



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](#)

A Zionist War



[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: 25161

Message

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 10:17 am Post subject: A Zionist War



The US War in Iraq is not a White man's war. Nor is it the oil companies' war. No, this is a Zionist war, - writes Kristoffer Larsson, a 22-year old Theology student and a writer for a Swedish Leftist newspaper in a brilliant and penetrating article:

A Zionist War

By Kristoffer Larsson

Some weeks ago I happened to watch Oliver Stone's great production Born the Fourth of July for the second time. In the movie, Ron Kovic (played by the handsome as always Tom Cruise) signs up for the army. He wants to go to Vietnam to fight Communism. "Better dead than red" is his motto. He leaves for Vietnam as a well-trained, young, brave American standing up for democracy fully prepared to die in order to fight the Communist threat wherever it arises. When he comes back from Vietnam, he is paralyzed from the waist and down. But he's not met by his fellow citizens as a hero. Instead he is met by demonstrators in his own age setting American flags on fire. He doesn't understand why. Expressing his hatred for the demonstrators when at the Bronx Veteran Hospital, he soon comes to realize the black nurses have quite another view of the war. As a male nurse explains to him, "Vietnam is the White man's war, the rich man's war." Later, as many other Americans in Vietnam, Kovic came to realize that war was not about democracy at all. Young Americans like himself were sent there to oppress a people fighting for their own freedom.

Some decades later, the world's biggest war-machine is now under way with genocide once again, this time in Iraq. The mass slaughtering is implemented by young boys who aren't really sure why they're there, but it's ordered by the White House on behalf of a ruthless, powerful elite. It was no surprise that Iraq didn't possess any weapons of mass destruction. After all the U.S. is not stupid enough to attack a state that actually so does - it could be dangerous! But although we for sure know that this war indeed was not a "preemptive war" or about "liberating" Iraq, the "war for oil"-theory - adopted by the greater majority in the anti-war movement - loses ground by the day. One ought to at least question if oil was the main reason for going to war. Oil tastes good, but the

Americans want cheap oil, not expensive. The occupation of Iraq cost the American tax payers more than 5.8 Billion dollars a month. [1] Thus, it would have been cheaper to support dictators in the region instead of overthrowing them – with the result of almost no oil at all. But this is not a White man's war. Nor is it the oil companies' war. No, this is a Zionist war.

In his outstanding essay *The Shadow of Zog*, Israeli author Israel Shamir writes about what was probably the real reason for invading Iraq:

"As the head of the Occupation Administration, Jay Garner's task is to create a new Iraq, friendly to Israel. The *Jerusalem Post*, a hard-line Zionist daily published by Conrad Black, friend of Pinochet and Sharon, carried an interview with one of his wannabe quislings, Ahmad Chalabi's right hand man, Musawi.

'Musawi talks enthusiastically of his hopes for the closest possible ties with Israel. There will be no place for Palestinians in the new Iraq, for the large Palestinian community is regarded by INC leaders (and presumably by their Zionist instructors) as a loathsome fifth column. Instead, an 'arc of peace'; would run from Turkey, through Iraq and Jordan to Israel, creating a new fulcrum in the Middle East.'

The Occupation Regime in Iraq was installed by the US army in the interests of Zionists, and it may be rightly called ZOG, Zionist Occupation Government if anything." [2]

The war on Iraq – just like the U.S.-threats against Iran – can be traced to Israel's interests in the region. Israel and its powerful lobby has for long been after the U.S. to deal with the Iraqi regime. The destabilization of the region is more favorable to Israel than it is to the U.S. After discussing "what is possibly the unacknowledged real reason and motive behind the policy" of going to war on Iraq, historian Paul W. Schroeder, in a footnote, wrote that if this is accurate

"it would represent something to my knowledge unique in history. It is common for great powers to try to fight wars by proxy, getting smaller powers to fight for their interests. This would be the first instance I know where a great power (in fact, a superpower) would do the fighting as the proxy of a small client state." [3]

The Jews constitute no more than between 2% and 2.5% of the American population, a fact which seems hard to believe for most Americans. According to a poll, published in October 2002, the average non-Jewish American believed that no less than 18% of the population were Jews.

Every fourth American asked answered that between 10% and 19% of the Americans were Jewish, while almost every fifth guessed that the Jews constitute between 20% and 29%. Some 12% thought the number was between 30 and 49%! "Pretty wild?" Lenni Brenner comments, and continues:

"But why should gentile Americans know better? Their guesses are based on what they see. Turn on the TV, go to the movies, pick up a newspaper, follow an election, and in every case Jewish involvement is far above 2.5%. (...) Twelve percent of our Jews think they are 2% of Americans, 13% think Jews are 3%, and 11% say they don't know, which is also a 'proper' answer. But 7 % of America's Jews think they are 1% of Americans. Five percent of the Jews thought Jews are 4%. Ten percent of the Jews said they are 5%. Eighteen percent believed Jews are 6-10%. Six percent estimated our Jews to be 11-15%, and 18% of America's Jews projected themselves as over 15% of the population, a whopping margin of error of over 600%." [4]

However, being a Jew does not make one a Zionist (although, unfortunately, almost all organized Jews are Zionists). In fact, the majority of the (non-organized) American Jews opposed the Iraqi War. But the way too powerful Israel lobby did support it. Its strong support for the war was definitely a major factor that shouldn't be overseen. Still today Zionist Jews stands for a big share of the contributions to the two big parties in America. As the Swedish daily Aftonbladet pointed out,

"The Jews pump enormous amounts of money into American politics, 30 times more than the Arab Americans. They have power. They rule by the motto 'money talks'." [5]

As a matter of fact, close to half the American billionaires are Jews (This phenomenon is however not limited to the United States. Six of the seven Russian Oligarchs are Jews! [6]). In his foreword to late Professor Israel Shahak's great book Jewish history, Jewish religion, the American dissident and author, Gore Vidal reveals a story which has affected the Middle East in a crucial way during the last sixty years:

"Sometime in the late 1950s, that world-class gossip and occasional historian, John F. Kennedy, told me how, in 1948, Harry S. Truman had been pretty much abandoned by everyone when he came to run for president. Then an American Zionist brought him two million dollars in cash, in a suitcase, aboard his whistle-stop campaign train. 'That's why our recognition of Israel was rushed through so fast.' As neither Jack nor I was an antisemite (unlike his father and my grandfather) we took this to be just another funny story about Truman and the serene corruption of American politics. (...)

I shall not rehearse the wars and alarms of that unhappy region. But I will say that the hasty invention of Israel has poisoned the political and intellectual life of the USA, Israel's unlikely patron.

Unlikely, because no other minority in American history has ever hijacked so much money from the American taxpayers in order to invest in a 'homeland'. It is as if the American taxpayer had been obliged to support the Pope in his reconquest of the Papal States simply because one third of our people are Roman Catholic. Had this been attempted, there would have been a great uproar and Congress would have said no. But a religious minority of less than two per cent has bought or intimidated seventy senators (the necessary two thirds to overcome an unlikely presidential veto) while enjoying support of the media."

Shahak himself translated an article which appeared in Hebrew in Kivunim, the journal of The World Zionist Organization, in February 1982, and has become known as the Kivunim-plan. The article, written by a Oded Yinon, had the title A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties and its idea for the Middle East was "based on the division of the whole area into small states, and the dissolution of all the existing Arab states," as Shahak summarized it. Although he considered it way too optimistic, or in fact "pure fantasy," Shahak added that

"The idea that all the Arab states should be broken down, by Israel, into small units, occurs again and again in Israeli strategic thinking. For example, Ze'ev Schiff, the military correspondent of Ha'aretz (and probably the most knowledgeable in Israel, on this topic) writes about the "best" that can happen for Israeli interests in Iraq: "The dissolution of Iraq into a Shi'ite state, a Sunni state and the separation of the Kurdish part" (Ha'aretz 6/2/1982). Actually, this aspect of the plan is very old." [7]

As happens, in the New York Times in November 2003, an article appeared by former president of the Council on Foreign Relations and a former editor of the Times, Leslie H. Gelb, with the headline The three-state solution. The idea presented was that the U.S. should consider dividing Iraq into three different states with "Kurds in the north, Sunnis in the center and Shiites in the south." Gelb writes that "This three-state solution has been unthinkable in Washington for decades... But times have changed." [8] Thus, the plan conceived by Zionists is everything but dead.

While almost the whole world denounces Israel's brutal treatment of the Palestinian people, the Zionists demonstrate their control over Washington. Not only do they finance a great deal of the presidential campaigns, they also have mainstream media in their control. "For the media is the nerve system of a modern state," writes Shamir.

"Modern democracy in practice in a very complicated society can be compared to a sophisticated computer. Its machinery can function successfully on one condition: there is a free flow of information across the system. While every input is instinctively checked and sieved on one criterion, whether it is good for Jews, it is not odd that the machine produces such freak output as "revenge on Babylon for its destruction of Jerusalem in BC 586". Indeed, in long-gone 1948 the first ruler of Israel, David Ben Gurion, promised: "We shall mete historic vengeance to Assyria, Aram and Egypt". Now it comes to pass, as Iraq, Syria and Egypt are targeted by Zog." [9]

Three decades after the death of Ben Gurion, the Guardian reports that "troops from the US-led force in Iraq have caused widespread damage and severe contamination to the remains of the ancient city of Babylon." [10] It took some time, but the prophecy has come true. But the late Ben Gurion did not just have dreams of meting revenge. He had dreams of creating a Greater Israel, too. In a speech in Knesset, on the third day of the Suez War, as then Prime Minister he recognized that the real purpose of fighting the war was "the restoration of the Kingdom of David and Salomon" to its biblical borders. [11] His successor Ariel Sharon has the same dream, and is fully prepared to fulfil it when given the opportunity. When the time is right, the mass slaughter and expulsion of the remaining Palestinians in the region will take place, no doubt.

Jeff Blankfort refers to Washington as the "the Zionists' Most Important Occupied Territory". He is right. Zionist Jews are more powerful than ever before. With the devoted support from Zionist Christians, Israel's interests are secured. The Zionist grip over American foreign policy on the Middle East has become impossible to deny. It is not in the interest of America to always do what's best for Israel. The U.S. is not ruled by the Americans, but by an elite and lobbies that finances (and threatens) politicians into obedience. Fighting wars in countries most Americans can't find on maps are of course not in the interest of the people. Despite greedy capitalists, there is one major factor that has to be taken into consideration when finding the motives for war. Far too many underestimate the strong importance Zionism plays in American foreign (and, to a lesser extent, domestic) affairs.

The U.S. is a "lobbyocracy" – a state ruled by powerful lobbies. Politicians are dependent of financial support from them to even stand a chance in electoral races. So is the case with the contemporary regime in Washington. President Bush and colleague war criminals in the White house have stocks in the war industry and are financed by it. They personally gain from the war. However, the American foreign policy on the Middle East and the unreserved U.S. support to Israel cannot be explained simply by this fact. Control over the Iraqi oil supplies alone are not reason enough for sending 150 000 American Soldiers to Iraq, at a so high cost. It is important to acknowledge that there is devoted Zionists in leading positions fully prepared to do whatever necessary as long as it's good for Israel. I'm speaking of the neoconservatives, shortly referred to as the neocons. Actually, Israel was the main issue for the neocons to leave the Democratic Party, where they once were to be found. Back in 1993, Professor of Political Science, Benjamin Ginsburg wrote:

"One major factor that drew them inexorably to the right was their attachment to Israel and their growing frustration during the 1960s with a Democratic party that was becoming increasingly opposed to American military preparedness and increasingly enamored of Third World causes. In the Reaganite right's hard-line anti-communism, commitment to American military strength, and willingness to intervene politically and militarily in the affairs of other nations to promote democratic values (and American interests), neocons found a political movement that would guarantee Israel's security." [12]

The neocons' commitment to Israel, the great influence of the Jewish lobby and the captivation of the Christian Communities by Zionism, is indeed the explanation for the constant U.S. support to Israel. It might seem foreign to some, but today it would be wrong referring to Israel as the client state of U.S. Nowadays it's more correct to say it's the other way around if anything. This was well put by Israeli born musician Gilad Atzmon, when interviewed:

"I think that originally Israel was there to support western colonialism (Balfour Declaration, etc.). It didn't stop there. American administrations realised in the late '70s and '80s that the only real danger to western globalization is Arab opposition and Islamic resistance. Israel was there to maintain a continuous conflict in the region. The

Americans got involved in the peace process, not in order to push for peace, but rather to maintain the conflict forever. So, in a sense, at least historically, you are right. Israel was there to serve American interests, but things have changed. In the last ten years we face a shift in the balance of power. The new bond between Zionists, Republican, and right-wing Christian groups introduced a completely new phase in the American-Israeli relationship. I think that American people would do themselves a great favour if they start to scrutinise the acts of their government. Americans should ask themselves whether it is American interests that are looked after or rather Israeli ones. The war in Iraq is a good place to start such an intellectual exercise.”[13]

In the case of the war on Iraq, the interests of greedy politicians selling themselves to the highest bidder (or keeping their mouth shut if they disagree), and the interests of the devoted Zionists as the neocons are, goes hand in hand. Peace will not come to the Middle East until the Americans have liberated themselves from the Zionist's grip over Washington and some peoples' conviction of always doing what's best for Israel over what's best for America. Conservative Pat Buchanan well summarized what the neocons' ideology is all about:

“What these neoconservatives seek is to conscript American blood to make the world safe for Israel. They want the peace of the sword imposed on Islam and American soldiers to die if necessary to impose it.”[14]

Truer words have never been written. In the end the Americans, just like Kovic, will have to ask themselves the one crucial question: What is it all good for us?

Kristoffer Larsson

kristoffer.larsson@sobernet.nu

[1] Iraq Monthly War Cost Rises To \$5.8 Billion, Set To Go Higher;
<http://www.parapundit.com/archives/002494.html>

[2] Shadow of Zog; <http://www.israelshamir.net/english/shadowofzog.html>

[3] Iraq: The Case Against Preemptive War;
http://www.amconmag.com/10_21/iraq.html

[4] The Demographics of American Jews;
<http://www.counterpunch.org/brenner10242003.html>

[5] Freden dör på stadens gator;
<http://www.aftonbladet.se/nyheter/0010/15/israel.html>

[6] The Oligarchs, by Uri Avnery; <http://www.counterpunch.org/avnery08032004.html>

[7] A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties, translated by Israel Shahak with a foreword; <http://student.cs.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/articles/article0005345.html>

[8] The three-state solution, by Leslie H. Gelb, New York Times, November 25 2003; <http://quicksitebuilder.cnet.com/supfacts/id365.html>

[9] Shadow of Zog; <http://www.israelshamir.net/english/shadowofzog.html>

[10] Destroying Babylon;
<http://dahrjamailiraq.com/weblog/archives/dispatches/000171.php>

[11] Jewish History, Jewish Religion, by Israel Shahak (p. 8 in the Swedish edition)

[12] Quoted in "The Shadow of Zog".

[13] The Gilad Atzmon Interview; <http://sf.indymedia.org/news/2004/01/1674134.php>

[14] Whose war?; http://www.amconmag.com/03_24_03/cover.html

Yahoo! Groups Links

To visit your group on the web, go to:
<http://groups.yahoo.com/group/shamireaders/>

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 10:47 am Post subject: The Israeli Origins of Bush II's Iraq War



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 25161

The Israeli Origins of Bush II's Iraq War

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=33763>

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 7:10 pm Post subject: Re: The Israeli Origins of Bush II's Iraq War



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 25161

Alpha wrote:

The Israeli Origins of Bush II's Iraq War

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=33763>

Buy it now for immediate delivery online at:

<http://www.irmep.org/cbda.htm>

<http://www.irmep.org>

A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm is a definitive Middle East policy strategy authored and implemented

by operatives in the highest levels of the US government. There is just one problem. The plan was a strategy for Israel, not the United States of America.

The book Neocon Middle East Policy reviews strategies and consequences of the "Clean Break" plan authored by Richard Perle, David Wurmser, and Douglas Feith in 1996. It analyzes the core assumptions of the policy, cost of tactics that have already been implemented and discusses the likelihood others will be executed in the future.

Neocon Middle East Policy then turns to the most difficult questions of all, "Can a policy crafted for a foreign government and presented to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu serve as a blueprint for US regional policy? At what cost in credibility, blood, treasure and American integrity? At what cost to Israel?"

Buy Online at <http://www.irmep.org/cbda.htm>

What are Middle East Academics saying about Neocon Middle East Policy?

"I find that the book is incredibly dead on target and would be an eye-opener in a big way to the American public. The chapters#3, 6-9#are very strong and well argued. I find it a bit exasperating that the simple truth both about the Israeli stronghold on the representation of the Palestine conflict in the American (and to a lesser extent European) media and about the true rationale behind the American invasion in Iraq is so off any radar, much less TV screen, in the US. There is a nightmarish quality to the whole complex." - P. Schelde

"This book is a must read for anyone interested in the Middle East and US-MidEast relations. It offers an impressive range of views from experts and activists which is an unusual combination. It is highly informative and makes the reader think about the Middle East but also about the way in which networks create foreign policy on a transnational basis. It should be in every library and will be useful on reading lists for courses - I will offer for my library and it will appear as a reference on my Law and Policy in the Middle East graduate class." - J. Strawson

Support IRmep research by buying your copy online at <http://www.irmep.org/cbda.htm>

'A Clean Break'/war for Israel (from James Bamford's 'A Pretext for War' book):

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



[Back to top](#)

Alpha
Lieutenant

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 7:23 pm Post subject: Iraq: A War For Israel?





Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 25161

Iraq: A War For Israel?

By Mark Weber

The United States Invasion of Iraq in March-April 2003, and the occupation of the country since then, has cost more than a thousand American lives and many tens of billions of dollars, and has brought death to many thousands of Iraqis.

Why did President Bush decide to go to war? In whose interests was it launched?

In the months leading up to the attack, President Bush and other high-ranking US officials repeatedly warned that the threat posed to the US and world by the Baghdad regime was so grave and imminent that the United States had to act quickly to bomb, invade and occupy Iraq.

On September 28, 2002, for example, he said: "The danger to our country is grave and it is growing. The Iraqi regime possesses biological and chemical weapons, is rebuilding the facilities to make more and, according to the British government, could launch a biological or chemical attack in as little as 45 minutes after the order is given... This regime is seeking a nuclear bomb, and with fissile material could build one within a year."

On March 6, 2003, President Bush declared: "Saddam Hussein and his weapons are a direct threat to this country, to our people, and to all free people... I believe Saddam Hussein is a threat to the American people. I believe he's a threat to the neighborhood in which he lives. And I've got good evidence to believe that. He has weapons of mass destruction... The American people know that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction."

These claims were untrue. As the world now knows, Iraq had no dangerous "weapons of mass destruction," and posed no threat to the US. Moreover, alarmist suggestions that the Baghdad regime was working with the al-Qaeda terror network likewise proved to be without foundation.

So if the official reasons given for the war were untrue, why did the United States attack?

Whatever the secondary reasons for the Iraq war, the crucial factor in President Bush's decision to attack was to help Israel. With support from Israel and America's Jewish-Zionist lobby, and prodded by Jewish "neo-conservatives" holding high-level positions in his administration, President Bush — who was already fervently committed to Israel — resolved to invade and subdue one of Israel's chief regional enemies.

This is so widely understood in Washington that US Senator Ernest Hollings was moved in May 2004 to acknowledge that the US invaded Iraq "to secure Israel," and "everybody" knows it. He also identified three of the influential pro-Israel Jews in Washington who played an important role in prodding the US into war: Richard Perle, chair of the Pentagon's Defense Policy Board; Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Defense Secretary; and Charles Krauthammer, columnist and author. [1]

Hollings referred to the cowardly reluctance of his Congressional colleagues to acknowledge this truth openly, saying that "nobody is willing to stand up and say what is going on." Due to "the pressures we get politically," he added, members of Congress uncritically support Israel and its policies.

Some months before the invasion, retired four-star US Army General and former NATO Supreme Allied Commander Wesley Clark said in an interview:

"Those who favor this attack [by the US against Iraq] now will tell you candidly, and privately, that it is probably true that Saddam Hussein is no threat to the United States. But they are afraid at some point he might decide if he had a nuclear weapon to use it against Israel." [2]

Fervently Pro-Israel

President Bush's fervent support for Israel and its hardline premier is well known. He reaffirmed it, for example, in June 2002 in a major speech on the Middle East. In the view of "leading Israeli commentators," the London Times reported, the address was "so pro-Israel that it might have been written by Ariel Sharon." [3]

Condoleeza Rice, Bush's National Security Advisor, echoed the President's outlook in a May 2003 interview, saying that the "security of Israel is the key to security of the world." [4]

In an address to pro-Israel activists at the 2004 convention of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), Bush said: "The United States is strongly committed, and I am strongly committed, to the security of Israel as a vibrant Jewish state." He also told the gathering: "By defending the freedom and prosperity and security of Israel, you're also serving the cause of America." [5]

Long Range Plans

Jewish-Zionist plans for war against Iraq had been in place for years.

In mid-1996, a policy paper prepared for then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu outlined a grand strategy for Israel in the Middle East. Entitled "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm," it was written under the auspices of an Israeli think tank, the Institute for Advanced Strategic and Political Studies. Specifically, it called for an "effort [that] can focus on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq, an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right..." [6]

The authors of "A Clean Break" included Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, and David Wurmser, three influential Jews who later held high-level positions in the Bush administration, 2001-2004: Perle as chair of the Defense Policy Board, Feith as Undersecretary of Defense, and Wurmser as special assistant to the Undersecretary of State for Arms Control.

The role played by Bush administration officials who are associated with two major pro-Zionist "neoconservative" research centers has come under scrutiny from The Nation, the influential public affairs weekly. [7]

The author, Jason Vest, examined the close links between the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA) and the Center for Security Policy (CSP), detailing the ties between these groups and various politicians, arms merchants, military men, wealthy pro-Israel American Jews, and Republican presidential administrations.

JINSA and CSP members, notes Vest, "have ascended to powerful government posts, where... they've managed to weave a number of issues — support for national missile defense, opposition to arms control treaties, championing of wasteful weapons systems, arms aid to Turkey and American unilateralism in general — into a hard line, with support for the Israeli right at its core... On no issue is the JINSA/CSP hard line more evident than in its relentless campaign for war — not just with Iraq, but 'total war,' as Michael Ledeen, one of the most influential JINSAans in Washington, put it... For this crew, 'regime change' by any means necessary in Iraq, Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia and the

Palestinian Authority is an urgent imperative."

Samuel Francis, author, editor and columnist, has also looked into the "neo-conservative" role in fomenting war. [8]

"My own answer," he wrote, "is that the lie [that a massively-armed Iraq posed a grave and imminent threat to the US] was fabricated by neo-conservatives in the administration whose first loyalty is to Israel and its interests and who wanted the United States to smash Iraq because it was the biggest potential threat to Israel in the region. They are known to have been pushing for war with Iraq since at least 1996, but they could not make an effective case for it until after Sept. 11, 2001..."

"What has been happening inside the Bush administration is no less a nest of treason than the Soviet spy rings of the New Deal era, and if political reality doesn't demand its exposure, simple loyalty to the United States does."

In the aftermath of the 2001 Nine-Eleven terror attacks, ardently pro-Zionist "neo-conservatives" in the Bush administration — who for years had sought a Middle East war to bolster Israel's security in the region — exploited the tragedy to press their agenda. In this they were backed by the Israeli government, which also pressured the White House to strike Iraq.

The Jerusalem correspondent for the Guardian, the respected British daily, reported in August 2002: "Israel signalled its decision yesterday to put public pressure on President George Bush to go ahead with a military attack on Iraq, even though it believes Saddam Hussein may well retaliate by striking Israel." [9]

Three months before the US invasion, the well-informed Washington journalist Robert Novak reported that Israeli prime minister Sharon was telling American political leaders that "the greatest US assistance to Israel would be to overthrow Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime." Moreover, added Novak, "that view is widely shared inside the Bush administration, and is a major reason why US forces today are assembling for war." [10]

Israel's spy agencies were a "full partner" with the US and Britain in producing greatly exaggerated prewar assessments of Iraq's ability to wage war, a former senior Israeli military intelligence official has acknowledged. Shlomo Bron, a brigadier general in the Israel army reserves, and a senior researcher at a major Israeli think tank, said that intelligence provided by Israel played a significant role in supporting the US and British case for making war. Israeli intelligence agencies, he said, "badly overestimated the Iraqi threat to Israel and reinforced the American and British belief that the weapons [of mass destruction] existed." [11]

For some Jewish leaders, the Iraq war is part of a long-range effort to install Israel-friendly regimes across the Middle East. Norman Podhoretz, a prominent Jewish writer and an ardent supporter of Israel, has been for years editor of Commentary, the influential Zionist monthly. In the Sept. 2002 issue he wrote: "The regimes that richly deserve to be overthrown and replaced are not confined to the three singled-out members of the axis of evil [Iraq, Iran, North Korea]. At a minimum, the axis should extend to Syria and Lebanon and Libya, as well as 'friends' of America like the Saudi royal family and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak, along with the Palestinian Authority, whether headed by Arafat or one of his henchmen."

Patrick J. Buchanan, the well-known writer and commentator, and former White House Communications director, has been blunt in identifying those who pushed for war: [12]

"We charge that a cabal of polemicists and public officials seek to ensnare our country in

a series of wars that are not in America's interests. We charge them with colluding with Israel to ignite those wars and destroy the Oslo Accords. We charge them with deliberately damaging US relations with every state in the Arab world that defies Israel or supports the Palestinian people's right to a homeland of their own. We charge that they have alienated friends and allies all over the Islamic and Western world through their arrogance, hubris, and bellicosity...

"Cui Bono? For whose benefit these endless wars in a region that holds nothing vital to America save oil, which the Arabs must sell us to survive? Who would benefit from a war of civilizations between the West and Islam?"

"Answer: one nation, one leader, one party. Israel, Sharon, Likud."

Uri Avnery — an award-winning Israeli journalist and author, and a three-time member of Israel's parliament — sees the Iraq war as an expression of immense Jewish influence and power. In an essay written some weeks after the US invasion, he wrote: [13]

"Who are the winners? They are the so-called neo-cons, or neo-conservatives. A compact group, almost all of whose members are Jewish. They hold the key positions in the Bush administration, as well as in the think-tanks that play an important role in formulating American policy and the ed-op pages of the influential newspapers... The immense influence of this largely Jewish group stems from its close alliance with the extreme right-wing Christian fundamentalists, who nowadays control Bush's Republican party. ...Seemingly, all this is good for Israel. America controls the world, we control America. Never before have Jews exerted such an immense influence on the center of world power."

In Britain, a veteran member of Britain's House of Commons bluntly declared in May 2003 that Jews had taken control of America's foreign policy, and had succeeded in pushing the US into war. "A Jewish cabal have taken over the government in the United States and formed an unholy alliance with fundamentalist Christians," said Tam Dalyell, a Labour party deputy and the longest-serving House member. "There is far too much Jewish influence in the United States," he added. [14]

Summary

For many years now, American presidents of both parties have been staunchly committed to Israel and its security. This entrenched policy is an expression of the Jewish-Zionist grip on America's political and cultural life. It was fervent support for Israel — shared by President Bush, high-ranking administration officials and nearly the entire US Congress — that proved crucial in the decision to invade and subdue one of Israel's greatest regional enemies.

While the unprovoked US invasion of Iraq may have helped Israel, just as those who wanted and planned for the war had hoped, it has been a calamity for America and the world. It has cost tens of thousands of lives and many tens of billions of dollars. Around the world, it has generated unmatched distrust and hostility toward the US. In Arab and Muslim countries, it has fueled intense hatred of the United States, and has brought many new recruits to the ranks of anti-American terrorists.

Americans have already paid a high price for their nation's commitment to Israel. We will pay an ever higher price — not just in dollars or international prestige, but in the lives of young men squandered for the interests of a foreign state — until the Jewish-Zionist hold on US political life is finally broken.

Notes

Remarks by Ernest F. Hollings, May 20, 2004. Congressional Record — Senate, May 20, 2004, pages S5921-S5925.

The Guardian (London), August 20, 2002.

R. Dunn, "Sharon Could Have Written Speech," The Times (London), June 26, 2002.

A. S. Lewin, "Israel's Security is Key to Security of Rest of World," Jewish Press (Brooklyn, NY), May 14, 2003. Rice's interview with the Israeli daily Yediot Aharonot is quoted.

Bush address to AIPAC convention, Washington, DC, May 18, 2004.

Text posted at: www.israeleconomy.org/strat1.htm See also: B. Whitaker, "Playing Skittles with Saddam," The Guardian (London), Sept. 3, 2002.

J. Vest, "The Men From JINSA and CSP," The Nation, Sept. 2, 2002.

S. Francis, "Weapons of Mass Deception: Somebody Lied," column of Feb. 6, 2004.

Jonathan Steele, "Israel Puts Pressure on US to Strike Iraq," The Guardian (London), August 17, 2002.

Robert Novak, "Sharon's War?," column of Dec. 26, 2002.

L. King, "Ex-General Says Israel Inflated Iraqi Threat," Los Angeles Times, Dec. 5, 2003.

P. J. Buchanan, "Whose War?," The American Conservative, March 24, 2003.

Uri Avnery, "The Night After," CounterPunch, April 10, 2003.

F. Nelson, "Anger Over Dalyell's 'Jewish Cabal' Slur," The Scotsman (Edinburgh), May 5, 2003; M. White, "Dalyell Steps Up Attack On Levy," The Guardian (London), May 6, 2003.

#2018 December 2004

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 7:31 pm Post subject: Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 25161

Neoconservatism as a Jewish Movement

<http://www.itszone.co.uk/zone0/viewtopic.php?t=32606>

[Back to top](#)



Alpha
Lieutenant
☆☆☆☆☆

Posted: Mon May 02, 2005 8:48 pm Post subject: How Israel Controls/Corrupts the US Government/Media



Joined: 06 Jan 2003
Posts: 25161

How Israel Controls/Corrupts the US Government/Media

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

[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

Page 1 of 1

Jump to:

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