi police and army troops, and thousands of U.S. soldiers. It could prove to be a watershed event for the Iraqi security forces,” reports [Knight Ridder](#). Operation Lightning is interesting because it contains elements of both overt and covert operations against the resistance. “Announcement of the offensive came as Iraq’s interior minister said yesterday that intelligence reports indicate that al-Qaida-linked Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, reputedly the mastermind behind bombings that have killed hundreds in Iraq, had been injured.” In other words, the al-Zarqawi false flag operation is being used as a pretext to terrorize average Iraqis, millions who directly or indirectly assist the resistance and are thus the real target of Operation Lightning (and Operation New Market in Haditha).

Part of the scheme is to have the installed “leadership” in Iraq demand the UN Security Council sign off on a more or less permanent occupation of the country by “US-led multinational forces,” as the [Xinhua News Agency](#) characterized it. “Despite continuing efforts to build up our security forces, these forces cannot as yet assume full responsibility for maintaining our national security and defending our borders,” Iraqi Foreign Minister Hoshiyar Zibari wrote in a letter to Security Council president Ellen Loj. In short, Zibari—the former spokesperson for the Kurdistan Democratic Party in the 1990s and representative to the organization in Britain and the United States—admits that the United States military will not be departing Iraq, as demanded by the majority of the Iraqi people, anytime soon.

As for Bush’s Fort Apaches, they are strategically located in the north (Irbil or Qayyarah), the west (al-Asad), the south (Tallil), and the center of Iraq (Balad). Here is a [map of Iraq’s military bases](#) prior to Bush’s invasion. As the above mentioned senior US official in Baghdad explained, the location of Bush’s Fort Apaches are “dictated by the level of the insurgency and the progress of Iraq’s fledgling security structures,” although their dispersal

seems more concerned with a post-civil war Iraq in mind (a Shi'ite south, Sunni center, and Kurdish north).

Of course, we cannot discuss Iraq without mentioning oil—and most of the oil is in the north, south and eastern part of the country ([see this map](#)).

As should be understood by those who pay attention—and have a memory longer than fifteen minutes (as do most Americans) or an evening's sit-com—VP Dick Cheney and his oil buddies have a keen interest in Iraq's oil, as a lawsuit initiated by Judicial Watch made proof positive. A “Judicial Watch press release [of July 17, 2003] states that [Cheney Energy Task Force] released documents ‘contain a map of Iraqi oilfields, pipelines, refineries and terminals, as well as 2 charts detailing Iraqi oil and gas projects’” (see Mano Singham's [Cheney's Oil Maps: Can the Real Reason for War be This Crass?](#))

Oil, Pax Israelica, and a thriving death merchant business for the likes of Lockheed Martin and General Dynamics ([death merchants figure largely in the Strauscon think tanks and foundations](#)) constitute a hydra-headed monster of shared geopolitical and multinational corporate interests. (Incidentally, earlier this month, the [federal appeals court](#) ruled that Cheney's oil spoils maps and documents are “not subject to the federal open meetings law,” in other words the American people have no right to see them, again sending an obvious message: America is corporate territory and the people need to butt out of corporate business, never mind that the White House has for some time been a multinational corporate branch office, contrary to what we are told on the Fourth of July).

It is obviously easier to micro-manage three small pieces than one simmering whole, as the Israelis realized early on as they devised ways (based on time-tested colonialist methods) to balkanize their Arab and Muslim neighbors who didn't take kindly to the idea of brother Arabs and Muslims reduced to the unenviable status of hewers of wood and drawers of water (a fate the Israelite Joshua condemned the Gibeonites to—in short, they were reduced to slavery, although Exodus 20:10 provides for a day off on the Sabbath).

Bush's Fort Apaches will serve as outposts on the Pax Israelica envisioned “reshaped” frontier, keeping “the barbarians from coming together,” and subverting pan-Arab nationalism and dangerous Islamic fundamentalism (through covert ops channeling this energy into tribal and ethnic self-destructiveness) by way of Hashemite (look toward Jordan) authoritarianism (or bought-and-sold tribal rule structures co-opted by the United States and Israel, based on earlier colonialist models).

Of course, chances are—after a lot of murder and cruel destruction—the Strauscon-Likute-neolib corporate plan will fail and fail miserably because, as history teaches, people consistently resist tyranny and authoritarianism. For nearly a century the history of the Middle East has been one of stubborn resistance to colonialism and occupation, although this is not generally a subject of western history books. Bush's Fort Apaches, dotting the landscape and providing support for a hand-picked “democratic” government through overt and covert operations, will eventually be over-run, as U.S. bases in

Vietnam were, and the Pentagon will be obliged to beat a hasty retreat once again. However, this time around, the question is: will they finally learn their lesson and come to understand that people will resist invasion and occupation and such endeavors are ultimately destined for failure? Or will they stubbornly and stupidly press onward until the empire crumbles in flames and the American people are reduced to the fate of all people left in the wake of all failed empires: collective misery and privation?

May 27, 2005

## John “Armageddon” Bolton Will Home Wreck the United Nations Soon Enough

It’s portrayed as a victory for Democrats—the nomination of John Bolton, a reactionary with a serious anger management problem, will be delayed for ten days while the Senate takes its Memorial Day break. “Senate Republicans fell short of the 60 votes needed to end debate on Bolton’s fitness to serve as UN envoy, giving his Democratic critics at least 10 days to muster Senate opposition to the nomination. The postponement lengthens the already drawn-out fight until after next week’s congressional recess,” writes [Bloomberg](#).

In a normal world, not Bushzarro world, Bolton would be tarred, feathered, and driven out of town on a rail, as would every member of the Bush administration and just about the entire Congress. Instead, Bolton, who is a veteran of Strausscon all-war-all-the-time think tanks (the American Enterprise Institute, the Project for the New American Century, and the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs) is considered the optimal choice by many for the ambassadorship because he is “no-nonsense” and a “tough talker,” that is to say he will tell the rest of the world to screw off when it complains about Bush’s war on Islam.

The eleventh hour stall of Bolton’s nomination came on the heels of a “demand for some classified documents about Bolton’s work in the State Department, which the White House has rejected. Republicans have expressed skepticism about that explanation, suggesting that it is an excuse for obstructing the nomination.” It is said the documents provide evidence Bolton “tried to tamper with intelligence assessments,” according to the [Voice of America](#). But this should hardly be surprising—or provide sufficient reason to derail his nomination—since the Bush administration predicated the invasion of Iraq on bogus or warped “intelligence assessments” (in other words, they lied and, as a result, more than 100,000 Iraqis were slaughtered).

“Even though many Senators might agree that Bolton is not the perfect candidate, he does represent Bush’s worldview and would be a fair, if overly harsh, representative of current U.S. policy,” writes [Alan Stewart Carl](#) on the Yellow Line blog. “In the end, the Bolton nomination is a face-off between those wanting a conciliatory foreign policy and those wanting a confrontational foreign policy. Baring any stunning revelations about Bolton’s past and assuming the Democrats are serious about not filibustering, the Senate will almost certainly confirm Bush’s appointee and, in doing so, his policy. If they don’t, Bush might as well dredge a lake for himself in Crawford, because he’ll be a total lame duck.” Of course, Bush will not need

to dredge a lake in Texas because he will get just about everything he wants—or rather what the Strausscons and the Likudites want.

Back in 2002, [Robert Fisk](#) wrote for the Independent that “a large number of former Israeli lobbyists are now working within the American administration and the Bush plans for the Middle East” and those plans “fit perfectly into Israel’s own dreams for the region.” Quoting the Nation, Fisk mentions “Vice-President Dick Cheney—the arch-hawk in the US administration—and John Bolton, now under-secretary of state for Arms Control, with Douglas Feith, the third most senior executive at the Pentagon” as prime movers of the war against Islam, as envisioned by JINSA. [Right Wing](#) describes JINSA thus:

*In recent years, JINSA was one of the groups that most strongly supported the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq. Former head of the Pentagon’s Defense Policy Board, Richard Perle, is a member of JINSA’s Board of Advisers and serves as a spokesman in furthering JINSA’s goals. Other former advisory board members include Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Douglas Feith. Former administration officials from the Reagan era are James Woolsey, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Michael Ledeen. Many individuals with defense backgrounds and affiliations serve on the board of advisers and are involved in numerous contracts with Israel. Leon Edney, David Jeremiah, and Charles May, former armed forces officers, have all been consultants to Northrop Grumman, which has built Israeli ships and planes. May, Paul Cerjan and Carlisle Trost have also worked for Lockheed Martin, which has sold F-16s, flight simulators, and rocket systems to Israel. Trost is a member of the board of General Dynamics, whose subsidiary Gulfstream has a \$206 million contract with the Pentagon.*

In short, an amalgamation of warmongers and death merchants.

Bolton’s job, as ambassador to the United Nations, will be to push non-stop the all-war-all-the-time ideology (in the name of Israel and for the sake of profit for the above mentioned death merchants).

Since Bush gets pretty much what he wants—and claims a “mandate” from the mostly somnolent American public, chumps and eventually cannon fodder for all-war in the name of Israel and Lockheed Martin—we can expect Bolton’s nomination to sail breezily through the Senate, albeit with a few minor waves made by Democrats who see a dismal future ahead and probably worry about the above mentioned tar and feathers (if not pikes for profile display in the streets).

It will take complete ruin—economically, socially, and politically—to put an end to the reign of this gang of profiteers, Zionists, and Christian Zionists. “John Bolton is the kind of man with whom I would want to stand at Armageddon,” averred Bolton’s mentor, [Jesse Helms](#). Unfortunately—for the Arab and Muslim world and more than a few sleepy Americans—this latter-day Armageddon is now short in the making as Bolton will be appointed to home wreck any significant opposition at the United Nations and the Bushcons push the envelope, bombing and invading Islamic countries in hurry-scurry fashion.

Sit tight and fasten your seatbelts.

May 26, 2005

## Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and the Silver Bullet

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is dead, or maybe he is alive. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is wounded, but maybe he isn't. "It remains unclear whether he is seriously wounded, whether he is in Iraq or elsewhere, and whether he has been replaced at least temporarily as leader of his group," reports the [BBC](#). Nobody knows much of anything about the mercurial Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, and yet he is "blamed for many of the most deadly attacks and is the only widely-recognized leader in the insurgency," even though he may be dead, seriously wounded, or not in Iraq. Considering the dearth of information on al-Zarqawi, how can the BBC and the corporate media claim he is the "only widely-recognized leader in the insurgency"?

The BBC continues: "Clearly, US commanders and the new Iraqi authorities believe that removing him from the scene would have a significant psychological and practical impact on the insurgency, at least temporarily," and never mind that, as stated above, he may not even be on the scene, or alive for that matter. Claiming al-Zarqawi is dead, in a spider hole somewhere licking his wounds, or on vacation in the Bahamas will not have a "psychological and practical impact on the insurgency," as claimed by the Pentagon. But fact of the matter is the Pentagon and its Iraqi version of the [ARVN](#) possess a dim view of what the "insurgency" actually is and the hobgoblin al-Zarqawi is a desperate attempt to put a face on the resistance. Or so it would seem.

"To capture or kill such a figurehead would also be a considerable symbolic and morale boost to US forces and the Iraqi administration," the BBC claims. "But no-one believes it would be a silver bullet that would finish off the resistance."

In fact, nothing short of the U.S. leaving Iraq will "finish off the resistance" (or stop it from resisting) and the Iraqi ARVN, once abandoned by the Pentagon, will wither like Nguyen Van Thieu's army did in Vietnam after the U.S. skedaddled. Iraqi Defense Minister Saadoun al-Duleimi will likely order his soldiers to fight on after the U.S. exits the stage and, like General Cao Van Vien, ARVN chief of staff, he will flee the country. Saadoun al-Duleimi's Phuoc Long (probably the most decisive battle of the Vietnam conflict) is right around the corner.

"In Iraq, the insurgency remains a complicated tapestry. As it has gone on, it has got more sophisticated."

Is it possible the corporate media (in Britain as well as the United States) is so blindsided and stupid? Of course the Iraqi resistance is "a complicated tapestry," mostly because it stretches across the breadth of Iraqi society and is not, as Bush and Crew and the slavish corporate media would have us believe, simply a collection of former "Saddamists" (yet another meaningless term created by the corporate media), dead-enders, malcontents, criminals, and foreign terrorists. The Iraqi resistance is not "run" by Abu Musab al-

Zarqawi or any other single individual (even one who actually exists, since al-Zarqawi is dead). Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is a contrivance, a monster face slapped on an anonymous resistance that cannot be defeated because it is indigenous and committed, not a sinister underground cabal of beheaders and suicide bombers as much at war with Shia Islam as the United States military, and not led by a half-witted and sadistic Jordanian Palestinian, a foreigner. “Rather than extremist foreign fighters battling to the death, the marines are mostly finding local men from Falluja who are fighting to defend their city from what they view as an illegitimate occupier,” [Scott Ritter](#) wrote earlier this year. “The motivations of these fighters may well be anti-American, but they are Iraqi, not foreign, in origin.”

Nonetheless, with reality staring story editors at the BBC dead in face, they write: “But trends like the increase in suicide bombings in Baghdad may be evidence of growing collaboration between the foreign elements and local Iraqi insurgents.” And, as well, it may be a military intelligence operation on the part of the Pentagon, increasing acts of savage violence engineered to make the undefeatable Iraqi resistance look bad and alienate possible supporters, a long-held objective of counter-insurgency for decades (for instance, insurgent “pseudo teams,” as organized by the [British Special Branch in Malaya](#), worked to discredit the insurgency). As [Chris Shumway](#) points out, many Iraqis believe “the mythic Al-Zarqawi is part of a foreign strategy to divide Iraq’s religious sects and political factions and justify a prolonged occupation... According to analysts and military documents obtained by the Associated Press, the most organized and active resistance cells consist mainly of native Iraqis: Sunni Muslims, Ba’ath party loyalists—many with experience in Saddam’s military and intelligence services—and tribal men who are fighting for a bigger role for their group in Iraq. Although they may be influenced by fundamentalist Islam, they are not, many analysts insist, fighting for a Taliban-like Islamic state as Al-Zarqawi’s fighters purportedly are.”

Bush and Crew believe (or want us to believe) “the level of insurgent violence” is a “sign of increasing desperation,” when in fact, as the BBC allows, “it may be further evidence that the insurgency is stronger and more sophisticated than US commanders and intelligence have calculated,” or are willing to admit. In desperation, the Pentagon has once again deployed “more than 1,000 soldiers to flush out foreign fighters and Iraqi extremists from Haditha,” as the [Los Angeles Times](#) reports.

Even so, “the pace of suicide bombings, sabotage and assassinations has shown no signs of abating,” and will not do so until the United States gets out of Iraq, something they keep telling us they will not do, even though it is obvious that with every “sweep” through Iraqi “terrorist strongholds” the resistance not only grows, but increases its deadly effectiveness. As if on cue, following the now dog-warred Straussian master plan and shooting script, “U.S. and Iraqi officials accuse Syria of tolerating the use of their territory as a conduit for foreign fighters entering Iraq,” once again refusing to face reality, a totality that demands common sense be enlisted: the Iraqi resistance is indigenous, not cooked up in Damascus or Tehran.

Meanwhile, as if to admit the Abu Musab al-Zarqawi myth is on its last legs,

an “Internet statement signed in the name of al-Qaida in Iraq said the group has appointed an interim leader for al-Zarqawi in light of his purported injury,” even though this was later disputed. As usual, the “statement, posted on a Web site known for carrying extremist material, could not be immediately authenticated,” although this hardly matters. “The back-and-forth on same Web site, known as a clearinghouse of Islamic militant material, could be a sign of confusion or competition within al-Qaida of Iraq. It follows speculation about the Jordanian-born militant that has been unusual in size and scope.” Of course, it makes absolutely no sense for al-Qaeda “in Iraq” to air its dirty laundry and admit this weakness publicly. But then, since the American people, who either directly or tacitly support Bush’s “war on terrorism,” are so easily fooled and are remiss when it comes to picking up on crucial details, this may not be much of a concern for the masters of war who are emboldened by the fact so few people actually care about their bald-faced lies and deceptions.

**May 26, 2005**

## **The Bush Gulag and Amnesty International's Annual Report**

May 25, 2005, was a cold day in Hell. Scott McClellan, Bush’s intrepid White House spokesman, admitted the United States government condones “atrocious” human rights violations, “thereby diminishing its moral authority and setting a global example encouraging abuse by other nations,” as the [New York Times](#) reports, citing accusations leveled by Amnesty International.

“President Bush and the administration,” averred McClellan, “admit culpability and plan to make amends. As of eight PM Eastern Standard Time, the president has ordered the release of all detainees held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, and Bagram AFB in Afghanistan. Moreover, beginning immediately, the president has ordered a sweeping and comprehensive investigation of all allegations of abuse and the Justice Department will not rest until all who are guilty of such abuses are held to account for their behavior.”

Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice ... won’t get fooled again.

Actually, Scott McClellan said no such thing. In fact, Mr. McClellan reamed the human rights organization. “I think the allegations are ridiculous, and unsupported by the facts,” said McClellan. “The United States is leading the way when it comes to protecting human rights and promoting human dignity. We have liberated 50 million people in Iraq and Afghanistan. We have worked to advance freedom and democracy in the world so that people are governed under a rule of law, that there are protections in place for minority rights, that women’s rights are advanced so that women can fully participate in societies where now they cannot.”

Not only have the batteries died in the dung-o-meter but somebody has disassembled the device and scattered its parts to the four corners of the empire. McClellan continued: “We’ve also—are leading the way when it comes to spreading compassion. The United States leads the way when it comes to providing resources to combat the scourge of AIDS.”

In fact, as [Human Rights Watch](#) documents, the Bushites are in the process of mixing apples and oranges when it comes to AIDS, thus allowing even more people to suffer horrible deaths. “The U.S. government is trying to withhold anti-HIV/AIDS funding unless both U.S.-based and foreign organizations adopt policies that explicitly oppose all forms of prostitution, Human Rights Watch and a group of more than 200 leading public and human rights experts and organizations said [on May 18] in a letter to U.S. President George W. Bush... ‘The U.S. government’s “anti-prostitution” pledge not only undermines its global efforts against HIV/AIDS,’ said Rebecca Schleifer, researcher with Human Rights Watch’s HIV/AIDS Program. ‘It also undermines the fundamental right of sex workers and trafficking victims to receive lifesaving information about HIV/AIDS. And it violates freedom of speech for anti-HIV/AIDS groups working with these high-risk groups.’”

According to the presbyopic religious fundies who advise and rule the Bush administration, AIDS in places such as Botswana, Cote d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Guyana, Haiti, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia is best addressed through sexual abstinence. “In an age where five million people are newly infected each year, and women and girls too often do not have the choice to abstain, an abstinence-until-marriage programme is not only irresponsible, it’s really inhumane,” remarked US Congresswoman [Barbara Lee](#) last July, as the Bushites pedaled their simplistic notions at an international summit on the disease in the Thai capital Bangkok.

So really, when you think about it—and obviously millions of us here in the United States never do—the Bushcons cannot help but tell lies whenever they open their mouth, as McClellan demonstrated once again when he made the mistake of mentioning AIDS and the amiable behavior of the United States, a demented nation now run by a gaggle of right-wingers who essentially believe AIDS is God’s punishment for the wicked. ( “AIDS is the wrath of a just God against homosexuals,” once declared the bible-thumper [Jerry Falwell](#). “To oppose it would be like an Israelite jumping in the Red Sea to save one of Pharaoh’s chariotters.” )

And so it is with the torture and “rendition” of Muslims, who figure in the Bush constellation about the same as homosexuals, that is to say they are to be dealt with severely and then—for the consumption of somnolent consumers at home, or those with one eye open, affixed to the telescreen—this severity will be spin-dried as compassion or swept under the proverbial rug. In essence, no matter what Amnesty International says or does, it does not matter because most Americans are not paying attention and really don’t care, thank you very much. [Paris Hilton and the “Spicy BBQ Burger”](#) have more relevance.

For instance, as the so-called Blair memo makes obvious, Bush fixed intelligence and facts around his long-held desire to bomb Iraq and kill a whole lot of Iraqis. “Bush had decided we’re going in, the memo said that Bush was going in, no matter what,” explains crack reporter [Greg Palast](#). “This is what nailed Nixon in the end, not just Watergate, but it was fixing the intelligence.”

Unfortunately, the days when people actually gave two cents worth of a damn are long gone. Few of us care about the Blair memo or the torture and murder of innocent taxi drivers in Afghanistan or the slaughter of more than 100,000 Iraqis predicated on disgusting lies and more than a few of us consider Amnesty International no different than the French.

In other words, they can screw off.

May 25, 2005

## AIPAC Wants You to Die in Iran

As a primary example how AIPAC runs the foreign policy of the United States, consider Dana Milbank's [AIPAC's Big, Bigger, Biggest Moment](#), published in the Washington Post. Milbank tells us: at the annual meeting of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, held in Washington recently, the pro-Israel "political action committee" (or rather a political bribery and intimidation, to say nothing of espionage, committee or more accurately racket) is "here to stay" (according to Howard Kohr, executive director), that is to say no niggling little investigation by the FBI will put a kink in the pressure camarilla's operations. Getting busted stealing U.S. secrets, according to Kohr, is no big deal, although it is a "test of [AIPAC's] collective resolve" in its effort to dominate U.S. foreign policy in the name of Israel.

Condi Rice and "congressional leaders" were in attendance, according to Milbank. "AIPAC is a demanding crowd, and even Rice, introduced as a 'very special friend,' did not satisfy universally. The participants applauded heartily her reminder that Bush did not meet with Arafat, but when she said Arafat's successor, Mahmoud Abbas, 'is committed to both freedom and security,' and when she mentioned more U.S. funds for Palestinians, the room was quiet." In other words, for the AIPAC faithful, helping out the Palestinians in any way is seriously frowned upon—no doubt a lot of them feel the same way Ariel Sharon and the Likudites do: the Palestinians (or "beasts walking on two legs," as the warm and fuzzy former PM of Israel, Menachem Begin, once characterized them) should expect nothing, maybe a few more "operations" (collective punishment and mass murder), and they should most definitely think about emigrating, maybe to Antarctica. Obviously, there is nothing Mahmoud Abbas can do except convince his people to walk across the desert, maybe with a bit of prodding from the munificent IDF, and settle in western Iraq or maybe somewhere in Jordan (AIPACers and Zionists consider Jordan the "real" home of the Palestinians, although none of them have ever lived there, or very few of them did until Israel ran them out of the country at gunpoint in 1948).

Milbank tells us "the attendees overall showed an impressive ideological discipline—right down to AIPAC's multimedia show, 'Iran's Path to the Bomb,' in the convention center's basement" (in Washington, a lot of things happen in basements; ask [Oliver North](#)). AIPAC and well-placed Zionists in the Pentagon and White House have a fixation about Iran and its supposed desire to get its hands on a couple nuclear bombs, ostensibly to "push the Jews into the sea" by way of radiation.

*The exhibit, worthy of a theme park, begins with a narrator condemning the International Atomic Energy Agency for being “unwilling to conclude that Iran is developing nuclear weapons” (it had similar reservations about Iraq) and the Security Council because it “has yet to take up the issue.” In a succession of rooms, visitors see flashing lights and hear rumbling sounds as Dr. Seuss-like contraptions make yellowcake uranium, reprocess plutonium, and pop out nuclear warheads like so many gallons of hummus for an AIPAC conference.*

Of course, the IAEA was absolutely spot on about Iraq—it did not possess nuclear weapons or, for that matter, many other weapons, or at least not weapons of a threat to Israel (remember [Condi’s “smoking gun”](#) and “mushroom cloud” in response to Hans Blix’s assertion that Iraq did not possess weapons of mass destruction, to which stand-up comedian Ari Fleischer replied: “The problem with guns that are hidden is you can’t see their smoke.”). It is a nostalgic addition for AIPAC to add a yellowcake uranium processor to their circus sideshow... it reminds us of the fiction Saddam was also in pursuit of the fabled [yellow cake](#).

Of particular interest at the AIPAC confab was a “debate” between Rep. Jane Harman (D-Calif.) and the Prince of Darkness himself, Richard Perle, former runner-up for the Jonathan Pollard “Sell Out Your Country” Award (he was [investigated by the Justice Department and found to have violated US policies relating to unlawful transmission of sensitive classified US information to Israel](#)).

*Perle drew cheers for denouncing Palestinian anti-Semitism and the French. Harman mentioned that an aide once worked for AIPAC, called her audience “very sophisticated” and celebrated Yasser Arafat’s death as “a blessing.” Debating a hard-liner in front of a pro-administration crowd, Harman heaped praise on President Bush, calling the Iraqi elections “sensationally impressive” and moving to “applaud” or “commend” Perle and the administration a dozen times. “Richard is right, and so is President Bush,” she said at one point.*

*But after half an hour of this, Harman could not keep up. Perle provoked cheers from the crowd when he favored a military raid on Iran, saying that “if Iran is on the verge of a nuclear weapon, I think we will have no choice but to take decisive action.” When Harman said the “best short-term option” is the U.N. Security Council, the crowd reacted with boos.*

In other words, when it comes to Israel and bombing Muslim and Arab nations (and forcing so-called “elections” on them), there is little difference between Democrats and Strausscons such as Richard Perle. It would seem the only difference between the two camps is in regard to Iran—Democrats such as Harman want a check for mass murder written by the United Nations while Perle believes no such check or permission is required and wants the United States to go it alone and bomb Iran in the name of AIPAC and Israel.

Iran will be attacked, maybe next month, possibly down the road a stretch (see [Scott Ritter’s analysis](#)). Naturally, this will be an unmitigated disaster since Iran will not stand still and do nothing during and after the bombs fall.

“The entire Zionist territory, including its nuclear facilities and atomic arsenal, are currently within range of Iran’s advanced missiles,” a senior Iranian official said last August. An attack on Iran “could only be carried out by angry or stupid people. For that reason, officials of the Islamic Republic must always be prepared to counter possible military threats,” declared [Yadollah Javani](#), head of the Revolutionary Guards political bureau. “Iran would respond within 15 minutes to any attack by the United States or any other country,” an anonymous Iranian official linked to the ruling mullahs told [Borzou Daragahi](#) of the San Francisco Chronicle in February. “Iranian authorities,” Daragahi continues, “say they have been getting ready for a possible attack. Newspapers have announced efforts to increase the number of the country’s 7 million-strong ‘Basiji’ volunteer militia, which was deployed in human-wave attacks during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s. Iranian military authorities have paraded long-range North Korean-designed Shahab missiles before television cameras.” But the Iranians, paying heed to the lessons on guerilla warfare against the United States in Iraq, are not limiting their potential response to conventional military readiness. “Over the last year, they’ve developed their tactics of ‘asymmetrical’ war, which would aim not at resisting a penetration of foreign forces, but to then use them on the ground to all kinds of harmful effect,” a military expert based in Tehran added. It is also a sure bet the Iranians would stir up trouble in neighboring Iraq if the United States or Israel invaded.

So here’s what Richard Perle and AIPAC are not telling you: if Iran is invaded (or simply bombed) it will respond in kind and this will necessitate a more robust military response by the United States, i.e., more bullet-stoppers will need to be thrown into the mix. Since the Pentagon is having big problems recruiting soldiers (even the cell phone generation, more or less lost in oblivious consumerism, realizes joining the military may translate into serious bodily harm or even death), if all hell breaks loose in Iran and Iraq, as the Iranians warn, the only option will be to kick start conscription, otherwise known as involuntary servitude, or less politely slavery.

In essence, Richard Perle and AIPAC want you to donate your kids (or yourself) to the plan for Greater Israel and the long-envisioned Pax Israelica empire. Perle and the Strausscons realize they cannot attack Iran without a large influx of troops (a fact mentioned by the Strausscon [William Kristol](#), who more or less, between the lines, asked for military conscription since brow-beating military recruiters bearing fistfuls of sign-up cash at the local mall or high school are not working out).

Maybe by this time next year, while AIPAC is chewing through “26,000 kosher meals, 32,640 hors d’oeuvres, 2,500 pounds of salmon, 1,200 pounds of turkey, 900 pounds of chicken, 700 pounds of beef and 125 gallons of hummus,” as Milbank notes, your 20-something son and daughter will be slumped over MREs (Meals Ready to Eat) in a foxhole somewhere in the Persian desert with deadly depleted uranium blowing around. Since there are 66,622,704 (as of 2002) Iranians, and many of them are young males, and 24,001,816 Iraqis (minus a hundred or more thousand, killed over the last couple years by “our troops” under the vicious guidance of the likes of Donald Rumsfeld), we can expect the (unphotographed) flag-draped caskets to arrive at Dover AFB in record numbers.

May 24, 2005

## Michael Isikoff: Government News Source Junkie

“It was terrible what happened,” [Michael Isikoff](#), spineless journalist for Newsweek, told Charlie Rose. “Even if it was just a little bit that we contributed to the violence that went on over there, that was awful, terrible.”

No, Isikoff wasn't talking about the “violence that went on” in Iraq and Afghanistan, so far resulting in the murder of more than 100,000 people, but rather the mistake he made in telling the truth about what goes on every day in places like Guantanamo Bay, Bagram AFB, Camp Cropper, and other dismal facilities within Bush's torture and sexual humiliation gulag. Problem is so-called journalists such as Michael Isikoff are like junkies, relying on so-called “sources” in the government for their stories, and when the government turns around and bites them in the ass they are screwed, damaging their precious careers in the process. Of course, Isikoff could have used a dozen or more sources to add fiber to his story (for instance, the [International Committee of the Red Cross](#) has complained about torture and the desecration of the Koran on numerous occasions), but as an “official source” junkie working for a corporate news organization he had to have an anonymous government source and this burned him big time.

But what is particularly pathetic and nauseating is that Isikoff seems to believe that the Newsweek story about dunking the Koran in a bucket of urine and feces was a singular incident that outraged the Muslim world and resulted in riots, when in fact Muslims have complained about the United States invading their countries, killing their fellow citizens, rounding up people and torturing them for years now. Moreover, it was the police who killed protesters in Jalalabad, Afghanistan, and Isikoff's article was simply the last straw for Muslims who have weathered insults and depredation for months.

Of course, the hand-wringing wimpishness of Michael Isikoff should not be surprising—after all, we're talking about the corporate media here, albeit the current crop of reactionaries at the helm in the United States find Isikoff and Newsweek “liberal” or “leftist,” once again demonstrating how far to the right the political barometer has swung in this country. It took about a nanosecond for the right to jump all over Isikoff like white on rice. According to [Rich Lowry](#), editor at the National Review, Newsweek “can be blamed for its shoddy original work, for its nonapology, and for the media culture of hostility toward the military that makes its mistake so characteristic. That is not to say that any of its reporters or editors harbors personal animosity toward the military.” In other words, Newsweek and Isikoff should censor themselves, not report the news, because it hurts Bush's military, currently busy at work breaking international laws and the Geneva Convention (but then the people tortured at Guantanamo are beyond the pale of international law and are, in fact, according to the Pentagon and reactionary shells such as Lowry, not even human, so it's no big deal). Moreover, somebody needs to tell Lowry that “shoddy original work” (i.e., depending on the government for news) is quite common these days, especially considering the role of the corporate media is to indoctrinate, not inform. Problem is Newsweek and Isikoff wandered a tad outside of the

established parameters (making a big deal about criminal behavior on the part of the Pentagon) and were set-up (the anonymous “source” back tracked) to take a fall and thus send a message to the media: move even further to the right and stop dissing the military, even when they do obviously criminal and egregious things like torturing innocent taxi drivers to death or dunking the Koran in fecal matter.

It should be obvious to even the most casual student of history that torture and humiliation is what armies do—to say nothing of mass murdering civilians, destroying crucial infrastructure, and in general reducing societies to rubble—and to believe otherwise, as Bush would have us do, makes one a naive sucker. Our “boys” in Iraq and Afghanistan were not sent to be the grateful recipients of flower petals but rather to make those countries and their people conform to the dictates imposed by our government. Newsweek knows this and so does Michael Isikoff. Average Americans with more than two brain cells to rub together should realize it as well. However, it is easier (and feels better) to buy the baloney Bush and Crew pass off—the United States invaded Iraq to “liberate” the Iraqi people (and the few rogue soldiers who torture will be punished)—and this is why Newsweek and Isikoff (and Dan Rather and Eason Jordan) have come under fire: they deviated from the fairy tale that “our troops” are in Iraq to help the Iraqi people.

**May 23, 2005**

## **Just In Time Terrorism: Al-Qaeda in Palestine**

Good old al-Qaeda. It is a mostly illusory booga-booga terrorist “network” that can be conveniently pulled out of a hat and flapped in the face of millions of people who tend to forget—or rather who are not sufficiently preoccupied with so-called terrorism in the name of never-ending war and mass carnage—and remind us this whole mess (so profitable for the likes of Lockheed Martin and Halliburton) will last generations, longer than the so-called Cold War, for a few generations minimum, as promised by our dour and unelected leaders.

Of course, in order to be effective, al-Qaeda (a contrived terror outfit with brand name pull) needs to come out of the woodwork at the appropriate time and place. One such place is occupied Palestine where people have struggled for decades to throw off Israeli invaders and colonialist occupiers. Naturally, the Israelis are unable to stomp out Palestinian nationalism and no matter what they do—short of rounding up every last Palestinian and shipping them to Jordan or an empty Iraqi desert—the determination of the Palestinians increases with every generation, blooming into more severe and tenacious radicalism.

Enter al-Qaeda.

“Al-Qaeda has established a foothold in Palestine with a new militant group based in Gaza formed by extremists who have become disillusioned with Hamas and Islamic Jihad,” [Annette Young](#) reports for the Scotsman. “Amid the biggest flare-up of violence in Gaza since a ceasefire was declared three months ago by Palestinians and Israelis, the Jerusalem Post has quoted unnamed Palestinian Authority security officials as saying that a new group

called Jundallah or ‘Allah’s Brigade’ had links to the terrorist organization headed by Osama bin Laden.”

There are two rather loud tocsins in the above paragraph: first, this bit of “news” appeared in the Jerusalem Post, [a well-known and “influential” Strausscon newspaper](#), and second the untrackable reliance on “unnamed Palestinian Authority security officials” who cannot be reached to corroborate the article’s rather damaging assertion that at least part of Palestinian nationalism is owned by the mercurial (and conveniently dead) Osama bin Laden.

It would appear this little tidbit of info is designed to spin Ariel Sharon’s alleged “withdrawal” from Gaza:

*Khaled Abu Toameh, a journalist for the Jerusalem Post, Israel’s oldest and most respected English-language daily, has interviewed PA officials who said the establishment of Jundallah confirmed suspicions that al-Qaeda was attempting to gain a foothold in Gaza ahead of the planned Israeli withdrawal beginning on August 15.*

In other words, al-Qaeda opportunists will fill the vacuum left behind as the IDF departs, either creating an excuse for future military actions in Gaza or building an argument that there can never be a Palestinian state because it will devolve into an al-Qaeda state or a state with “rogue regime” elements. In 2002, a few months after nine eleven, al-Qaeda (through Sulaiman Abu Gaith) allegedly confirmed “our continuation in working to attack Americans and Jews, and targeting them, both people and buildings,” according to the [Anti-Defamation League](#), quoting a report appearing in the “pan-Arab newspaper Al-Hayat.” As well, we are told al-Qaeda’s sub-title is: “the World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders,” as if to underscore the purpose of the shadowy organization (first, to kill Jews, second to kill “Crusaders,” that is to say Americans).

“Abu Abdullah al-Khattab, who identified himself as the spokesman for Jundallah [al-Qaeda] in Gaza,” writes Annette Young, “denied his group was linked to al-Qaeda but hinted that as well as Israeli targets, the group was planning to target US interests in the region.”

*But on the record, PA officials were yesterday reluctant to confirm links between Jundallah and al-Qaeda, with senior Palestinian negotiator Saeb Erekat, casting doubt on ties. “It is very unlikely that al-Qaeda would be operating in Gaza,” he told the Scotland on Sunday... The emergence of a new militant group in Gaza, especially one with reported links to al-Qaeda, was not surprising, said Ra’anan Gissin, an aide to prime minister Sharon.*

Of course not. But it should be remembered Gissin deemed as “sheer nonsense” the accusation, made in late 2002, that Israeli intelligence had set-up a fake al-Qaeda cell in Gaza. Gissin told the [BBC](#) that the Palestinian accusations were propaganda and disinformation put out by officials trying “to exonerate themselves from the allegations they are collaborating and participating with terrorists.” Sophie Claudet, reporting for the Sydney Morning Herald in Gaza City on December 9, 2002, quoted a spokesman for

the Israeli Foreign Ministry as declaring: “There is no need for Israel to make up something like this because [the hardline Islamic movements] are all the same as al-Qaeda.” In other words, all Palestinians working against Israeli occupation are “the same as al-Qaeda,” a not surprising comment considering the source.

No doubt Gissin and his anonymous colleague at the Israeli Foreign Ministry believe Rashid Abu Shbak, the head of preventive security in Gaza, is a liar and a mountebank for telling the media that the PA “had traced back to Israel mobile phone calls and emails—purportedly from Germany and Lebanon—asking Palestinians to join al-Qaeda. One email had even been ‘signed’ by the al-Qaeda leader, Osama bin Laden... The Palestinians [arrested by preventive security] ... were then paired, unbeknown to them, with Israeli collaborators in Gaza, and received money and weapons.” In short, the fake al-Qaeda cell was a false flag operation, behavior Israeli intelligence has a long and sordid history of engaging in. “Ninety-five percent of the work of the intelligence agencies around the world is deception and disinformation,” [Andreas von Bulow](#), who served on the parliamentary commission which oversees the three branches of the German secret service while a member of the Bundestag (German parliament) from 1969 to 1994, told Christopher Bollyn soon after nine eleven. “Von Bulow told AFP that he believes that the Israeli intelligence service, Mossad, is behind the Sept. 11 terror attacks. These attacks, he said, were carried out to turn public opinion against the Arabs and boost military and security spending,” Bollyn writes. Obviously, a fabricated al-Qaeda cell in Gaza, emerging as Israel “withdraws” from the Gaza Strip (where poverty, unemployment, and poor living conditions remain in their wake), would be a propaganda boon for Israel, a colonial state with a high stake in characterizing Palestinian Arabs as maniacal killers who want to push the Jews into the sea. Israel will never allow a Palestinian state and will do all in its power to convince the world the Palestinians are incontrovertible terrorists.

It is indicative this latest fake al-Qaeda cell story emerged on the pages of the Strausscon controlled Jerusalem Post, formerly owned by Hollinger International (a co-publisher of the National Interest, a Strausscon rag) and not long ago boasted Conrad Black as its CEO (until he was caught with his hand in the corporate cookie jar). “Black, who became a member of the British House of Lords in 2001, is closely associated with a number of influential neoconservative figures and right-wing think tanks. He is a close associate of Richard Perle, who serves on Hollinger’s board, and is on the board of trustees of the Hudson Institute and the Nixon Center,” explains [Right Web](#). Last year the Jerusalem Post was sold to CanWest Global Communications Corp. (its CEO is the son of the late media mogul Israel Asper, who “was unyielding in his support for the Zionist cause,” as the [Ottawa Citizen](#) reported in 2003) and an Israeli media corporation, Mirkaei Tikshoret.

Of course, it does not take an al-Qaeda to foment violent opposition to the brutal Israeli occupation in the Gaza and West Bank. In fact, all it takes is continued IDF “operations” (attacks on civilians) in places like the Jabalia camp, Beit Hanoun, and other crowded places in the Gaza where “swathes of agricultural land were leveled and there was widespread damage to public

and private property—homes, schools, commercial interests—and public infrastructure [roads, sewage, and electricity lines] ” (see [UNRWA Gaza Field assessment of IDF Operation Days of Penitence](#)). “Across the territory as a whole, demolition rates have reached alarming levels in 2004: 1,360 Gazans per month, or 45 persons each day, have been made homeless as a result of IDF demolition operations. Whilst Operation Days of Penitence was ongoing in Northern Gaza, 482 persons were made homeless in Rafah, as the IDF continue to hack away at Palestinian areas along the Egyptian border.” As [Human Rights Watch](#) reported last year, “16,000 people had been made homeless in Rafah during raids and incursions over the last four years and that the Israeli Defense Forces had exaggerated the threat posed by weapons smuggling tunnels under the Rafah-Egypt.” In 2002, well before the cruel depredations of last year, [Human Rights Watch](#) characterized IDF actions as violating “provisions in international law against collective punishment, the destruction of private property, and the use of force against civilians.” But then Ariel Sharon and the Likudites, much like Bush and the Straussons, don’t do human rights.

[Andrew Phillips](#), or Lord Phillips of Sudbury, writes of his recent visit to the Rafa refugee camp in the Guardian:

*One vivid exposure to the real state of things was my visit in the Rafa refugee camp to a UN school (one soon realizes that without massive UN help the occupied territories would collapse). A class of 50 bright-eyed, articulate 13-14-year-olds visibly bridled when I asserted that renewed suicide bombings and Palestinian independence were incompatible. ‘How are we to defend ourselves?’ blurted a tearful girl whose father, I was told, had been ‘murdered’ by the Israelis. Another had had a brother killed and another a father. Thirteen had had their houses destroyed. Many families were in their third ‘home’ since being forced out in 1947/8. Yet despite such plangent demonstrations of passionate defiance, the key picture I gleaned from my trip was of a people yearning for peaceful closure for both sides. One illusion is to think the path to that goal is not strewn with dangers and setbacks. Another is that military might, and walls, can permanently end suicide bombings and worse.*

Phillips’ hopeful optimism aside (considering the rock hard intransigence of the well-funded and organized Zionist endeavor), if indeed al-Qaeda does exist, the above is more than enough to push desperate (and homeless) Gazans into the clutches of the so-called terrorist “network” initially created by the CIA and Pakistan’s ISI, for desperation breeds violence, even suicidal violence.

**May 23, 2005**

## [In the Wrong Place at the Wrong Time: Wife of War Criminal Does Jerusalem](#)

Laura Bush, wife of the notorious war criminal George Bush, tried to put the best face on her embarrassing visit to occupied Palestine over the weekend as she arrived in Cairo. “These are very, very emotional places. They’re sacred places to religions,” Bush told the corporate media, either completely missing or ignoring the reality of the situation. “Everyone knows how high the

tensions are and believe me, I was very, very welcomed by most people,” [said Bush](#) from the Arab Israeli village of Abu Ghosh near Jerusalem. Indeed, tensions are high, thanks to Ariel Sharon and the policies of her husband, George the Lesser. “There are thousands of years of fighting and hatred, but what I’m hoping is . . . that it can be our generation that puts that aside so that we can all come to the Holy Land in peace,” she told reporters in the gardens of the 12th-century Church of the Resurrection.

Obviously, Laura Bush was not making reference to generic “fighting and hatred,” old as humanity itself, but was talking about the fighting and hatred in the so-called Holy Land, and not the genocidal violence portrayed in the Hebrew and Christian Bible, or the organized violence of the Crusades, but rather violence between Zionist settlers and Palestinians, a violence and hatred less than a hundred years old. In the current context, one we are asked to believe Laura Bush’s “weekend visit to Jerusalem holy sites” obviates, the violence is facilitated by the Israeli state with ample assistance of the United States, currently led (thanks to bogus elections) by Laura’s warm and fuzzy mass murdering husband. It apparently disturbs Mrs. Bush that she cannot “come to the Holy Land in peace,” that is to say a Holy Land effectively controlled by Israel, with docile Palestinians, Stepford Palestinians who have accepted their role as the “hewers of wood and drawers of water” (as dictated by the Hebrew bible), a rather unreasonable assumption, to say the least, considering the historical struggle of people against tyranny and occupation down through the millennium.

*She wrapped up her Holy Land trip in Abu Ghosh with an appeal for peace between Israelis and Palestinians, the aim of the diplomatic “road map” sponsored by her husband, which has been stalled by non-compliance and regular violence.*

In other words, it is all the fault of those damn Palestinians, “beasts walking on two legs,” as the former PM of Israel, Menachim Begin, elected by the wonderful people of Israel, so forthrightly called a couple million indigenous Arabs who happened to live on the land for centuries. Naturally, the Palestinians have all the reason in the world to be cynical about “peace deals” brokered by the United States (and now the so-called Quartet: the United States, United Nations, the European Union and Russia) because such deals end up inflicting more misery on the Palestinians. “The first attempt at genuine peace between the Arabs and the Israelis, the Camp David Accords brokered by President Carter, turned out to be a disaster that has lingered on for thirty years,” notes [Michael S. Ladah](#), an Arab American, “to the surprise and disappointment of Arab and U.S. negotiators, the Israeli negotiators imbedded various escape clauses, relieving Israel from a real commitment to peace.” In short, the Israelis are not interested in peace with the Palestinians, they will do everything in their power to short circuit any meaningful negotiations. Laura’s husband concurs. “In a significant policy shift, Mr. Bush relaxed Washington’s objections to Jewish settlements in the West Bank, and attempts by Israel to dictate the terms of a final settlement with the Palestinians,” [Suzanne Goldenberg](#) wrote for the Guardian on April 15, 2004, the same day I forked over a large part of my income to the illegitimate government here in the United States, a substantial sum of which is gift-wrapped and handed over to the Zionist state, no strings attached. In short,

regardless of Laura Bush's tea parties with Palestinian women, there is no "road map" and there never will be, so long as Bush and the Christian Zionists rule (with more than a little help from their friends in the Senate).

"None of you belong here," a Palestinian screamed at Bush and her entourage of Israeli security goons and Secret Service agents as they entered Jerusalem's Dome of the Rock mosque (not far from the al-Aqsa mosque, the third most holy shrine in Islam, which the Zionists, many Orthodox Jews, and Christian Zionists in Israel and the United States [want to destroy](#) so they can re-build the [Temple of Solomon](#)). According to the Israeli and United States governments, however, the outraged Palestinian had it wrong: as the Zionists would have it, Palestinians do not belong in Palestine and the Israelis have worked hard and long to get rid of them ([4,082,300 Palestinians are registered as refugees with UNRWA](#), the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, including the descendants of refugees from the 1948 "war," thus reducing an astounding 46% of all Palestinians homeless).

As if to demonstrate what a good "friends" many Israelis are to America, as Bush visited the adjacent Western Wall complex, dozens "of nationalist Jews demanding Washington free convicted Israeli spy Jonathan Pollard" harangued the unelected U.S. president's wife. Pollard is the former United States Navy intelligence officer who was convicted of spying for Israel. Pollard pleaded guilty to espionage on June 4, 1986 and in 1987 and received life in prison. "In 1998, Israel admitted in a statement from then-Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu that Pollard had been an Israeli spy," notes [Wikipedia](#). "In recent years, many have claimed that Pollard's punishment is too harsh, including Caspar Weinberger, who was a major force behind his original sentencing." In other words, there is one standard for spies working for Israel and another for all other spies. As one Jonathan Pollard [apologia site](#) put it, "Pollard discovered that information [intelligence on Syrian, Iraqi, Libyan and Iranian nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare capabilities] vital to Israel's security was being deliberately withheld by certain elements within the U.S. national security establishment... [and] Israel was legally entitled to this vital security information according to a 1983 Memorandum of Understanding between the two countries," so the Israelis decided to steal it. In other words, if I told you I wanted to sell my house to you and then decided against this, you'd have all the right in the world to steal it. But then Zionists in Israel and America are expert second-story men.

Finally, Laura Bush's little trarriance to the "Holy Land" is less than worthless, little more than an ill-conceived public relations stunt, because it does absolutely nothing to solve the problems between the Palestinians and Israelis, problems that would be solved in short order if the Zionist state of Israel would simply stop stealing Palestinian land and reducing the remainder to a Bantustan open-air prison where more than [one-fifth of young Palestinian children are malnourished](#) and more than [50% of Palestinian adults are unemployed](#). Laura Bush taking tea with Palestinian women (likely hand-picked well in advance) is not only an absurdity, it is an arrogant smack in the face to millions of Palestinians.