

Chapter Eleven

Thirteen Predictions for the War on Terrorism

Astounding Accuracy is the result of knowing the collectivist agenda.

© 2001 – 2009 by G. Edward Griffin

All text with numbers is exactly as written on 2001 September 14.

Epilogues were last updated on 2009 June 2.

It is always dangerous to make predictions – especially if they are put into print. If they prove to be wrong, they can haunt you for the rest of your life. Nevertheless, here are thirteen predictions I published three days after the 9/11 terrorist attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. I said then that I fervently hoped they would be wrong. Nevertheless, some of my friends thought I had lost my mind. My detractors said I was unpatriotic and should be locked up as a sympathizer of terrorism. Unfortunately, all of these predictions have come to pass. Here they are *exactly* as written on September 14, 2001.

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

Epilogue: On October 8, 2001, President Bush announced the beginning of military strikes against Afghanistan and said: “Today we focus on Afghanistan, but the battle is broader. Every Nation has a choice to make. In this conflict, there is no neutral ground.”¹ On the day that Congress approved the first \$20 billion to finance the war on terrorism, Senator Hillary Clinton said that the government should make it clear “to every nation in the world, you’re either with us or you’re not, and there will be consequences.”² Even so-called conservative spokesmen have succumbed to the party line. On October 31, The Young America’s Foundation based in Hendon, Virginia – an organization that promotes conservative issues on the nation’s college campuses – found it alarming that some professors were questioning the wisdom of US interventionist policy. One professor was quoted as saying such a horrible thing as “We need to think about the resentment all over the world felt by people who have been victims of American military action.” Another professor is quoted as saying

¹ “In this conflict, there is no neutral ground,” *USA Today*, Oct. 8, 2001, p. 5A.

² “Congress ready to pay the price to hit culprits,” by William M. Welch and Kathy Kiely, *USA Today*, Sept. 13, 2001, p. 5A.

“You can’t plant hatred and not expect to reap hatred.” Such statements are not acceptable to the Young America’s Foundation, which views them as offensive and harmful to the war effort.¹

2. Most American political leaders are now committed to world government, so the second prediction is that they will crow about how America will not tolerate terrorism, but they will not act as Americans. Instead, they will act as internationalists. They will turn to the UN to lead a *global* war against terrorism. They will seek to expand the capacity of NATO and UN military forces. Although American troops will provide the backbone of military action, they ultimately will operate under UN authority.

Epilogue: On March 11, 2002, President Bush gave an address marking the passage of six months since the terrorist attack of September 11. He said with satisfaction: “A mighty coalition of civilized nations is now defending our common security.... More than half the forces now assisting the heroic Afghan fighters, or providing security in Kabul, are from countries other than the United States.”

In the past, when speaking of American involvement in military conflict, it has been customary for the President to conclude his remarks by asking for Divine blessing upon the United States and its fighting forces. In this case, however, Mr. Bush ended his speech with: “May God bless our coalition.”

When the US invaded Iraq, supposedly to prevent Hussein from using weapons of mass destruction, countries at the UN that were aligned with the Leninist camp did not support the action, but that made no difference to the globalist Bush Administration staffed almost entirely by members of the CFR. They did not seek Congressional approval to declare war, as is required by the US Constitution. Instead, they said they were acting under authority of a United Nations resolution. In other words, they were serving the UN, not the US

In 2004, as the new Iraqi government was being hand picked by the UN, the Bush Administration asked Congress to provide funding for a permanent U.N army of so-called “peacekeepers.” Called the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), the proposal calls for Americans to pay \$600 million for recruiting and training 75,000 soldiers primarily from Third World countries.

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

Epilogue: On October 20, 2001, former Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, announced that nuclear and chemical disarmament should become a top priority in the war on terrorism.² On November 13, 2001, US President Bush and Russian President Putin announced that, as a means of fighting global terrorism, they agreed to cut their

¹ “Professors blame US for terrorism,” by Jon Daugherty, WorldNetDaily.com, Article_ID=25137, Oct. 1, 2001.

² “Gorbachev: Anti-Terror Coalition Should Become Coalition for New World Order,” Associated Press, October 20, 2001, FOXNews.com.

nuclear arsenals by two-thirds.¹ These reductions will be monitored by the UN. Russia has broken every similar agreement in the past, so there is no reason to expect that pattern to change. It must be remembered that Putin is a former high-ranking officer of the Soviet KGB, which created most of the international terrorist organizations.

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

Epilogue: On November 14, 2001, President Bush announced that terrorists are to be tried by US military courts. However, at the time of the attack on September 11, the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC) had not yet been ratified by enough nations to fully empower it. It was still thirteen short of the sixty nations that the UN claims are required. The rate of new ratifications was accelerated after September 11, and the required number was reached within a few months. The ICC came into existence in 2002, and the stage was finally set for the fulfillment of this prediction.

In the February-March issue of *Policy Review*, CFR members Abraham Sofaer and Paul Williams explained that, once President Bush's military tribunals are established, the next step "could be accomplished through a UN Security Council Resolution" to expand the jurisdiction of the UN court to include terrorism. The problem, however, was that the participating nations could not agree on a definition of terrorism, which is understandable in light of the fact that any common-sense definition would include many of the UN leaders themselves.

In spite of the fact that the United States had previously signed the ICC treaty, the Bush Administration announced on May 6, 2002, that it had no legal obligation to honor it. The reason stated was, not that the treaty endangered the rights of American citizens and not that Americans might be hauled into foreign courts and judged by magistrates who are hostile to American traditions, but because the UN Security Council did not have sufficient supervisory authority in the process. In making the announcement, Undersecretary-of-State Marc Grossman intimated that, if this technicality can be worked out, the US would support it.

However, on June 19, 2002, the Bush Administration proposed a UN Security Council resolution stating that its real objection to the ICC was that political leaders and soldiers from the United States and other countries carrying out so-called peace-keeping operations around the world might be brought to trial for terrorism or war crimes as a result of those military actions. That is a valid concern, but there is an equally valid concern that ordinary citizens might also be become targets of criminal

¹ "US, Russia to sharply cut arsenals," by Laurence McQuillan, *USA Today*, Nov. 14, 2001, p. 1A.

charges by governments that are hostile to free expression of opinion or political activities they consider to be against their best interest. However, the Administration expressed no concern about the rights of ordinary citizens. The sole concern was for government officials and the soldiers who carry out their orders.

In early July of 2002, the Bush Administration vetoed an extension of the UN military mission to Bosnia because it was concerned that US personnel there might be hauled before the ICC on war-crime charges. It promised to reverse its vote if the US were granted immunity from such action. On July 11, the Administration accepted a compromise offer in which immunity was extended for a period of twelve months. The important point is that, in spite of the widespread play in the media that the US was opposing the ICC, the reality is that it was *endorsing* the ICC in principle while only seeking to escape its authority for a little while longer.¹ In June of 2003, The UN Security Council extended the exemption for another twelve months, but not without strong opposition from other nations. It was clear that these extensions could not be counted on indefinitely. Commenting on the event, Brigham Young law professor, Richard Wilkins, warned that the Court “is without sufficient checks and balances. It has the most powerful prosecutor ever with the vaguest criminal statute passed anywhere. The I.C.C. leaves open to total discretion of the prosecutor and the court the determining of what the ‘crimes’ mean.”²

On June 23, 2004, the UN Security Council, driven by the news of US soldiers abusing Iraqi prisoners, refused to approve another twelve-month extension of the exemption for US personnel, and the Bush Administration declined to pursue the issue further. Technically, American soldiers in Iraq were still exempt from ICC prosecution because the US was not *yet* a member of the tribunal, and the Court’s jurisdiction is *currently* excluded from countries that prosecute crimes by their own military.³ Nevertheless, the US was nudged another step closer to being subject to the world court, and there can be no doubt about the ultimate goal.

The play is not yet over. The CFR team that sets US policy is eager to expand the authority of the UN, and that requires empowerment of the ICC. The possibility of using captured terrorists as a means to that end must be very tempting to them – provided only that they, themselves, are exempt. We shall see.

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

Epilogue: Following the September 11 attack, there was hardly a day that didn’t carry news about how the Justice Department and the FBI had failed because of inadequate funding, manpower, and authority. On February 27, 2002, Attorney General John Ashcroft testified before Congress and formally requested nearly \$2 billion in

¹ “International Criminal Court Sellout,” by William Norman Grigg,” *The New American*, Aug., 12, 2002, p. 29.

² “US safe from global court – for now,” by Jon Dougherty, *WorldNetDaily*, June 7, 2003, http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=33049.

³ “U.S. Drops Plan to Exempt G.I.s from U.N. Court,” by Warren Hoge, *New York Times*, June 24, 2004.

additional funding to expand FBI and other internal-security manpower. As for expanded authority, see item seven, below.

In every session of Congress since 9/11, the FBI budget has been expanded. This has been justified in the name of fighting terrorism, but most of the money and manpower has been used to monitor American citizens who, increasingly, are being labeled “potential” or “latent” terrorists because they have become angered over the growth of homeland totalitarianism. In 2009, the FBI burst beyond its traditional national jurisdiction and launched an international mission called “global justice” in which FBI agents are authorized to interrogate suspects and prisoners held in other countries, a role that previously had been the sole prerogative of the CIA.¹

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

Epilogue: The evidence of prior knowledge is now so extensive that it fills an entire chapter entitled *The War on Terrorism*, which is available at the Freedom Force web site, www.freedom-force.org. It appears in the Issues section as Part 4 of *The Future Is Calling*.

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

Epilogue: On October 30, 2001, the Center for Disease Control released what it called the Model State Emergency Health Powers Act (MEHPA) and sent copies to legislators in all fifty states. The legislators immediately began to incorporate its provisions into their state laws. Under the banner of protecting Americans from the effect of bio-terrorism, the original draft authorized governors to declare a state of emergency without the approval of their legislatures. Under this emergency, the state can confiscate personal property, including real estate, food, clothing, means of transportation, and communications. It can control the distribution of food, clothing, fuel, firearms, and most other commodities. It can also compel citizens to submit to testing for disease. If a disease is identified or even suspected, or if a person refuses to undergo testing, he can be quarantined in a government facility where, presumably, he will be subject to compulsory treatment of whatever kind decreed by the state. The

¹ “FBI planning a bigger role in terrorism fight,” by Josh Meyer, *Los Angeles Times*, May 28, 2009.

model act declares that state legislatures cannot even challenge their governors in any of this for at least two months after the plan has been executed.

Also in October 2001, Congress adopted so-called “anti-terrorism” legislation that was a classic example of “Doublespeak” right out of Orwell’s *1984*. In Orwell’s world, “war is peace, freedom is slavery, and ignorance is strength.” In our world, Congress passed a bill to expand the federal government into many areas forbidden by the Constitution and unblinkingly called it the USA Patriot Act. The full title is the “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001.” It could not have been named better by Orwell, himself. In addition to putting the government in charge of airport security, it requires private citizens to inform on each other. Anyone engaged in a trade or business is now required to file a report with the government if any customer spends \$10,000 or more in cash. That is just the beginning. The bill easily can be amended in the future to require a report of *any* “suspicious” or “anti-government” activity.¹

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

On November 24, it was revealed that the Canadian National Defense Act was amended in response to the terrorist attack against the US and now gives the Canadian government power to close off any geographical area, to forcibly remove people from their homes inside that area, and be exempt from any obligation to compensate them for their loss. The justification for doing so need not be for national security. The government can act in the name of furthering “international relations.” That means, of course, that there are no definable limits on this power.³

By January, 2002 – back in the United States – Congress was on a fast track rubber-stamping the following proposals emanating from CFR social engineers: (1) conversion of the states’ National Guard units into a federal police force; (2) establishing federal control over local law enforcement and crisis-response agencies; (3) extending federal authority over medical services; (4) authorizing federal agencies to use phone taps, open postal mail, and monitor email – without a warrant or even probable cause; and (5) requiring all citizens to obtain a national ID card or

¹ “New Federal Patriot Act Turns Retailers into Spies against Customers,” by Scott Bernard Nelson, *The Boston Globe*, www.bcentral.com, Nov. 20, 2001.

² Ottawa approach akin to Nazis, judge charges,” *National Post*, Nov. 9, 2001, p. A4.

³ “Anti-terror law gives military too much power: experts,” by Ian Jack, *National Post*, www.nationalpost.com, Nov. 24, 2001.

nationalized driver's license tied into a federal and international data bank. Many of these measures were proposed long before September 11. Their origin is a series of reports issued by a group created in 1998 called The United States Commission on National Security/21st Century – usually referred to as the Hart-Rudman Commission because its co-chairmen were former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman.

It appeared to be a government study group but, in fact, it was a front for the Council on Foreign Relations. The Commission was sponsored by Congressman Newt Gingrich, a member of the CFR. Both Hart and Rudman were members of the CFR. The Commission based its findings on the work of futurist author, Alvin Toffler, a member of the CFR. Executive Director Charles Boyde and Study Group Director, Lynn Davis, were members of the CFR. Commissioners Lee Hamilton and James Schlesinger (former Secretary of Defense) were members of the CFR. One of the better-known commissioners was Leslie Gelb, who was *president* of the CFR. Altogether, twelve of the twenty-nine study-group members were from the CFR and virtually *all* of the key positions were in their hands. The first report released by the Commission, entitled *New World Coming*, said: “States, terrorists, and other disaffected groups will acquire weapons of mass destruction and mass disruption, and some will use them. Americans are likely to die on American soil, possibly in large numbers.” The report looked forward hopefully to a time when “the United Nations is a chief instrument in solving transnational issues” and “assumes a central role in conflict prevention and resolution.” A subsequent report, entitled *Road Map for National Security*, laid out plans for creating a Homeland Security agency, converting the National Guard into a federal police force, and most of the other measures previously reviewed. The rush toward a national and international police state – in the name of fighting terrorism – has been orchestrated by members of the CFR who, incidentally, intend to manage it.

The FBI now is free to place wiretaps on telephones without a court order. On November 21, 2001, the FBI announced its new eavesdropping operation called “Magic Lantern” that allows it to secretly plant a program into anyone’s computer so that every stroke made on the keyboard will be reported back. That means the government now can capture a record of everything you create on your computer, including private passwords, encrypted files, and even deleted files.¹

The National Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 brought all intelligence agencies under the control of a federal Director of National Intelligence, established national standards for birth certificates and drivers’ licenses, initiated biometric screening systems for airports, and extended the FBI’s authority to wiretap citizens’ phones even if they are not suspected of being connected with a terrorist group, such people as dissidents and so-called lone wolves.

While the government clamors to prevent citizens from having any secrets whatsoever, it moves in the opposite direction for itself. President Bush issued Executive Order 13223 that forbids public access to presidential papers, even those from previous administrations. The only researchers who now have access to these sources of historical data are those who are deemed to have a “need to know” – which

¹ “FBI develops ‘Trojan horse’ software for better eavesdropping,” by Ted Bridis, AP, *Sacramento Bee*, www.sacbee.com, Nov. 21, 2001.

means only those who support the CFR spin on important issues. Even Congress is now outside the “need-to-know” category. White House briefings to Congressional leaders on military operations in the Middle East have been greatly curtailed and now contain little more than what is given to the press. In typical Orwellian fashion, we are told that, if America’s elected representatives were to know what the President is doing as Commander-in-Chief, it would be a threat to national security.

If Congress is no longer entitled to know what the Executive branch of government is doing, it is certain that mere citizens will have even less access to information. Government agencies have been instructed by President Bush to reject public requests for documents under the Freedom of Information Act, and Justice Department lawyers have been assigned to defend those rejections. The excuse, of course, is that this action is necessary for national security against terrorism.

During a press conference at the White House on March 13, 2002, President Bush was asked why the newly appointed Director of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge, had refused to testify before a bipartisan group of Congress. The President’s reply clearly revealed the new face of American government. It is no longer comprised of three branches, each to check and balance the power of the others. It is a throwback to the Old World concept of supreme power in the hands of one man who rules from the top. The purpose of Congress now is primarily to give advice to the President – which he is free to ignore – and to authorize funding for his programs. The President said: “He doesn’t have to testify. He’s part of my staff. And that’s part of the prerogative of the executive branch of government, and we hold that very dear.... We consult with Congress all the time. I’ve had meaningful breakfasts with the leadership in the House and the Senate. I break bread with both Republicans and Democrats right back here in the Oval Office and have a good, honest discussion about plans, objectives, what’s taking place, what’s not taking place.... We understand the role of Congress. We must justify budgets to Congress.... [But] I’m not going to let Congress erode the power of the executive branch.”

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

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

Almost all of the new laws focus on Americans citizens rather than potential foreign terrorists. For example, the definition of “terrorism,” for federal criminal purposes, has been greatly expanded. A person could now be considered a terrorist by belonging to a pro-constitutional group, a citizen militia, or a pro-life organization. Legitimate protests against the government could place tens of thousands of other Americans under federal surveillance.¹

¹ “Keep Your Eye on the Target,” by the Honorable Ron Paul, *Congressional Record*, Nov. 29, 2001. (www.house.gov/congrec2001/cr112901.htm.)

By the end of November 2001, approximately 1,200 people had been arrested as terrorist suspects or as sources of information regarding terrorism. Formal charges were not brought against them. They were not allowed to have legal representation. They were not brought before a judge or given a hearing or trial. They were simply arrested and imprisoned without any Constitutional authority to do so. Furthermore, no one outside of government even knows who they are. Their names have been kept secret. This, allegedly, was to protect their privacy. Incredible! These people were thrown into prison and denied due process of law; yet we are expected to believe that the government is concerned about their *privacy*?

All of these encroachments against freedom have been high-agenda items among CFR-controlled government agencies for many years – long before September 11. Most of them were originally promoted as instruments for punishing tax evasion or controlling political unrest. No one seriously believes that these measures would have prevented the September attack. The war on terrorism has merely been an excuse to put them into effect.

On February 27, 2002, the Federal Trade Commission ordered US cell-phone companies to adopt technology enabling government agencies to track the location of all phones. Since most customers carry their phones with them, this allows the government to know their exact location at all times. The official explanation was that this will help locate victims of crime who make emergency 911 calls and also locate stranded drivers who don't know where they are. The companies announced they would be 95% compliant by the year 2005.

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

Epilogue: It was the notorious Nazi, Hermann Goering, who explained the strategy this way: "The people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."¹

¹ G.M. Gilbert, *Nuremberg Diaries* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co., 1947), pp. 278, 279.

Indeed it does. On December 6, 2001, Attorney General John Ashcroft spoke to the Senate Judiciary Committee and said: “To those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: Your tactics only aid terrorists – for they erode our national unity and diminish our resolve. They give ammunition to America’s enemies.”¹

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

Epilogue: The Public Safety and Cyber Security Enhancement Act of 2001 offers a long list of valid concerns about genuine Internet crimes and then proposes vast power to the federal government to access private email messages without even having to show probable cause. All that would be required is to claim that the action is for the purpose of public safety or national security, and this could be done by any government agency, not just law enforcement. It is now increasingly common for Internet Service Providers to terminate the service of customers who are strong critics of government policy, apparently under the assumption that they are potential terrorists. At present, such terminations typically appear as a sudden breakdown in service that, for some mysterious reason, cannot be restored by technicians. Most ISPs are not willing to reject the requests of government agencies, especially when the claim is being made that the action is in the interest of national security.

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

Epilogue: On October 21, 2001, General Richard B. Myers, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, said: “The fact that it could last several years, or many years, or maybe our lifetimes would not surprise me.” Shortly after that, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld wrote an editorial appearing in the *New York Times* in which he said: “Forget about ‘exit strategies’; we’re looking at a sustained engagement that carries no deadlines.” On March 13, 2002, President Bush emphasized this theme again when he told reporters at a White House press conference: “This is going to be a long struggle. I keep saying that. I don’t know whether you all believe me or not. But time will show you that it’s going to take a long time to achieve this objective.”

11. The eleventh prediction is that it will take a long time to locate Osama bin Laden. A TV reporter can casually interview him at his mountain stronghold, but the US military and CIA – with legions of spies and Delta forces and high-tech orbiting satellites – they

¹ “Justice defends Ashcroft’s Congressional testimony, *CNN*, Dec. 7, 2001, <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/12/07/inv.ashcroft.testimony>.

cannot find him. Why not? Because they do not *want* to find him. His image as a mastermind terrorist is necessary as a focus for American anger and patriotic fervor. If we are to wage war, there must be someone to personify the enemy. Bin Laden is useful in that role. Of course, if his continued evasion becomes too embarrassing, he will be killed in military action or captured – if he doesn't take his own life first. Either way, that will not put the matter to rest, because bin Laden is not the *cause* of terrorism. He is not even the *leader* of terrorism. He is the *icon* of terrorism. If he were to be eliminated, someone else would only have to be found to take his place. So it is best to give each of them as much longevity as possible. That is why terrorists like Arafat, Hussein, Qadhafi and Khomeini, not only are allowed to remain in power, but receive funding and military aid from the US government. They are the best enemies money can buy.

If that sounds far-fetched, consider the words of Fareed Zakaria, Managing Editor of *Foreign Affairs*, the official journal of the Council on Foreign Relations. (The goal of the CFR is the creation of world government, and the great majority of US foreign-policy planners – from the President on down – belong to it.) In the September 16, 1996, issue of *Newsweek* magazine, Zakaria said:

If Saddam Hussein did not exist, we would have to invent him. He is the linchpin of American policy in the Mideast.... If not for Saddam, would the Saudi royal family, terrified of being seen as an American protectorate (which in a sense it is), allow American troops on their soil? Would Kuwait house more than 30,000 pieces of American combat hardware, kept in readiness should the need arise? Would the king of Jordan, the political weather vane of the region, allow the Marines to conduct exercises within his borders?... The end of Saddam Hussein would be the end of the anti-Saddam coalition. Nothing destroys an alliance like the disappearance of the enemy.¹

Epilogue: On November 15, 2001, *USA Today* reported: "Several hundred Army commandos have been posted at road blocks outside Kandahar to help prevent Taliban and al-Qaeda fighters from escaping. The US soldiers are interviewing captured Taliban commanders and setting up surveillance gear, such as radar, heat detectors and cameras. ... Teams of two to 12 men are searching abandoned caves, tunnels and buildings for maps, documents or computer disks that could lead to bin Laden, officials said. From the skies, pilots are using heat detectors to locate warm bodies in cold Afghan caves. CIA agents are using cash to bribe sources for information about bin Laden's whereabouts, officials said."²

On November 26, the first strong signal was given from the White House that, eventually, bin Laden might be replaced by Saddam Hussein as the icon of terrorism. "Saddam is evil," said President Bush, and he hinted that, after the conquest of Afghanistan, the war on terrorism may be carried to Iraq.³ Meanwhile, bin Laden remains the preferred focus for hate.

¹ "If he didn't exist, we would have to invent him," by Fareed Zakaria, *Newsweek*, Sept. 16, 1996, p. 43.

² "Bin Laden hunt escalates as US aid workers freed," by Barbara Slavin, Jonathan Weisman and Jack Kelley, *USA Today*, Nov. 15, 2001, p. 1A.

³ "Bush turns America's fury towards Saddam," by Stephen Robinson, *News Telegraph*, <http://news.telegraph.co.uk>, Nov. 26, 2001.

On December 19, 2001, *USA Today* reported: “One defense official claimed a bin Laden escape could benefit the war on terrorism because popular support for continued military action in other regions would remain strong.”¹ Please re-read that statement.

To justify the US attack on Iraq, Hussein was essential as a hated enemy icon. After the occupation, however, he no longer served that function, so when he was discovered cowering in a hole, there was no reason not to take him into custody. Bin Ladin, however, is another matter. Even though his name has faded from the daily news, he still is remembered as the symbol of the terrorist attack on 9-11. A rumor was circulated in the Spring of 2004 that he already had been captured and hidden away by US forces pending a spectacular announcement to be timed with the November elections. That, of course, would be a big boost for the Bush campaign and conceivably could get him re-elected in spite of voter dissatisfaction over the Iraqi occupation. It will be interesting to see if this rumor proves to be true.

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

Epilogue: Even before the Taliban had been toppled in Afghanistan, the wheels were set in motion for a coalition government to be organized under UN supervision. On November 28, on the first day of the UN-sponsored negotiations to that end, representatives of the Northern Alliance agreed to most elements of the UN plan. Even at that early date, UN spokesmen announced that they intended to install a “temporary” multi-national military force, under its control, after the fighting is over.² After nine days of negotiations, representatives of the various Afghan factions agreed to the UN blueprint. The agreement specifically specified a multinational “peacekeeping” force to be stationed in Kabul and provided for its future expansion into the rest of the country.³

On December 19, it was learned that a dozen countries were preparing to contribute military forces to a UN “peacekeeping” force in Afghanistan.⁴

On January 11, 2002, the peacekeeping force, under the lead of British troops, was busy recruiting and training an army made up predominantly of Afghans. Funding, supply, and command were under tight UN control.⁵

On January 28, 2002, the new Afghan leader Hamid Karzai, who was brought into power by pressure from the US, announced that he wanted the present

¹ “Bombs halted; search continues,” by Jonathan Weisman, *USA Today*, Dec. 19, 2001. p. 1A.

² “Deal near in Afghan talks,” by Elliot Blair Smith, *USA Today*, Nov. 28, 2001, p. 1-A.

³ “Afghan factions sign landmark deal,” *BBC News*, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/world/south_asia/newsid_1692000/1692695.stm, Dec. 5, 2001.

⁴ “Bombs halted,” *op. cit.*

⁵ See “Afghanistan working to build national army,” by Tom Squitieri, *USA Today*, January 11, 2002, p. 10A.

multinational military force, not just to remain in Kabul, but to expand throughout all of Afghanistan.¹ Two days later, he addressed the UN Security Council and, once again, called for UN military forces.²

After the US occupation of Iraq, the pattern was exactly the same in that country. In June of 2004, when the US turned over power to an alleged independent government, it was UN Special Envoy Lakhdar Brahimi who appointed its Prime Minister, its chairman of the National Congress, its two deputy presidents, and all of its thirty-three cabinet members.

On November 8, 2005, the UN Security Council voted to extend the US-led military occupation of Iraq another year beyond its previously announced withdrawal date.

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

Yes, actions have consequences, and the long-range consequences of this act of terrorism are even more devastating than the loss of life and property that has been the focus of the media so far. Behold the Grand Deception: The action is in the *reaction*. *The war on terrorism is a war on freedom.*

SEND THIS REPORT TO YOUR FRIENDS. You can print this as a handout or send it as an email attachment. To send as an attachment, bring it on screen in Adobe Acrobat and select FILE > SEND MAIL > PAGE BY EMAIL. From the box that appears, you can send to more than one person at a time. Include a brief personal message and sign off with your name so recipients will know it is not spam. Then click on SEND. If spell check appears, select IGNORE ALL. An optional method is to copy this file to a disk and process it as you would any other email attachment.

¹ "Bush Rejects US Peacekeepers," by George Gedda, Associated Press, *Yahoo News*, Jan. 28, 2002, http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&cid=514&u=/ap/20020128/ap_on_go_pr_wh/us_afgh...

² "Afghan Leader Asks UN for Bigger Security Force," by Irwin Arieff, *Reuters News Service*, Jan. 30, 2002, <http://www.reuters.com/printfriendly.jhtml?StoryID=556954>.