

The Last Outpost

[Home](#) | [Reading Room](#) | [Pics](#) | [Audio](#) | [Video 1](#) | [Video 2](#) | [Video 3](#) | [Video 4](#) | [Media](#) | [Links](#) | [Site](#) | [Salmon](#) | [For S](#)

Re [Voice of the White House 14](#) | [Page 1](#) > | [September 29th 2006](#)

The [Voice of the White House 24](#) | [September 29th 2006](#)

The Voice of the White House for September 29th 2006

Washington, D.C., September 29th 2006: “Some very unhappy people here but not about the mid term elections. It seems that after the Second World War, the Soviets captures all of the records of the Nazi concentration camps...from 1935 to 1945....and put them in their archives in Moscow. Because they pretty much knock a hole in the legend of six millions gassed, Jewish groups pressured Russia not to ever allow any researcher to see or copy any of these and for certain, never to release the contents of these files to anyone, ever. Russians are easy to bribe and apparently someone in the States got the whole file (*on microfilm*) and there is fury and panic over this. Jewish groups have asked the DoJ to declare these “*improperly released*” classified documents and grab them. Unfortunately, there is no legal basis for doing this. The original documents were German and the microfilms are Russian, not American. Some of these groups have built up a thriving business on the subject and anything concrete that could sink their boat is something not to put up with. This is a subject that most people don’t care about but to those who do, it is a real bell-ringer. All of this hinges on whether or not the present owner got these legally. If our people can’t prove he didn’t, it looks like fun and games in the History department!”

Green Zone Follies

Baghdad, 28th Sept 06: “I have been out of this area for a month, along with a number of others, on a PR project. Coming back here is like going back to Hell for breakfast. The insurgents occasionally drop mortar rounds inside the sacred Green Zone, killing people including diplomatic personnel and once, two colonels out for a squash game. No one can do anything about it so we keep it quiet. This whole project, bringing democracy and joy to poor rag head heathens has fallen completely apart. Morale in Iraq does not exist and self-mutilations, suicides and serious mental problems are so commonplace that no one even notices any more. The field equipment, trucks, howitzers, spotter aircraft, tanks and armored vehicles are all either in the shops or waiting in line. The sand here destroys everything eventually and Rumsfeld never bothers to replace anything. The food and medical services are very good but that’s about all. We spy on the GIs to be sure they aren’t sending out ‘negative’ messages to home and the various religious Iraqi people are slaughtering themselves, and us, at an accelerated rate. The Iraqi death tolls are enormous and our own are very bad and kept very quiet. Now, they tell me, Cheney wants the entire National Guard activated and shipped over here along with every reservist or discharged GI with former combat service. They have the orders drawn up there and we have copies. Engineers have been putting up miles of new barracks and the supply services are tipped to expect ‘significant very large shipments’ of food, clothes, shoes, helmets and so on. A quarter of a million men are supposed to be reactivated and sent over here before Christmas. A general officer said, in my office, that they were just waiting until after the elections in November. Bush and Cheney want a general draft but that won’t wash so instead, everyone and anyone that can move; comes over. Basically, the resistance has beaten us but of course no one can ever talk about that. They call it ‘defeatism’

and one can get into trouble for it. Soldiers who bitch get transferred to the west where the lifespan of a GI is somewhat limited.”

'Not enough cash for war'

by Suzanne Goldenberg and Richard Norton-Taylor
Guardian Weekly

George Bush received a serious rebuke about his wartime leadership this week when his army chief said he did not have enough money to fight the war in Iraq.

Six weeks before midterm elections in which the war is a crucial issue, the protest from the army head, General Peter Schoomaker, exposes concerns within the US military about the strain of the war on Iraq, and growing tensions between uniformed personnel and the secretary of defence, Donald Rumsfeld.

Three retired senior military officers on Monday accused Mr Rumsfeld of bungling the war on Iraq, and said the Pentagon was "incompetent strategically, operationally and tactically".

Major General Paul Eaton, a retired officer who was in charge of training Iraq troops, said: "Mr Rumsfeld and his immediate team must be replaced or we will see two more years of extraordinarily bad decision-making."

The rare criticism from the three officers, all veterans of the Iraq war, will be unwelcome to Mr Bush at a time when the Republican party had hoped to campaign on its strong leadership in the "war on terror".

The officers echoed the findings of the National Intelligence Estimate last weekend, which said the Iraq war had fuelled Islamist extremism around the world. They also accused the Pentagon of putting soldiers' lives at risk by failing to provide the best equipment available. "Why are we asking our soldiers and marines to use the same armour we found was insufficient in 2003?" asked Thomas Hammes, a retired Marine Corps colonel.

The criticism comes amid an unprecedented show of defiance from the army chief, Gen Schoomaker. The general refused to submit a budget plan for 2008 to Mr Rumsfeld, arguing that the military could not continue operations in Iraq and its other missions without additional funds, the Los Angeles Times reported. The seriousness of the protest was underlined by Gen Schoomaker's reputation as an ally of the Pentagon chief. The general came out of retirement at Mr Rumsfeld's request to take up the post.

"It's quite a debacle," said Loren Thompson, a military analyst at the Lexington Institute thinktank. "Virtually everyone in the army feels as though their needs have been shortchanged."

Gen Schoomaker's defiance gives a voice to growing concern within the military about the costs of America's wars, and the long-term strain of operations around the world. For the past three years the \$400bn cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been funded by emergency spending bills passed by Congress.

Gen Schoomaker and others say that the Iraq war has also put a severe strain on regular military budgets. That puts the generals at odds with Mr Rumsfeld's strategic vision of a more nimble, hi-tech military. In addition Congress and the White House have cut a number of army spending requests over the past months.

As the war in Iraq continues with no sign of a reduction in US forces, military officials have repeatedly complained about the strain on personnel, and say they fear they may be forced to rely more heavily on the National Guard and reservists to meet the demands of overseas deployments. General John Abizaid, America's senior commander in the Middle East, said last week there was little chance of any drawing down of the 140,000 forces in Iraq before next spring.

The burden of that commitment was underlined on Monday when the army extended the combat tours of about 4,000 soldiers serving in the Ramadi area.

US war costs since September 11th exceed \$500bn

September 28, 2006

Peter Walker
Guardian

The Iraq war is currently costing US taxpayers around \$2bn (£1.07bn) a week, as the military replaces damaged equipment and tries to establish more permanent bases, reports in US newspapers said today.

A report by the non-partisan Congressional Research Service projected that the war would cost \$110bn for the fiscal year 2007, the Houston Chronicle said.

This would be a 20% rise on last year and almost double the monetary cost of the first year of the war, a report in the Boston Globe said.

According to the Globe, the report estimated that once Congress approved two pending bills on military spending, total war costs since the September 11 2001 attacks would have exceeded \$500bn, of which \$379bn had been spent on Iraq, \$97bn in Afghanistan and \$26bn on improving the security of US military bases elsewhere.

The costs had increased despite a levelling off of US troop numbers in Iraq and Afghanistan. According to the report, the extra money was being used in part because of a greater intensity of attacks on American forces, the Boston Globe said.

Another significant factor was "the building of more extensive infrastructure to support troops and equipment in and around Iraq and Afghanistan", the report said.

Although the US military has said it does not want to maintain a long-term presence in either country, it is building semi-permanent bases to support troops, suggesting a recognition that the deployments might be long ones.

The spending was bumped up further by the need to buy extra equipment for troops - ranging from radios to tanks - and to replace equipment damaged in attacks or by wear and tear,

officially known as "reset" costs. These costs had jumped from \$7.2bn in 2004 to \$22.9bn this year, while infrastructure costs - for example bases and airfields - were up from \$40bn to \$60bn.

However, the report noted that these factors alone were "not enough to explain" the total increase in operating costs.

"You would expect (operating costs) to level off if you have the same level of people," the report's principal author, Amy Belasco, was quoted as saying by the Boston Globe.

"You shouldn't have as much cost to fix buildings that were presumably repaired when you got there. It's a bit mysterious."

According to the Houston Chronicle, war costs were expected to be a significant drain on the US budget in the next decade - the Congressional Research Service estimated that even with fewer troops deployed, total war funding could reach \$808bn by 2016.

Another Contract for Company That Planted News in Iraq

September 28th 2006

AP

BAGHDAD, Sept. 27 (AP) — A public relations company that participated in a United States military program that paid Iraqi newspapers for articles favorable to allied forces has been awarded another multimillion-dollar media contract with American forces in Iraq.

The public relations firm, the Lincoln Group, won a two-year contract to monitor a number of English and Arabic news outlets and to produce public-relations products like talking points or speeches for American forces in Iraq, officials said Tuesday.

"Lincoln Group is proud to be trusted to assist the multinational forces in Iraq with communicating news about their vital work," a company spokesman, Bill Dixon, said in a statement.

Details about the contract were confirmed by the United States military spokesman in Iraq, Lt. Col. Barry Johnson, and were described in documents posted on a federal government Web site outlining contracts awarded.

The contract is worth roughly \$6.2 million per year over a two-year period, Colonel Johnson said.

The idea, according to contract documents, is to use the information to "build support" in Iraqi, Arab, international and American audiences for what the military describes as its goals in Iraq, such as destroying the insurgency and helping Iraqis build a democracy.

The list of news outlets to be watched includes The New York Times, Fox Television and the satellite channel Al Arabiya.

There was considerable debate last year when it became known that the Lincoln Group had

been part of a United States military operation to pay Iraqi newspapers to run positive articles about coalition activities.

Colonel Johnson would not comment on how the Lincoln Group was chosen, saying it was a "standard contracting process." He said the contract did not include any provisions to purchase favorable coverage or pay for favorable articles. The Lincoln Group, based in Washington, would not comment on the contract beyond the statement issued.

Comment: Isn't it nice to know the right people? Anyone who has seen the output of this group of well-greased slackers would marvel. They have the literary skills of 'Weekly Reader' writers and the intellect of chickens. BH

Russia, China 'cooking something up'

September 29, 2006
by W Joseph Stroupe
Asia Times

Russian President Vladimir Putin was asked about Russia-China relations and the mounting regional/global clout of the SCO (*Shanghai Cooperation Organization*). He expressed great satisfaction and excitement about the path of Russia-China relations, but quickly denied that the two strategic partners were involved in "cooking anything up between themselves".

In fact, he claimed that the mounting regional and global clout of the SCO has never been planned for or intentionally striven for by the two partners, that it has entirely happened "by surprise". And, of course, he claimed once again that neither the SCO nor the deepening Russia-China strategic partnership was "aimed at the US or NATO" (North Atlantic Treaty Organization).

But contrary to Putin's soothing assurances to the West at the recent Valdai Club meeting, Russia and China most certainly do have "something in the geopolitical oven", and it has been cooking steadily for nearly a decade. In fact, their geopolitical main course is practically ready to be served to the table, so to speak, and directly contrary to Putin's recent claims they both intended from the beginning for the SCO eventually to play a significant role.

One only has to read the Sino-Russian Joint Statements from 1997 forward to see that the two partners embarked on a carefully conceived and adroitly executed geopolitical course and strategy a decade ago, and they have made tremendous progress toward the achievement of the specific goal they set way back then. Note these facts and precisely what their goal has been in the excerpts and commentary that follow:

From the Sino-Russian Joint Statement of April 23, 1997:

The two sides shall, in the spirit of partnership, strive to promote the multipolarization of the world and the establishment of a new international order.

The establishment of a just and equitable new international political and economic order based on peace and stability has become the pressing need of the times and the inevitable necessity of history.

All countries, big or small, strong or weak, rich or poor, are equal members of the international community. No country should seek hegemony, practice power politics or monopolize international affairs.

Both sides express concern over the attempt at enlarging and strengthening military blocs, because such a tendency may pose a threat to the security of certain countries and aggravate regional and global tension.

Both sides underscore that the vast member of developing countries and the Non-Aligned Movement are important forces in promoting world multipolarization and building a new international order.

Developing countries have enhanced their awareness of self-strengthening through unity, played a greater role in world politics and increased their share of the world economy.

Their rise will give a strong boost to the historical process towards the establishment of a new international order. [Emphasis added]

From "PRC, Russia leaders issue joint statement", December 10, 1999:

[The two sides] propose to push forward the establishment of a multipolar world on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter and existing international laws in the 21st century, strengthen the UN's dominant status in international affairs, and peacefully resolve international disputes through political means ... and establish a fair, equal, and mutually beneficial international political and economic order. Third, the two sides point out that negative momentum in international relations continues to grow, and the following is becoming more obvious: The forcing of the international community to accept a unipolar world pattern and a single model of culture, value concepts and ideology, and a weakening of the role of the United Nations and its Security Council; the seeking of excuses to give irresponsible explanations or amendment to the purposes and principles of the UN Charter; the reinforcing and expanding of military blocs; the replacing of international law with power politics or even resorting to force; and the jeopardizing of the sovereignty of independent states using the concepts of "human rights are superior to sovereignty" and "humanitarian intervention".

The two sides agree to work together with the rest of the world to oppose the momentum presently preventing the establishment of a just multipolar structure for international relations.

Seventh, the two countries express their satisfaction with the implementation of the Bishkek Declaration issued by the summit of China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, known as the "Shanghai Five States", on August 25, 1999.

In line with the Sino-Russian equal and trustworthy strategic partnership of cooperation, the two sides are willing to strengthen their cooperation, considering that the two countries share similar or identical views on such issues as the establishment of an international multipolar order and democracy and justice in international affairs. [Emphasis added]

From the China-Russia Joint Statement of July 1, 2005:

Strictly abiding by the propositions on building a multipolar world and a new international order as enunciated in the Joint Statement of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation Regarding Global Multipolarity and the Establishment of a New International Order of April 23, 1997,

The international community should thoroughly renounce the mentality of confrontation and alignment, should not pursue the right to monopolize or dominate world affairs, and should not divide countries into a leading camp and a subordinate camp.

In the sphere of regional security, the establishment of security cooperation mechanisms that take into account the interests of all parties, are open, and are not directed at other countries has fundamental significance. [Emphasis added]

Look at the declarations

The ultimate target of deepening Russian-Chinese strategic cooperation is clearly the pushing toward the establishment of what they call the "multipolar world order" to end US global dominance. The joint statements above prove that fact beyond any reasonable doubt whatever.

Consequently, the repeated claims by the two that no "third country" is being targeted amount only to pure diplomatic indirection and propaganda. The US most certainly is being targeted. You cannot push to establish a new international order to end dominance by one power without simultaneously targeting the one power that currently has that domination - namely, the United States itself. However, the targeting being done by Russia, China and their global partners isn't that of directly hitting the US economy to sink it, or of directly attacking the US military in a confrontation.

The targeting of the US global position of dominance is much smarter than that. It is indirect targeting, in which US economic, political and even military dominance and power are undermined and weakened by virtue of the creation of a deepening and widening global complex of strategic resources-based economic, political and military ties, a complex that is centered in the East rather than looking to the US as center, and a complex that mostly disregards, and increasingly rivals, US interests.

That strategy of ending US global dominance by pushing for "multipolarity", not directly confronting the US but rather building a non-US-centric global complex, works because the US is able to dominate the globe only because the world at large permits it to do so and either actively or indirectly facilitates such dominance. The US is not nearly omnipotent, politically, economically or militarily. It must dominate by virtue of willing allies and key powers that permit the US to exercise its influence through them, and by maintaining fear on the part of its rivals with respect to opposing the US in the spheres of the global economy and the military. Without the combination of willing cooperation and fearful acquiescence on the part of the world at large, the US will tumble from its global position of dominance.

Russia and China have correctly calculated, therefore, that if they can undermine that willing cooperation and fearful acquiescence by turning enough of the globe's key states away from a US-centric stance toward a stance more in line with their own purpose, inculcating them firmly

into their own growing complex of economic, political and even military ties centered in the East, then the US will incrementally suffer ever greater political and economic isolation and subsequent weakening of its leverage and position on the world stage.

At the center of the new global complex of ties is the Russia-China axis itself. That has been the strategy of the two partners since before they issued their Joint Statement of April 23, 1997 - to build a new international economic and political order that isn't US-centric, that progressively robs the US of the deep cooperation and fearful acquiescence it needs across the globe to keep it atop the current order, and that thereby cuts deeply into the US ability to continue to dominate the world order. They aren't directly confronting the US in their efforts, but make no mistake - they are powerfully targeting the US nonetheless.

The United States has inadvertently cooperated on a massive scale with Russia and China in their push to create this new order, cooperated with them in their political, ideological and economic push to isolate the US incrementally. By its policies and actions since the collapse of the Soviet Union, and especially since September 11, 2001, the US has profoundly isolated itself on the world stage. That has played, and continues to play, directly into the hands of Russia, China and their strategic partners who understand US global isolation is the key to ending US global dominance. That is the real meaning of the policies and actions undertaken by Russia, China and their partners in the lead-up to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003, in which they have worked steadily to isolate the US and to keep it isolated, and to deepen its isolation. They have been very quick to capitalize on growing US isolation to construct rapidly their global complex of resources-based economic, political, ideological and security ties not centered on the US, and as rivals to the US.

Hence whenever Russian and Chinese leaders say that neither the US nor NATO is being targeted by their activities, that is an entirely facetious statement designed to give the two partners plausible deniability, in that the statement is technically true - they aren't directly hitting or confronting the US economy or military. But they most certainly are actively working to undermine the US global position by insidious, indirect and profoundly effective means. And US leaders simply aren't intelligent and humble enough to understand the effectiveness of the strategy or how they themselves are aiding in its success.

Note that in the joint statements quoted above, the two partners (Russia and China) repeatedly spoke not only of a new political order, but also of a new international economic order. Notably, in the April 23, 1997, statement the following statement was made:

Both sides underscore that the ... developing countries and the Non-Aligned Movement are important forces in promoting world multipolarization and building a new international order.

Developing countries have enhanced their awareness of self-strengthening through unity, played a greater role in world politics, and increased their share of the world economy.

Their rise will give a strong boost to the historical process towards the establishment of a new international order. [Emphasis added]

It so happens that the vast bulk of the world's strategic resources are located within the very group mentioned here, the developing countries and the Non-Aligned Movement. It is not by

accident that Russia and China have concentrated their efforts there, succeeding in deeply integrating those nations into their global complex of ties, and simultaneously those resource-rich nations have become ever more characterized by adoption of deeply anti-American economic, political and/or religious ideologies.

The undermining and weakening of US global economic power and dominance are key to the achievement of the goal of ending the unipolar order that is led by the United States. It is being accomplished without direct confrontation between the US and its rivals. The massive ongoing transfer of wealth from the US to its rivals and the attendant weakening of the US economy is in no small part facilitated by energy developments and the growing cohesiveness and anti-US political affinity among the globe's energy producers, who by and large disdain continued US global dominance. Additionally, entities such as the SCO are being employed to reverse US geopolitical advances in energy-rich regions by helping to close ranks among its members, further placing the strategic US economic security in a precarious position. The US has requested, but has been denied, any role whatever in the SCO, which is shaping up to be a closed entity to the West.

On September 15, RIA Novosti reported that prime ministers of SCO member countries, while gathered in Dushanbe for a key meeting, gave instructions for studies to be conducted into the establishment of a regional energy club. In June at the SCO Summit, Putin caused a stir when he proposed the creation of the energy club centered in the SCO and designed to balance the interests of producers and key consumers such as China (a key founding member of the SCO) and India (which has observer status in the SCO) in a new arrangement that would transcend the leverage of a mere axis of producers alone. That proposal appears to be taking definite shape now, with officials from Kazakhstan and Russia tasked with drafting proposals for a key meeting next year of the grouping's fuel and energy experts. The ongoing development of the SCO-centered energy club proposed by Putin in June is a development of profound importance and constitutes a major advance in the Russian effort to complete the drawing of the circle of international energy security, a circle that by and large excludes the West.

Russia and China have been "cooking something up between themselves" for at least a decade now, and the results are already dramatic, to say the least. Don't expect Russia and its partners to "play nice" with energy and other strategic resources, not in view of the colossal stakes for both sides in the Great Game and the fact that the West will stop at nothing to try to turn the Game around in its favor before the clock soon runs out.

Putin's promise that Russia will not behave like an energy superpower is a promise that cannot be kept. It is a promise the West must not give credence to or rely upon, but the West itself is partly to blame for the increasingly contentious relations between resource-rich East and resource-dependent West. The moment of truth for both sides in the Great Game and for the current global order itself is impending.

W Joseph Stroupe is editor of Global Events Magazine, online at www.GeoStrategyMap.com. He has authored a new book on the implications of ongoing energy geopolitics, Russian Rubicon: Impending Checkmate of the West.

"Falsehood is an amorphous monster, conceived in the brain of knaves and brought forth by the breath of fools. It's a mortal pestilence, a miasmatic vapor that passes,

like a blast from hell, over the face of the world and is gone forever. It may leave death in its wake and disaster dire; it may place on the brow of purity the brand of the courtesan and cover the hero with the stigma of the coward; it may wreck hopes and ruin homes, cause blood to flow and hearts to break; it may pollute the altar and disgrace the throne, corrupt the courts and curse the land, but the lie cannot live forever, and when it's dead and damned there's none so poor as to do it reverence." ~**William Cowper Brann**

And all the sons of Congressmen! And the two adorable 100 Proof Bush daughters!
(*Ginna and Tonic*)

"As democracy is perfected, the office of president represents, more and more closely, the inner soul of the people. On some great and glorious day the plain folks of the land will reach their heart's desire at last and the White House will be adorned by a downright moron." ~**H.L. Mencken**

"That we are to stand by the president, right or wrong is not only unpatriotic and servile, but is morally treasonable to the American public." ~**Theodore Roosevelt**

"Actions are held to be good or bad, not on their own merits, but according to who does them. There is almost no kind of outrage, torture, imprisonment without trial, assassination, and bombing of civilians, which does not change its moral color when it is committed by our side. The nationalist not only does not disapprove of atrocities committed by his own side, he has remarkable capacity for not even hearing about them." ~**George Orwell**

"Under the Bush administration, openness and accountability have been replaced by secrecy and evasion of responsibility. They abuse their power, conceal their actions from the American people, and refuse to hold officials accountable." ~**Senator Edward M. Kennedy**

"George W. Bush is deeply interested in Deep Space Exploration. His next project will be to circle Uranus and search for Kingons....."

~**Dallas Herald**

"A government official is a man who has risen from obscurity to something worse."
~**Pat Robertson**

"The voters decide nothing. Those that count the votes decide everything."
~**J.V. Stalin**

"The Senior White House staff is living proof that Pentecostal mongoloids regularly cohabit with chimpanzees, frogs and Norway rats"

~**Dr. Myron Kalbfuss, Biology Department, Stanford University**

America's Enemies!

There are four entities who represent the most dangerous enemies to American liberties since George III.

They are:

1. The Neocons or Likudists who owe their personal allegiance to another country and now completely control our foreign policy. They lied and deceived us into the Iraq war and are demanding that more and more American soldiers die to preserve their own country and ideals.
2. The Christian Evangelical right who is trying to force the United States into becoming a theocracy under their rule. They know in their hearts that they alone can restructure a secular humanist America into their idea of Heaven on Earth.
3. An element of American society that call themselves Patriots and are obsessively militaristic and great admirers of the corporate or fascistic state. Many of these have been very minor members of the American military and as a counterbalance to their reserve or rear area tours of duty, are rabidly in favor of draconian military action, the bloodier the better. Usually these drumbeaters are too old or too fat to fight and have no sons of draft age.
4. George W. Bush, who is the worst president in the history of the United States and directly responsible for the huge death tolls in Iraq, is determined to rule the United States until God puts a stop to him and is even more determined to force the American people into becoming obedient, Christian and self-sacrificing lemmings who worship at his shrine and march in step.

Recommended reading

We gather information, on a daily basis, from many websites. There are a number of publications that are well worth viewing for their intelligent reporting of national and international news. All of those sources, listed below, are daily newspapers with the exception of the Asia Times. The latter is a very well written site with in-depth articles that are worth reading.

The New York Times: www.nytimes.com

The Washington Post: www.washingtonpost.com

The Christian Science Monitor: www.csmonitor.com

The Guardian: www.guardian.co.uk

Seattle Post-Intelligencer: www.seattlepi.nwsourc.com

Asia Times www.atimes.com

Note: Very little of the information in this edition of TBR news has come from the mainline American media. It is just not there. Most of it has come from foreign sources and the Internet. Most of our sources can be seen on the main page.

I remember an old British saying: 'Treason doth never prosper/What's the reason? Why if prospers, none dare call it treason!' Apt. Or as a Greek writer once said, 'Boys kill frogs for sport but the frogs die in earnest.' Good morning, frogs, and be sure to die in earnest

"People whose lives are barren and insecure seem to show a greater willingness to obey than people who are self-sufficient and self-confident. To the frustrated, freedom from responsibility is more attractive than freedom from restraint. They are eager to barter their independence for relief of the burdens of willing, deciding and being responsible for inevitable failure. They willingly abdicate the directing of their lives to those who want to plan, command and shoulder all responsibility ~Eric Hoffer "The True Believer"

NEVER, I say, had a country so many openings to happiness as this. Her setting out in life, like the rising of a fair morning, was unclouded and promising. Her cause was good. Her principles just and liberal. Her temper serene and firm. Her conduct regulated by the nicest steps, and everything about her wore the mark of honor. It is not every country (perhaps there is not another in the world) that can boast so fair an origin.

To see it in our power to make a world happy - to teach mankind the art of being - so to exhibit, on the theatre of the universe, a character hitherto unknown, and to have, as it were, a new creation entrusted to our hands, are honors that command reflection, and can neither be too highly estimated, nor too gratefully received.

She is now descending to the scenes of quiet and domestic life. Not beneath the cypress shade of disappointment, but to enjoy in her own land, and under her own vine, the sweet of her labors, and the reward of her toil. In this situation, may she never forget that a fair national reputation is of as much importance as independence. That it possesses a charm that wins upon the world, and makes even enemies civil. That it gives a dignity which is often superior to power, and commands reverence where pomp and splendor fail.

It would be a circumstance ever to be lamented and never to be forgotten, were a single blot, from any cause whatever, suffered to fall on a revolution, which to the end of time must be an honor to the age that accomplished it: and which has contributed more to enlighten the world, and diffuse a spirit of freedom and liberality among mankind, than any human event (*if this may be called one*) that ever

preceded it. ~**Thomas Paine: The American Crisis New York, December 9, 1783**

"Once a Republican, always a coprophile..." ~**Mother Theresa**