

**THIS WEEK'S ANALYSIS:**[Cap and Trade: Bad Medicine for a Sick Economy](#)[The Media is Globalist, not Left nor Right](#)[Sotomayor: Bohemian Grove Wannabee](#)[Obama Panders to Gays at the White House](#)[More Evidence Al Qaeda is a Controlled US Black Operation](#)**CAP AND TRADE: BAD MEDICINE FOR A SICK ECONOMY**

What the Obama administration has rammed through Congress in the name of saving the environment is not only a hoax of draconian proportions (that Carbon Dioxide is a harmful pollutant, responsible for Global Warming) but also a means to mandating government control over all forms of energy production. By implementing an arbitrary and restrictive cap on the production of Carbon Dioxide (17 percent by 2020, compared to 2005 levels), and then forcing high CO2 producers to buy carbon credits from zero or low CO2 producers this bill will alter and distort the current cost structure of the markets and not actually change the amount of CO2 put into the atmosphere at all. In essence this is a massive wealth transfer scheme from efficient energy producers to inefficient producers, and energy users everywhere will pay for this multi-billion dollar boondoggle.

MSNBC interviewed Pat Buchanan who was quick to point out the fraudulent basis of this package in Congress:

MSNBC's Witt: "Why doesn't anyone want to call it a climate bill?"

Buchanan: "Well, because the science is suggesting that maybe all of this [global warming] isn't really happening or it's not really dangerous or it's not really man made. Barack Obama, the President is right when he said we shouldn't be afraid of the future. [But] That is exactly how this bill got passed—through fear. [Obama is saying:] 'We're all going to change. The climate's going to change. The oceans are going to rise. Our cities are going to be under water.'

"But more and more scientists are coming forward to say this is a hoax and a scam which is designed to transfer wealth and power from the private sector to the government sector and from the government of the United States to a world government. Which is what we're going to get in Copenhagen when we get this Kyoto two agreement."

One of the growing number of defectors from the Global Warming camp of propagandists is Dr. David Evans, of the Australian Greenhouse Office, (now Office of Climate Change), a top consultant who no longer believes Carbon Dioxide has any major impact on global warming. Here are excerpts from his recent article in The Australian.

"I devoted six years to carbon accounting, building models for the Australian Greenhouse Office. I've been following the global warming debate closely for years. When I started that job in 1999 the evidence that carbon emissions caused global warming seemed pretty good: CO2 is a greenhouse gas, the old ice core data, no other suspects.

"The evidence was not conclusive, but why wait until we were certain when it appeared we needed to act quickly? But since 1999 new evidence has seriously weakened the case that carbon

emissions are the main cause of global warming, and by 2007 the evidence was pretty conclusive that carbon played only a minor role and was not the main cause of the recent global warming. There has not been a public debate about the causes of global warming and most of the public and our decision makers are not aware of the most basic salient facts:

"1. The greenhouse signature is missing. We have been looking and measuring for years, and cannot find it.

"Each possible cause of global warming has a different pattern of where in the planet the warming occurs first and the most. The signature of an increased greenhouse effect is a hot spot about 10km up in the atmosphere over the tropics. We have been measuring the atmosphere for decades using radiosondes: weather balloons with thermometers that radio back the temperature as the balloon ascends through the atmosphere. They show no hot spot. Whatsoever.

"If there is no hot spot then an increased greenhouse effect is not the cause of global warming. So we know for sure that carbon emissions are not a significant cause of the global warming. If we had found the greenhouse signature then I would be an alarmist again.

"When the signature was found to be missing in 2007 (after the latest IPCC report), alarmists objected that maybe the readings of the radiosonde thermometers might not be accurate and maybe the hot spot was there but had gone undetected. Yet hundreds of radiosondes have given the same answer, so statistically it is not possible that they missed the hot spot.

"Recently the alarmists have suggested we ignore the radiosonde thermometers, but instead take the radiosonde wind measurements, apply a theory about wind shear, and run the results through their computers to estimate the temperatures. They then say that the results show that we cannot rule out the presence of a hot spot. If you believe that you'd believe anything.

"2. There is no evidence to support the idea that carbon emissions cause significant global warming. None. There is plenty of evidence that global warming has occurred, and theory suggests that carbon emissions should raise temperatures (though by how much is hotly disputed) but there are no observations by anyone that implicate carbon emissions as a significant cause of the recent global warming.

"3. The satellites that measure the world's temperature all say that the warming trend ended in 2001, and that the temperature has dropped about 0.6C in the past year (to the temperature of 1980). Land-based temperature readings are corrupted by the "urban heat island" effect: urban areas encroaching on thermometer stations warm the micro-climate around the thermometer, due to vegetation changes, concrete, cars, houses. Satellite data is the only temperature data we can trust, but it only goes back to 1979. NASA reports only land-based data, and reports a modest warming trend and recent cooling. The other three global temperature records use a mix of satellite and land measurements, or satellite only, and they all show no warming since 2001 and a recent cooling.

“4. The new ice cores show that in the past six global warmings over the past half a million years, the temperature rises occurred on average 800 years before the accompanying rise in atmospheric carbon. Which says something important about which was cause and which was effect.

“None of these points are controversial. The alarmist scientists agree with them, though they would dispute their relevance. The last point was known and past dispute by 2003, yet Al Gore made his movie in 2005 and presented the ice cores as the sole reason for believing that carbon emissions cause global warming. In any other political context our cynical and experienced press corps would surely have called this dishonest and widely questioned the politician's assertion.

“Until now the global warming debate has merely been an academic matter of little interest. Now that it matters, we should debate the causes of global warming. So far that debate has just consisted of a simple sleight of hand: show evidence of global warming, and while the audience is stunned at the implications, simply assert that it is due to carbon emissions.

“In the minds of the audience, the evidence that global warming has occurred becomes conflated with the alleged cause, and the audience hasn't noticed that the cause was merely asserted, not proved. If there really was any evidence that carbon emissions caused global warming, don't you think we would have heard all about it ad nauseam by now?

“The world has spent \$50 billion on global warming since 1990, and we have not found any actual evidence that carbon emissions cause global warming. Evidence consists of observations made by someone at some time that supports the idea that carbon emissions cause global warming. Computer models and theoretical calculations are not evidence, they are just theory.

“What is going to happen over the next decade as global temperatures continue not to rise? The Labor Government [of Australia] is about to deliberately wreck the economy in order to reduce carbon emissions. If the reasons later turn out to be bogus, the electorate is not going to re-elect a Labor government for a long time. When it comes to light that the carbon scare was known to be bogus in 2008, the ALP [Australian Labor Party] is going to be regarded as criminally negligent or ideologically stupid [not if the media continues to suppress the truth] for not having seen through it. And if the Liberals support the general thrust of their actions, they will be seen likewise.

“The onus should be on those who want to change things to provide evidence for why the changes are necessary. The Australian public is eventually going to have to be told the evidence anyway [not so—even as the world cools, they keep blaming any changes in any direction on Global Warming], so it might as well be told before wrecking the economy.”

Dr. Evans doesn't understand that there are other hidden agendas at work here that have nothing to do with solving any real problems. This is not about saving the planet but all about creating a false crisis that allows for government intervention and control of energy. The same forces that have foisted this massive hoax upon the public will use their ample resources and control of the media to ensure that the truth never gets out. The PTB have very

imaginative ways of explaining away almost anything to a dumbed-down populace with marginal abilities to analyze.

Even the claim that the Polar Bear population is declining due to global warming is bogus. As the UK Telegraph reports, “Over the coming days a curiously revealing event will be taking place in Copenhagen. Top of the agenda at a meeting of the Polar Bear Specialist Group (set up under the International Union for the Conservation of Nature/Species Survival Commission) will be the need to produce a suitably scary report on how polar bears are being threatened with extinction by man-made global warming.

“This is one of a steady drizzle of events planned to stoke up alarm in the run-up to the UN's major conference on climate change in Copenhagen next December. But one of the world's leading experts on polar bears has been told to stay away from this week's meeting, specifically because his views on global warming do not accord with those of the rest of the group.

“Dr Mitchell Taylor has been researching the status and management of polar bears in Canada and around the Arctic Circle for 30 years, as both an academic and a government employee. More than once since 2006 he has made headlines by insisting that polar bear numbers, far from decreasing, are much higher than they were 30 years ago. Of the 19 different bear populations, almost all are increasing or at optimum levels, only two have for local reasons modestly declined.

“Dr Taylor agrees that the Arctic has been warming over the last 30 years. But he ascribes this not to rising levels of CO₂ – as is dictated by the computer models of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and believed by his PBSG colleagues – but to currents bringing warm water into the Arctic from the Pacific and the effect of winds blowing in from the Bering Sea.”

As for the new legislation itself Peter Schiff weighs in: “Today the House voted on ‘cap and trade’ legislation. Disguised as an environmental bill, this proposal would merely be another gigantic tax. The lion's share of the new revenue is already committed to politically connected special interests that will reap windfalls at everyone else's expense. To make matters worse, the bill before Congress amounts to a blank slate, with the EPA empowered to draft the details in any manner they see fit. If Congress is going to shoot the economy in the knee, they should at least be required to pull the trigger themselves.

“‘Cap and trade’ will do nothing to reduce pollution [even assuming CO₂ is a pollutant, which it is not], yet it will drive up production costs throughout the economy – rendering us even less globally competitive that we are today. In addition to the huge cost of paying the tax, its enforcement involves the creation of an entire new bureaucracy, the costs of which will be borne by American consumers in the form of higher [utility] prices.

Peter Orvetting calls the “American Clean Energy and Security” Act a “rip-off,” and reveals the typical political machinations that go on in Congress to get bad bills passed. “On Friday evening, the House of Representatives passed the American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES), a well-intentioned but misbegotten Frankenstein monster of a bill intended to combat climate change. Republicans Mary Bono Mack, Mike Castle, Mark Kirk, Frank LoBiondo, John McHugh, Dave Reichert, and Chris Smith joined

211 Democrats to put the bill over the top 219-212. Showing the profiles in courage typical of elected politicians, about three dozen Democrats hung back during the roll call until passage was certain, waiting until they could safely vote no without riling their party's leaders [a typical tactic of politicians who want to later be seen as having opposed something they go along with but know is eventually going to turn out bad].

“As its sponsors struggled to make it palatable to representatives from energy-producing states, the bill swelled from 942 pages to just over 1,200, leaving undecided members little time to digest the new material. This brings to mind Rep. John Conyers's admission to Michael Moore that members of Congress ‘don't really read most of the bills’ they vote for, because it would ‘slow down the legislative process.’

“Two weeks after his election as president, Barack Obama said, ‘Few challenges facing America and the world are more urgent than combating climate change. The science is beyond dispute and the facts are clear.’ Shortly thereafter, more than 100 scientists signed a newspaper advertisement responding, ‘With all due respect Mr. President, that is not true.’ The scientists [actually, numbering over 30,000] from places as varied and esteemed as Los Alamos National Laboratory, the American Physical Society, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Princeton University, and the University of Pennsylvania, said the case for alarm regarding climate change is grossly overstated.’

“But even many who are not skeptical about global warming found things to dislike in ACES. Rep. Dennis Kucinich, who voted against it, said, ‘It won't address the problem. In fact, it might make the problem worse.’ Kucinich faulted the bill's ‘Enron-style accounting methods’ and allocation of \$60 billion for Carbon Capture and Sequestration, ‘a single technology which may or may not work.’ Kucinich faulted the corporate welfare embedded in the bill, saying that the ‘trillion dollar carbon derivatives market will help Wall Street investors,’ with any benefits ‘passed through coal companies and other large corporations, on whom we will rely to pass on the savings [an important point, and demonstrates how the big boys always find a way to profit from government perverse incentives].’

“‘I take climate change seriously,’ libertarian economist Megan McArdle wrote last week. But she said the projections for ACES's ‘effect on global warming are entirely negligible,’ and any hope that U.S. passage of the bill will ‘persuade China and India to get on board’ is ‘entirely wishful thinking on the part of American environmentalists. China is not going to let its citizens languish in subsistence farming because 30 years from now, some computer models say there will be some not-well-specified bad effects from high temperatures. Nor is India.’

“While the Congressional Budget Office says ACES will drive up the average family's energy bill by about \$175 per year by 2020, that does not take into account the larger economic cost. A Center for Data Analysis study concludes ACES will hurt the gross domestic product by \$9.4 trillion by 2035 and cost the average family \$1,241 per year. That's because, as the Wall Street Journal put it last week, ‘the whole point of cap and trade is to hike the price of electricity and gas so that Americans will use less. These higher prices will show up not just in electricity bills or at the gas

station but in every manufactured good, from food to cars.’ A British analysis finds the average family there is paying nearly \$1,300 a year for carbon-cutting programs that were introduced just a few years ago.

“As Obama himself said during his run for the Democratic presidential nomination, ‘Under my plan of a cap and trade system, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket. Businesses would have to retrofit their operations. That will cost money. They will pass that cost onto consumers.’ Meanwhile, reductions in consumer spending will necessarily mean a decline in production which could eliminate more than 1.1 million jobs. This is an awful lot to pay for legislation that will not reduce global warming and will not encourage other major economic powers to become more environmentally conscious. Maybe next time, Congress should read the bill before voting on it.”

Tim Ball writing for the Canadian Free Press covers why alternative energies are a long way from replacing cheap and effective nuclear and fossil fuel technology.

“On June 23 Obama said, ‘This energy bill will create a set of incentives that will spur the development of new sources of energy, including wind, solar, and geothermal power.’ These currently produce only 3.9 percent of US energy. Wind and solar have severe limitations because they require 100 percent back up from conventional sources. They cannot replace a sufficient portion of current energy needs to supply even a dramatically reduced demand [and the cost per unit of generating power is so much higher than fuel or nuclear generating plants, that it is extremely inefficient to look to these technologies as a total replacement].

“Obama's said, ‘At a time of great fiscal challenges, this legislation is paid for by the polluters who currently emit the dangerous carbon emissions that contaminate the water we drink and pollute the air we breathe.’ This is false. He incorrectly substitutes carbon for CO₂ which is not a pollutant for air or water; it occurs naturally in both. It's true that industries producing CO₂ will initially pay through Cap and Trade but they will pass the costs to the consumer. A critical question is who pays when all the ‘polluters’ are out of business?

“Coal currently produces 46.8 percent of US energy. Obama identified it as his main target during the campaign. ‘What I've said is that we would put a cap-and-trade system in place that is more—that is as aggressive if not more aggressive than anybody else's out there, so if somebody wants to build a coal-powered plant, they can, it's just that it will bankrupt them because they're going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted.’ If they go out of business as Obama expects, the economy will collapse as industries dependent on the energy disappear. Ironically alternative energies will also suffer because the 100 percent backup they require will not be available.

“A report from Britain about attempts to replace traditional energy with renewables notes, ‘Britain is already struggling to meet its ambitious target of supplying 10% of electricity needs from renewables by 2010 and 15% by 2015. Today's figure is about 2%.’ Once you realize the renewable strategy is not working how quickly can you recover?

“The big question is whether the UK can act fast enough to tackle the looming crisis. Even if the government’s nuclear plans remain intact, it could be at least 10 years before the first new nuclear station is ready. A typical coal or gas-fired project could take between three and five years to construct. Recovery potential is worse in the US because regulations extend construction time for nuclear plants and environmentalists will do everything to block coal plants. Meanwhile economies of these countries suffer even though they didn’t do anything as drastic as Obama proposes. Recovery can’t possibly occur within Obama’s first term, which may make it his last.

“Will the Obama policy work any better? NO, because it is based on the same lie other countries used that CO2 is a problem and made worse by using deception of inaccurate scientific terminology. He then guarantees failure with policies that have already failed. So D. H. Lawrence was wrong in Obama’s case. You can’t trust the teller or the tale. There is no question Obama is clever but as Goethe said, ‘A clever man commits no minor blunders.’ His climate and energy policies are blunders of devastating proportions” Well said!

I’ll let Congressman Ron Paul have the final say: “The Cap and Trade Bill HR 2454 was voted on last Friday. Proponents claim this bill will help the environment, but what it really does is put another nail in the economy’s coffin. The idea is to establish a national level of carbon dioxide emissions, and sell pollution permits to industry as the Catholic Church used to sell indulgences to sinners. HR 2454 also gives federal bureaucrats new power to regulate a wide variety of household appliances, such as light bulbs and refrigerators, and further distorts the market by providing more of your tax money to auto companies. The administration has pointed to Spain as a shining example of this type of progressive energy policy. Spain has been massively diverting capital from the private sector into politically favored environmental projects for the better part of a decade, and many in Washington apparently like what they see. However, under no circumstances should anyone serious about economic recovery emulate an economy that is now approaching 20 percent unemployment, where every green job created, eliminated 2.2 real jobs and cost around \$800,000 each! The real inconvenient truth is that the cost of government regulations, taxes, fees, red tape and bureaucracy is a considerable expense that has to be considered when companies decide where to do business and how many people they can afford to hire. Increasing governmental burden directly causes capital flight and job losses, as Spain has learned. In this global economy its easy enough for businesses to relocate to countries that are more politically friendly to economic growth. If our government continues to kick the economy while its down, it will be a long time before it gets back up.”

This entire Global Warming series of solutions will exacerbate and make worse the prospect for economic recovery. But that, of course, will merely allow for yet further government intervention. As Harry Browne, the former Libertarian Party candidate for president, used to say: “the government is great at breaking your leg, handing you a crutch, and saying, ‘You see, without me you couldn’t walk.’”

THE MEDIA IS GLOBALIST, NOT LEFT OR RIGHT

The Left is always arguing that there is a vast right-wing conspiracy in the media, and the Right feels it is a left-wing

controlled media. Actually, they are both wrong. It’s a globalist controlled media that has long pandered to the Left, but has also learned to create a new false brand of Right (Fox News et al) who still promote the government agenda. There is no better evidence of this than the startling news that the Washington Post has fired one of its best liberal columnists, and covered up the real reason why.

Glen Greenwald writing for Salon.com is sure there must be a right-wing conspiracy going on at the Post. “One of the rarest commodities in the establishment media is someone who was a vehement critic of George Bush and who now, applying their principles consistently, has become a regular critic of Barack Obama -- i.e., someone who criticizes Obama from what is perceived as ‘the Left’ rather than for being a Terrorist-Loving Socialist Muslim. It just got a lot rarer, as The Washington Post -- at least according to Politico’s Patrick Gavin -- just fired WashingtonPost.com columnist, long-time Bush critic and Obama watchdog (i.e., a real journalist) Dan Froomkin.

“What makes this firing so bizarre and worthy of inquiry is that, as Gavin notes, Froomkin was easily one of the most linked-to and cited Post columnists. At a time when newspapers are relying more and more on online traffic, the Post just fired the person who, in 2007, wrote 3 out of the top 10 most-trafficked columns. In publishing that data, Media Bistro used this headline: ‘The Post’s Most Popular Opinions (Read: Froomkin).’ Isn’t that an odd person to choose to get rid of? Following the bottomless path of self-pity of the standard right-wing male -- as epitomized by Pete Hoekstra’s comparison of House Republicans to Iranian protesters and yet another column by Pat Buchanan decrying the systematic victimization of the white male in America -- Charles Krauthammer last night said that Obama critics on Fox News are ‘a lot like [Hugo Chavez] Caracas where all the media, except one, are state run.’”

“But right-wing polemicists like Krauthammer are all over the media. In addition to his Rupert Murdoch perch at Fox, Krauthammer remains as a regular columnist at the Post, alongside fellow right-wing Obama haters such as Bill Kristol, George Will, Jim Hoagland, Michael Gerson and Robert Kagan [all globalists and neocons, not true Right-wing] -- as well as a whole bevy of typical, banal establishment spokespeople who are highly supportive of whatever the permanent Washington establishment favors (David Ignatius, Fred Hiatt, Ruth Marcus, David Broder, Richard Cohen, Howie Kurtz, etc. etc.). And that’s to say nothing of the regular Op-Ed appearances by typical Krauthammer-mimicking neoconservative voices such as John Bolton, Joe Lieberman, and Douglas Feith -- and the Post Editorial Page itself.

“Notably, Froomkin just recently had a somewhat acrimonious exchange with the oh-so-oppressed Krauthammer over torture, after Froomkin criticized Krauthammer’s explicit endorsement of torture and Krauthammer responded by calling Froomkin’s criticisms ‘stupid.’ And now -- weeks later -- Froomkin is fired by the Post while the persecuted Krauthammer, comparing himself to endangered journalists in Venezuela, remains at the Post, along with countless others there who think and write just like he does: i.e., standard neoconservative pabulum. Froomkin was previously criticized for being ‘highly opinionated and liberal’ by Post ombudsman Deborah Howell (even as she refused to criticize blatant right-wing journalists). All of this underscores a critical and

oft-overlooked point: what one finds virtually nowhere in the establishment press are those who criticize Obama not in order to advance their tawdry right-wing agenda but because the principles that led them to criticize Bush compel similar criticism of Obama.

“Rachel Maddow is one of the few prominent media figures who will interview and criticize Democratic politicians ‘from the Left’ (and it’s hardly a coincidence that it was MSNBC’s decision to give Maddow her own show -- rather than the endless array of right-wing talk show hosts plaguing television for years -- which prompted a tidal wave of ‘concern’ over whether cable news was becoming ‘too partisan’). In general, however, those who opine from the Maddow/Froomkin perspective are a very endangered species, and it just became more endangered as the Post fires one if its most popular, talented, principled and substantive columnists.” Indeed. All Greenwald’s concerns are easily explained when one understands how the globalists use both Left and Right to continue down the same semi-socialist road leading to more Global governance and solutions.

SOTOMAYOR A BOHEMIAN GROVE WANNABEE

It is interesting to note that a club for high powered women executives has emerged with the explicit purpose of mimicking the male-only power club the top insiders have joined in order to further their Faustian pacts and secret deliberations. Supreme Court nominee Sonya Sotomayor is (or was until recently) a member of the Belizean Grove—a women’s version of the infamous Bohemian Grove—even though the aspiring women insiders have yet to acquire a permanent piece of land comparable to the northern California location of the all-male Bohemian Grove. For now they jet-set down to Belize in Central America for their meetings and extra-curricular dubious activities.

The AP reported, “Judge Sonia Sotomayor, President Obama’s nominee for the Supreme Court, resigned Friday from an elite women’s club after Republicans questioned her membership. In a letter to Senators Patrick J. Leahy, Democrat of Vermont, and Jeff Sessions, Republican of Alabama, Judge Sotomayor said she was convinced that the club, the Belizean Grove, did not practice ‘invidious discrimination’ and that her membership in it did not violate judicial ethics.

“The Belizean Grove bills itself as women’s answer to the 130-year-old all-male Bohemian Club in California. The men’s club owns a 2,500-acre camping area in Northern California called the Grove. Chief Justice Earl Warren belonged to the club beginning in the 1940s, before he joined the court and long before the federal judiciary adopted a code of conduct.”

A lot of other powerful men have also been members of the Bohemian Club, whose roster of membership is a closely guarded secret—as are its meetings, occasional orgies, and Satanic cult rituals—including many US presidents and Congressmen. I have long maintained that conspirators use such clubs as recruiting grounds and training grounds for future insiders. Sotomayor’s membership in a club trying to mimic for women what the grove for the most powerful male conspirators in the nation does is more evidence that this is a controlled individual who seeks to be one with the Powers That Be. That should be of more concern to those scrutinizing her judicial credentials than any individual court ruling.

OBAMA PANDERS TO GAYS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

The US has gone a long way down the path to moral corruption when gays are openly invited to the White House. A lot of conservatives did not know that there was a large contingency of gays in the Reagan White House, and that group was more than just openly tolerated by the top Reagan staff. Gays figured prominently in the first Bush administration as well and increased dramatically under Bill Clinton. George Bush hired lots of gays, but always kept it under wraps, knowing that he couldn’t openly champion their cause without alienating conservatives.

Obama, who most likely is gay or bi-sexual, given the ample testimony of one of his former gay partners, Larry Sinclair, still has to be careful about moving too quickly to promote the gay agenda—causing no small fallout and dissatisfaction within the Gay activist community. As the Washington Post noted, “President Obama opened the doors of the White House to hundreds of gay and lesbian leaders yesterday, continuing his cautious outreach to a constituency that has loudly criticized his efforts on their behalf.”

I have no doubt that Obama has a full slate of gay “rights” legislation ready to press upon Congress, but he’s playing it very careful while pushing the envelope on other dangerous and socialist issues like Health Care Reform and Cap and Trade. That matches his reassuring words to homosexual leaders: “We’ve been in office six months now. I suspect that by the time this administration is over, I think you guys will have pretty good feelings about the Obama administration.”

IRAQIS CELEBRATE US WITHDRAWAL A BIT TOO SOON

As Iraqis jubilantly displayed their pleasure at the withdrawal of US troops from Iraqi cities, it is important to realize that US troops are still manning major fortified checkpoints and have total control over the green zone. It is also important to understand that the US paid off the insurgency to make the surge appear successful. Now that those payments have stopped, will civil war return? Very likely, especially as the Iraqi oil contract offerings were not well received by international oil companies. Not only were the terms too tight and one sided, but the Parliament hasn’t even passed an oil law yet stipulating how the oil revenues will be divided up between the various competing regions of Iraq—a recipe for conflict down the line.

Chris Floyd comments on the surge and pull back in Iraq: “The levels of violence did drop from the horrific heights of 2006 and 2007 -- again, partly because the American-assisted ethnic cleansing had been so successful. (In much the same way, there was a significant drop in Nazi violence against Jews in, say, Poland -- after the Nazis had killed most of the Jews in Poland.) But the violence in Iraq never went away; the conquered land remained one of the most dangerous places on earth, and very few of the 4 million refugees felt safe enough to return home. (And in many cases, their ‘ethnically cleansed’ homes were no longer available to them.) And of course, the million dead are still dead -- and the millions more maimed, broken, ruined, grieved and traumatized are still suffering.

“And now that the Americans and their Iraqi clients have reneged on their payoff deal with the Sunni insurgents they bribed to keep quiet during the surge, we are seeing the inevitable ‘uptick’ in

violence (to borrow Joe Biden's atrociously dismissive term for the coming slaughter in Obama's Afghanistan 'surge'). More than 150 people have been killed in just two bombings of Shi'ite sites in the past five days. And right on cue, the Obama Administration trots out the same old platitudes: 'Nothing to worry about, nothing to see here, things are just hunky-dorry, don't sweat the small stuff, it's all good.' The Obama mouthpiece at the Pentagon, Geoff Morrell, then tried to blame the 'sporadic' mass slaughters on the 'Status of Forces Agreement,' which calls for American troops to withdraw from Iraqi cities by the end of June. This is all part of an overall 'withdrawal' plan concocted by the Bush Regime and their client Maliki, and adopted, with only the slightest modifications, by Barack Obama as his own.

"Naturally, both the 'withdrawal from cities' this month and the promised 'withdrawal of all combat troops' from the country in August 2010 are riddled with 'exceptions.' For example, Americans will remain thoroughly ensconced in strategic points inside the city of Baghdad (not least in the massive Crusader fortress they are building in the Green Zone), while continuing to 'assist' Iraqi military operations in all Iraqi cities. And of course, the long-range 'withdrawal' plan will leave tens of thousands of American troops on the ground in Iraq -- again, 'assisting' and 'training' Iraqi forces."

MORE EVIDENCE AL QAEDA IS A CONTROLLED US BLACK OPERATION

Wayne Madsen in his recent contribution to the Online Journal reviewed a whistleblower's tip adding to the evidence that US black operations continues to fund and supply al Qaeda insurgents in Iraq with foreign fighters, money and equipment. The weapons connection was revealed when several hundred thousand AK-47 automatic rifles the US purchased via black market sources and shipped to Iraq went missing. Sure they did! How do you "lose" that many weapons? And, who were the rifles intended for? The Iraqi army has an excess of AK-47, and allied troops serving in Iraq all have their own weapons. The US story doesn't add up.

"Wayne Madsen Reports (WMR) has learned from an intelligence source who served in 2007 at the Tallil Air Base in Iraq, that United States intelligence services imported Afghan mercenaries into Iraq in order to attack Iraqi civilians and military personnel, as well as coalition forces, including U.S. service personnel. The Afghans were recruited from Taliban ranks and were paid for their services in Iraq. WMR has learned that during 2007, Iraqi police stopped a truck hauling a 40-foot trailer on the Kerrada Bridge in Baghdad. When the Iraqi police officers checked the truck's trailer, they were amazed to discover between 30 and 40 Afghan Taliban. They said they were brought into Iraq by the United States and were tasked with stirring up trouble in Iraq, much of it ascribed by U.S. military commanders as the work of the dubiously-named Tanzim Qaidat al-Jihad fi Bilad al-Rafidayn (Organization of Jihad's Base in the Country of the Two Rivers) or more commonly known as 'Al Qaeda of Mesopotamia.' The Iraqi police were told by senior U.S. military commanders on the scene to allow the Afghani insurgents to depart the Kerrada Bridge without any further hindrance. [END]