



## War Without End

The global war against terror from a British perspective

[FAQ](#) [Popular Topics](#) [Search](#) [Memberlist](#) [Usergroups](#) [Register](#)  
[Profile](#) [Log in to check your private messages](#) [Log in](#)  
[UK and World News](#) [Spam Audit](#) [Ignore List](#)

**www.NoID.net**  
**Stop ID cards and the database state**

### Treason in high places: Pentagon zionists, AIPAC and Israel

Goto page [1](#), [2](#), [3](#) ... [9](#), [10](#), [11](#) [Next](#)



[War Without End Forum Index](#) -> [Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

[View previous topic](#) :: [View next topic](#)

#### Author

**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

#### Message

Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 6:56 pm Post subject: **Treason in high places: Pentagon zionists, AIPAC and Israel**



**Monday, May 09, 2005**

**The Larry Franklin / AIPAC Case -- A Memo to the Media**

<http://gorillaintheroom.blogspot.com/2005/05/larry-franklin-aipac-case-memo-to.html>

**FBI reaches crossroads in probe of pro-Israel lobby group AIPAC | csmonitor.com**

What makes this article valuable is the links it offers to other articles:

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2005/0331/dailyUpdate.html>

**American Mainstream Media is avoiding reporting on the AIPAC**

<http://representativepress.blogspot.com/2005/04/american-mainstream-media-is-avoiding.html>

**JINSA Israel firsters: 'IRAQ DOWN, IRAN LEFT TO GO':**

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=32610>

**AIPAC Still Uber Alles?**

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=32631>

## **Eric Alterman: Can We Talk (about the Jewish Neocons)**

<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20030421&s=alterman>

## **A Zionist War:**

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=33993>

-----

I also think that most of the Zionist (Israel first) JINSA/CSP/PNAC Neocons only have one allegiance and that is to Israel.. Cheney, Woolsey and others seem to be in the game to benefit financially.... Check out the following article:

[http://www.ifamericansknew.org/us\\_ints/nc-green.html](http://www.ifamericansknew.org/us_ints/nc-green.html)

-----

<http://www.rebellion.org/noticia.php?id=4298>

## **Treason in high places: Pentagon zionists, AIPAC and Israel**

James Petras

Rebelión

The FBI investigation into Israeli espionage agents in the Pentagon is part of a major struggle between prominent Zionists in the Pentagon and the US security apparatus. Ever since the Bush regime came to power there has been a fierce political and organizational war between the Pentagon Zionists and their militarist collaborators, on the one hand, and the professional military and intelligence apparatus, on the other. This conflict has manifested itself in a series of major issues including the war in the Middle East, the rationale for war, the relationship between Israel and the US, the strategy for empire, as well as tactical issues like the size of military force needed for colonial wars and the nature of colonial occupation. From 9/11/2001 to the invasion of Iraq, the Pentagon Zionists and the civilian militarists had the upper hand: they marginalized the CIA and established their own intelligence services to "cook the data", they pushed through the doctrine of sequential wars, beginning with Afghanistan and Iraq and projecting wars with Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and other Muslim countries. The Pentagon Zionists increased Israel's power in the Middle East and promoted its expansionist colonization of Palestine, at the expense of US soldiers, budget busting expenditures and CIA objections.

The US military and security apparatus has retaliated. First by debunking Zionist lies about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, then by exposing the role of Zionist client Ahmed Chalabi as a double agent for Iran, followed by a two-year investigation of Pentagon Zionists passing documents to Israeli military intelligence and the secret police, the Mossad.

More is at stake than a turf war between the 'Israel First' Pentagon crowd and their opponents in the US military, diplomatic corp and intelligence agencies. The fundamental issue is the freedom of the US people to decide or at least influence their political leaders and their appointees without being subject to the manipulation and control by a foreign government (Israel) and their highly placed agents in positions of power.

Israel has for decades subverted US foreign policy to serve its interests through the organized power of major Jewish organizations in the US. What is new in the current

Pentagon spy case is that rather than pressuring from the outside to secure favorable policies for Israel, the Israel loyalists are in top positions within the government making strategic decisions about US global policy and providing their Israeli handlers with secret documents pertaining to top level discussions in the White House on questions of war and peace. Today the politics of Pentagon and AIPAC espionage is especially dangerous – because what is at stake is a new US and/or Israeli war on Iran which will ignite the entire Middle East.

The move to high-level spying by top Zionist policy-makers like Douglas Feith, Elliott Abrams, Paul Wolfowitz and others in the Bush Administration is the culmination of a long series of strategic policies promoted by AIPAC designed to enhance Israeli expansionist goals in the Middle East.

Wolfowitz, Feith, Abrams, Perle, Rubin et al were the most zealous promoters of the war against Iraq. They worked closely with other Zionist ideologues like Bush speechwriter David Frum to promote the notion of “axes of evil”, to engage in a sequence of wars against Muslim regimes hostile to Israeli colonial policy in Palestine and beyond. Wolfowitz, Feith set up the parallel ‘intelligence’ agency (the Office of Special Planning) run by fellow Zionist Abram Shulsky using Chalabi to provide phony data on Iraq to precipitate that war. An army of ‘Israel First’ academic and journalist ideologues wrote, spoke and acted to justify the US attack on Iraq as the first part of a regional war to destroy any and all regimes critical of Israeli expansionism. Cohen, Rubin, Kristol, Foxman, Ledeen and many others provided “expert” propaganda on why US soldiers should kill and be killed for Greater Israel. Almost daily meetings and consultations took place between the top Zionists officials and the Israeli military and intelligence leaders in the offices of Feith and other Zionists. The Pentagon offices of Feith and Wolfowitz appeared to be an upscale bordello for high ranking Israeli officials. Judging from the subsequent policies it is clear that Pentagon Zionists took their cues from their Israeli counterparts – Israel was given greater funding, unlimited access to US policy makers and information pertaining to US policy in the Middle East. Meantime US intelligence and military officials were marginalized, their objections to Israeli positions blown away, their very presence seen as obstacles to realizing Sharon's vision of a Greater Israeli – sharing (?) domination over the Middle East.

Given the high level of structural collaboration and integration of US Pentagon Zionists and US Jewish organizations with the Israeli state, the boundaries of what is United States policies and interests and what are Israeli prerogatives and interests are blurred. From the perspective of the Pentagon Zionists and their organized Jewish supporters, it is “natural” that the US spends billions to finance Israeli military power and territorial expansion. It is “natural” to transfer strategic documents from the Pentagon to the Israeli State. As Haaritz states, “Why would Israel have to steal documents when they can find out whatever they want through official meetings?” The routinization of espionage via official consultations between Israeli and US Zionist officials became public knowledge throughout the executive branch. Only it wasn't called espionage, it was referred to as ‘exchanging intelligence’, only the Israelis sent ‘disinformation’ to the Pentagon Zionists to serve their interests while the latter passed on the real policies, positions and strategies of the US government.

The history of the key Zionists in the Pentagon reveals a pattern of disloyalty to the US and covert assistance to Israel. Harold Rhode and William Luti, both fanatical Pentagon Zionists under Feith, Wolfowitz and I. Lewis Libby have been under investigation by the FBI for passing documents to Israel. Rhode had his security clearance suspended recently. CIA operatives in Baghdad reported he was constantly on his cell phone to Israel reporting on US plans, military deployments, political projects, Iraqi assets and a host of other confidential information. Michael Ledeen, another influential Zionist policy maker who worked in the Pentagon lost his security clearance after he was accused of passing classified material to a ‘foreign country (Israel)’. In 2001 Feith hired Ledeen to work for the Office of Special Plans which handled top secret documents. Feith himself was fired in March 1983 from the National Security Council for providing Israel with classified data. The FBI investigated Wolfowitz for

having provided documents to Israel on a proposed sale of US weapons to an Arab country.

It is clear that Israeli agents, not simply Zionists ideologues, infest the top echelon of the Pentagon. The question is not merely a question of taking this or that policy position in favor of Israel but of working systematically on a whole range of issues to further Israeli power over and against US imperial interests.

What is surprising is not the current investigation over Israeli spies in the Pentagon but why they have not been arrested, indicted and sentenced a decade or two earlier.

The problem of American Jewish organizational collaboration with Pentagon espionage - namely the role of the AIPEC as an accomplice in the current spy case - is not exceptional. In their books, former Mossad agent, Victor Ostrovsky ( *The Other Side of Deception*, 1994), and Gordon Thomas and Martin Dillon (Robert Maxwell: *Israel's Superspy*, 2002) describe how the Israeli security forces have recruited overseas Zionist Jews, who are called sayanim, to serve as back-up supporters and collaborators in Israeli overseas operations. AIPAC is not merely a pro-Israel 'lobby' but a long-standing listening post and gatherer of public and confidential government information for Israel. At a more 'philosophical' level there is an insidious belief widely held among the leaders of major Jewish organizations like AIPAC that the basic question for all Jews is whether the "policy is good for the Jews" - narrowly defined to mean the interest of the State of Israel and its current rulers. In pursuit of "Defending Israel at all costs" it is very likely that some of these officials go over the line into wartime espionage.

President Bush has declared that he is a "wartime President" – the US is officially involved in a colonial war of aggression against the Iraqi people. In these circumstances, espionage in time of war is a capital offense... even if the spymasters are Israelis. It is no wonder that the Zionist and Israeli propaganda machine is working overtime to undermine the espionage investigation.

After the first announcement by CBS television, the rest of the mass media gave prominent space to Israeli and AIPEC denials. More seriously the CBS broadcast deliberately harmed the FBI spy investigation into the links between the Pentagon and AIPEC. The FBI blames CBS's revelations concerning Franklin when, the latter had already confessed and was working with the FEDS to implicate AIPAC and Israeli agents. Zionist ideologues in the US mass media and the Israeli press try to downplay the incident – first through vehement denials and subsequently to reducing the case of treason to a question of a routine exchange of information by a single "lower level", bumbling but fanatically pro-Israel Gentile functionary. They forget to mention he was hired and directed by Douglas Feith and Paul Wolfowitz to be their expert on Iran deeply involved in handling top secret documents and formulating policy on Iran.

The Israeli officials claim that Mossad and military intelligence solemnly pledged to stop spying on the US after the Jonathan Pollard case. "We have never spied on the US since...", they claim. In fact over 800 Israeli spies posing as 'art' students and tourists were expelled after 9/11 and several Mossad agents posing as movers in New Jersey and Tennessee were expelled.

The arrogance of Israeli power in then US, which Sharon publically boasted about, is largely based on the simple principle embraced by all Zionist zealots whether they are Ivy league academics or neo-fascist felons (like Elliot Abrams) is "What's good for Israel is good for the US". "Good for Israel" today means bloody US wars against Israel's adversaries, unconditional support for Israeli expansion and pillage of Palestine and now spying on the US for the good of Israel. Guided by this slogan it is easy to see how everything in the US that might be of use to Israeli intelligence whether it be documents, directives or strategic debates about big wartime issues taking place in the White House are fair game for

transmission to Israeli intelligence.

Rather than face the evidence, the Zionist ideologues have taken to ad hominem attacks on their espionage agent as merely a middle level official who didn't influence policy. They overlook the fact that he was the 'delivery boy' for his Zionist bosses who actually do make policy and work with top echelons of the Israeli state in 'coordinating' US policy to fit Israel's needs. The power of the Israeli-US Zionist propaganda machine is so overwhelming that the FBI had to investigate for 2 years, make endless wiretaps, videos and photos, interview dozens of government and not-government officials before they could prepare to make the charges. Despite being taped and photographed in the act of taking top secret documents, AIPEC officials deny everything and then hire a string of high-powered defense lawyers. Already the pro-Zionists mass media suggest that Zionist-AIPEC spying is really a case of 'mishandling sensitive documents' – a case of putting top secret documents in the wrong mailbox. Really!

In less than two days the pro-Israel mass media buried the story, and a series of 'news reports' were published featuring AIPEC denials, Israeli ridiculing their Pentagon mole as a fanatical idiot (Haaretz) and launching a counter attack questioning the motives of the investigation and the FBI counter-espionage service. The media published stories from anonymous "insiders" who purportedly spoke of the FBI dropping espionage charges in favor of charges of "mishandling a classified document" or even simply dropping the case altogether. They claim that the spy handing over a classified document to Israeli interests didn't know it was a crime, a case of an innocent, well-intentioned error of judgment. This piece of propaganda has been thoroughly discredited when it was revealed that the Israeli agent (Franklin) confessed and has been cooperating with the FBI for the past months.

Nothing captures the power and pervasive and corrosive influence of the US-Zionist apparatus on US politics as much as the absolute silence of both major candidates faced with a high-level security lapse and potentially damaging spy investigation. John Kerry, the Democratic candidate trailing Bush in the polls refuses to expose the Zionist Pentagon's 'security failures' despite national security being at the center of his campaign. The reason is very clear: Kerry is tied to the AIPEC-Israel-US Zionist political machine and he is willing to sacrifice US security for the Zionist vote even when faced with the issue of Israeli espionage in a time of war.

The Republicans went one step further – sending their top politicians to an AIPEC political extravaganza organized in New York two days after AIPEC was cited by the FBI as the Israeli intermediary in the passing of secret documents. At no time in recent modern history has any governing or opposition party engaged in public festivities with an organization engaged in foreign espionage. The explanation is the unprecedented and unique political situation that exists in the US today – the extraordinary power that a small, economically dependent state exercises over a global imperial state via its wealthy organized political-religious agents.

If Israel can get anything it wants from its Zionist patriots in high places in the US government, then why engage in espionage? There are several explanations.

The hand delivery of documents by Franklin can be seen as a time saving and security-wise move. If discovered, Franklin's mentors can simply deny involvement – he was acting on his own, an argument put forth in the Israeli press. The idea of Franklin as some kind of 'loose cannon' does not explain why he was hired, retained and given delicate assignments and praised by the senior Zionists (Feith, Wolfowitz, Ledeen and Abrams) up to the time of his exposure. Secondly the document transferred provided Israel with very timely information on a major top-level debate: US policy toward Iran, more particularly who was for or against a military assault on Teheran. This allows Israel to plan its own military strategy knowing in advance Washington's possible response and directing its higher up Pentagon collaborators how to prepare the ground for acceptance of Israeli aggression. Fundamentally Israel wanted

to be in the

White House decision making loop at every stage of Middle East policymaking via Wolfowitz, Feith et al and via confidential documentary accounts which the Mossad could analyze directly. There was a 'need' for espionage, because the Mossad does not merely rely on one source of information, nor does it operate only on one track. It has direct formal and 'informal' relations (spying) with 'friendly' government policy-makers. It operates on many levels, legal and illegal, through Zionist collaborators as well as overseas agents, through agents with false passports and through local Zionist sleepers, who can be activated for specific tasks...

#### Conclusion

Investigations and evidence are usually enough to proceed with indictments, interrogations and the pursuit of the leaders and foreign handlers in a major espionage case, especially in wartime. Thousands of innocent South Asians, Arabs and Muslims have been picked up and jailed on the most flimsy excuses ("suspicions"). But in the case of Israeli-AIPEC-Pentagon espionage the normal legal processes are inoperative.

The question of espionage prosecution depends on political power - a struggle between the Israeli State backed by the major Presidential candidates and parties, the Zionist-American political machines and their mass media acolytes on the one hand and, on the other hand the FBI, professional intelligence apparatus (CIA, DIA), state prosecutor and his investigatory staff and few stray political voices. The so-called progressive movements and policy critics are strangely silent: Even as they speak out against war, they fail to denounce an espionage case which is intimately related to the next Middle Eastern war – an Israeli attack on Iran. Why don't progressive Jews denounce AIPAC espionage to further a new war in Iran? A signed statement "Not in our name" would clearly separate them from these agents of foreign wars. Three days after the initial expose, the mass media have buried the story. The FBI is delaying any announcements. The prosecuting attorney is under tremendous one-sided political pressure. Lacking any mass media outlets the US republic is a helpless giant, tied in knots by malicious dwarfs, unable to defend itself, unable to define its own policy interests. The latest report from the FBI tells us that self-confessed Israeli agent was preparing to lead the authorities to his contacts in the Israeli government when CBS blew open the case. Was CBS aware of the danger to the Israeli secret services and was it trying to undermine the investigation? No doubt some sort of official statement will be made, perhaps even an indictment will be made of the middle level functionary on secondary charges and the FBI may even dare to interview Wolfowitz and Feith on their knowledge of the espionage network with predictable consequences. However if there is anything beyond an interview, the Zionist media will charge "anti-Semitism", a "Second Dreyfuss" case, which will probably end the current investigation.

The 'underground' struggle between the Pentagon Zionists and the US security apparatus will continue. If Bush is re-elected, Wolfowitz will most likely become Secretary of Defense. If Kerry is elected, the closet Zionist, Richard Holbrooke, will take charge of the Pentagon.

American citizens will have to face a serious question: If the security services are incapable of defending our country from foreign espionage in high places – What is to be done?

In either case we face an imminent Zionist designed and promoted military attack on Iran, which is likely to lead to a general conflagration which can only benefit the neo-fascists who run the state of Israel. And you are afraid of being called an anti-Semite for opposing the Israel's espionage and regional wars.

August 31, 2004

---

**Is the Potential AIPAC/Neocon Scandal About to "Blow Up"?**

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=30639>

---

**AIPAC Boasts Control of the White House:**

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=29880>

---

**'A Clean Break' (from James Bamford's 'A Pretext for War'):**

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=28769>

---

**How Israel Controls/Corrupts Controls the US Government and Media:**

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=53>

---

Jason Vest co-wrote the following article about the Office of Special Plans (OSP) which Bamford discusses on pages 307-308 of his 'A Pretext for War' book (Lt. Colonel Karen Kwiatkowski, who was interviewed in your documentary, is also mentioned there by Bamford):

[http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2004/01/12\\_405.html](http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2004/01/12_405.html)

Notice via this article (How Ahmed Chalabi Conned the Neocons) conveyed that Chalabi promised the neocons that he would have good relations with Israel and an oil pipeline from Iraq to Israel after being put in place as the leader of Iraq:

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=27765>

Note the following article about how Karen Kwiatkowski witnessed Israeli military officials walking through the Pentagon like they owned the place:

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article5829.htm>

**Revealing Arrogance Of  
Israeli Generals In Pentagon**

A Strange Thing Happened On The Way To The War

By Karen Kwiatkowski

© 2004 The American Conservative

Lt. Col. Karen Kwiatkowski, a former Pentagon insider, concludes her observations on the run-up to the Iraq war in this last of a three-part series.

As the winter of 2002 approached, I was increasingly amazed at the success of the propaganda campaign being waged by President Bush, Vice President Cheney, and neoconservative mouthpieces at the Washington Times and Wall Street Journal. I speculated about the necessity but unlikelihood of a Phil-Dick-style minority report on the grandiose Feith-Wolfowitz-Rumsfeld-Cheney vision of some future Middle East where peace, love, and democracy are brought about by pre-emptive war and military occupation.

In December, I requested an acceleration of my retirement after just over 20 years on duty and exactly the required three years of time-in-grade as a lieutenant colonel. I felt fortunate not to have being fired or court-martialed due to my politically incorrect ways in the previous two years as a real conservative in a neoconservative Office of Secretary of Defense. But in fact, my outspokenness was probably never noticed because civilian professionals and military officers were largely invisible. We were easily replaceable and dispensable, not part of the team brought in from the American Enterprise Institute, the Center for Security Policy, and the Washington Institute for Near East Affairs.

There were exceptions. When military officers conspicuously crossed the neoconservative party line, the results were predictable-get back in line or get out. One friend, an Army colonel who exemplified the qualities carved in stone at West Point, refused to maneuver into a small neoconservative box, and he was moved into another position, where truth-telling would be viewed as an asset instead of a handicap. Among the civilians, I observed the stereotypical perspective that this too would pass, with policy analysts apparently willing to wait out the neocon phase.

In early winter, an incident occurred that was seared into my memory. A coworker and I were suddenly directed to go down to the Mall entrance to pick up some Israeli generals. Post-9/11 rules required one escort for every three visitors, and there were six or seven of them waiting. The Navy lieutenant commander and I hustled down. Before we could apologize for the delay, the leader of the pack surged ahead, his colleagues in close formation, leaving us to double-time behind the group as they sped to Undersecretary Feith's office on the fourth floor. Two thoughts crossed our minds: are we following close enough to get credit for escorting them, and do they really know where they are going? We did get credit, and they did know. Once in Feith's waiting room, the leader continued at speed to Feith's closed door. An alert secretary saw this coming and had leapt from her desk to block the door. "Mr. Feith has a visitor. It will only be a few more minutes." The leader craned his neck to look around the secretary's head as he demanded, "Who is in there with him?"

This minor crisis of curiosity past, I noticed the security sign-in roster. Our habit, up until a few weeks before this incident, was not to sign in senior visitors like ambassadors. But about once a year, the security inspectors send out a warning letter that they were coming to inspect records. As a result, sign-in rosters were laid out, visible and used. I knew this because in the previous two weeks I watched this explanation being awkwardly presented to several North African ambassadors as they signed in for the first time and wondered why and why now. Given all this and seeing the sign-in roster, I asked the secretary, "Do you want these guys to sign in?" She raised her hands, both palms toward me, and waved frantically as she shook her head. "No, no, no, it is not necessary, not at all." Her body language told me I had committed a faux pas for even asking the question. My fellow escort and I chatted on the way back to our office about how the generals knew where they were going (most foreign visitors to the five-sided asylum don't) and how the generals didn't have to sign in. I felt a bit dirtied by the whole thing and couldn't stop comparing that experience to the grace and gentility of the Moroccan, Tunisian, and Algerian ambassadors with whom I worked.

In my study of the neoconservatives, it was easy to find out whom in Washington they liked and whom they didn't. They liked most of the Heritage Foundation and all of the American Enterprise Institute. They liked writers Charles Krauthammer and Bill Kristol. To find out whom they didn't like, no research was required. All I had to do was walk the corridors and

attend staff meetings. There were several shared prerequisites to get on the Neoconservative List of Major Despicable People, and in spite of the rhetoric hurled against these enemies of the state, most really weren't Rodents of Unusual Size. Most, in fact, were retired from a branch of the military with a star or two or four on their shoulders. All could and did rationally argue the many illogical points in the neoconservative strategy of offensive democracy-guys like Brent Scowcroft, Barry McCaffrey, Anthony Zinni, and Colin Powell.

I was present at a staff meeting when Deputy Undersecretary Bill Luti called General Zinni a traitor. At another time, I discussed with a political appointee the service being rendered by Colin Powell in the early winter and was told the best service he could offer would be to quit. I heard in another staff meeting a derogatory story about a little Tommy Fargo who was acting up. Little Tommy was, of course, Commander, Pacific Forces, Admiral Fargo. This was shared with the rest of us as a Bill Luti lesson in civilian control of the military. It was certainly not civil or controlled, but the message was crystal.

When President Bush gave his State of the Union address, there was a small furor over the reference to the yellowcake in Niger that Saddam was supposedly seeking. After this speech, everyone was discussing this as either new intelligence saved up for just such a speech or, more cynically, just one more flamboyant fabrication that those watching the propaganda campaign had come to expect. I had not heard about yellowcake from Niger or seen it mentioned on the Office of Special Plans talking points. When I went over to my old shop, sub-Saharan Africa, to congratulate them for making it into the president's speech, they said the information hadn't come from them or through them. They were as surprised and embarrassed as everyone else that such a blatant falsehood would make it into a presidential speech.

When General Zinni was removed as Bush's Middle East envoy and Elliot Abrams joined the National Security Council (NSC) to lead the Mideast division, whoops and high-fives had erupted from the neocon cubicles. By midwinter, echoes of those celebrations seemed to mutate into a kind of anxious anticipation, shared by most of the Pentagon. The military was anxiously waiting under the bed for the other shoe to drop amidst concerns over troop availability, readiness for an ill-defined mission, and lack of day-after clarity. The neocons were anxiously struggling to get that damn shoe off, gleefully anticipating the martinis to be drunk and the fun to be had. The other shoe fell with a thump on Feb. 5 as Colin Powell delivered his United Nations presentation.

It was a sad day for me and many others with whom I worked when we watched Powell's public capitulation. The era when Powell had been considered a political general, back when he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, had in many ways been erased for those of us who greatly admired his coup of the Pentagon neocons when he persuaded the president to pursue UN support for his invasion of Iraq. Now it was as if Powell had again rolled military interests-and national interests as well.

Around that same time, our deputy director forwarded a State Department cable that had gone out to our embassy in Turkey. The cable contained answers to 51 questions that had been asked of our ambassador by the Turkish government. The questions addressed things like after-war security arrangements, refugees, border control, stability in the Kurdish north, and occupation plans. But every third answer was either "To be determined" or "We're working on that" or "This scenario is unlikely." At one point, an answer included the "fact" that the United States military would physically secure the geographic border of Iraq. Curious, I checked the length of the physical border of Iraq. Then I checked out the length of our own border with Mexico. Given our exceptional success in securing our own desert borders, I found this statement interesting.

Soon after, I was out-processed for retirement and couldn't have been more relieved to be away from daily exposure to practices I had come to believe were unconstitutional. War is generally crafted and pursued for political reasons, but the reasons given to Congress and the American people for this one were so inaccurate and misleading as to be false. Certainly, the neoconservatives never bothered to sell the rest of the country on the real reasons for occupation of Iraq-more bases from which to flex U.S. muscle with Syria and Iran, better positioning for the inevitable fall of the regional sheikdoms, maintaining OPEC on a dollar track, and fulfilling a half-baked imperial vision. These more accurate reasons could have

been argued on their merits, and the American people might indeed have supported the war. But we never got a chance to debate it.

My personal experience leaning precariously toward the neoconservative maw showed me that their philosophy remains remarkably untouched by respect for real liberty, justice, and American values. My years of military service taught me that values and ideas matter, but these most important aspects of our great nation cannot be defended adequately by those in uniform. This time, salvaging our honor will require a conscious, thoughtful, and stubborn commitment from each and every one of us, and though I no longer wear the uniform, I have not given up the fight.

January 19, 2004 issue

Copyright © 2004 The American Conservative

(<http://www.amconmag.com>)

---

### **The New Bush: Diplomacy and Death Squads**

<http://www.rebellion.org/noticia.php?id=11956>

James Petras

#### Rebelión

The mass media in the US and Europe has given prominence to the “new style” foreign policy approach of the Bush Administration: Secretary of State Condeleeza Rice visits European capitals and meets with European leaders, declaring that a new era of co-operation is at hand. Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld highlights the need for greater transatlantic defense cooperation in a meeting with European Defense Ministers. President Bush on his trip to Europe declares the US-European Alliance is indivisible, the divisions a “thing of the past”, and a new era of joint security activity as essential. The language and tone of the Bush Administration has certainly changed: There is no longer gratuitous insults about “Old Europe”, there are no longer public threats and declarations of unilateral military action. Only the Zionist neo-conservatives, like Kagan, Kristol and Frum, outside the government, continue to rage against the European negotiations with Iran and declare the “end of the Trans-Atlantic affair” (Financial Times - Jan. 31, 2005). The New York Times and the major columnists and television news commentators speak of a “new turn” toward diplomacy and a politics of reconciliation, of the re-emergence of diplomacy instead of militarism, of multilateralism instead of unilateralism.

While it is true that the tone has changed, the substance, the militarist-war policies, of the Bush Administration has remained the same or even hardened.

This is evident first and foremost in the new appointments to key positions in the Administration as well as the top officials retained in office. Condeleeza Rice, a strong advocate of Middle East warfare and Special Forces operations was promoted to Secretary of State, in charge of US foreign policy and titular head of the State Department. Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz and Feith remain number one, two and three in the Pentagon. They are the architects of the Afghan and Iraq War and strong advocates and planners of new wars against Iran and Syria. Moreover according to US journalist, Seymour Hersh, with extensive ties among top officials in Washington, “Defense Department civilians under the leadership of Douglas Feith, have been working with Israeli planners and consultants to develop and refine potential (sic) nuclear, chemical weapons and missile targets inside Iran” (New Yorker, January 24-31, 2005). Elliot Abrams, like Feith and Wolfowitz unconditional and unquestioning supporters of Israel, has been promoted to Deputy of National Security adviser

and continues as senior adviser for the Middle East. The new appointees to the top power positions in the expanding and far-reaching intelligence apparatus include John Negroponte, to head the National Intelligence Agency. Negroponte was the organizer of the death squads in Honduras and the mercenary terror armies, "the Contras" in Nicaragua. He largely oversaw the slaughter of thousands of Iraqis in Fallujah and the running of the torture and assassination chambers, during his term as Ambassador of Occupied Iraq. He has close ties with Abrams from the 1980's when the latter was defending the massacres of hundreds of thousands of Guatemalans under Rios Mont and over 70,000 Salvadorans under the psychopathic Roberto D'Aubuisson. The new head of the CIA, Porter Goss made his reputation in Miami as field officer of the CIA, supporting and promoting clandestine terror operations by Cuban exiles against revolutionary Cuba. The new head of Homeland Security is Michael Chertoff, rabid Zionist (no less so than Abrams or Feith) who was responsible for the arbitrary arrests of hundreds if not thousands of innocent Arab and South Asian Muslim immigrants – simply because of their country of origin or religion. They were held as "terrorism suspects" for months; habeas corpus laws and all constitutional rights were denied. Chertoff is the author of the infamous Patriot Act, which "legalizes" the totalitarian practices which Chertoff applied to the immigrants and can now extend against all Americans. Marc Grossman retains his senior position as Undersecretary of State for Latin American Affairs. He was and is today in the forefront of US violent opposition to President Chavez in Venezuela. Alberto Gonzales, who scorned international law, approved terrorism and torture of Iraqi prisoners, who denies the validity and relevance of the Geneva Accords has been promoted to Attorney General, giving him power to arbitrarily arrest and prosecute whoever he deems a 'threat' to 'national security'.

These appointments and promotions have evoked few if any vocal opposition from the Democratic Party. Most of the critical comments focus on their "professional competence" rather on their murderous and criminal behavior. Progressives and critics have argued that these new leaders do not have the "ethical standing" to administer US foreign policy and that President Bush has committed egregious errors. These criticisms fail to confront the political basis of Bush's appointments. These appointments and promotions are the perfect and precise choices for a policy of continued war in Iraq, sequential Middle Eastern Wars involving Iran and Syria, greater domestic control and repression in the face of rising discontent over the cost of multiple wars, and unquestioned support for Ariel Sharon's consolidation and expansion of Jewish control over the occupied West Bank and power in the Middle East.

In direct contrast to the frivolous media reports about Bush's "overtures" to Europe, Bush and the new appointees have tightened their hold over the military and secret police apparatus, have greater power and monstrous budgets to engage in new wars. All factual indications demonstrate that Bush's Administration "charm offensive" is a deliberate and provocative façade to divide and conquer European leaders to back old and new wars. With Iraq, the US has not moved toward Europe – it has increased its war funding and fighting troops and demands Europe provide money and training officers to prepare the Iraqi colonial army to buttress the US occupation. The US talks of multilateral policy with European partners, but rejects joining the "partners" diplomatic negotiations with Iran, while its Defense Department Zionists plan with Israel a massive unilateral or bilateral bombing of Iran. Europe improved relations with Cuba and Venezuela; while Goss, Grossman and Rice increase military threats, arm Colombia as a surrogate aggressor and plan new destabilization efforts and assassination plots. Europe proposes to increase its trade and investments with China, including military exports, while Goss describes China as a military threat to US supremacy in Asia and defends the policy of military encirclement. Rice and Rumsfeld secure a new military security treaty with Japan, clearly aimed not only at North Korea, but China, as the Chinese clearly recognize.

As is evident there is little substance and no changes between the Old and New Bush regimes. If Europe moves 'closer' to Bush Administration, it will be because the Europeans have retreated from their diplomatic policies and have adapted to US militarism. So far, apart

from rhetorical, diplomatic language, European leaders have only sought to play down their real differences with the Bush Administration not to renounce them. Europe will probably agree to provide some funding (not very much) and a few advisers to train Iraqi military and police officials, but only a token number, up to now less than 10% of what was agreed a year ago. At a time when US' European clients like the Ukraine, Poland, Hungary and Bulgaria are reducing their small military contingents in Iraq it is hardly likely that the Western European powers will commit resources, especially when there is so much to gain by having the US spend itself into bankruptcy and un-competitiveness over an un-winnable colonial war. Likewise US aggression against Venezuela, China and Russia has led to greater efforts at military defense, trade diversification and monetary decisions which weaken the US dollar and destabilize the financial architecture of imperial wars.

Why has the US "reached out to Europe" if it is intent on pursuing the same unilateral military policies? Why the diplomatic trips to Europe and the adoption of a conciliatory style if the purpose is to continue to play the war card in the Middle East and to stand unconditionally with Sharon's resettlement of Gaza settlers in the Palestinian West Bank? There are several hypotheses:

The "diplomatic offensive" is a public relations campaign to influence the US public and to secure support from vulnerable European allies like Britain's Tony Blair and Italy's Silvio Berlusconi. Washington can subsequently pursue its military agenda, claiming they "gave diplomacy a chance" but the Europeans failed to grasp that "hard power" (military aggression) is a necessary accompaniment of "soft power" (diplomacy). This is clearly the case with the Middle East, where the powerful Zionist policymakers and ideologues, who have been unsurprisingly absent from the European trips, have already "predicted" the Europeans will fail to act (militarily) against Iran and Syria when the negotiations "fail" (in terms of US and Israeli military interests).

The second hypothesis is that the prolonged war in Iraq and the growing deficits and costs have forced the US to seek, via diplomatic gestures, to secure European financial aid and assistance in the building up of the Iraqi colonial army and state apparatus. The European overtures are directed toward bringing in Europe as a "partner" in the construction of a neo-colonial state in which Iraqis pay for the war and provide the soldiers, while the US retains ultimate control.

The third hypothesis is that the Europeans are "turning right". In this line, Washington may think that with the colonial run elections in Iraq, Sharon's resettlement from Gaza to the West Bank (so-called "withdrawal") and feigned "openness" to European reconciliation, it may be able to convince Europe to join Bush's unlimited crusade for "democracy and freedom".

It is extremely doubtful that Washington will secure any lasting agreement with Europe on any basic question. The reason is simple, the civilian militarists who run US foreign policy, the newly appointed and promoted, are profoundly enamored with the military route to world power. Their biographies and their immediate pronouncements and actions are convincing proof that they are incapable of any open negotiations, compromise or diplomatic settlements. European leaders will have to choose between pursuing their divergent path of global power via trade, diplomacy and selective coercion or capitulate to a regime dominated by civilian-militarist extremists driven by an irrational desire to militarily confront China, intervene in Venezuela, destroy the Middle East adversaries of Israel and provoke Russia.

It is abundantly clear that organizers of death squads, terrorist planners and global militarists are ill equipped for quiet diplomacy. They are best suited for hysterical diatribes about democracy while engaging in imperial wars which slaughter the real flesh and blood democrats.

February 21, 2005

Last edited by Alpha on Fri May 13, 2005 9:25 pm; edited 25 times in total

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 7:49 pm Post subject: FBI witch hunt?



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

Frank Gaffney (who wrote the article below which appeared in Jewish World Review) is an Israel firster hack as you can read in the following article:

<http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20020902&s=vest>

[http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0904/gaffney\\_2004\\_09\\_08.php3](http://www.jewishworldreview.com/0904/gaffney_2004_09_08.php3)

Jewish World Review Sept. 8, 2004 / 23 Elul, 5764 Jewish World Review Sept. 8, 2004 / 23 Elul, 5764

FBI witch hunt?

By Frank J. Gaffney Jr.

Think the mole that became a molehill incident is over? Think again!

<http://www.jewishworldreview.com> | For weeks now, the FBI has carried out in the press a prosecution of individuals and organizations it has so far been unable or unwilling to pursue in court.

Using innuendo and a steady stream of (often recycled) press leaks, the names and reputations of a number of people "including several who are senior officials in the United States government at the moment" have been sullied.

There is no need to repeat their names here. Virtually all are people I have known and greatly admired for decades. It is bad enough their years of public service have been in any way diminished by those leaping to unfounded conclusions.

Even more troubling is the transparent character of this witch hunt: With apparently one exception, all those named in one way or another in connection with this inquiry (for example, they have been briefed on the matter, they run large Pentagon bureaucracies in which an individual suspected of misconduct — or, perhaps, espionage — works, etc.) have something in common: They are Jews.

At this writing, it remains unclear if any crime has been committed or, if it has, if any prosecution will be forthcoming. Unnamed FBI sources, though, keep telling the media the bureau has been interested for some time in a Washington-based diplomat representing the government of a democratic and strategically vital ally, Israel; two staff members of the influential American-Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC); and one midlevel Defense

Department employee who may or may not be accused of sharing with the others a classified draft presidential decision memorandum on U.S. Iran policy.

Most press reports have in some way insinuated other people now or formerly associated with the offices of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney who have concerns about or responsibility for the Iran portfolio have also been of interest to the FBI. There is, mind you, no publicly available evidence to support this insinuation. Yet it persists from news cycle to news cycle.

The insidious implication is that people who are Jewish or for other reasons sympathetic to the Jewish State therefore embrace Israel's conviction that the Islamist, nuclear-arming, terrorist-sponsoring Iran government is a mortal threat that must be dealt with — sooner, rather than later. According to this, U.S. interests are not at risk from Tehran, only Israeli ones.

Such suggestions call to mind past charges that people such as these have divided loyalties, are disposed to subordinate the security concerns of their own country to those of Israel or some larger Jewish conspiracy. "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion" come to mind.

Today, anti-Semitic witch hunts can be dressed up as ideological conflicts between the Bush administration's so-called "hard-liners" and "moderates." The former are increasingly caricatured as "neoconservatives." For many who use this ill-defined term, though, it serves as an unmistakable, pejorative code word for "Jews."

To be sure, there are those in the U.S. government — notably, in the State Department and CIA — who have profound policy disagreements with key Defense Department decisionmakers. Acrimonious interagency disputes between these organizations, particularly about the magnitude of the danger from the Iranian regime and how best to counter it, have leached again and again into the public eye. This has been particularly true since President Bush's State of the Union declaration after September 11, 2001, that Iran was part of the "axis of evil."

A critical point: Simply writing off the attacks against senior Defense Department and other officials to bureaucratic rivalry obscures the fact Mr. Bush has made clear his own views about the Iranian mullahocracy. Those within his administration who evidently are feeding rumors and innuendoes seemingly hope to damage not just their rivals, but the commander in chief, himself. The piling on of Democratic legislators like Sen. Jay Rockefeller of West Virginia and Rep. John Conyers of Michigan has simultaneously inflamed the situation and clarified the gambit with their demands, respectively, for intelligence committee investigations and special prosecutors.

If the conduct of hostile bureaucrats and Democratic partisans, reprehensible as it is, can at least be easily understood, the behavior of the FBI is less comprehensible. It would be one thing if law enforcement filed charges and presenting compelling evidence of wrongdoing — and clarity as to who engaged in it. Without such information, however, one has to wonder whether it is purely coincidental that the FBI has, since September 11, been assiduously cultivating a constituency keenly interested in driving wedges between the U.S. and Israel, neutralizing AIPAC's considerable influence in Washington and diminishing the effectiveness of the most articulate advocates of President Bush's offensive strategy for the War on Terror.

The bureau reported to the September 11 commission that, over the past three years, its officials have held some 900 meetings with, among other constituencies (including Sheiks and Jewish groups), self-identified "leaders" of the Muslim-American and Arab-American community. The available record suggests that most, if not virtually all of the latter meetings — including at least 19 with FBI Director Robert Mueller or his senior subordinates — have been with representatives of groups long sympathetic with Iranian or other Islamist causes.

It would be a dangerous irony if the witch hunt assailing prominent Bush administration Jews were to weaken a vital alliance, embolden our enemies and cause Mr. Bush acute domestic political problems to boot.

Last edited by Alpha on Sat Mar 05, 2005 1:12 am; edited 1 time in total

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 9:57 pm Post subject: FBI Spy Probe of Neocons' Espionage at Pentagon



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=19958>

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Wed Sep 08, 2004 10:20 pm Post subject: US ZOG Will Not Prosecute Treason at the Pentagon



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

FBI investigates suspected Pentagon security breaches

By Guy Dinmore in Washington

Published: September 7 2004 20:36 | Last updated: September 7 2004 20:36

An FBI investigation into suspected security breaches involving Pentagon officials and Israel is unlikely to result in prosecution of senior figures following pressure from the White House, according to people familiar with the case.

The investigation has highlighted concerns that a small group of neo-conservatives in the Pentagon not only may have divulged classified information to Israel, but also tried to mount intelligence and foreign policy operations without informing the State Department and Central Intelligence Agency.

Analysts said that although the neo-conservative proponents of regime change in Iraq and Iran had fallen out of favour with the White House, the presidential election in November still afforded them protection.

The White House denied allegations of a cover-up. A spokesman said there was full support for the investigation.

Sources familiar with the investigation said the White House and John Ashcroft, the US attorney-general, had intervened to apply the brakes. "The White House is leaning on the FBI. Some people in the FBI are very upset, they think Ashcroft is playing politics with this," a former intelligence official said.

Paul McNulty, the Virginia district attorney in charge of the probe, had been told to slow down, the sources said. Asked for comment, Mr McNulty's office would only say that the

investigation was continuing.

The investigations came to light last month, when officials confirmed reports that Lawrence Franklin, a mid-level analyst at the Pentagon, was the subject of an FBI inquiry into whether he passed classified information to an Israeli diplomat in Washington and to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (Aipac), an influential lobby group.

Aipac had been under investigation for more than two years, a senior White House official said. Aipac and Israel deny involvement in espionage.

Stephen Green, author and investigative reporter, said the FBI had interviewed him about several prominent neo-conservatives, including Paul Wolfowitz, the deputy defence secretary, Douglas Feith, undersecretary for policy at the Pentagon, as well as former officials including Richard Perle, Stephen Bryen and Michael Ledeen.

The FBI is said to be looking back at investigations into alleged breaches of security involving Israel and current and former officials. None of the cases reached court. However, David Frum, former speechwriter for the president, said the investigators had found nothing serious and were about to drop the matter. He described what he called an anti-Israeli obsession among some parts of the administration who viewed Israel "not as the ally it is by law and treaty but as the source of all the trouble in the Middle East and the world".

Mr Franklin, officials say, is suspected of providing Aipac with a draft national security presidential directive that proposed a tougher policy towards Iran.

In December 2001, Mr Franklin attended a meeting in Rome organised by Mr Ledeen with Manucher Ghorbanifar, an Iranian arms dealer with ties to Israel, and Antonio Martino, Italy's defence minister, and Nicolo Pollari, head of Italian military intelligence.

Find this article at:

[http://news.ft.com/cms/s/344aa23c-0103-11d9-9d96-00000e2511c8,ft\\_acl=.html?uuid=344aa23c-0103-11d9-9d96-00000e2511c8&ft\\_acl=](http://news.ft.com/cms/s/344aa23c-0103-11d9-9d96-00000e2511c8,ft_acl=.html?uuid=344aa23c-0103-11d9-9d96-00000e2511c8&ft_acl=)

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Thu Sep 09, 2004 8:43 am Post subject: Thinking about Neoconservatism



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

[http://www.vdare.com/misc/macdonald\\_neoconservatism.htm](http://www.vdare.com/misc/macdonald_neoconservatism.htm)

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Thu Sep 09, 2004 4:19 pm Post subject: The Zionists and Torture in Iraq



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

The Zionists and Torture in Iraq

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=19190>

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Thu Sep 09, 2004 4:23 pm Post subject: How Israel Corrupts/Controls US Congress and Media



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

How Israel Corrupts/Controls US Congress and Media

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=53>

Neocon Office of Special Plans (mentioned in detail in James Bamford's recently released 'A Pretext for War' book) 'cooked' intelligence in order to have the US go to war in Iraq for the Likud in Israel:

<http://www.warwithoutend.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=19707>

**Alpha wrote:**

Treason in high places: Pentagon zionists, AIPAC and Israel

James Petras  
7-9-4 RebeliÃ³n

The FBI investigation into Israeli espionage agents in the Pentagon is part of a major struggle between prominent Zionists in the Pentagon and the US security apparatus. Ever since the Bush regime came to power there has been a fierce political and organizational war between the Pentagon Zionists and their militarist collaborators, on the one hand, and the professional military and intelligence apparatus, on the other.

This conflict has manifested itself in a series of major issues including the war in the Middle East, the rationale for war, the relationship between Israel and the US, the strategy for empire, as well as tactical issues like the size of military force needed for colonial wars and the nature of colonial occupation. From 9/11/2001 to the invasion of Iraq, the Pentagon Zionists and the civilian militarists had the upper hand: they marginalized the CIA and established their own intelligence services to "cook the data", they pushed through the doctrine of sequential wars, beginning with Afghanistan and Iraq and projecting wars with Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia and other Muslim countries. The Pentagon Zionists increased Israel's power in the Middle East and promoted its expansionist colonization of Palestine, at the expense of US soldiers, budget busting expenditures and CIA objections.

The US military and security apparatus has retaliated. First by debunking Zionist lies about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, then by exposing the role of Zionist client Ahmed Chalabi as a double agent for Iran, followed by a two-year investigation of Pentagon Zionists passing documents to Israeli military intelligence and the secret police, the Mossad.

More is at stake than a turf war between the "Israel First"™ Pentagon crowd and their opponents in the US military, diplomatic corp and intelligence agencies. The fundamental issue is the freedom of the US people to decide or at least influence their political leaders and their appointees without being subject to the manipulation and control by a foreign government (Israel) and their highly placed agents in positions of power.

Israel has for decades subverted US foreign policy to serve its interests through the organized power of major Jewish organizations in the US. What is new in the current Pentagon spy case is that rather than pressuring from the outside to secure favorable policies for Israel, the Israel loyalists are in top positions within the government making strategic decisions about US global policy and providing their Israeli handlers with secret documents pertaining to top level discussions in the White House on questions of war and peace. Today the politics of Pentagon and AIPAC espionage is especially dangerous "because what is at stake is a new US and/or Israeli war on Iran which will ignite the entire Middle East.

The move to high-level spying by top Zionist policy-makers like Douglas Feith, Elliott Abrams, Paul Wolfowitz and others in the Bush Administration is the culmination of a long

series of strategic policies promoted by AIPAC designed to enhance Israeli expansionist goals in the Middle East.

Wolfowitz, Feith, Abrams, Perle, Rubin et al were the most zealous promoters of the war against Iraq. They worked closely with other Zionist ideologues like Bush speechwriter David Frum to promote the notion of "axis of evil", to engage in a sequence of wars against Muslim regimes hostile to Israeli colonial policy in Palestine and beyond. Wolfowitz, Feith set up the parallel "intelligence" agency (the Office of Special Planning) run by fellow Zionist Abram Shulsky using Chalabi to provide phony data on Iraq to precipitate that war.

An army of "Israel First" academic and journalist ideologues wrote, spoke and acted to justify the US attack on Iraq as the first part of a regional war to destroy any and all regimes critical of Israeli expansionism. Cohen, Rubin, Kristol, Foxman, Ledeen and many others provided "expert" propaganda on why US soldiers should kill and be killed for Greater Israel. Almost daily meetings and consultations took place between the top Zionists officials and the Israeli military and intelligence leaders in the offices of Feith and other Zionists. The Pentagon offices of Feith and Wolfowitz appeared to be an upscale bordello for high ranking Israeli officials. Judging from the subsequent policies it is clear that Pentagon Zionists took their cues from their Israeli counterparts "Israel was given greater funding, unlimited access to US policy makers and information pertaining to US policy in the Middle East. Meantime US intelligence and military officials were marginalized, their objections to Israeli positions blown away, their very presence seen as obstacles to realizing Sharon's vision of a Greater Israeli "sharing" (?) domination over the Middle East.

Given the high level of structural collaboration and integration of US Pentagon Zionists and US Jewish organizations with the Israeli state, the boundaries of what is United States policies and interests and what are Israeli prerogatives and interests are blurred. >From the perspective of the Pentagon Zionists and their organized Jewish supporters, it is "natural" that the US spends billions to finance Israeli military power and territorial expansion. It is "natural" to transfer strategic documents from the Pentagon to the Israeli State. As Haaretz states, "Why would Israel have to steal documents when they can find out whatever they want through official meetings?" The routinization of espionage via official consultations between Israeli and US Zionist officials became public knowledge throughout the executive branch. Only it wasn't called espionage, it was referred to as "exchanging intelligence", only the Israelis sent "disinformation" to the Pentagon Zionists to serve their interests while the latter passed on the real policies, positions and strategies of the US government.

The history of the key Zionists in the Pentagon reveals a pattern of disloyalty to the US and covert assistance to Israel. Harold Rhode and William Luti, both fanatical Pentagon Zionists under Feith, Wolfowitz and I. Lewis Libby have been under investigation by the FBI for passing documents to Israel. Rhode had his security clearance suspended recently. CIA operatives in Baghdad reported he was constantly on his cell phone to Israel reporting on US plans, military deployments, political projects, Iraqi assets and a host of other confidential information. Michael Ledeen, another influential Zionist policy maker who worked in the Pentagon lost his security clearance after he was accused of passing classified material to a "foreign country" (Israel). In 2001 Feith hired Ledeen to work for the Office of Special Plans which handled top secret documents. Feith himself was fired in March 1983 from the National Security Council for providing Israel with classified data. The FBI investigated Wolfowitz for having provided documents to Israel on a proposed sale of US weapons to an Arab country.

It is clear that Israeli agents, not simply Zionists ideologues, infest the top echelon of the Pentagon. The question is not merely a question of taking this or that policy position in favor of Israel but of working systematically on a whole range of issues to further Israeli power over and against US imperial interests.

What is surprising is not the current investigation over Israeli spies in the Pentagon but why they have not been arrested, indicted and sentenced a decade or two earlier.

The problem of American Jewish organizational collaboration with Pentagon espionage - namely the role of the AIPAC as an accomplice in the current spy case - is not exceptional. In their books, former Mossad agent, Victor Ostrovsky (The Other Side of

Deception, 1994), and Gordon Thomas and Martin Dillon (Robert Maxwell: Israel's Superspy, 2002) describe how the Israeli security forces have recruited overseas Zionist Jews, who are called sayanim, to serve as back-up supporters and collaborators in Israeli overseas operations.

AIPAC is not merely a pro-Israel "lobby" but a long-standing listening post and gatherer of public and confidential government information for Israel. At a more "philosophical" level there is an insidious belief widely held among the leaders of major Jewish organizations like AIPAC that the basic question for all Jews is whether the "policy is good for the Jews" - narrowly defined to mean the interest of the State of Israel and its current rulers. In pursuit of "Defending Israel at all costs" it is very likely that some of these officials go over the line into wartime espionage.

President Bush has declared that he is a "wartime President" - "the US is officially involved in a colonial war of aggression against the Iraqi people. In these circumstances, espionage in time of war is a capital offense" even if the spymasters are Israelis. It is no wonder that the Zionist and Israeli propaganda machine is working overtime to undermine the espionage investigation.

After the first announcement by CBS television, the rest of the mass media gave prominent space to Israeli and AIPAC denials. More seriously the CBS broadcast deliberately harmed the FBI spy investigation into the links between the Pentagon and AIPAC. The FBI blames CBS's revelations concerning Franklin when, the latter had already confessed and was working with the FEDS to implicate AIPAC and Israeli agents. Zionist ideologues in the US mass media and the Israeli press try to downplay the incident "first through vehement denials and subsequently to reducing the case of treason to a question of a routine exchange of information by a single "lower level", bumbling but fanatically pro-Israel Gentile functionary. They forget to mention he was hired and directed by Douglas Feith and Paul Wolfowitz to be their expert on Iran deeply involved in handling top secret documents and formulating policy on Iran.

The Israeli officials claim that Mossad and military intelligence solemnly pledged to stop spying on the US after the Jonathan Pollard case. "We have never spied on the US since", they claim. In fact over 800 Israeli spies posing as "art" students and tourists were expelled after 9/11 and several Mossad agents posing as movers in New Jersey and Tennessee were expelled.

The arrogance of Israeli power in then US, which Sharon publically boasted about, is largely based on the simple principle embraced by all Zionist zealots whether they are Ivy league academics or neo-fascist felons (like Elliot Abrams) is "What's good for Israel is good for the US". "Good for Israel" today means bloody US wars against Israel's adversaries, unconditional support for Israeli expansion and pillage of Palestine and now spying on the US for the good of Israel. Guided by this slogan it is easy to see how everything in the US that might be of use to Israeli intelligence whether it be documents, directives or strategic debates about big wartime issues taking place in the White House are fair game for transmission to Israeli intelligence.

Rather than face the evidence, the Zionist ideologues have taken to ad hominum attacks on their espionage agent as merely a middle level official who didn't influence policy. They overlook the fact that he was the "delivery boy" for his Zionist bosses who actually do make policy and work with top echelons of the Israeli state in "coordinating" US policy to fit Israel's needs. The power of the Israeli-US Zionist propaganda machine is so overwhelming that the FBI had to investigate for 2 years, make endless wiretaps, videos and photos, interview dozens of government and not-government officials before they could prepare to make the charges.

Despite being taped and photographed in the act of taking top secret documents, AIPAC officials deny everything and then hire a string of high-powered defense lawyers. Already the pro-Zionists mass media suggest that Zionist-AIPEC spying is really a case of "mishandling sensitive documents" - "a case of putting top secret documents in the wrong mailbox. Really!

In less than two days the pro-Israel mass media buried the story, and a series of "news reports" were published featuring AIPAC denials, Israeli ridiculing their Pentagon mole as a fanatical idiot (Haaretz) and launching a counter attack questioning the motives of the investigation and the FBI counter-espionage service. The media published stories from anonymous "insiders" who purportedly spoke of the FBI dropping espionage charges in favor of charges of " mishandling a classified document" or even simply dropping the case altogether. They claim that the spy handing over a classified document to Israeli interests didn't know it was a crime, a case of an innocent, well-intentioned error of judgment. This piece of propaganda has been thoroughly discredited when it was revealed that the Israeli agent (Franklin) confessed and has been cooperating with the FBI for the past months.

Nothing captures the power and pervasive and corrosive influence of the US-Zionist apparatus on US politics as much as the absolute silence of both major candidates faced with a high-level security lapse and potentially damaging spy investigation. John Kerry, the Democratic candidate trailing Bush in the polls refuses to expose the Zionist Pentagon's "security failures" despite national security being at the center of his campaign. The reason is very clear: Kerry is tied to the AIPAC-Israel-US Zionist political machine and he is willing to sacrifice US security for the Zionist vote even when faced with the issue of Israeli espionage in a time of war.

The Republicans went one step further " sending their top politicos to an AIPAC political extravaganza organized in New York two days after AIPAC was cited by the FBI as the Israeli intermediary in the passing of secret documents. At no time in recent modern history has any governing or opposition party engaged in public festivities with an organization engaged in foreign espionage. The explanation is the unprecedented and unique political situation that exists in the US today " the extraordinary power that a small, economically dependent state exercises over a global imperial state via its wealthy organized political-religious agents.

If Israel can get anything it wants from its Zionist patriots in high places in the US government, then why engage in espionage? There are several explanations.

The hand delivery of documents by Franklin can be seen as a time saving and security-wise move. If discovered, Franklin's mentors can simply deny involvement " he was acting on his own, an argument put forth in the Israeli press. The idea of Franklin as some kind of " loose cannon" does not explain why he was hired, retained and given delicate assignments and praised by the senior Zionists (Feith, Wolfowitz, Ledeen and Abrams) up to the time of his exposure. Secondly the document transferred provided Israel with very timely information on a major top-level debate: US policy toward Iran, more particularly who was for or against a military assault on Teheran. This allows Israel to plan its own military strategy knowing in advance Washington's possible response and directing its higher up Pentagon collaborators how to prepare the ground for acceptance of Israeli aggression.

<>

Fundamentally Israel wanted to be in the White House decision making loop at every stage of Middle East policymaking via Wolfowitz, Feith et al and via confidential documentary accounts which the Mossad could analyze directly. There was a "need" for espionage, because the Mossad does not merely rely on one source of information, nor does it operate only on one track. It has direct formal and "informal" relations (spying) with "friendly" government policy-makers. It operates on many levels, legal and illegal, through Zionist collaborators as well as overseas agents, through agents with false passports and though local Zionist sleepers, who can be activated for specific tasks;

#### Conclusion

Investigations and evidence are usually enough to proceed with indictments, interrogations and the pursuit of the leaders and foreign handlers in a major espionage case, especially in wartime. Thousands of innocent South Asians, Arabs and Muslims have been picked up and jailed on the most flimsy excuses ("suspicious" ). But in the case of Israeli-AIPAC-Pentagon espionage the normal legal processes are inoperative.

The question of espionage prosecution depends on political power - a struggle between the Israeli State backed by the major Presidential candidates and parties, the Zionist-American political machines and their mass media acolytes on the one hand and, on the other hand the FBI, professional intelligence apparatus (CIA, DIA), state prosecutor and

his investigatory staff and few stray political voices.

The so-called progressive movements and policy critics are strangely silent: Even as they speak out against war, they fail to denounce an espionage case which is intimately related to the next Middle Eastern war – an Israeli attack on Iran. Why don't progressive Jews denounce AIPAC espionage to further a new war in Iran?

A signed statement “Not in our name” would clearly separate them from these agents of foreign wars. Three days after the initial expose, the mass media have buried the story. The FBI is delaying any announcements. The prosecuting attorney is under tremendous one-sided political pressure. Lacking any mass media outlets the US republic is a helpless giant, tied in knots by malicious dwarfs, unable to defend itself, unable to define its own policy interests. The latest report from the FBI tells us that self-confessed Israeli agent was preparing to lead the authorities to his contacts in the Israeli government when CBS blew open the case.

Was CBS aware of the danger to the Israeli secret services and was it trying to undermine the investigation? No doubt some sort of official statement will be made, perhaps even an indictment will be made of the middle level functionary on secondary charges and the FBI may even dare to interview Wolfowitz and Feith on their knowledge of the espionage network with predictable consequences. However if there is anything beyond an interview, the Zionist media will charge “anti-Semitism”, a “Second Dreyfuss” case, which will probably end the current investigation.

<>The “underground”™ struggle between the Pentagon Zionists and the US security apparatus will continue. If Bush is re-elected, Wolfowitz will most likely become Secretary of Defense. If Kerry is elected, the closet Zionist, Richard Holbrooke, will take charge of the Pentagon.

American citizens will have to face a serious question: If the security services are incapable of defending our country from foreign espionage in high places – What is to be done?

In either case we face an imminent Zionist designed and promoted military attack on Iran, which is likely to lead to a general conflagration which can only benefit the neo-fascists who run the state of Israel. And you are afraid of being called an anti-Semite for opposing the Israel's espionage and regional wars.

August 31, 2004

<http://www.rebellion.org/noticia.php?id=4298>

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Thu Sep 09, 2004 10:28 pm    Post subject: Neocons Blast  
Bush's Inaction On 'Spy' Affair



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

<http://www.forward.com/main/article.php?ref=perelman20040909327>

Neocons Blast Bush's Inaction On 'Spy' Affair  
By MARC PERELMAN  
September 10, 2004

In an indication of their growing estrangement with the Bush administration, neoconservatives are slamming the White House for failing to stop what they describe as an antisemitic campaign to marginalize them being conducted by the CIA and the State Department.

This view was outlined in a memo circulating among neoconservative foreign policy analysts

in Washington. Obtained by the Forward, the memo criticizes the White House for not refuting press reports on the FBI's investigation of Pentagon analyst Lawrence Franklin that suggest wrongdoing on the part of Jewish officials at the Defense Department.

"If there is any truth to any of the accusations, why doesn't the White House demand that they bring on the evidence? On the record," the

memo stated. "There's an increasing antisemitic witch hunt."

A source who has seen the memo said it was written by Michael Rubin, a former member of the Pentagon's policy planning staff who dealt with Iran policy. Rubin, now a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, declined to comment for this story.

"I feel like I'm in Paris, not Washington," the author of the memo wrote. He added: "I'm disappointed at the lack of leadership that let things get where they are, and which is allowing these bureaucracies (sic) to spin out of control."

The memo comes as the FBI is investigating the possibility that Franklin passed classified information on Iran policy to officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, who in turn provided the documents to Israel. Israel and Aipac have denied any wrongdoing. Media reports suggest that several other Pentagon officials have been questioned in connection to the probe.

Some Washington insiders claim that the White House silence over the Franklin affair reflects a growing view within the administration that the neoconservatives "widely seen as leading proponents of the Iraq war" represent a mounting political burden, given the continuing chaos in Iraq.

While President Bush and his closest advisers openly shared the neoconservatives' belief that American military action was needed to remove Saddam Hussein, the two sides seem to have parted ways over Iran. Neoconservative analysts in and out of government are calling on the United States to attempt to secure regime change in Tehran. The administration has increasingly suggested that it has no plans to take such forceful steps against Iran.

The recent controversy surrounding the FBI investigations also can be traced to renewed concerns in some quarters of the intelligence and security communities that Washington's close relationship with Jerusalem "centered, in the critics' view, in the neoconservative group at the Pentagon" is hurting American national interests.

While they generally refuse to speak on the record, some former intelligence and law-enforcement officials have alleged that Israel operates an aggressive spying operation in America. Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Sharon, have vehemently denied such claims, insisting that their country does not conduct espionage operations against the United States.

Some observers point to the harsh treatment of accused spy Jonathan Pollard as evidence of the intelligence community's strong feelings on the issue. Pollard, a former Navy civilian analyst, is serving a life sentence for providing Israel with classified documents about Soviet armament. Members of the security establishment have worked aggressively to block attempts by Jewish organizations to have Pollard's sentence commuted on humanitarian grounds.

This old resentment toward Israel and its supporters in the United States has found new echo with the growing criticism of the neoconservatives for their advocacy of war in Iraq. In recent months, several critics of the neoconservatives' influence on Middle Eastern policy have openly accused Israel of pushing a hawkish agenda.

Retired general Anthony Zinni, a former chief of the U.S. Central Command and presidential Middle East envoy, told CBS in May that "the worst-kept secret in Washington" was that the neoconservatives pushed the war in Iraq for Israel's benefit. Similar criticism of Israel and Jewish groups appeared in the recent book "Imperial Hubris," by Anonymous, who was later identified as Michael Scheuer, a serving senior CIA official.

"Objectively, al Qaeda does not seem off the mark when it describes the U.S.-Israel relationship as a detriment to America," wrote Scheuer, a former head of the CIA analytical team focusing on Al Qaeda. "One can only react to this stunning reality by giving all praise to Israel's diplomats, politicians, intelligence services, U.S.-citizen spies, and the retired senior U.S. officials and wealthy Jewish-American organizations who lobby an always amenable Congress on Israel's behalf."

In recent months, signs of alienation from the neoconservatives have come as well from the Bush administration. American officials, for example, have accused longtime Pentagon favorite Ahmed Chalabi, leader of the Iraqi National Congress, of warning Iranian intelligence officials that the United States had broken Iran's secret communications codes. The FBI's investigation to determine who in government had told Chalabi about the secret code-breaking operation has focused on Defense Department officials, sources said.

American officials, speaking anonymously, have given conflicting comments on whether the Franklin and Chalabi probes are linked.

The barrage of news reports on the allegations of improper conduct on the part of Aipac and Pentagon officials has fueled a suspicion among neo-conservatives that they are the victims of a smear campaign quietly endorsed by the White House. The recent memo being circulated in neoconservative circles points a finger at several State Department officials, including Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, and at members of the National Security Council, including Robert Blackwill, who took over Iraq policy recently and is said to be behind the Chalabi crackdown.

The memo, in an apparent reference to a June 2003 article in The Washington Post describing administration infighting over U.S. policy toward Tehran, asserted that media leaks from the State Department sank an effort by Pentagon officials to call for more aggressive action against Iran in a key policy document called the national security presidential directive, or NSPD.

"It was bad enough that the White House rewarded the June 15, 2003 leak by canceling consideration of the NSPD," the memo stated. "It showed the State Department that leaks could supplant real debate. But while Armitage or Blackwell (sic) might be seeking to score points inside the beltway, they are feeding conspiracies in the Middle East that will sink the president's policies in Turkey, Iraq, Iran, etc."

To back up claims of antisemitism, the memo points to reports that the FBI has hired Stephen Green, a longtime critic of American-Israeli ties, as a consultant. A former United Nations official, Green has a long record of claiming that Israel uses Jewish Americans, some of them prominent, to spy on the United States. Green has said in interviews that FBI officials interviewed him at length in the past few weeks.

"Green has... been on a one-man mission to expose deep-cover Israeli agents for decades," the memo said.

Green stressed that the bureau had sought him out "and not the other way around" and that its officials did not ask about Franklin but about leading neoconservative like Wolfowitz and Feith.

[Back to top](#)



**Alpha**  
Lieutenant  
☆☆☆☆

Posted: Sat Sep 11, 2004 7:15 am Post subject: Jewish Leaders Slam FBI Probe



Joined: 06 Jan 2003  
Posts: 26358

Jewish Israel Firster Senators More Worried about Leak than Israeli espionage at the Pentagon (this is exactly why these Zionist traitors to America should not be serving in our government because they are serving the interests of Israel first):

Date: Thu, 09 Sep 2004 18:51:13 -0700  
From: "Mark Weber" <weber@ihr.org>

Subject: Jewish Leaders Slam FBI Probe

WHITE HOUSE DRAWS FIRE FROM CONGRESS, OFFICIALS OVER LEAK OF FBI PROBE  
/

WEXLER: COMMUNITY 'BROADBRUSHED'

By Ori Nir, from Washington -- Forward (New York) -- Sept. 10, 2004  
<http://www.forward.com/main/article.php?ref=nir20040909324>

With America's pro-Israel lobby scrambling to combat media leaks from unnamed government officials, the White House is drawing criticism from congressmen and Jewish communal officials over the FBI investigation into allegations that officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee illegally transferred secret information to Israel.

Lawmakers and Jewish organizational leaders are questioning the motivation for the investigation and its two-year course, stressing that no indictments have emerged -- only leaks from administration officials familiar with the FBI probe. In addition to expressing outrage over the media leaks, several Congressmen are also condemning the investigation itself, which they say has spawned unfair accusations of disloyalty against Aipac and represents an abuse of power on the part of Attorney General John Ashcroft.

"To think that one of the leading American Jewish organizations has been investigated for two years, and the highest people at the White House were aware of it, is extremely unsettling," said Rep. Robert Wexler, a Florida Democrat. "If there was an individual or group who broke the law, they need to be held accountable. But the broad-brushing of Aipac and the American Jewish community is extremely inflammatory and needs to be stopped."

Wexler, a member of the House Judiciary Committee, sent a letter to Ashcroft last week demanding that the Justice Department either submit charges or "exonerate the American Israel Public Affairs Committee of this public castigation."

Massachusetts Democrat Barney Frank said that the investigation "does appear to be an effort to discredit, to get Aipac." He said: "I'm troubled by it. It's a very inappropriate effort to

criminalize a policy debate. It's John Ashcroft, and the president and [Vice President Dick] Cheney."

Also voicing criticism were the two Jewish Republican senators, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania and Norm Coleman of Minnesota. Specter told the Jewish Telegraphic Agency that Ashcroft should launch an investigation into the leaks. "I know Aipac; I know its integrity," he said. "It's a smear." Coleman said that "the real issue here is preventing leaks -- of classified materials and about ongoing investigations." The Minnesota senator argued that "to leak details about an ongoing FBI investigation and the alleged role of Aipac is premature at best and a smear campaign at worst."

At least one lawmaker, Representative John Conyers of Michigan, was calling for a congressional investigation regarding the substance of the allegations. Conyers, the top-ranking Democrat on the House Judiciary Committee, asked the committee's Republican chairman, James Sensenbrenner of Wisconsin, to open an investigation into the claim that a "rogue element of the United States government" may have worked with a foreign government in possible contravention of foreign policy.

In Jewish communal circles, the criticisms and calls for investigations were focused on either the media leaks or the probe itself.

Malcolm Hoenlein, executive vice chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, suggested that the administration and media had blundered. "There will be a lot of hard questions that will have to be answered by a lot of people when this is all over," Hoenlein said. "People will have to be held to account. What happened? Why it happened? What was going on in the last two years?"

Jack Rosen, president of the American Jewish Congress, echoed several other Jewish organizational leaders in demanding an investigation into the leaks. "Who did it and why? What's the agenda?"

The rising chorus of criticism comes as it becomes clear that, contrary to the predictions of Aipac leaders, the controversy is not fading away. In the two weeks since CBS News first reported that the FBI is investigating allegations that a Defense Department analyst transferred secret information to Israel through Aipac, anonymous sources have been leaking information to the media on a regular basis, suggesting that the probe extends beyond one Pentagon official sharing one document with Israeli diplomats or pro-Israeli lobbyists:

\* According to press reports quoting several administration officials, the investigation into possible wrongdoing by Aipac was launched more than two years ago, based on suspicions that Aipac employees passed secret information to Israel. One report said that the president's national security adviser, Condoleezza

Rice, and her top deputy, Stephen Hadley, were informed of the probe not long after Bush took office in 2001.

\* The alleged transfer of a secret White House policy brief by a Pentagon Iran analyst, Larry Franklin, to Aipac staffers last summer was seen by investigators as the "smoking gun." It advanced the investigation, particularly after Franklin agreed to cooperate with investigators.

\* FBI agents wiretapped the homes of two senior Aipac staffers, Steve Rosen and Keith Weissman, who were interviewed by FBI agents August 27, the day the story broke. Their offices were searched and the hard drive of Rosen's computer was copied, according to reports. Abbe Lowell, a criminal lawyer who specializes in white-collar criminal defense, is representing Rosen and Weissman. In the past, Lowell has defended politicians accused of ethics violations.

\* At the Pentagon, agents focused on Franklin but also interviewed other officials at the office of Under Secretary of Defense for Policy Douglas Feith. According to press reports, Feith was also interviewed, and some of these Pentagon officials, according to reports, are also being investigated on suspicion that they may have told Iraqi dissident Ahmed Chalabi that the United States has broken secret Iranian communications codes -- information that Chalabi is suspected of having transferred to Iran. According to one report, the Chalabi investigation, or even a part of the investigation, is linked with connections between Pentagon officials and pro-Israel lobbyists. Other reports say the two investigations are separate.

\* Franklin, according to an Israeli press report, was in contact not only with the political counselor at Israel's Washington embassy, Naor Gilon, but also with the intelligence attache, a colonel who was identified by his first initial, Y. The colonel, according to the daily Ma'ariv, received information from Franklin and reported his contacts with the American analyst to his superiors at Israel's military intelligence command in Tel Aviv. Israeli officials told Ma'ariv, however, that there was nothing illegal or unethical in the contacts with Franklin, which are described as "working meetings."

\* Parallel to its investigation into Aipac's conduct, the FBI had reportedly been conducting surveillance of Israeli diplomat Gilon. The Aipac investigation and the surveillance of Gilon reportedly converged -- and led to the Pentagon -- after Franklin walked into a meeting between Gilon and the two Aipac staffers at a Washington restaurant a year ago.

\* Media reports, attributed to government sources, also said that despite its denials, Israel still runs an aggressive spying operation in the United States, which American counterterrorism agents are surveying.

The wave of allegations and leaks has Jewish activists worried. "The longer this story is out there without concrete facts or some conclusion, the more we will bleed," one Jewish organizational official said.

One concern voiced by Jewish activists was that Aipac's enemies would use this opportunity to discredit the Jewish community. The first such salvo came from conservative pundit and former presidential hopeful Pat Buchanan last Sunday on NBC's "Meet the Press."

Alluding to Jonathan Pollard, the American Jewish Navy analyst now serving a life sentence for spying for Israel, Buchanan said: "We also need to investigate whether there is a nest of Pollardites in the Pentagon who have been transmitting American secrets through Aipac, the Israeli lobby, over to Reno Road, the Israeli embassy, to be transferred to Mr. Sharon." If the allegations proved true, he said, "we are getting dangerously close to the T-word," an apparent reference to treason.

Such attacks on Aipac will affect the whole Jewish community, communal insiders said. An official with one major Jewish organization worried that Aipac's aggressive lobbying tactics have alienated some lawmakers, making them more likely to move away from the organization as the scandal unfolds. "They have a crappy reputation with some members of Congress who say certain [positive] things publicly, and behind the scenes say: 'I am tired of them twisting my arm.'"

Several Jewish activists, speaking on condition of anonymity, also cautioned against what they described as a defiant reaction on the part of some communal leaders who raised the specter of antisemitic conspiracy.

"If every single time we get into trouble we cry antisemitism, no one is going to believe us when we confront the real problem of antisemitism," a senior official of a Jewish organization said. Another organizational official said: "It's ridiculous to react like that before you know what happened there. In the absence of accurate knowledge, any comment is just silly."

=====

#### NEOCONS BLAST BUSH'S INACTION ON 'SPY' AFFAIR

By Marc Perelman -- Forward (New York) -- Sept. 10, 2004

<http://www.forward.com/main/article.php?ref=perelman20040909327>

In an indication of their growing estrangement with the Bush administration, neoconservatives are slamming the White House for failing to stop what they describe as an antisemitic campaign to marginalize them being conducted by the CIA and the State Department.

This view was outlined in a memo circulating among neoconservative foreign policy analysts in Washington. Obtained

by the Forward, the memo criticizes the White House for not refuting press reports on the FBI's investigation of Pentagon analyst Lawrence Franklin that suggest wrongdoing on the part of Jewish officials at the Defense Department.

"If there is any truth to any of the accusations, why doesn't the White House demand that they bring on the evidence? On the record," the memo stated. "There's an increasing antisemitic witch hunt."

A source who has seen the memo said it was written by Michael Rubin, a former member of the Pentagon's policy planning staff who dealt with Iran policy. Rubin, now a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, declined to comment for this story.

"I feel like I'm in Paris, not Washington," the author of the memo wrote. He added: "I'm disappointed at the lack of leadership that let things get where they are, and which is allowing these bureaucrats (sic) to spin out of control."

The memo comes as the FBI is investigating the possibility that Franklin passed classified information on Iran policy to officials of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, who in turn provided the documents to Israel. Israel and Aipac have denied any wrongdoing. Media reports suggest that several other Pentagon officials have been questioned in connection to the probe.

Some Washington insiders claim that the White House silence over the Franklin affair reflects a growing view within the administration that the neoconservatives -- widely seen as leading proponents of the Iraq war -- represent a mounting political burden, given the continuing chaos in Iraq.

While President Bush and his closest advisers openly shared the neoconservatives' belief that American military action was needed to remove Saddam Hussein, the two sides seem to have parted ways over Iran. Neoconservative analysts in and out of government are calling on the United States to attempt to secure regime change in Tehran. The administration has increasingly suggested that it has no plans to take such forceful steps against Iran.

The recent controversy surrounding the FBI investigations also can be traced to renewed concerns in some quarters of the intelligence and security communities that Washington's close relationship with Jerusalem -- centered, in the critics' view, in the neoconservative group at the Pentagon -- is hurting American national interests.

While they generally refuse to speak on the record, some former intelligence and law-enforcement officials have alleged that Israel operates an aggressive spying operation in America. Israeli officials, including Prime Minister Sharon, have vehemently denied such claims, insisting that their country does not conduct espionage operations against the United States.

Some observers point to the harsh treatment of accused spy Jonathan Pollard as evidence of the intelligence community's strong feelings on the issue. Pollard, a former Navy civilian analyst, is serving a life sentence for providing Israel with classified documents about Soviet armament. Members of the security establishment have worked aggressively to block attempts by Jewish organizations to have Pollard's sentence commuted on humanitarian grounds.

This old resentment toward Israel and its supporters in the United States has found new echo with the growing criticism of the neoconservatives for their advocacy of war in Iraq. In recent months, several critics of the neoconservatives' influence on Middle Eastern policy have openly accused Israel of pushing a hawkish agenda.

Retired general Anthony Zinni, a former chief of the U.S. Central Command and presidential Middle East envoy, told CBS in May that "the worst-kept secret in Washington" was that the neoconservatives pushed the war in Iraq for Israel's benefit. Similar criticism of Israel and Jewish groups appeared in the recent book "Imperial Hubris," by Anonymous, who was later identified as Michael Scheuer, a serving senior CIA official.

"Objectively, al Qaeda does not seem off the mark when it describes the U.S.-Israel relationship as a detriment to America," wrote Scheuer, a former head of the CIA analytical team focusing on Al Qaeda. "One can only react to this stunning reality by giving all praise to Israel's diplomats, politicians, intelligence services, U.S.-citizen spies, and the retired senior U.S. officials and wealthy Jewish-American organizations who lobby an always amenable Congress on Israel's behalf."

In recent months, signs of alienation from the neoconservatives have come as well from the Bush administration. American officials, for example, have accused longtime Pentagon favorite Ahmed Chalabi, leader of the Iraqi National Congress, of warning Iranian intelligence officials that the United States had broken Iran's secret communications codes. The FBI's investigation to determine who in government had told Chalabi about the secret code-breaking operation has focused on Defense Department officials, sources said.

American officials, speaking anonymously, have given conflicting comments on whether the Franklin and Chalabi probes are linked.

The barrage of news reports on the allegations of improper conduct on the part of Aipac and Pentagon officials has fueled a suspicion among neo-conservatives that they are the victims of a smear campaign quietly endorsed by the White House. The recent memo being circulated in neoconservative circles points a finger at several State Department officials, including Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, and at members of the National Security Council, including Robert Blackwill, who took over Iraq policy recently and is said to be behind the Chalabi crackdown.

The memo, in an apparent reference to a June 2003 article in The Washington Post describing administration infighting over U.S. policy toward Tehran, asserted that media leaks from the State Department sank an effort by Pentagon officials to call for more aggressive action against Iran in a key policy document called the national security presidential directive, or NSPD.

"It was bad enough that the White House rewarded the June 15, 2003 leak by canceling consideration of the NSPD," the memo stated. "It showed the State Department that leaks could supplant real debate. But while Armitage or Blackwell (sic) might be seeking to score points inside the beltway, they are feeding conspiracies in the Middle East that will sink the president's policies in Turkey, Iraq, Iran, etc."

To back up claims of antisemitism, the memo points to reports that the FBI has hired Stephen Green, a longtime critic of American-Israeli ties, as a consultant. A former United Nations official, Green has a long record of claiming that Israel uses Jewish Americans, some of them prominent, to spy on the United States. Green has said in interviews that FBI officials interviewed him at length in the past few weeks.

"Green has... been on a one-man mission to expose deep-cover Israeli agents for decades," the memo said.

Green stressed that the bureau had sought him out "and not the other way around" and that its officials did not ask about Franklin but about leading neoconservative like Wolfowitz and Feith.

=====

See also: "The Israel Espionage Probe: Does it Matter?," by Mark Weber.  
[http://www.ihr.org/news/040901\\_weber.shtml](http://www.ihr.org/news/040901_weber.shtml)

[Back to top](#)



Display posts from previous:  All Posts  Oldest First  Go



[War Without End Forum Index -> Wake Up America! Your Government is Hijacked by Zionism](#)

All times are GMT  
Goto page [1](#), [2](#), [3](#) ... [9](#), [10](#), [11](#) [Next](#)

Page 1 of 11

Jump to:   Go

You **cannot** post new topics in this forum  
You **cannot** reply to topics in this forum  
You **cannot** edit your posts in this forum  
You **cannot** delete your posts in this forum  
You **cannot** vote in polls in this forum

Powered by phpBB © 2001, 2005 phpBB Group