BUSH TO EXPAND MILITARY RATHER THAN WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ

The sheer audacity of this globalist administration continues to amaze me. In the face of an election defeat and a building national sentiment demanding that Bush extricate America from Iraq, President Bush announces the equivalent of “Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead!” His call to expand the military and order another carrier Task Force to the Persian Gulf reveals this administration’s true intent to continue antagonizing the Muslim world.

As the Washington Post reported, “In a wide-ranging session in the Oval Office, the president said he interpreted the Democratic election victories six weeks ago not as a mandate to bring the U.S. involvement in Iraq to an end but as a call to find new ways to make the mission there succeed. He confirmed that he is considering a short-term surge in troops in Iraq, an option that top generals have resisted out of concern that it would not help.”

Obviously, if the president was really serious about winding down the war in Iraq as soon as possible, there would be no necessity for increasing the overall size of the military. A temporary surge in troops is not all relevant, if the intent was really a temporary one. After all, the quickest way to ease the manpower problems of combat fatigue and multiple deployments to Iraq is to get out of Iraq. If the Bush administration had any intention of doing so, he would not be pushing to expand the permanent military.

Naturally, the interminable nature of the phony war on terror provides an almost unlimited excuse to expand military power. Charles Peña reports, “The U.S. Army’s chief of staff, Gen. Peter J. Schoomaker has admitted what many military analysts have been saying for some time now: the active duty Army ‘will break’ as a result of the Iraq deployment. But with roughly a half million men and women in the active duty Army, how is it that 152,000 troops currently deployed in Iraq could push the Army to the brink? The answer lies in troop rotations.”

Yes and no. Troop deployments are tough on morale more than anything – especially when few troops do not feel they are doing something worth the sacrifice in Iraq. But deployments are especially tough on reservists and the employers that have to keep jobs open for them to return. But will the existing Army really “break” under existing circumstances? Hardly. Few people realize that only a small percentage of troops in Iraq are combat troops – some 25,000 out of 150,000. Even the Iraqi vice president complained about this predominance of logistic, service, and administrative troops in Iraq.

Ultimately, the mix of troops or their deployment efficiency is not the crucial issue. The key issue is whether or not the Iraq problem can even be solved with military power only. LA Times columnist William Arkin says that Bush is addicted to the military option. That is only true because of the hidden globalist motives that drive this administration. Arkin either does not understanding what the globalists are up to or is concealing his knowledge of those underlying motives to create worldwide conflict [my comments in brackets]:

“More Troops? Come on. Five years after Sept. 11, barely five weeks after a losing election, the President of the United States decides America needs a larger military? These guys can’t see past today’s events to craft a strategy for tomorrow. [On the contrary, they see very well what they are doing (creating conflict) and its working].

“They say that the Army and Marine Corps has been stretched to a breaking point, that more troops are needed to fight the ‘long war’ against global terrorism. I might be convinced that America might need a larger (or different) military to address the challenges it will face in the future. But what it needs FIRST is to get out of the Iraq, a move that would instantly alleviate the pressures on today’s military. [Indeed! But that won’t happen].

“... Whether it’s Iraq, drugs in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Africa, hurricane Katrina, or the increase in domestic crime it is so clear only Washington can’t see that our tendency to see a military solution to everything is not only wrong but has had profound negative effects. ... Bush has ordered Secretary of Defense Robert Gates to develop a plan to add tens of thousands of permanent ‘end strength’ to the Army and Marine Corps. [This task was given Gates before he went to Iraq on his first fact-finding mission, which is telling].

“News also came yesterday that Gen. John Abizaid, the overall commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, plans to retire in March. The Arabic speaking Abizaid was once seen as a soothing tonic after the bumbling Gen. Tommy Franks skedaddled from the scene less than a month after victory in Iraq in 2003. Culturally aware, politically sensitive, polished, he has reportedly been offered higher posts in the government. [Any highly placed general who leaves the military and doesn’t blow the whistle on what’s going on over there still has aspirations to be part of the globalist team].”

It was this same Abizaid who called for an additional Navy aircraft carrier in Persian Gulf this week. This action was clearly aimed at providing a show of force toward Iran. Abizaid claims it is a “deterrent” and “not aimed at any particular county.” Really? As if Iran was going to pull off some major military attack on Israel that needed to be deterred. Iran’s president may be foolishly throwing around end-times religious statements to provoke international wrath, but he isn’t stupid enough to start a war. He doesn’t have to, knowing that the US or Israel are intent on doing that soon. The military hardware is quickly being positioned by the US for just such an attack.

Debka.com’s analysis tends to agree: “DEBKA file’s military sources report that this request, revealed by a senior Pentagon official, is the first time in four years that an American general has asked for a special force as a
The application to deploy a third carrier in the Gulf in late March 2007 is a pointer to the projected time line of this operation. It will confront Tehran and Damascus with the option of direct intervention to rescue their Iraqi allies, or standing aside. President George W. Bush is officially reported to have not yet decided on the coming steps in Iraq. However, the Central Command’s application for another carrier suggests that the decision is more or less final.

It does look like the US is going to tackle Iran and Syria more or less simultaneously sometime this next year. The intervention inside Iran by special forces is already occurring. But, as Muhammad Sahmi of The Progressive points out, "If the Bush Administration attacks Iran, it would be violating the U.N. Charter. And it would also be violating the Algiers Accord that the United States signed with Iran in 1981 to end the hostage crisis. Point I, paragraph 1, of that accord states, ‘The United States pledges that it is and from now on will be the policy of the United States not to intervene, directly or indirectly, politically or militarily, in Iran’s internal affairs.’"

Syria, like Iran is the target of political intervention and destabilization as well. Time Magazine revealed this week that “[a] classified document suggests the Administration is considering a plan to fund political opposition to the Damascus government. Some critics say it would be an unwarranted covert action….” The Bush Administration has been quietly nurturing individuals and parties opposed to the Syrian government in an effort to undermine the regime of President Bashar Assad. Parts of the scheme are outlined in a classified, two-page document which says that the U.S. already is ‘supporting regular meetings of internal and diaspora Syrian activists’ in Europe. The document bluntly expresses the hope that ‘these meetings will facilitate a more coherent strategy and plan of actions for all anti-Assad activists.’"

All the talk about a brief “surge” in troop numbers adds more fodder to the calls for a larger military – even if no one has successfully determined how a new massing of troops in Iraq would accomplish anything different than the failed surge this past August. William Arkin commented in a different article about this as well:

“The first thing that should be understood about more [troops] though is that adding tens of thousands of troops to the U.S. military isn’t instant. Marine Corps Gen. Peter Pace, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said last month that it would take two years to recruit and train a new division. In other words, it is not about winning in Iraq now.” Correct. It is about getting ready for more military intervention in the near future.

Even our own generals can’t agree on a specific mission such a surge would be applied to, let alone a longer-term coherent strategy in Iraq. The current set of tactics contain a little bit of everything: patrolling, checkpoints, training, and lots of logistics and administration. As the AP reported, “Top generals have expressed concern that even temporarily shipping thousands of more troops would be largely ineffective in the absence of bold new political and economic steps, and that it would leave the already stretched Army and Marines Corps even thinner once the surge ended. They also worry that it feeds a perception that the strife and chaos in Iraq is mainly a military problem; in their view it is largely political, fed by economic distress.”

Economic stress is certainly a factor and is getting worse by the day, but it is by no means the main problem. Hatred for opposition groups and the US occupation is the main issue in Iraq. As more ethnic violence erupts, the US is increasingly blamed – both for what the US does wrong (using excessive force in bombing civilians) and what it fails to do (disarming the various armed groups). If the Iraqis only knew that US agent provocateurs were secretly supplying the insurgency, directing some of its leaders, and causing most of the “suicide” car bombings, the Iraqis would erupt in total rebellion against the US presence.

Expect a shakeup in military leadership as a further manifestation of the ongoing illusions of change in Iraq. According to the AP, “A shuffle of top American generals in Iraq is likely to accompany the shift in U.S. policy that President Bush is considering. Army Gen. John P. Abizaid, commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, has submitted plans to go ahead with a retirement that is months overdue, according to the U.S. Central Command.

“And the top U.S. commander in Iraq, Gen. George Casey, has indicated in recent months that he also may not stay much longer than the end of this year. Since they have opposed sending more troops to Iraq, their departures could make it easier for Bush and his new Defense Secretary Robert Gates to switch course in the troubled campaign, where they are considering a short-term surge in forces.”

Ivan Eland lists the “Top Ten Things Not to Do in Iraq”:

(1) Don’t send more U.S. troops. By pursuing this course, neoconservative armchair generals – such as Frederick Kagan – who helped Bush get into this mess, want to help him dig the hole deeper. Yet the senior U.S. military officers on the ground in the Middle East are not keen on this option. They realize that the quagmire makes it impossible for U.S. forces to ever succeed, and they have been inclined toward withdrawal. [But they will send more troops precisely because if negatively affects US long-term interests and security].

(2) “Don’t think that sending more U.S. troops is politically sustainable. In a democracy, putting more troops and money into a war that has lost public support rivals the stupidity of invading a country to bring democracy to a fragmented society with no prior democratic experience or culture.” [One of the globalist objectives is to make Bush the laughing stock of the world, even as the US becomes more hated. Losing public support at home makes our own government look even more arrogant and isolated in its evil].
3. “Don’t use any extra forces to secure Baghdad. The Bush administration can’t seem to accept what the U.S. military command in Iraq has said: that more U.S. forces will only inflame Iraqi resistance. [But, the US keeps using excessive force—especially in large operations].

(4) “Don’t use any extra U.S. troops to train Iraqi forces. Even if the Iraqi army and police could be made larger and better quickly – which they can’t be – the biggest difficulty is not their competence. The main problem is that they will fight for their religious sect, ethnic group, or tribe, not for their country. [And that isn’t going to change].

(5) “Don’t think that training Iraqi security forces is a viable U.S. exit strategy. Because of the fragmented nature of Iraqi society, training such forces is merely enabling one side’s combatants in an accelerating civil war. Many of those already trained are now operating as Shi’ite death squads attacking Sunnis.

(6) “Don’t think that the ISG’s proposed withdrawal of combat forces by early 2008, while retaining about half the 140,000 troops to train Iraqi forces, is a viable solution. ... If combat troops are withdrawn, the less visible training mission would incur fewer U.S. casualties and generate less intense media coverage back home during the next election season. [Meaning the cosmetics will change but not the intention to stay in Iraq].

(8) “Don’t pursue the ’80 percent solution.’ This proposal would abandon any attempt at reconciliation with the Sunnis and throw all of the diminishing U.S. influence behind the groups that effectively control the Iraqi government. [Eland does mean reconciliation in a unified government like the Bush administration is pushing. See #10 below].

(8) “Don’t think that talking to Syria and Iran will pay big dividends in Iraq. Right after the invasion, these countries were afraid that they would be next and thus were more amenable to helping out the United States. Now, they are both delighted that they have the United States over a barrel—that is, bogged down in a quagmire and less likely to put them in the cross hairs. So they will be in no hurry to help U.S. forces extricate themselves from the tar baby. [Or so they think. They are going to be next whether they cooperate or not.]

(9) “Don’t continue talking about democracy or victory in Iraq. Neither is possible, and such rhetoric makes withdrawal harder before either is achieved.

(10) “Don’t think Iraq can exist as a unified country. Iraq already has decentralized governance and militias dominating various areas. The United States should mediate a conclave of all Iraqi groups to recognize this decentralized governance and to negotiate a viable oil sharing agreement. The decentralization option is the only one that has any hope of reducing and compartmentalizing the violence. At this late date, however, even this option might not prevent unbridled mayhem.”

TRUE COST OF WAR:

Commentator Charles Young states that a Nobel economist calculates the true cost of Iraq is far higher than President Bush claims – and America will pay the price for decades to come. “Joseph Stiglitz, winner of the Nobel Prize for economics, estimates the true cost of the war at $2.267 trillion. That includes the government’s past and future spending for the war itself ($725 billion), healthcare and disability benefits for veterans ($127 billion), and hidden increases in defense spending ($160 billion). It also includes losses the economy will suffer from injured vets ($355 billion) and higher oil prices ($450 billion).

“When America invaded Iraq in 2003, the Bush administration predicted that the war would turn a profit, paying for itself with increased oil revenues. So far, though, Congress has spent more than $350 billion on the conflict, including the $50 billion appropriated for 2007. But according to one of the world’s leading economists, that is just a fraction of what Iraq will actually wind up costing American taxpayers.”

BRZEZINSKI ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Zbigniew Brzezinski said a few more cogent things about Iraq and world affairs in an interview with Charlie Rose. I’ll paraphrase and add my comments.

The former Carter National Security Advisor (who controlled Carter’s foreign policy) stated that there is no real Iraqi government effectively governing in Iraq. The al-Maliki government has no real power and wouldn’t even exist if it were not for the protection of living in the US-controlled Green Zone – an armed fortress for all US leaders within Baghdad. He contrasted this ineffective government to the stable Kurdish semi-autonomous region to the north, whose government is effective precisely because it controls a nearly homogeneous ethnic people with a defined territory with its own source of revenue (oil).

Of course, Brzezinski couldn’t help putting in a few statements which belied his own allegiance to the globalists he has so long represented. He said we have “squandered an opportunity to use America’s unique position as the only super power” in changing the world. No realist really believes that any super power can do this, but it is a handy excuse for more intervention.

He said, “China might rise to be a super power in the next 20 or 30 years,” and particularly noted China’s rising influence in Africa and the Middle East. He notes that China might provide military support in Middle East against the US, but it already has. Brzezinski knows that China will be a world power much sooner than 20 or 30 years, but he doesn’t want to alarm Americans about either the Russians or Chinese, which are, in my opinion, the real “Axis of Evil.”

He also made a telling remark about what he feels should be “the great debate.” In true globalist fashion he asks, “What is distinctive about our age?” He answers that “what gives global politics meaning” – which was previously “shaped by national sovereignty, peoples going to war, and driven only by leaders at the top” – is that now “there is a political awakening, people all across the globe demanding to exercise their own will politically, people now inflamed and willing to fight relentlessly.” He’s wrong when he infers this to be a natural, public-based phenomenon. These people rising up are just so much cannon fodder, having been enlisted, radicalized and pressed into demonstrations by the same leaders who have always created crises in
order to engender popular rebellions. Brzezinski was actually just taking a jab at national sovereignty (seen by the globalist mind as tyrannical).

Also telling was his remark that solving the Israel-Palestinian conflict was the key to calming the Middle East. In his view, this won’t be settled without an “international intervention.” He mentioned four major key solutions to solving the crisis. You can see the globalist plan written all over this suggestions:

(1) Getting the Arabs to agree on “no right of return” for historical refugees to Israel proper. Such an influx would overwhelm the voting power of Jews. [The Arabs will never agree to this, so this is a failed solution from the start].

(2) The Sharing of Jerusalem – always a symbol of repression to Palestinians. [But also the primary base for attacks on Israel to the Palestinians. This is not a solution either, but a recipe for even greater conflict, necessary to justify international intervention].

(3) Giving up settlements on Arab land. [So far, this has never led to peace either. Look at Gaza which is totally now in hands of the Arabs. Attacks on Israel have increased since the IDF forced the expulsion of Israeli Jews from the settlements in Gaza, and Hamas and Fatah are currently engaged in a mini-civil war].

(4) Demilitarization of Palestinian militias by NATO forces. [There it is – international intervention, the prime goal of the globalists. They never give back sovereignty once they have intervened in the name of “peace.” Look at Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor].

US CITIZEN (WHISTLEBLOWER) HELD INCOMUNICADO IN IRAQ

Even though I could not find any language in the Military Commissions Act of 2006 that applied to citizens, I did warn that our government has a secret history of doing terrible things to citizens in private. The Chicago Tribune blew the whistle on the government’s torture and mistreatment of a US citizen in Iraq, who was working for a corrupt Iraqi Security contractor. Take note, this could happen to any of us. It is clear that people on the dark side of the government feel they can do anything they want to a citizen with no fear of the courts or other retribution:

“A Chicago man who worked for an Iraqi contractor alleged Monday he was imprisoned in a U.S. military compound in Baghdad, held incommunicado for more than 3 months and subjected to interrogation techniques ‘tantamount to torture.’

“In a federal lawsuit filed in Chicago, Donald Vance, 29, a Navy veteran, charged that his constitutional rights were trampled by American military interrogators even though they knew he was a U.S. citizen. ... Vance said he and co-worker Nathan Ertel suspected their Iraqi employer, Shield Group Security, of paying off local sheiks for influence in obtaining government contracts.

“The two blew the whistle, becoming informants for the FBI in Chicago and U.S. officials in Iraq. But when they felt their lives had been threatened by their employer, they gathered up weapons and arranged for U.S. military forces to rescue them. ... But after being debriefed at the U.S. Embassy, the two were awakened in the middle of the night, arrested, handcuffed, blindfolded and taken to the first of two U.S. military installations, according to the lawsuit.

“Vance said military authorities at Camp Cropper knew he was a U.S. citizen because he had his passport and other identification with him. Conditions at the camp were primitive and depressing, he said. Vance was kept in solitary confinement in a tiny, unclean cell, the lawsuit alleged. It was difficult to sleep because the lights shined non-stop, temperatures were kept extremely cold and music pounded at ‘intolerably loud volumes,’ the suit said. Vance was frequently denied food and water, sometimes for an entire day, the suit said.

“Vance said he was interrogated for lengthy periods, denied necessary medical care and repeatedly threatened with ‘you’ll never leave here again.’ Vance said he was unable to make a phone call to the outside world, and his family didn't know where he was or even if he was alive. ... "

“Vance was held for two additional months [after his partner’s release] before he was dropped off at the Baghdad International Airport ‘without so much as an apology,’ said Michael Kanovitz, another Vance lawyer... ‘He has never committed, much less been charged with, any crime.’"

All of this constitutes a blatant denial of Habeas Corpus, even after these guys served as informant for the FBI against the corruption of their Iraqi bosses. I believe that this Iraqi contractor had insider contacts within the dark side of US headquarters in Iraq and called up his handlers to take down these Americans who tried to blow the whistle on him. It is disgraceful how the US Embassy betrayed these men once debriefed.

BALKANS UPDATE: UN STILL HASN’T GIVEN ANYONE BACK THEIR SOVEREIGNTY

Evidence is surfacing that UN intervention in the Balkans has still not led to peace. Neither has sovereignty been returned to democratically elected governments. Nebojsa Malik of Antiwar.com has the summary:

“There is no doubt that future analysts will regard 2006 as the year of setbacks for the American Empire. The most visible defeats have taken place in the Middle East: Iraq first and foremost, then the abortive Israeli war against the Hezbollah in Lebanon, and the recent defeat of US-sponsored warlords in Somalia. But Empire’s influence is waning in the Balkans as well.

“Earlier this year, Muslim and Croat nationalists in Bosnia defeated a package of US-drafted constitutional reforms. Bosnian Serbs, too, have refused any further submission to Imperial diktat, electing a government that has sworn to protect their constitutional rights. One of its first actions was to reject the plan to ‘reform’ the country’s police [replacing local officials with UN puppets], which the U.S. and EU have been trying to impose for the past year.

“Despite its announcements throughout 2006, the Empire has also failed to achieve the illegal separation of the occupied Serbian province of Kosovo. Seized by NATO in 1999, after a 78-day bombing campaign, and administered by the UN and an Albanian-dominated Provisional
Government, the province has been systematically ethnically cleansed of its non-Albanian population, with Serb property, monuments and heritage a particular target. Champions of an independent Albanian Kosovo have vocally trumpeted its inevitability by the end of 2006 – yet the year is almost out, and that has not been the case. The sham ‘negotiations,’ begun in February under the leadership of pro-Albanian envoy Martti Ahtisaari, have failed to force the Serbian government to cede one-seventh of its territory to Albanian separatists. Serbia’s new constitution, approved at a referendum in October, explicitly claims sovereignty over Kosovo.”

**US NUCLEAR DEALINGS: WHAT’S GOING ON?**

When it comes to all things nuclear (or “nuculer” as President Bush mispronounces it) Washington policy is as confusing and devious as any. In 1994, the Clinton administration granted rogue state North Korea a couple of free nuclear reactors with contracts going to US companies and paid for with US government loans. All this was supposedly with a firm agreement committing NK to give up its nuclear weapons program. We know where that led.

Then recently, the US violated all international protocols and constraints of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Pact by agreeing to give India – who has refused to sign the pact and has an active nuclear weapon and missile program – full access to the latest US nuclear reactor technology.

Now the US is offering to build four civilian nuclear power plants in China with contracts going to Westinghouse. Naturally, the funding of the contracts will be courtesy of the US taxpayer-supported Export/Import bank. Why, we may ask, cannot China, with nearly a trillion dollars in foreign reserves and a massive trade imbalance with the US, pay for its own nuclear power plants? Why this giveaway?

On the surface, all these of these deals smack of government facilitating business for the starving US nuclear industry – long denied the ability to build nuclear power plants in the US due to overzealous environmental regulations. I certainly think that is a major part of these one-sided deals, but I also think it goes deeper into geopolitical issues.

As for China, the globalists continue to find devious ways to transfer technology to China even as China is touted by the Pentagon as a “future enemy.” Don’t forget that US Globalists like Gen. George Marshall’s gang at the State Department actually brought Mao to power in China by cutting off military aid to Chang Kai Shek in 1948. But globalists now want to foment potential counter forces to China so that the Russian-Chinese axis of evil can be defeated in the next global war, which they are busy provoking. Enter India. It may well be that the US is actively courting India as a future partner to provide a military and industrial counter balance to China in the future.

Keep in mind that Russia has always been India’s traditional patron as far as military aid. The US is now interested in selling India weapons. China traditionally has backed Pakistan, India’s rival nuclear state. The US weaseled its way into Pakistan with an unsavory dark side relationship between the Pakistani ISI and the CIA, facilitating the spread of Pakistani nuclear weapons know-how to other rogue states and setting up the underground control network for al Qaeda (all the while claiming to fight terror). That’s the reason why, when the CIA shouts orders, the Pakistanis jump – as evidenced by the recent bombing of a fundamentalist school in Pakistan on orders the CIA.

Thus, as long as President Pervez Musharraf stays alive (no small feat given the rising hostility against him in his own country) the US has Pakistan all tied up.

In like manner, if the US is trying to gain a foothold in India through offering nuclear technology, it has already half-botted the job. India is loudly claiming the US betrayed their initial secret agreement on the nuclear power pact. Instead of giving India a guaranteed supply of enriched Uranium, the US legislation made it only temporary and subject to regular review. Instead of honoring the provision allowing India to keep its military program free from scrutiny, the US has added slippery fine print that indicates there are no such guarantees. There are other issues as well, and the opposition parties in India are attacking the government and pressuring it not to accept the agreement. All these issues are complex and developing. Hopefully we may get a clearer view over time as this plays out. I’ll keep you posted.

**“LEAVE US ALONE” IRANIAN REFORMERS PLEAD**

The Progressive’s Muhammad Sahimi notes that Iranian reformers feel that their efforts to topple radical fundamentalists in Iran are being hindered by US efforts to force a “regime change.” US covert interference tends to harden the people against real reform and it taints true reformers as “US Lackeys.”

“Back in March, the Bush Administration released its new ‘National Security Strategy of the United States,’ and regime change in Iran leaps out of it as a goal. ‘We may face no greater challenge from a single country than from Iran,’ the document baldly states in a grand exaggeration. ... Not only is the goal of regime change illegal, it is also unachievable. ‘Democracy cannot be imported, nor can it be given to a people by invading their nation, nor by bombing them with cluster bombs. It must be indigenous,’ says Shirin Ebadi, the Iranian human rights advocate who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2003.

“The Administration has refused to rule out the possibility of military strikes, and even the use of nuclear weapons, on Iran’s nuclear facilities and beyond, as if the Iraq quagmire has not taught it anything. And Iran is not Iraq. Iraq was formed only in 1932 with artificial boundaries that have no historical roots. Iran, on the other hand, has existed for thousands of years as an independent nation. Hence, Iranian nationalism is extremely fierce. Military strikes on Iran would create a potent mixture that combines fierce Iranian nationalism with the Shiites’ long tradition of martyrdom in defense of their homeland and religion. The attacks would engulf the entire region in flames.

“Armchair warriors, such as William Kristol [a Neo-con], have been claiming that intense bombing of Iran will lead to an uprising by Iranians. The absurd argument is that, ‘We will destroy Iran, but Iranians will love us for bombing them, and hate the hardliners.’ Although a large majority of Iranians despise the hardliners, anyone who has the
slightest familiarity with Iran’s history knows that intense bombing of Iran will not lead to their downfall. Rather, it will help them consolidate power.” I think the globalist know this. After all, they were the ones who betrayed the Shah and installed the radical Ayatollah Khomeini into power in Iran.

HOLIDAY GREETING

I know the briefs always contain a lot of bad news. That’s the way the world is and you pay me to tell it like it is. Nevertheless, I don’t let things get me down or depressed and you shouldn’t either. Our job is not necessarily to win in the temporal sense, but to do our best to warn our friends (at least those who sense that something is wrong) about the grand deceptions of our day. Too many good people are supporting evil ignorantly because they fail to be rigorous in listening to the promptings of conscience warning of wolves in sheep’s clothing.

Thanks to all of you for supporting my efforts to keep you informed. I’d rather know the full truth and prepare for what’s coming than be happily naive and go cruising into the future blind. Next week’s brief will contain my annual Big Picture view of the world and where it’s headed. Don’t miss it. Here’s wishing you all a very Merry Christmas.

Best, Joel Skousen