

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Manufacturing Dissent

Making the Public Mind

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst

Manufacturing Dissent

Copyright Notice

Copyright © 2003-2022 by Zahir Ebrahim.

All rights reserved.

Words: 99176 | Pages: 258 | 8.5 x 11.0 | March 19, 2022

Published by Project Humanbeingsfirst™

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons

PDF URL: <https://tinyurl.com/Manufacturing-Dissent-ZE-3>

Copyright © Zahir Ebrahim. Full permission to copy, repost, and reprint, in its entirety, unmodified and unedited, for any purpose, in any reproduction medium, granted, provided the PDF Source URL and this copyright notice are also reproduced verbatim as part of this license, and not doing so may be subject to copyright license violation infringement claims pursuant to remedies noted at <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap5.html>. All figures, images, quotations, and excerpts are used without permission based on non-profit “fair-use” for personal education and research use only in the greater public interest consistent with the understanding of laws noted at <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.html>. Partial replication or dissemination of this book with any page omitted is an infringement. Any use beyond “fair-use” requires written consent from all copyright holders. The Ebook edition may not be sold. **Ebook edition is for Gratis Distribution Only.** Ebook edition may be printed for non-profit personal use and gratis give-away. All web links are restored through Internet Archive's Wayback Machine. Full copyright notice and disclaimers at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200312/http://humanbeingsfirst.org/#Copyright> , <https://web.archive.org/web/20200325/http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/#Legal-N-Things>.

PDF With Images Generated on Saturday, March 19, 2022 12:00 AM

258 1542 99176 610019 5 47 0 7672 Rev 3

“Beware of that man for he has written a book!”

By this Author

1. [BOOK Manufacturing Dissent](#)
2. [BOOK NAKBA 2020: World Order / Zionism Palestinian-Goyim Studies](#)
3. [BOOK The Next Global Menace Ali Baba Plusplus: Alien Invasion](#)
4. [BOOK The Useful Idiot's Guide To Pandemic 2020](#)
5. [BOOK The Pakistan Decapitation Papers - A Report On The Banality Of Evil](#)
6. [Pamphlet Secular Humanism: Bane of Civilizations From Secular Humanism To Islam - The Only Solution](#)
7. [Pamphlet Open Guidance to Imran Khan Reimagining Pakistan Project ReGenesis](#)
8. [Pamphlet Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People: The Global Warming Psyops That People Don't Get](#)
9. [Pamphlet The White Man's Burden](#)
10. [Pamphlet Epilogue: 10th Anniversary of Benazir Bhutto's Assassination - Pakistan on the chopping block in 2018?](#)
11. [Pamphlet Jerusalem: Reality vs Impracticality – The Protection Racket of the Jewish State](#)
12. [BOOK The Poor-Man's Guide To Modernity - Oligarchic Primacy For World Government](#)
13. [BOOK Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam - Muslims And Imperial Mobilization](#)
14. [BOOK Case Study Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to Hijack? Volume I.](#)
15. [Pamphlet Thus Spake Holy Qur'an Volume I On Schisms](#)
16. [BOOK Prisoners of the Cave, 2003](#)
17. [Pamphlet Undoing The Theft Of Palestine](#)
18. [Pamphlet The Invisible House of Rothschild](#)
19. [Pamphlet How To Return To Palestine This Day Forward 15 May 2010](#)
20. [Report Whistleblowing Masterpiece of Plagiarism in Pakistan with System-wide Collusion - Case Study in National Loss of Ethics](#)

The Powers That Be shut down Project Humanbeingsfirst websites hosted on Google Blogger on the morning of March 26, 2020, removing all its websites. Its project email account humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com is also no longer accessible as of that date.

Wayback Machine has a copy

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document](#)
- [Project Humanbeingsfirst Home](#)
- [Faith - To Inspire And To Indoctrinate](#)
- [On Islam](#)
- [Pakistan-Politico: The Divine Destiny of Pakistan](#)
- [Prisoners of the Cave](#)
- [Sites PDF-Index](#)

Manufacturing Dissent

“The best way to control the opposition is to lead it ourselves.”

This page is intentionally blank

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

TOC

Table of Contents

TOC	Table of Contents	i
Preface	What is Engineering Consent – The Social Engineers' Dream and the Public's Enslavement	iii
I	Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception	1
II	Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird	9
III	The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky – Master of Controlled Opposition	27
IV	The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers – Masters of Controlled Opposition	55
V	Gatekeepers of Dissent From Left to Right	85
VI	Controlled Dissent – Lying by Omission on Oligarchic Rule Behind the Scenes	91
VII	Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare – The Mighty Wurlitzer Engineering Consent	107
VIII	Manufacturing Consent – The Open Democratic Society Free Press Template	179
Epilogue	Swallowing The Red Pill – How deep is the rabbit hole?	227
About	About the author	241
	Backcover	pg

This page is intentionally blank

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Preface

What is Engineering Consent

The Social Engineers' Dream and the Public's Enslavement

The terminology “Engineering Consent” refers to the cunning discipline of perception management for mass behavior control. That exercise is ancient and Plato addressed it most poignantly as the *Simile of the Cave* in his now 2500 year old book *The Republic*. In modernity, that exercise in mass behavior control in which the public voluntarily offers a measure of their consent for someone else's agenda, whether being pursued overtly or covertly is immaterial, whether noble or ignoble is also immaterial, whether it's in the public interest or against public interest is again immaterial, has been formalized into two separate components: (1) “soft” social engineering and (2) “hard” social engineering. There is often a compartmentalized coordination between the two with several degrees of cellular separation such that all interconnections can be plausibly denied and causality turned on its head. Soft social engineering is rooted in soft “scholarship”, meaning, learned discourses, academic treatise, ideology, books, news media, pulpits, education system, religion, self-deception, et. al., all better served by the catchall term “propaganda” which simply means to make the public mind according to someone else's wishes while letting the public pretend that they made their own mind. It is a manipulative exercise. It is the irresistible natural calling of shepherds and turns on the axis of authority figures. At the end of the day, this exercise is still of mere words however. It is like the shepherd without his faithful sheep dog, blowing his whistle to which the sheep respond only by force of habit. It works well for old sheep, but new untrained sheep can pose a problem. And after a long absence of the sheep dog, even old sheep become hard to motivate by merely blowing the whistle.

As Adolph Hitler had well understood, words alone are often not sufficient to mobilize a people.

Words have to be backed by “events” or “acts”, real or imagined, that induce public horror in support of propaganda. Hard social engineering is rooted in hard mobilizing “events”, the sheep dog equivalent, meaning, covert-ops, false-flag, warfare, crisis situations, real or imagined threats and horrors whose impact the public can be made to feel, or anticipate with fear, and react to as predicted, often probabilistically by a new mathematical discipline called game theory which can statistically manipulate several variables simultaneously to predict behavior. The public mind is collectively maneuvered by the pied pipers to the point of a significant vocal number actually demanding the same solutions the controllers want to sell them in the first place as the panacea for solving the crisis situation. In advertising and marketing this is easily recognized by the business student as its bedrock discipline of “demand creation”. It is the foundation of a trillion dollar global advertising industry. The herd principle ensures its dispersion among the silent majority. The same ideas constitute the bedrock of social engineering for public governance but unfortunately most refuse to recognize it as such. In fact, as any shrewd observer expects, it is actively denied by the same pied pipers in order to not dilute its efficacy in making the public mind. That fiction has to be maintained for political purposes especially in a democracy where the electorate supposedly choose their rulers by popular vote of their own free will. Hitler explained this at great length in *Mein Kampf* (inter alia, see Vol. 2, Chapter VI), and created an entire ministry in the Third Reich under the leadership of Joseph Goebbels, Reichminister of Propaganda and National Enlightenment, to make the German public's mind. Today that function is decentralized, and far more sophisticated than under Nazi socialism which ruled its public mostly at the point of the bayonet.

Engineering the public's consent for the narrow agendas of the elite, the controllers outside the cave in Plato's allegory, is of course a game as old as hegemony, as old as empire. But today's modernity has introduced many erudite twists and turns with sophisticated political theories practiced upon the unsuspecting public mind (such as Machiavelli, Hegelian Dialectic, Big Brother Statism, Plausible Deniability, Limited Hangout, Manufacturing Consent and Manufacturing Dissent for different demographics). And the direct psychological (and biological) manipulation of both the irrational mind (the subconscious mind, catering to fears, desires, anxieties, the harnessing of which is by demand creation) and the cognitive mind (the conscious mind, cognitive infiltration by authority figures who sell big lies, half-truths, three-quarter truths, often wrapped in long-held beliefs and prejudices which make these appear to be true in group-think and in shared ethos, especially in moments of crisis when the normal brain functioning is already in shock and people congregate around those with whom they have shared beliefs and trust, and these deceit are subsequently belabored by authority figures and group-think pied pipers to eventually become the presuppositional facts and axioms underlying all popular narratives).

These exercises, run long enough, hard enough, with a continuous supply of *“high degree of*

doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification” as Zbigniew Brzezinski put it in his *American Mein Kampf*, *The Grand Chessboard*, and a whole new generation grows up believing myths to be historical fact. This is also the empirical foundation upon which Jews have been sold that they need Zionism and a militarized Jewish state in Palestine even if it means soiling their Jewish hands in the blood of its native inhabitants. It applies to all indoctrination systems spanning the gamut of education from classroom to religion to entertainment to nationalism et al.

All of this is the early stage discipline of social engineering --- mass behavior control with at least some measure of voluntary consent from the masses. Time is not far away when bio-chemical tampering of the brain and genetic manipulation of DNA may obsolete this early stage of behavior control as was depicted in Aldous Huxley's fable *Brave New World* in 1931. While fables are eruditely read even in high schools, this discipline of social engineering is not taught in universities except in disjoint bits and pieces in disconnected faculties. But it is researched and practiced as a unified whole almost universally, with military precision, for making the public mind. Its zenith has been reached in the United States psychological / biological warfare programs, far surpassing Europe's former dominance of the field in previous centuries. The biological and chemical tampering of the public's mind has been prognosticated for over half century. Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, America's National Security Advisor and the architect of the Carter Doctrine that gave to the USSR its Vietnam War in Afghanistan in Muslim blood, had observed in his 1970 sociological study of our scientific-technological era, titled: *Between Two Ages - America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, that:

“Life seems to lack cohesion as environment rapidly alters and human beings become increasingly manipulable and malleable. Everything seems more transitory and temporary: external reality more fluid than solid, the human being more synthetic than authentic. Even our senses perceive an entirely novel "reality"—one of our own making but nevertheless, in terms of our sensations, quite "real."* More important, there is already widespread concern about the possibility of biological and chemical tampering with what has until now been considered the immutable essence of man. Human conduct, some argue, can be predetermined and subjected to deliberate control. Man is increasingly acquiring the capacity to determine the sex of his children, to affect through drugs the extent of their intelligence, and to modify and control their personalities. Speaking of a future at most only decades away, an experimenter in intelligence control asserted, **"I foresee the time when we shall have the means and therefore, inevitably, the temptation to manipulate the behaviour and intellectual functioning of all the people through environmental and biochemical manipulation of the brain."** --- (pg. 12)

We have long been living in that era of mind-behavior manipulation. The proper functioning of our open democratic societies more than the totalitarian authoritarian ones, are increasingly dependent upon it. Aldous Huxley, as visiting professor at UC Berkeley in the spring semester in 1962, on the 30th anniversary of his Brave New World had made an ominous presentation to the students foreshadowing the mind-behavior control mechanisms being developed to get people to love their servitude. Titled: The Ultimate Revolution, Huxley observed that:

“You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: **that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.**”

The purpose of this book is to analyze only one small aspect of those techniques. The essays in this compendium on engineering consent, specifically, by manufacturing dissent, have appeared in the author's other compilations. All good words on paper that will remain still-born, for words alone can no more free the mind of its invisible chains than propaganda alone can shackle the mind. It takes a good measure of voluntary consent for both. The forces engineering consent shackle the public mind in the crafty way captured by the German philosopher Goethe nearly two centuries ago: **“None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.”** There are no similar social engineering forces in play for the benefit of liberating the mind from the matrix of behavior control. That calling must be unleashed from within, without help from social engineering.

California

Wednesday, March 16-19, 2022

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter I

Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception

The Master Social Science

Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science, and the real power of Western Democracy which famously permits dissent among its free peoples. Here is an example from a news headline in alternate media: “Government Insider: Bush Authorized 911 Attacks” – and the “Insider” surely “sleeps with the fishes”, right? Wrong. He moves about quite freely! How comes? Isn't he a great threat to those whom he rats on? The Dialectics of Infamy (also known as Ezra Pound's “Technique of Infamy”: invent not one but two or more lies to keep the public busy debating which of these is true) has something for everyone in the dissent-space. It caters to the needs and proclivities of every breed of emergent dissenting flock and every possibility of opposing thought. Everything except that which might actually be consequential in derailing “imperial mobilization” and effectively preempting incremental *fait accompli* of real agendas! Those who do pose real threats to these real agendas are trivially made to “sleep with the fishes” – from JFK to RFK to MLK to X!

The manipulation of the mainstream public to get them “United We Stand” is a well understood and rather banal social science today, often euphemistically labeled as “manufacturing consent”. From Roman Emperors to Hitler to President George W. Bush in the modernity du jour, all have expertly capitalized upon it. Zbigniew Brzezinski even expertly documented it with great finesse. “Prisoners of the Cave” entirely unraveled it as “Deception Point 911 And Its Greatest Democratic Enablers”.

The manipulation of the dissentstream however – the handful among any population who are the

thinking peoples, as Hitler had noted: “First, those who believe everything they read; Second, those who no longer believe anything; Third, those who critically examine what they read and form their judgments accordingly” – is the least understood.

Indeed, before we begin with the dissentstream, it is instructive to fully quote from the master of sociology himself who had insightfully identified the importance of the “First” type to Machiavellian state-craft, and the main target for manufacturing consent as “the crowd of simpletons and the credulous ... when the voting papers of the masses are the deciding factor”:

“In journalistic circles it is a pleasing custom to speak of the Press as a 'Great Power' within the State. As a matter of fact its importance is immense. One cannot easily overestimate it, for the Press continues the work of education even in adult life. Generally, readers of the Press can be classified into three groups:

First, those who believe everything they read; [type-1 demographics]

Second, those who no longer believe anything; [type-2 demographics]

Third, those who critically examine what they read and form their judgments accordingly. [type-3 demographics]

Numerically, the first group is by far the strongest, being composed of the broad masses of the people. Intellectually, it forms the simplest portion of the nation. It cannot be classified according to occupation but only into grades of intelligence. Under this category come all those who have not been born to think for themselves or who have not learnt to do so and who, partly through incompetence and partly through ignorance, believe everything that is set before them in print. To these we must add that type of lazy individual who, although capable of thinking for himself out of sheer laziness gratefully absorbs everything that others had thought over, modestly believing this to have been thoroughly done. The influence which the Press has on all these people is therefore enormous; for after all they constitute the broad masses of a nation. But, somehow they are not in a position or are not willing personally to sift what is being served up to them; so that their whole attitude towards daily problems is almost solely the result of extraneous influence. All this can be advantageous where public enlightenment is of a serious and truthful character, but great harm is done when scoundrels and liars take a hand at this work.

Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception

The second group is numerically smaller, being partly composed of those who were formerly in the first group and after a series of bitter disappointments are now prepared to believe nothing of what they see in print. They hate all newspapers. Either they do not read them at all or they become exceptionally annoyed at their contents, which they hold to be nothing but a congeries of lies and misstatements. These people are difficult to handle; for they will always be sceptical of the truth. Consequently, they are useless for any form of positive work.

The third group is easily the smallest, being composed of real intellectuals whom natural aptitude and education have taught to think for themselves and who in all things try to form their own judgments, while at the same time carefully sifting what they read. They will not read any newspaper without using their own intelligence to collaborate with that of the writer and naturally this does not set writers an easy task. Journalists appreciate this type of reader only with a certain amount of reservation.

Hence the trash that newspapers are capable of serving up is of little danger--much less of importance--to the members of the third group of readers. In the majority of cases these readers have learnt to regard every journalist as fundamentally a rogue who sometimes speaks the truth. Most unfortunately, the value of these readers lies in their intelligence and not in their numerical strength, an unhappy state of affairs in a period where wisdom counts for nothing and majorities for everything. Nowadays when the voting papers of the masses are the deciding factor; the decision lies in the hands of the numerically strongest group; that is to say the first group, the crowd of simpletons and the credulous.

It is an all-important interest of the State and a national duty to prevent these people from falling into the hands of false, ignorant or even evil-minded teachers. Therefore it is the duty of the State to supervise their education and prevent every form of offence in this respect. Particular attention should be paid to the Press; for its influence on these people is by far the strongest and most penetrating of all; since its effect is not transitory but continual. Its immense significance lies in the uniform and persistent repetition of its teaching. Here, if anywhere, the State should never forget that all means should converge towards the same end. It must not be led astray by the will-o'-the-wisp of so-called 'freedom of the Press', or be talked into neglecting its duty, and withholding from the nation that which is good and which does good. With ruthless determination the State must keep control of this instrument of popular education and

place it at the service of the State and the Nation.” --- (Mein Kampf, Adolph Hitler, Vol. 1, Chapter X, <http://gutenberg.net.au/ebooks02/0200601.txt>)

Thus it isn't accidental that Hitler remains the most studied Machiavellian sociologist at the Rand Corporation, and his Mein Kampf perhaps the favorite reading at the Pentagon and among its policy planners who are spread out in a hundred think-tanks along the Hudson and the Potomac. The propaganda techniques Hitler mastered however, did not originate with him, and he clearly attributed his profound wisdom to his antagonists' great prowess:

“On the other hand, British and American war propaganda was psychologically efficient. By picturing the Germans to their own people as Barbarians and Huns, they were preparing their soldiers for the horrors of war and safeguarding them against illusions. ...

From the enemy, however, a fund of valuable knowledge could be gained by those who kept their eyes open, whose powers of perception had not yet become sclerotic, and who during four-and-a-half years had to experience the perpetual flood of enemy propaganda.

The worst of all was that our people did not understand the very first condition which has to be fulfilled in every kind of propaganda; namely, a systematically one-sided attitude towards every problem that has to be dealt with. ...

The great majority of a nation is so feminine in its character and outlook that its thought and conduct are ruled by sentiment rather than by sober reasoning. This sentiment, however, is not complex, but simple and consistent. It is not highly differentiated, but has only the negative and positive notions of love and hatred, right and wrong, truth and falsehood. Its notions are never partly this and partly that. English propaganda especially understood this in a marvellous way and put what they understood into practice. They allowed no half-measures which might have given rise to some doubt.

Proof of how brilliantly they understood that the feeling of the masses is something primitive was shown in their policy of publishing tales of horror and outrages which fitted in with the real horrors of the time, thereby cleverly and ruthlessly preparing the ground for moral solidarity at the front, even in times of great defeats. Further, the way in which they pilloried the German enemy as solely responsible for the war--

Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception

which was a brutal and absolute falsehood--and the way in which they proclaimed his guilt was excellently calculated to reach the masses, realizing that these are always extremist in their feelings. And thus it was that this atrocious lie was positively believed. ...

The success of any advertisement, whether of a business or political nature, depends on the consistency and perseverance with which it is employed.

In this respect also the propaganda organized by our enemies set us an excellent example. It confined itself to a few themes, which were meant exclusively for mass consumption, and it repeated these themes with untiring perseverance. Once these fundamental themes and the manner of placing them before the world were recognized as effective, they adhered to them without the slightest alteration for the whole duration of the War. At first all of it appeared to be idiotic in its impudent assertiveness. Later on it was looked upon as disturbing, but finally it was believed.

But in England they came to understand something further: namely, that the possibility of success in the use of this spiritual weapon consists in the mass employment of it, and that when employed in this way it brings full returns for the large expenses incurred.

In England propaganda was regarded as a weapon of the first order, whereas with us it represented the last hope of a livelihood for our unemployed politicians and a snug job for shirkers of the modest hero type. ...

I learned something that was important at that time, namely, to snatch from the hands of the enemy the weapons which he was using in his reply. I soon noticed that our adversaries, especially in the persons of those who led the discussion against us, were furnished with a definite repertoire of arguments out of which they took points against our claims which were being constantly repeated. The uniform character of this mode of procedure pointed to a systematic and unified training. And so we were able to recognize the incredible way in which the enemy's propagandists had been disciplined, and I am proud to-day that I discovered a means not only of making this propaganda ineffective but of beating the artificers of it at their own work. Two years later I was master of that art." --- (Mein Kampf, Adolph Hitler, Vol. 2, Chapter VI)

Perhaps for Hitler, Edward Bernays' 1928 American classic "Propaganda" might have been the

favorite bedtime reading, nightly perusing its opening pages which of course begin with the fantastic observation:

“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.” --- (Edward Bernays, 1928, pg.1, Propaganda)

All and sundry among the scholars of empire have written books upon books on the many techniques for “manufacturing consent” – from Advertising and Marketing techniques to how it was done in the Third Reich to construct “United We Stand” out of the “crowd of simpletons and the credulous” – while the state-craft in their own democracies quietly practice it upon their own peoples laboring under the illusion of “freedom of the press” with “All the news that’s fit to print” all the time! But it isn’t particularly a secret, and is done quite openly, albeit quietly.

The manipulation of the intelligent conscionable ones however, the “Manufacturing of Dissent”, remains the most poorly analyzed master social science in the West, even though it is also the most secretly practiced black-art of modern democratic state-craft to effectively deal with the “Second” and “Third” groups of people who are typically the ones opposing the national security state’s war-mongering and inhuman policies.

Hitler attempted to win the “Third” group over to his side to be among the Third Reich’s ruling elite (if they were of the right racial makeup). Those whom he couldn’t attract, he ignored along with the “Second” group, on account of both of them being so minuscule in number. The most dangerous among them of course were simply made to “sleep with the fishes” by the SS. Hitler had chosen to exclusively focus his propaganda war-machine on “the crowd of simpletons and the credulous ... when the voting papers of the masses are the deciding factor”.

The Western system of democracy however, does not, and cannot, ignore any of the three groups because of its coveted Bill of Rights and the necessity to maintain the illusions of freedom and free-speech not just for its own domestic consumption, but as the *beacon of democracy* for other nations.

The “First” group is easy – and remain the focus of the pretty well understood “Manufacturing Consent” by the co-opting systems put in place by empire. Noam Chomsky of course made a career out of this neologism with his notable contribution in his book by that name, and was anointed by the

NYT as “arguably the most important intellectual alive” for his moral voice of dissent against the national security state. Because of his preeminence in the dissent space as its de facto lead opinion-maker with even mainstream news sources and publishing houses airing his views as freely as the alternate media and scholars in social sciences unable to write a paper without citing him, his brand of dissent is prominently dissected in this compendium. The other two demographic groups are also encouraged or co-opted to join 'empire' – and the majority among them willingly do so because of the immense riches and/or benefits to one's career and social standing that are to be had in voluntarily remaining silent (in the best case of complicity), and shilling for empire in sophisticated ways suited to their much higher intelligence capabilities (in the worst case as circus clowns of hectoring hegemons).

The remaining gadflies, non-conformists, and assorted rebel rousers in the second and third group become the focus of “Manufactured Dissent”. They are cleverly and continually put on the treadmill of engineered dissent that deliberately goes nowhere. Otherwise, left to their own free-thinking unco-opted devices, even small numbers can end up making a significant difference in the long run. Yes, even in the facade of Democracy, since it does constitute a non-linear system of empowered human action. It is not their direct action however that constitutes a significant threat, but the potential of their mobilizing impact among the minority of ordinary conscionable peoples in the larger society whom they might galvanize into efficacious action, that is the real threat. Astutely channeling dissenting energies towards inefficacy and clever red herrings, is the potent weapon system of choice for deployment among this rebellious group and their potential larger flock.

This is quite distinct from an open fascist oligarchy and open dictatorships with regimented and coerced human-will which leave little room for non-linearity of human action. In such blatantly ruled autocratic systems, it is only the majority coming together that can bring about any significant transformations – and that too, only through revolutionary means. Which is why the loci of direct manipulative control remains upon the majority peoples in such systems. And the tiny thinking minority is trivially silenced through the instilled fear crafted from disappearances, incarcerations, forced exiles, and “sleeps with the fishes” – the bread and butter of empirical state-craft in non democracies.

The devilishly sophisticated manipulation of public perceptions and public behavior employs the Technique of Infamy and the Dialectics of Deception to Machiavellianly engineer both consent and dissent that enables *fait accompli* to be orchestrated. *Ex post facto*, even if the deception and engineering of public's beliefs, opinions and behavior from behind the scenes is revealed, it cannot make any impact – for matters are now irreversible.

Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception

It is Project Humanbeingsfirst's profound intent that these matters be immediately corrected in all freedom-loving societies – for, indeed, intellectual freedoms and voicing dissent under constitutional protection of human rights that permit mobilizing against state tyranny without the fear of being disappeared or put on rendition flights, are all precious exercises in non-authoritarian regimes provided something useful and impactful can be done with it.

As matters stand, in virtually all democratic societies without any notable exception, these exercises are unable to make any substantial difference to state policy either in times of war or in times of peace. These exercises have mostly become steam-valves for releasing public angst and giving freedom-loving people the illusion of democratic empowerment. It is the master social science that few understand.

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter II

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

“The best way to control the opposition is to lead it ourselves.”



Caption Dissent Pied Piper Herdsman and Collection Agent for Type-2 Demographics – the rebellious 'empire is bad' and 'officialdom is lying' crowd of skeptics who 'believe nothing' and cannot be permitted to run uncontrolled in open democratic societies which constitutionally permit dissent. Image Pied Piper of Hamelin via wikipedia.

Just because someone takes an opposing stance does not necessarily make them a real opponent. The two sides may be in cahoots to corral the public mind, or the opposition may be contrived to put on a stage show, or fabricated to convince those reluctant of the chosen course of action, or co-opted knowing fully well which side of their bread is buttered. They are, whether wittingly as mercenaries and Superman, or unwittingly as useful idiots and stooges, all part and parcel of the gift of Mephistopheles to mankind. How does this gift work? Not by appearing repugnant to its audience so that the gift is instantly rejected by any sound of mind, but by appearing appealing and seductive based on the psyche of each individual, group, and group-think composition. This is so basic a real-world 101, so basic a realpolitik 101, so basic a Machiavelli 101, so basic a street-savvy 101, that the fact that one even has to state it explicitly, and repeatedly, just shows how little the modern public mind understands. How much it has been dumbed

down between *bread and circuses*, despite its well to do productive members often possessing superlative educational degrees and other professional *pay-stub earning qualifications*. So what is

real dissent? What is its purpose?

The whole aim of practical politics of dissent by genuine gadflies to power is to prevent the future fait accompli that is being engineered by 'history's actors' in the present. This is why genuine dissent, that with real teeth and non-zero efficacy, cannot be permitted to exist and flourish. It is instead replaced with manufactured dissent as an essential part of statecraft itself when the illusion of dissent and public opinion is to be maintained in a 'free' democratic society.

Rehearsing crimes of power after these crimes are fait accompli; after all the barbers in town already know it; after their disclosure as the narrative of official history through FOIA declassification, *whistle-blowing* and *deep-throat* leaks, and in posthumous confessional diaries of monumental war criminals, none of which really reveal any real secrets, or only do so ex post facto when it is already a fait accompli; is either the job of the professional historian who relies on officialdom to write the official history pre-sanctioned by power by what it chooses to document and what it chooses to make-believe to posterity, or of manufactured dissent!

Let the twain: a genuine intellectual gadfly vs. fabricated and manufactured dissent and its following of useful idiots, not be confused with each other!

The manufactured dissent con-man is the *Ubermensch* (Nietzsche's Superman for whom morality is utilitarian and mainly for controlling those with lesser intelligence) who echoes the axioms of power underneath his supercilious dissent with it, or tells the obvious truth ex post facto, to the applause of the instruments of power itself, while collecting all the well-intentioned activists and consciences around him as useful idiots. He is the collection-agent for power. He collects useful idiots around his dissent narrative that appears high-minded moral stance. His con job is to ensure that public's dissent and anger at the national security state's policies does not stray too far from the mainstream home that is enthusiastically supporting the state's policies in its oppositional effect. The world is full of such dissent artistes, a modern necessity to complement the manufacturing of consent; to cunningly constrain public opposition within acceptable limits when dissent is permitted in a 'free' society.

This brilliant Superman herdsman often comes anointed with super advanced degrees, honorary titles, accolades, is well-published, most cited, and speaks with an MIT, Harvard or Oxford accent. He is as powerful in his dissenting "United We Stand" message to his tiny herd as the Superman orator is in his "United We Stand" message to the mainstream herd. The Superman herdsman of dissent is the more brilliant twin in the Hegelian Dialectic of manufactured consent vs. manufactured dissent.

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

Manufactured dissent is also easy to spot. It almost always states the obvious – rather than the un-obvious. It cleverly keeps the real secrets secret or obfuscated by not going there. It focusses on the effects and stays silent on the cause. It usually also runs with the foxes while hunting with the hounds. It happily eats from the same plate that it purports to spit into. And the most avant-garde of the lot even run with infantile absurdities to make all dissent appear infantile and absurd in the eyes of the mainstream public, lest the latter inadvertently stray from their own home pastures. And since Adolph Hitler had empirically demonstrated the truth of his statement: “The great masses of people will more easily fall victims to a big lie than to a small one. Especially if it is repeated over and over.”, the Superman of dissent too repeats the same big lie of the establishment upon which consent is being engineered among the masses!

For instance, just look for all those who share the common establishment “truth”: OBL and Al Qaeda successfully invaded the most armed to the teeth superpower in the world on 9/11, magically hijacked four airliners in the air with box-cutter knives within a matter of an hour, rammed them into two tall buildings and magically demolished three in a feat of demolition which before that day had never been carried out in the entire written history of mankind. All this was planned and orchestrated by an Islamofascist Ali Baba from the Hindu Kush mountains armed to the teeth with cellphones and AK-47s, in collaboration with an illusive database named “Al Qaeda”. The names of the believers of this fantastic fable in the who's who of dissent is surprising. These include some of the biggest and most celebrated names in dissent to keep company with the Neo-cons, the Pentagon, the State Department, the World Bank, the IMF, the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, the United Nations and all its member countries, and the Bush-Obama Administrations: Noam Chomsky, Francis Boyle, the late Howard Zinn, former Congressman Ron Paul, Congressman Dennis Kucinich, Scott Ritter, Dennis Halliday, Michael Moore, Helen Caldicott, Robert Fisk, John Pilger, Greg Palast, Amy Goodman, Daniel Ellsberg, Nelson Mandela, Arundhatti Roy of India, Tariq Ali and Pervez Hoodbhoy of Pakistan, etc.

Once the big lie is cleverly conceded to officialdom without question, all dissent with empire's barbaric acts against its proclaimed enemies is effectively made futile: “either you are with us or with the terrorists” (George W. Bush). Because, as the empire is now given the license to arguably claim, it is only protecting itself from the diabolically brilliant and most superior foe that is even able to penetrate the strongest superpower on earth's super militarized defenses on its own native soil! Then dissent all you want – so long as you keep that core lie intact in all your adumbration: “No thank you.’ We can let him know that the people of the world do not need to choose between a Malevolent Mickey Mouse and the Mad Mullahs.” (Arundhatti Roy). The argument is cleverly moved away from forensically examining the crime as Sherlock Holmes might do, to the best way to deal

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

with the criminals by presupposing who the criminals are: 'they attack us because we have been over there ... I am suggesting that we listen to the people who attacked us ... ' (former congressman Ron Paul). Thus both, the establishment chiefs manufacturing consent, and the dissent chiefs manufacturing dissent, end up continually reinforcing the same presuppositions of the system, the same big lie; the former by openly advocating the big lie, the latter by openly refraining from challenging the big lie. Both are propagandists; the former by commission, the latter by omission. British essayist Aldous Huxley captured the implication of silence and the crime of omission most elegantly in his Preface to Brave New World:

“The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.” --- (Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to Brave New World, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

That is how the Superman herdsman leads the pack of useful idiots in manufactured dissent. He craftily lowers the “iron curtain” of ignorance between the masses and such facts or arguments as the system regards as undesirable or necessary to enforce. And he cleverly echoes the core lies of empire in toto, or presupposes them in his argumentative and tedious dissent. The focus is most craftily shifted from the crime to ex post facto anti-war critique of empire's “imperial mobilization” – after “imperial mobilization” is a fait accompli:

“Of course as I told you, I never believe the government, or rarely believe the government. Do I believe the government version of what happened? Well, I am skeptical. Do I believe that the government was in the conspiracy to do this? I don't know. I don't know enough about the situation, and the truth is, I don't care that much. That's past. ... the whole argument that the people are engaged in, about, was the government behind a conspiracy to blow up the two towers, to me that's a diversion from what we really have to do, deal with the fact that whatever, whoever was behind 9/11, the government took advantage of that, to take us to war, and to put us on a disastrous course, and it's that war, those wars, that disastrous course we have to deal with. I don't want to go back to the controversy that I think is endless controversy,

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

and just gets in the way of dealing with the immediate situation.” --- (Howard Zinn, November 18, 2008)

It is not merely a lucky coincidence for empire that the most prominent leaders of dissent all inevitably retain the big lie of empire intact, each according to their own genius mind. From the tag team of Noam Chomsky and the late Howard Zinn on the left, to the tag team of former US congressman Ron Paul and Fox News anchor Glenn Beck on the right – and a hundred and ten lauded names in between – the empire has the full gamut of respectable dissent field covered. There is something for every malcontent in the 31 flavors of dissent.

When brilliant antipodes, like the “vulgar propagandist” Prof. Bernard Lewis, and his nemesis, “arguably the most important intellectual alive”, Prof. Noam Chomsky, agree on a sacred “truth” of empire, then those with an iota of neurons still firing on all cylinders are provided the opportunity to ponder the non sequitur. A WWF wrestling game being broadcast on all channels: in the lower right hand corner is empire's greatest scholar from empire's greatest university, Princeton, and in the upper left hand corner is empire's greatest detractor from empire's greatest technion, MIT.... ; hmmm...., sounds like they both work for the same bosses and consent is being engineered with “Operation Canned Goods” copycat of the Third Reich. It too had given Mein Führer the propaganda pretext to “goosestep the Herrenvolk across international frontiers.” (Robert H. Jackson at Nuremberg) But then: “How fortunate for governments that the people they administer don't think.” (Adolph Hitler)

The Third Reich had in fact mobilized its entire Reichsdom on precisely this acutely pathological observation of people; itself fabricating the “conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being” (Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*, 1996) with its “Operation Canned Goods” that gave the German public their own “pearl harbor”; and Adolph Hitler: “a propagandist reason for starting the war”. Mein Führer, by his own admission, well understood the victor's primacy imperative that can never imagine defeat at the peak of its own hubris: “The victor will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not the right that matters, but victory.” (Adolph Hitler, quoted by William Shirer)

That Machiavellian modus operandi for engineering the public mind borrowed from the Third Reich is unfortunately not the end of it. Some convolutions are added to the establishment's “truths” to make discovery a tad more confusing than the aforementioned deconstruction recipe of shrewdly examining who else is echoing the big lie in conjunction with the establishment functionaries. To

Machiavellianly preempt the eternal skeptics of establishmentarian “truth” irrespective of who brings it to them; to cleverly defocus their expected intransigent resistance to “imperial mobilization” by making them run on treadmills as otherwise “democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization” (Zbigniew Brzezinski, op. cit.); a flavor of manufactured dissent also dissents with the establishment's own “truths”.

This equally diabolical breed of Superman gadfly deliberately introduces plausible sounding false “conspiracy theories” among the skeptics and the diehard malcontents. It is even pedantically referred to as inducing “beneficial cognitive diversity” in favor of the establishment. To see through their snake-oil takes a bit more sophistication and a mind attuned to the vagaries of power and its many incantations.

Which is why the majority of well-intentioned activists who had previously escaped from the underground dungeons of the manufacturing consent factory are routinely trapped by this new elitist collection agency! It is elitist because it is often composed of the intellectual elite and the self-proclaimed avant-garde in intellectual thought who feel they are ahead of the herd if they don't buy the establishment's lies. Adolph Hitler perceptively understood this skeptical public mind and typecast it as the second majority group in a nation: “Second, those who no longer believe anything;”. The first and largest majority group he had observed are: “First, those who believe everything they read;”. Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf* about the second group (the Type-2 demographics, the dissenting crowd of skeptics who believe nothing from official sources):

“The second group is numerically smaller, being partly composed of those who were formerly in the first group and after a series of bitter disappointments are now prepared to believe nothing of what they see in print. They hate all newspapers. Either they do not read them at all or they become exceptionally annoyed at their contents, which they hold to be nothing but a congeries of lies and misstatements. These people are difficult to handle; for they will always be sceptical of the truth. Consequently, they are useless for any form of positive work.” --- (Adolph Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Vol. 1, Chapter X)

Hitler's phrase, “*useless for any form of positive work*”, was most perceptive – for these are the easily swayed audience by the baseless “conspiracy theories” invented by the agents and assets of the establishment. This audience, dominated almost entirely by the same most vocal peace activists and rabble rousers who march emotionally in anti-war protests on weekends and holidays, achieves precisely the intended purpose of the establishment: they foolishly defocus the energies of dissent

from homing in onto the first cause of war-faring dystopia and upon the real criminals who pull the strings for its fabrication from behind the facade of elected governments.

It is noteworthy that Machiavelli was invented in the West during the Age of Enlightenment. So was its Liberal Democracy which legally permitted dissent. And thus Controlled Dissent became part of this style of statecraft. Without understanding the political philosophies that drive the theology of Western liberal democracy, its control systems, which include dissent, the Mighty Wurlitzer, and the Hegelian Dialectics, cannot be understood. These wrap the public mind in convolutions that defy not just the common man's imagination, but also the obsequious intelligentsia's that looks for favors and livelihood from the very system that it critiques. And the intelligentsia that is all too well-read, easily becomes so invested in its own successes that it chooses to self-police rather than risk its livelihood and cult-like celebrity stature that comes by staying within the limits carved out by the system.

It is neither the acme of excellence to predict thunder after witnessing lightening, nor to herald the arrival of winter after seeing the falling autumn leaves. Nor is it the acme of excellence to 'see victory only when it is within the ken of the common herd.' Neither is it the acme of excellence 'if you fight and conquer and the whole Empire says, "Well done!"' And Sun Tzu goes on in the Art of War: 'To lift an autumn hair is no sign of great strength; to see the sun and moon is no sign of sharp sight; to hear the noise of thunder is no sign of a quick ear.'

The acme of excellence for the genuine intellectual gadfly is to point the path to the un-obvious before anyone else can see it. To be the 'chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantations', to be a 'witness to their mendacity', to not fit 'into any role that might be assigned to him', nor fit into 'any of the histories written by the victors'.

The Songbird

When the Biblical Prophet Abraham was being thrown into the fire by the tyrannical ruler Nimrod, all creation was in tremendous angst. Even stones spoke out against the injustice of the tyrant. Every moral creature endeavored to the rescue of the Prophet to put out the fire. A tiny songbird picked a droplet of water in its minuscule beak and started to fly over to the fire.

An Angel asked the little songbird:

"Surely you are not going to put out the fire with that droplet(!);

and surely the high flames will consume you!

What do you think you are doing, little Don Quixote?"

The tiny songbird replied:

"yes, you are right; I know that my tiny droplet will not save the Great Prophet...

But I bring to the endeavor of standing up to this tyranny whatever I am capable of, and this hopelessly tiny droplet is all I am capable of."

In the age of universal deceit it is rare to find such an un co-opted mind that is also free from the cobwebs of conformist thought. It is even rarer to find anyone among the public who would believe him in his own time when something can be done to interdict the non-kosher plans of the 'history's actors'. The genuine gadfly to power is almost always either ignored, marginalized, or administered the hemlock which he drinks with great relish.

By himself, the genuine gadfly is the lonely songbird with a droplet of water in its beak rushing to douse the great fire lighted by Nimrod. By keeping it isolated and lonely, by preventing the drop from becoming a deluge, the songbird is shrewdly protected from realizing its aim. All the freedom of speech in vacuum and one still dies of asphyxiation! It is not the freedom to speak, but the freedom to be heard that is denied to the songbird. The journey of mankind from tyranny to tyranny is paved on the songbird's unheard songs. An empirical truism that is reflected in both: the fate of prophets of antiquity who were the 'chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantations' and 'witness to their mendacity', easily abandoned by their own peoples when not killed or exiled by the rulers; and the fate of prophets of modernity for whom more creativity has been brought to bear in keeping with the more sophisticated times.

New mental illnesses have been coined in the DSM handbook of psychiatry to consign the latter day gadfly to state hospitality, defined as suffering from 'oppositional defiant disorder' exhibiting a pattern of 'negativistic, defiant, disobedient and hostile behavior toward authority figures'. New legal entitlements have been framed to label anyone who challenges power, as the 'terrorist', for what else but to share in that same fate to the great applause and patriotic gratification of the common herd.

In effect, we are back to the early crossroads of the Roman Era in our twenty-first century, and the world turned into a giant coliseum of entertainment for the masses. All roads today lead to one-world government – the empire of the oligarchy.

The Songbird (contd.)

Like the powerless songbird, the powerless rebel identifies with his [categorical imperative](#), willingly carrying even the tiniest truth-bombs in his mouthful, if not atomic bombs in his F-16, regardless of consequence to self. A higher calling that is built-in by nature into all songbirds and patriots of truth in all of creation who can rise to [higher states of consciousness](#). Historically, epic battles have been waged by state armies with massive destruction reigned down upon humanity. In modernity, the main battleground is the battle for the mind, and truth-bombs can defeat a fleet of warships of every design.

Which is precisely why the genuine songbird is a dying breed today -- the empire understands that unless that natural instinct in its peoples is [co-opted](#) and replaced with its own pied pipers to lead the public mind, it can easily defeat its fleets.

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

In the meantime, the dying songbird sings on unheard – while manufactured dissent lives on under establishment cover cornering both the dissent publishing market and the scholarly citation market with lame rehearsals of the obvious and the absurd; and history's actors continue to engineer future history unhindered. Ex post facto, the onlookers will become the new standard patriots just as Mark Twain captured it: “In the beginning of a change, the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot”. Costs nothing to be a patriot: the hallmark of manufactured dissent! It even makes a pretty good living under establishment cover peddling the study of what the history's actors leave behind.

George W. Bush's White House senior advisor had captured this grotesque reality most unabashedly for the New York Times correspondent in 2004:

' "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do." ' --- (Ron Suskind, New York Times, Oct. 17, 2004)

The future generation's manufactured dissent will use today's songbirds' songs as gospel truth written in god's own hand writing. It will rehearse these songs of truth ad nauseam to lead its own choir anew in immense sense of patriotic gratification just as it does today, cunningly ignoring the songbirds of its own time. Rehearsing history while echoing the core big lies and axioms of powers du jour will remain its claim to profession as well as fame just as it is today. That is if dissent is still permitted in the George Orwell's world under construction. The trend however appears to be more inclined in the long term towards the world prognosticated by Aldous Huxley where dissent is outright redacted from the very DNA of the standardized humanity. People made to actually enjoy their own servitude. The German philosopher Goethe had aptly summed it: “None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.”

Even the common herd can feel the penetrating signs of it approaching faster than the hijacked airliners that ram into tall buildings without interdiction in the most armed to the teeth superpower in history – at the American airports for instance where very intelligent peoples in the most industrious and creative nation on earth continue to quietly subject themselves to indignities in the name of freedom which no one in their self-respecting mind ought to really subject themselves to. Pretty

soon, most will even be happy doing it – if many aren't already!

A world without the songbird approaches even faster.

Endnotes

[1] Superman refers to Nietzsche's superman; see *Thus Spake Zarathustra - A BOOK FOR ALL AND NONE* by Friedrich Nietzsche (download from <http://www.gutenberg.org/1/9/9/1998/>).

[2] For a detailed analysis of manufactured dissent as a Hegelian Dialectic, see: *A Note on the Mighty Wurlitzer – Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html> .

[3] For an examination of the fascinating theory behind “conspiracy theories”, see: *Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/03/anatomy-of-conspiracy-theory.html> ; see the revealing paper by President Obama's information Czar, Dr. Cass Sunstein, the Harvard Law Professor who openly advocated precisely the method of credibly crafting false conspiracy theories among the public in order to neutralize the ultimate skeptics of establishment's core lies, titled: “Conspiracy Theories”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1084585 ; see the forensic examination of this paper and its superficial critics in: *A License to Kill: Did David Ray Griffin and Steve Lendman miss the real purpose of Cass Sunstein's “Conspiracy Theories”?* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/zahir-responds-griffin-v-cass-sunstein.html> .

[4] For the role of genuine gadfly to power as moral agents of change see Vaclav Havel's full quote in *Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/responsibility-of-intellectuals-redux.html> .

[5] For the parable of the Songbird and Nimrod see *Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/12/of-ostriches-and-rebels-zahirebrahim.html> .

[6] For understanding the empire of the oligarchy and how it is being fashioned in stages with “an end run around national sovereignty”, see *The Poor-Man's Guide to Modernity*, <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/book-poor-mans-guide-to-modernity-9th-edition-2015-zahirebrahim.pdf> .

[7] Just because someone takes an opposing stance does not necessarily make them a real opponent.

[a] For some arguably rich examples of respectable manufactured dissent from Left to Right who live and thrive under establishment cover and benefaction, see *Songbird or Superman – You Decide!* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/songbird-or-superman.html> .

[b] More contemporary examples of both respectable and outlandish manufactured dissent can be found in: *Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/manufacturing-dissent.html> ; its Preamble section excerpts at length from Mein Kampf to examine Adolph Hitler's insightful characterization of the three types of public mind that is brilliantly harnessed by Western statecraft today for engineering consent.

[c] The case of Paul Craig Roberts, the former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan Administration, an economist and self-proclaimed “Father of Reaganomics”, a former editor and columnist for the Wall Street Journal, Business Week, and Scripps Howard News Service, and the darling of the Christian white man's dissent with the establishment now that Jews have replaced their former tormentors in running the world show, is particularly illustrative of both manufactured dissent as well as dissent for narrow vested interests; see: *Rebuttal to Paul Craig Roberts': 'Washington Arrogance has Fomented a Muslim Revolution'* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/letter-paul-craig-roberts-rebuttal.html> .

[d] The case of the distinguished former New York Times journalist Chris Hedges is similarly telling, as yet another former highly prized establishmentarian gratuitously echoing the axioms of empire in his new role as the dissenting conscience of America. What Chris Hedges cleverly omits and what he posits in his desire to soothe his conscience is deconstructed in: *Response to Chris Hedges' amalgam of half-truths 'A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe'* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/09/response-chris-hedges-decade-after-911.html> , <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/gatekeepers-from-left-to-right.html> .

[e] The case of the distinguished Dr. Francis Boyle, the Hans Morgenthau student, lawyer and political scientist extraordinaire, groomed at Harvard and University of Chicago, serving as the axial pivot of egregious dissent against the villainy of imperial powers at the International Criminal Court of Justice and the World Court in the Hague, is even more illustrative. Like his Jewish confrere Prof. Noam Chomsky, the good Samaritan Christian too retains the core lies of empire even while bringing criminal charges for torture against its visible helmsman at the Hague. A mental midget or a brilliant Superman? It is always instructive to adjudicate for oneself. See Zahir Ebrahim's Response to

Francis Boyle's '2011: Prospects for Humanity?' – *Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/resp-francisboyle-2011-prospects-for.html> .

[f] Some illustrative examples of manufactured dissent that is really only an articulation of the white man's burden having been taken over by another more “superior race”, and the *grapes are now sour* for the former “superior race”, see: *The White Man's Burden appears Uniformly Distributed among Jews Christians and Atheists – how can one tell the difference?* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/02/white-mans-burden-uniformly-distributed.html> .

[g] Some illustrative examples of fabricated dissent among the “lesser peoples”, the colonized mind, who willingly carry the white man's burden are in the *FAQ: What is an Intellectual Negro?* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/02/what-is-intellectual-negro.html> .

[h] For understanding co-option which is the first prime-mover motivation for ordinary peoples to fake dissent, play controlled dissent, stay silent, or utter gibberish inducing “beneficial cognitive diversity” into the global conversation to once again diffuse or channel the opposition towards ineffective cause célèbre, see *The Art and Science of Co-option* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/08/what-have-i-learnt-zahir-ebrahim.html> .

[i] Last but not least, for understanding the convoluted dissent of the king of global dissent, Noam Chomsky, who epitomizes the very antithesis of the dying songbird, see *The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky Revisited in 2015* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2015/12/noam-chomsky-revisited-in-2015-by-zahir.html> .

Noam Chomsky has contributed a great deal of meaningful vocabulary to dissent, such as 'worthy' vs 'unworthy' victims, throughout his extraordinary life of dissent. His insightful observations on thought control that become subliminal include:

Quote Noam Chomsky

'This “debate” is a typical illustration of a primary principle of sophisticated propaganda. In crude and brutal societies, the Party Line is publicly proclaimed and must be obeyed — or else. What you actually believe is your own business and of far less concern. In societies where the state has lost the capacity to control by force, the Party Line is simply presupposed; then, vigorous debate is encouraged within the limits imposed by unstated doctrinal orthodoxy. The cruder of the two systems leads, naturally enough, to disbelief; the

sophisticated variant gives an impression of openness and freedom, and so far more effectively serves to instill the Party Line. It becomes beyond question, beyond thought itself, like the air we breathe.'

and

'Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instills a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.'

and

'The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.'

End Quote

What else should one conclude of a public intellectual who makes the aforementioned most perceptive observations to critique the narrative control of status quo, and then practices the same Machiavellian maxims in his own controlled dissent against the same status quo? Let's use the English language dictionary to help guide us:

Dictionary Definition of **hypocritical**

adjective

1 : behaving in a way that suggests one has higher standards or more noble beliefs than is the case.

Dictionary Definition of **hypocrite**

noun

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

1 : a person who puts on a false appearance of virtue or religion

2 : a person who acts in contradiction to his or her stated beliefs or feelings

synonyms : pretender, dissembler, deceiver, liar, pietist, sanctimonious person, plaster saint;

informal : phony, fraud, sham, fake

usage : “I've been made to feel inadequate my whole life by someone who turns out to be a total hypocrite”

Virtually every public intellectual with few exceptions who critique empire's burlesques, ahem, its excesses, employs the state's own fundamental presuppositions in their dissent. As for instance, in our own modernity, that the “war on terror” is real because 9/11 was an invasion from abroad by “Islamofascist terrorists”. Then, “like the air we breathe”, the presupposition becomes the silent and unnoticed backdrop of all public conversations by both supporters as well as detractors of empire's actions at home and abroad. Now, in the presumably free societies under assault, mainly those in the West but also the emerging democracies copying the West, one can go freely about critiquing empire's criminal enterprise of wholesale bombing of defenseless nations in the name of self-defence while the core axiom upon which it is based remains unchallenged. Pakistan, for instance, bombs its own peoples in its tribal belt under the same rubric of fighting the “war on terror” in the name of its own self-defence. The United States takes enacts draconian police-state laws against its own denizens using the same pretext. The world follows suit.

Naturally, there will never be any efficacy in such toothless dissent against the self-sustaining exercises which are precisely designed to create more terror by the ever increasing new innocent victim populations whose entire families have been slaughtered from the skies, and hence more “war on terror” when they rise up in their own self-defence using the only weapon available to them to avenge their loved ones, creating an endless self-sustaining war that is exemplified by on-going worldwide insurgency vs counter-insurgency against now organic terror that is continually seeded in manufactured terror. This is indeed the empiricism we witness.

The exercise of this style of dissent provides a convenient collection ground to gather all the Type-2 who are bothered by all this senseless slaughter of innocent civilians, who now freely exercise their lungs to let off some steam on weekends and in weekly op-eds and in money-making books under the illusion that there is “lively debate within that spectrum – [which] even encourage[s] the more critical and dissident views.” It gives “people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all

the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.” Furthermore, it yields great propaganda value for the virtues of Western style liberal democracy over autocratic governments because this exercise “gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate.”

Respectable dissent publications are now taught in schools and universities to new generations to teach them “critical thinking” skills (sic!) which retain the core presuppositions of the system while spinning respectable theories of empire, such as *The Road to 9/11: Wealth, Empire, and the Future of America*, 2007, by Peter Dale Scott. At election times, the carefully crafted leaders of dissent guide their Type-2 flock on where to vote, with and without illusion, but vote nevertheless, as opposed to withdrawing their public consent altogether for the facade of democratic elections that promise change but never does.

You kill many birds with Noam Chomsky style erudite dissent employing the same maxims of engineering consent that he has himself explained!

Machiavelli was invented in the West. So was its Liberal Democracy which legally permitted dissent. And thus Controlled Dissent became part of this style of statecraft. Without understanding the political philosophies that drive the theology of Western liberal democracy, its control systems, which include dissent, the Mighty Wurlitzer, and the Hegelian Dialectics, cannot be understood. These wrap the public mind in convolutions that defy not just the common man's imagination, but also the obsequious intelligentsia's that looks for favors and livelihood from the very system that it critiques. And the intelligentsia that is all too well read, easily becomes so invested in its own successes that it chooses to self-police rather than risk its livelihood and cult-like celebrity stature that comes by staying within the limits carved out by the system.

See *Deconstructing the reality behind The Reality of the "Lesser Evil"* , by Project Humanbeingsfirst.org, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2012/11/the-reality-of-lesser-evil.html> ; see *Response to Press TV's Interview with Noam Chomsky 'No change coming with Obama'*, by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/01/respto-chomskys-nochange-obama.html> ; see *Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!* By Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/not-voting-is-yes-vote-to-reject-system.html> ; see *FAQ: Prove to me that the 9/11 Narrative is a Big Lie* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/04/faq-prove-that-911-narrative-is-big-lie.html> ; *Sanctification of the 9/11 Narrative - Long Term Impact of Sanctification of the 9/11 Big Lie*, by Zahir Ebrahim,

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/04/sanctification-of-911-narrative-zahir.html> ; see *Insurgency vs. Counter-Insurgency - Case Study: Manufacturing Pretext for Perpetual Controlled Conflict and Controlled Chaos*, by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/insurgency-vs-counter-insurgency.html> ; see *The Art and Science of Co-option*, op. cit.

[8] For Howard Zinn's demagoguery, diverting attention from the crime of 9/11 itself in response to a question from the public, see: <http://prisonplanet.com/howard-zinn-i-dont-care-if-911-was-an-inside-job.html> ; transcript from: <http://youtube.com/watch?v=S-WQ5z53IW8> .

[9] The epithet “vulgar propagandist” is dissent Superman Noam Chomsky anointing establishment's Superman Bernard Lewis in the following interview: '... now, until Bernard Lewis tells us that, and that's only one piece of a long story, we know that he is just a vulgar propagandist and not a scholar.' --- Interview to Evan Solomon, CBC, part-2, minute 5:50, December 9, 2003, <http://youtube.com/watch?v=bieFwutoqvA> .

The epithet: “*arguably the most important intellectual alive*” is establishment's mouthpiece, The New York Times, anointing Noam Chomsky. The incestuous self-reinforcement of imperial “truths” among these Superman and the instruments of the establishment who also principally share the same racial and tribal heritage, each playing their own assigned role in the Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent, should no longer be surprising. See subsection *Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent*, endnote [2], op cit.

[10] For an example of dissent cornering the citation market, see: *Chomsky Is Citation Champ*, MIT news bulletin, April 15, 1992, <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/1992/citation-0415.html> .

[11] For an example of making a lifetime of lucrative living out of dissent, see: *Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist*, by Peter Schweizer, January 30, 2006, Hoover Institution, <http://www.hoover.org/research/noam-chomsky-closet-capitalist> .

[12] For empirical evidence of the facade of elected governments and why the macro policy calculus of hegemony of the superpower does not change despite changing the front faces in the White House every four years, and the most lauded dissent's calculated inability to focus on the first-cause of that most visible dysfunction, see Response to American Congressman Dennis Kucinich: *Impeachment alone does not solve the problem!* by Zahir Ebrahim, June 13, 2008, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/06/impeachment-does-not-solve-problem.html> ; and see Response to American criminal lawyer Vincent Bugliosi: *Vanilla or Chocolate is merely the icing on the devil's cake!* by Zahir Ebrahim, April 09 2009, <http://print->

humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/04/vanilla-or-chocolate-icing-on-devils-cake.html .

[13] To understand the motivation for Pavlovian training of Americans at US airports beyond the obvious, see *Zahir Ebrahim's letter to American Advice Goddess, Amy Alkon*: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/09/letter-amyalkon-tsa-trauma-and-lawsuit.html> .

[14] Supplementary study: *Propaganda* by Edward Bernays, 1928, (download from <http://whale.to/b/bernays.pdf>); watch BBC documentary on Edward Bernays at: <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/propagandism.html#Edward-Bernays> ; listen to sociologist and essayist Aldous Huxley explain the elements of the “Ultimate Revolution” at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1962: “We are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me, the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.”, http://archive.org/download/AldousHuxley-TheUltimateRevolution/AldousHuxley-TheUltimateRevolution_64kb.m3u .

Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird

This page is intentionally blank

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter III

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

Master of Controlled Opposition

Noam Chomsky is an integral part of the Democratic system of the West which permits dissent in the name of freedom and relies on the system of controlled dissent to diabolically limit its effectiveness as much as it relies on the system of engineered consent to make the public mind. To comprehend the consummate cunning in the fabled dissent of Chomsky one must understand the dissent system in complete depth.

“Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT has made odd and frankly specious claims regarding skepticism of the government's official story of the September 11th, 2001 attacks (<http://youtu.be/3i9ra-i6Knc>). His statements were misleading and have, in fact, misled many people who defer to him as an expert on these matters. ... Professor Chomsky, as an authority on linguistics and on the clarity of words, should respond directly to these facts and to this public challenge. Either a 9/11 cover-up exists, which we must demand an end to as a free and open society; or else there is no government cover-up, and the 9/11 crimes have been solved.” --- (A Public Challenge to Professor Noam Chomsky: Debating the September 11th Attack Evidence, Joe Giambrone, Dec 01, 2015, via Kevin Barrett's [TruthJihad radio](#))

Challenging Professor Dr. Noam Chomsky is like challenging Professor Dr. Bernard Lewis, two peas in a pod, identical twins from the same tribe merely playing the Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent, the wwf-style wrestling tag team event in which the ostensibly vigorous opponents eat at the same elitist dinner table, the former from Pax Americana's MIT and the latter from Pax Americana's Princeton.

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

They don't debate. They are propagandists, and they each have a public mission which is complementary to each other. The Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent is examined in complete depth as a Machiavellian political science instrument of making the public mind in [The Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare](#).

So, here let's just focus on the dissent of my own former teacher at MIT, Professor Noam Chomsky, from whom I learned a great deal about many matters, including intellectual tools to parse deceit, including self-deceit. I have put those skills to good use over the past 15 years, since 9/11 when I started attending anti-war protest marches in 2002 after witnessing the horrendous destruction of Afghanistan, and to wielding these intellectual tools acquired from master philosophers and political scientists to disassemble their own propaganda spiels for making of the public mind since 2003, after America's FBI visited me at home looking for terrorists under my bed. I wrote of that affair in my maiden 2003 book **Prisoners of the Cave** which I even sent to my professor Noam Chomsky for his comments with many earnest questions, just like this good Samaritan Mr. Joe Giambrone has posed in the best of intentions.

Well, like this innocent fellow, I too was a tad green behind the ears at that time and had not quite figured out the full dynamics of manufactured dissent, its theoretical and philosophical underpinnings. And like this good fellow, I too got no comments back from my good old professor except to say that his in-basket was full at the moment and he may never get to my manuscript. Of course, I took that to mean that many more important people were in line ahead of me begging for his favors and doing him favors in turn in an incestuous self-reinforcement cycle of shoring each other up in the dissent-space for keeping the axioms of empire intact. Had professor Chomsky ever read my book, he would never have replied anyway. But over the years I kept engaging with my professor over email, continually learning remarkable new absurdities from him, until I actually figured it out. I figured out the Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent which made all absurdities and inconsistencies go away. This is very unfortunate actually, because my new understanding of how power actually flows in society to make the public mind, lost me many of my friends, confreres, and well-wishers. For I stopped suffering both propagandists and useful idiots.

Well, in this brief tract let's just examine the challenge that has been thrown once again to professor Noam Chomsky by this yet another well-intentioned American waking up from his deep slumber of mainstream USA in December 2015 and asking the preliminary simpleton questions that occur to any thoughtful mind when it first gives up its belief in tooth-fairies and pious governments. Note that I didn't say Santa Claus, because it is Christmas week after all, and we don't want to deprive any children reading this the Western civilization's wonderful gift of fantasy to sell more products.

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

Well, unfortunately, this good Samaritan mis-perceives. By throwing this open challenge to the foremost and “arguably the most important intellectual alive” (as per the New York Times), an anointment which has surely helped Noam Chomsky market more books to children and be more effective as their collection agent, our new protagonist of truth and justice perhaps imagines that there is some genuine issue here which needs to be resolved, just like I too once felt, way back in my early years of trying to think for myself. There isn't any issue my friends. Here is why.

Professor Noam Chomsky is rather straightforward to parse if you have the right master key to his dissent. That key is basically this: **Chomsky will keep all the axioms of power intact as “divine truths”, and dissent vigorously with the effects that result from the imperial mobilization based on those axioms.**

This principle is the hallmark of manufactured dissent. It is neither random nor arbitrary, but principled and based on a keen understanding of human behavior in the aggregate. While the three trillion dollar advertising industry controls human behavior in the individual when they sell us lifestyles and its endless sexy products, unpopular policy-implementations and abhorrent policy prescriptions require controlling human behavior in the aggregate for “United We Stand”. Chomsky is the designated pied piper for type-2 people in society, using Hitler's classification of the public mind for categorization. Here are some passages from my essay which explains the dynamics of this master key to manufacturing dissent, [Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird](#):

Begin Excerpt



Caption Noam Chomsky, Pied Piper for type-2 demographics - the empire is bad crowd. Image Pied Piper of Hamelin via wikipedia.

The Chomsky Talent in his own words:

“The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum - even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.”

“Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instills a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.”

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

For instance, just look for all those who share the common establishment “truth”: OBL and Al Qaeda successfully invaded the most armed to the teeth superpower in the world on 9/11, magically hijacked four airliners in the air with box-cutter knives within a matter of an hour, rammed them into two tall buildings and magically demolished three in a feat of demolition which before that day had never been carried out in the entire written history of mankind. All this was planned and orchestrated by an Islamofascist Ali Baba from the Hindu Kush mountains armed to the teeth with cellphones and AK-47s, in collaboration with an illusive database named “Al Qaeda”. The names of the believers of this fantastic fable in the who's who of dissent is surprising. These include some of the biggest and most celebrated names in dissent to keep company with the Neo-cons, the Pentagon, the State Department, the World Bank, the IMF, the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, the Royal Institute of International Affairs in London, the United Nations and all its member countries, and the Bush-Obama Administrations: Noam Chomsky, Francis Boyle, the late Howard Zinn, former Congressman Ron Paul, Congressman Dennis Kucinich, Scott Ritter, Dennis Halliday, Michael Moore, Helen Caldicott, Robert Fisk, John Pilger, Greg Palast, Amy Goodman, Daniel Ellsberg, Nelson Mandela, Arundhatti Roy of India, Tariq Ali and Pervez Hoodbhoy of Pakistan, etc.

Once the big lie is cleverly conceded to officialdom without question, all dissent with empire's barbaric acts against its proclaimed enemies is effectively made futile: “either you are with us or with the terrorists” (George W. Bush). Because, as the empire is now given the license to arguably claim, it is only protecting itself from the diabolically brilliant and most superior foe that is even able to penetrate the strongest superpower on earth's super militarized defenses on its own native soil! Then dissent all you want – so long as you keep that core lie intact in all your adumbration: “No thank you.’ We can let him know that the people of the world do not need to choose between a Malevolent Mickey Mouse and the Mad Mullahs.” (Arundhatti Roy). The argument is cleverly moved away from forensically examining the crime as Sherlock Holmes might do, to the best way to deal with the criminals by presupposing who the criminals are: ‘they attack us because we have been over there ... I am suggesting that we listen to the people who attacked us ... ’ (former congressman Ron Paul). Thus both, the establishment chiefs manufacturing consent, and the dissent chiefs manufacturing dissent, end up continually reinforcing the same presuppositions of the system, the same big lie; the former by openly advocating the big lie, the latter by openly refraining from challenging the big lie. Both are propagandists; the former by commission, the latter by omission. British essayist Aldous Huxley captured the implication of silence and the crime of omission most elegantly in his Preface to Brave New World:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.’ — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

That is how the Superman herdsman leads the pack of useful idiots in manufactured dissent. He craftily lowers the “iron curtain” of ignorance between the masses and such facts or arguments as the system regards as undesirable or necessary to enforce. And he cleverly echoes the core lies of empire in toto, or presupposes them in his argumentative and tedious dissent. The focus is most craftily shifted from the crime to ex post facto anti-war critique of empire's “imperial mobilization” – after “imperial mobilization” is a fait accompli.

End Excerpt

Professor Noam Chomsky, Pax Americana scholar extraordinaire, will remain an enigma for many on his inexplicable stances in dissent, especially on both JFK and 9/11 where he most gullibly re-echoed and re-exported the axioms of empire with great vigor and was believed by his constituency, until one understands that dissent in free societies is permitted to exist by design of the Republic, unlike in dictatorships, as in Nazi Socialism for instance, or in Communism, or in military junta led societies and feudal kingdoms, etceteras. And because of that, dissent must not be permitted to become effective in derailing the unstated agendas and overt imperial mobilization of the rulers who continue to wield the real powers from behind the facade of elected governments.

Dissent is socially engineered by the architects of the public mind to exist in its most ineffective form so that while effectively sterile and impotent, it can still give the modern “democracy” mantra of Western civilization a renewed lease on *la mission civilisatrice*, the *white man's burden* if you will. After the waning of direct rule by the oligarchy or god appointed pontiffs in the West which democracy had replaced with such fanfare while keeping the real power pyramid essentially intact, the illusion of dissent has to be maintained for the domestic benefit of those crying for democracy, freedoms, liberty. So the masses are given the dissent-space that goes nowhere, except as a feel-good cathartic exercise for its useful idiots, and lucrative book publishing and speaking engagement business for its pied pipers. In order to achieve this behavior control of those who are no longer malleable by the mainstream media and the mainstream scholars, the new freedom to dissent must

be led to control its length, breadth, and height, and cunningly channeled in specious pursuits to ensure that it does not interfere with the exercise of power by “history's actors” as their private prerogative.

The entire matter of dissent is in fact only Machiavellian political science at work no differently than it is at work for engineering consent among the masses. As the foremost political scientist and linguist in the dissent-space of Pax Americana, which means not just the developed West, but also its tin-pot vassals in the Global South, meaning, preeminent among those who control the global mind (political scientists of today who replaced the philosophers of antiquity) and the semantics of language (the linguists who give meaning to words and consequently inform the mind), Dr. Noam Chomsky serves the function of a most glorified pied piper for his own constituency with the finesse of a peerless expert technician. He is believed. By Whom? Once again from the Masters of Dissent and the Dying Songbird:

Begin Excerpt

Which is why the majority of well-intentioned activists who had previously escaped from the underground dungeons of the manufacturing consent factory are routinely trapped by this new elitist collection agency! It is elitist because it is often composed of the intellectual elite and the self-proclaimed avant-garde in intellectual thought who feel they are ahead of the herd if they don't buy the establishment's lies. Adolph Hitler perceptively understood this skeptical public mind and typecast it as the second majority group in a nation: “Second, those who no longer believe anything;”. The first and largest majority group he identified as: “First, those who believe everything they read;”, “the crowd of simpletons and the credulous”. Hitler wrote in Mein Kampf about the second group, type-2:

“The second group is numerically smaller, being partly composed of those who were formerly in the first group and after a series of bitter disappointments are now prepared to believe nothing of what they see in print. They hate all newspapers. Either they do not read them at all or they become exceptionally annoyed at their contents, which they hold to be nothing but a congeries of lies and misstatements. These people are difficult to handle; for they will always be sceptical of the truth. Consequently, they are useless for any form of positive work.” --- (Adolph Hitler, Mein Kampf, Vol. 1, Chapter X)

Hitler's phrase, “*useless for any form of positive work*”, was most perceptive – for these are the easily swayed audience by the baseless “conspiracy theories” invented by the agents and assets of

the establishment. This audience, dominated almost entirely by the same most vocal peace activists and rabble rousers who march emotionally in anti-war protests on weekends and holidays, achieves precisely the intended purpose of the establishment: they foolishly defocus the energies of dissent from homing in onto the first cause of war-faring dystopia and the real criminals who pull the strings for its fabrication from behind the facade of elected governments.

End Excerpt

Noam Chomsky has contributed a great deal of meaningful vocabulary to dissent, such as 'worthy' vs 'unworthy' victims (see [Deconstructing the reality behind The Reality of the 'Lesser Evil'](#)), throughout his extraordinary life of manufacturing dissent. His insightful observations on thought control that become subliminal include (again excerpting from the Masters of Dissent and the Dying Songbird):

Begin Excerpt

Quote Noam Chomsky

'This "debate" is a typical illustration of a primary principle of sophisticated propaganda. In crude and brutal societies, the Party Line is publicly proclaimed and must be obeyed — or else. What you actually believe is your own business and of far less concern. In societies where the state has lost the capacity to control by force, the Party Line is simply presupposed; then, vigorous debate is encouraged within the limits imposed by unstated doctrinal orthodoxy. The cruder of the two systems leads, naturally enough, to disbelief; the sophisticated variant gives an impression of openness and freedom, and so far more effectively serves to instill the Party Line. It becomes beyond question, beyond thought itself, like the air we breathe.'

and

'Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instills a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.'

and

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

'The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.'

End Quote Noam Chomsky

What else should one conclude of a public intellectual who makes the aforementioned most perceptive observations to critique the narrative control of status quo, and then practices the same Machiavellian maxims in his own controlled dissent against the same status quo? Let's use the English language dictionary to help guide us:

Dictionary Definition of **hypocritical**

adjective

1 : behaving in a way that suggests one has higher standards or more noble beliefs than is the case.

Dictionary Definition of **hypocrite**

noun

1 : a person who puts on a false appearance of virtue or religion

2 : a person who acts in contradiction to his or her stated beliefs or feelings

synonyms : pretender, dissembler, deceiver, liar, pietist, sanctimonious person, plaster saint;

informal : phony, fraud, sham, fake

usage : "I've been made to feel inadequate my whole life by someone who turns out to be a total hypocrite"

Virtually every public intellectual with few exceptions who critique empire's burlesques, ahem, its excesses, employs the state's own fundamental presuppositions in their dissent. As for instance, in our own modernity, that the "war on terror" is real because 9/11 was an invasion from abroad by

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

“Islamofascist terrorists”. Then, “like the air we breathe”, the presupposition becomes the silent and unnoticed backdrop of all public conversations by both supporters as well as detractors of empire’s actions at home and abroad. Now, in the presumably free societies under assault, mainly those in the West but also the emerging democracies copying the West, one can go freely about critiquing empire’s criminal enterprise of wholesale bombing of defenseless nations in the name of self-defence while the core axiom upon which it is based remains unchallenged. Pakistan, for instance, bombs its own peoples in its tribal belt under the same rubric of fighting the “war on terror” in the name of its own self-defence. The United States takes enacts draconian police-state laws against its own denizens using the same pretext. The world follows suit.

Naturally, there will never be any efficacy in such toothless dissent against the self-sustaining exercises which are precisely designed to create more terror by the ever increasing new innocent victim populations whose entire families have been slaughtered from the skies, and hence more “war on terror” when they rise up in their own self-defence using the only weapon available to them to avenge their loved ones, creating an endless self-sustaining war that is exemplified by on-going worldwide insurgency vs counter-insurgency against now organic terror that is continually seeded in manufactured terror. This is indeed the empiricism we witness.

The exercise of this style of dissent provides a convenient collection ground to gather all the Type-2 who are bothered by all this senseless slaughter of innocent civilians, who now freely exercise their lungs to let off some steam on weekends and in weekly op-eds and in money-making books under the illusion that there is “lively debate within that spectrum – [which] even encourage[s] the more critical and dissident views.” It gives “people the sense that there’s free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.” Furthermore, it yields great propaganda value for the virtues of Western style liberal democracy over autocratic governments because this exercise “gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate.”

Respectable dissent publications are now taught in schools and universities to new generations to teach them “critical thinking” skills (sic!) which retain the core presuppositions of the system while spinning respectable theories of empire, such as *The Road to 9/11: Wealth, Empire, and the Future of America*, 2007, by Peter Dale Scott. At election times, the carefully crafted leaders of dissent guide their Type-2 flock on where to vote, with and without illusion, but vote nevertheless, as opposed to withdrawing their public consent altogether for the facade of democratic elections that promise change but never does.

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

You kill many birds with Noam Chomsky style erudite dissent employing the same maxims of engineering consent that he has himself explained!

Machiavelli was invented in the West. So was its Liberal Democracy which legally permitted dissent. And thus Controlled Dissent became part of this style of statecraft. Without understanding the political philosophies that drive the theology of Western liberal democracy, its control systems, which include dissent, the Mighty Wurlitzer, and the Hegelian Dialectics, cannot be understood. These wrap the public mind in convolutions that defy not just the common man's imagination, but also the obsequious intelligentsia's that looks for favors and livelihood from the very system that it critiques. And the intelligentsia that is all too well read, easily becomes so invested in its own successes that it chooses to self-police rather than risk its livelihood and cult-like celebrity stature that comes by staying within the limits carved out by the system.

End Excerpt

Precisely because of such perceptive understanding of the crafty dynamics of making the public mind in democratic societies, Professor Noam Chomsky of MIT leading the manufacturing of dissent among type-2 malcontents, appears no different in his core purpose than his Ivy League tribe mate Professor Bernard Lewis of Princeton leading the manufacturing of consent among type-1 mainstream public.

They each serve a different constituency on behalf of the same oligarchic rulers in the power pyramid. They each have their own marching orders. One lies by commission, tells brazen and vulgar lies to engineer the mainstream public's consent. The other lies by omission, by neglecting to challenge the axioms and Big lies of power while putting up the great show of vigorous dissent to corral the smaller numbers of dissenting public towards ineffectiveness of resistance. For manufacturing consent, the empire is projected as good. For manufacturing dissent, the empire is projected as bad. But the same external enemy is retained, and only re-incarnated either as "jihadis" and "Militant Islam" (consent), or "revolutionaries" and "blowback" (dissent). Neither manufacturers will ever extend their discourse to covert-ops, to forensic analysis of overarching agendas, and to a self-inflicted "inside job" similar to "operation canned goods" of the Third Reich! Noam Chomsky immediately characterized 9/11 as "blowback" and virtually instantly composed a booklet titled "9-11" in its aftermath along precisely the aforementioned template, successfully selling millions of copies in different languages worldwide. He quickly gathered all the type-2s and the prominent alternate media newscasters and editors in the United States of America to the point of view that 9/11 was a "blowback" due to America's own criminal excesses abroad, so that none among their flock might

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

veer off into other directions of perceptively identifying the enemy by exposing the Big lie which even a modicum of commonsense was inviting one towards lest it derail America's imperial mobilization. Both the doctors, Bernard Lewis and Noam Chomsky, one protagonist of empire and the other its antagonist, cunningly collaborated on mis-identifying the enemy exactly as the empire wanted.


It cannot be stated anymore emphatically: both are propagandists, and that's just their job description. However, since Chomsky had used the vernacular "vulgar propagandist" for Bernard Lewis (in an interview to Evan Solomon, CBC, December 9, 2003), hmmm, one is given to wonder whether one can apply the same vernacular to my good ol' professor Noam Chomsky? Why bother. The job description already identifies their respective roles without the need for any unpleasant invectives. We shall remain more civilized and sophisticated in this revisitation of the subject in this Christmas week of 2015. We have grown too you know. We simply reject their combined bullshit in toto and move-on.

After all, they are not holding a gun to our head. They are not forcing us to believe anything against our own free will, there is no room 101 and no one is coercing us to add two plus two to equal five. We are doing that corrupted addition ourselves. These leaders of propaganda are still only using their words, albeit in most convoluted and elaborate webs of deceit, to make our mind. And their only reason for success is because we are stupid. And when we are even semi-intelligent and quite capable of using our commonsense to do the arithmetic correctly, our moral cowardice prevents us from doing so. That's our failing, and the source of their parasitic strength. Take that one failing away, and they have nothing to stand on. No legs whatsoever. All these con men of Pax Americana manufacturing consent or dissent while living off of its largesses, Jews and Gentiles alike, anarchists and statists alike, moralists and nihilists alike, massa and his house niggers alike, come crashing down under the weight of their own pomposity. The secret of their parasitic strength is dissected in [The Art and Science of Co-option](#).

Easier said than done of course. Because, that exercise to not conform to some narrative of some authority figure, is not made anymore easier for the type-2 masses of the dissentstream than it was for their former selves and for their colleagues whom they have now left behind as the type-1 masses of the mainstream. This mass of humanity is made from exactly the same mold, just with different authority figures in the lead. It is just as Hitler had correctly figured out and identified in Mein Kampf to make the fledgling Third Reich at the point of bayonet. His legates are working assiduously to make a more permanent Fourth from the same raw material, but with a twist: with a measure of the public's own consent rather than entirely at the point of the bayonet.

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

The predators and shepherds proclaim the nature of the public's instincts as well as their own quite openly: “*Some are sheep while others are wolves, we are the wolves*”. So long as the sheep keep blaming the wolves, and refuse to recognize their own contribution to their own co-option, we empower these parasites --- for they don't care what we think. When has the shepherd ever considered what the sheep think as he produces mutton for his customers? If you stop being a sheep, and withhold your consent to be persuaded by the magic of the shepherd's whistle, the propagandists leave you alone. You are the type-3 in Hitler's classification of the



Caption Type-3 Demographics: 'Third, those who critically examine what they read and form their judgments accordingly.' Labeled “conspiracy theorists”, this tiny minority is invited to enjoy State Hospitality Centers. See [Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory](#) by Zahir Ebrahim. Image adapted from the web.

public mind, quite immune to propaganda warfare and psy-ops: “Third, those who critically examine what they read and form their judgments accordingly.” Hitler characterized you as follows:

“The third group is easily the smallest, being composed of real intellectuals whom natural aptitude and education have taught to think for themselves and who in all things try to form their own judgments, while at the same time carefully sifting what they read. They will not read any newspaper without using their own intelligence to collaborate with that of the writer and naturally this does not set writers an easy task. Journalists appreciate this type of reader only with a certain amount of reservation.”
--- (Adolph Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Vol. 1, Chapter X)

But now the State invites you to its Hospitality Suites. You are now the terrorist! And if no evidence can be contrived, then you are deemed to be suffering from “emotional or mental illness” which is defined in the revised DSM manual as a psychiatric disorder called “oppositional defiant disorder”, a pattern of “negativistic, defiant, disobedient and hostile behavior toward authority figures”. You are the conspiracy theorist for heaven's sake. No not like the *useful idiots* chasing UFOs and free energy, but like the American intellectual and polyglot poet Ezra Pound, confined to St. Elizabeth hospital to recover from his mental illness of challenging the narratives of his own nation during the World Wars of the twentieth century. This is why controlled dissent exists in free societies ---

because their rulers do not wish to have the Siberian Gulag like the USSR did, or the SS like the Third Reich did. The need to maintain illusions of democracy and free speech, and to promulgate these Western values throughout the colonized world necessitates the existence of dissent pied pipers. The State's bayonet is only necessary for the minuscule minority that is type-3 not already covered into silence, and for the handful of recalcitrant type-2s who make a nuisance of themselves for the State with their uncontrolled anarchism. As long as they are controlled, they make good useful idiots to foment agitation, revolutions, chaos, and for being the agent provocateurs who lend pretext for enacting pre-planned agendas --- and that is largely the story of dissent today.

Virtually all rank and file of dissent in the West today, including a significant majority of their well-intentioned but foolish second-tier pied pipers on both the Left and the Right, are type-2, each gallantly led from the front by some Nietzschean Superman, the Übermensch, who each spin appropriate illusions to feed their respective masses. My dismantling of the [Gatekeepers From Left to Right](#) demonstrates the self-evident truth of the preceding observation.

This template for manufacturing dissent for Pax Americana is ubiquitous and shared among the Übermensch irrespective of their individual tribe, religion, or nation. Drawing upon another example from the Christian Right clearly outlines the common pen into which type-2 sheep are routinely herded by their respective shepherds. In a letter to Dr. Paul Craig Roberts, the former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Reagan Administration, and the incumbent darling of the Christian white supremacists' dissent who hold all Jews and minorities in strong disdain and therefore require one of their own ilk to be anointed as their rebel leader, I responded to his cunningly mis-identifying the enemy in the aftermath of the Mumbai terrorist attack: "The attack on Mumbai required radicalized Muslims". Dr. Roberts used the same "blowback" propaganda template used so effectively by Noam Chomsky to explain all terror events blamed on Muslims, in his article of December 05, 2008: *'Washington Arrogance has Fomented a Muslim Revolution'*.

'Your article is nonsense. It is the work of a disinformationist, if not an outright simpleton. It ignores black-ops entirely. It ignores the reality-space of creating pretexts for incremental faits accomplis for world-government. It blames the Mumbai terror event as the blowback for America's excesses. The wanton and meaningless terror act was nothing of the kind. There is also no revolution brewing among the Muslims "to throw off their Western oppressors." Far from it. Your essay is merely a devious attempt to resurrect a boogiemán that doesn't exist – along the lines of "clash of civilizations", but replacing Bernard Lewis' "Islamic Triumphalism" with your "radicalized Muslims" due to oppression. **It isn't clear why one should rejoice in**

Muslims being called “revolutionaries” for acts which are entirely terroristic, wanton, take the lives of innocent, and outright criminal. If anything, it is maligning an entire peoples. Still works wonders when the enemy is kept external.’ --- (Zahir Ebrahim's letter to Paul Craig Roberts, Dec 06, 2008)

Most unfortunate that virtually all the so called *rebel leaders* and *pied pipers of bloated consciences* turn out to be expert propagandists of Pax Americana for their respective flock. They reside worldwide, are of different nationalities, come from many different professional backgrounds, each tuning his propaganda spiel to the social genius, mental capacity, and psychological and political propensity of his own flock.

But that is indeed the twisted reality of any modernity in which “Deception is a state of mind and the mind of the State” (James Jesus Angleton, Head of CIA Counter Intelligence, 1954-1974). Especially when its public does not quite share in the State's enthusiasm for 'la mission civilisatrice' under Pax Americana. The people have to be manipulated and corralled to engineer their consent and cripple their dissent. This is what Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, America's former National Security Advisor under president Jimmy Carter, described of America's domestic demographics and its political inclinations in the decade preceding 9/11, in his diabolical book that brazenly blueprints the methods of “imperial mobilization”, titled *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*:

“The earlier empires were built by aristocratic political elites and were in most cases ruled by essentially authoritarian or absolutist regimes. The bulk of the populations of the imperial states were either politically indifferent, ... or infected by imperialist emotions ...a quest for national glory, 'the white man's burden', 'la mission civilisatrice', not to speak of the opportunities for personal profit – all served to mobilize support for imperial adventures to sustain essentially hierarchical imperial power pyramids. The attitude of American public toward the external projection of American power has been more ambivalent. The public supported America's engagement in WWII largely because of the shock effect of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. After the Cold War had ended, the emergence of the United States as the single global power did not evoke much public gloating but rather elicited an inclination toward more limited definitions of American responsibilities abroad. Public opinion polls conducted in 1995 – 1996 indicated a general public preference for 'sharing' power with others, rather than for its monopolistic exercise.” --- (pgs. 24,25)

“It is also a fact that America is too democratic at home to be autocratic abroad. This

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

limits the use of America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation. Never before has a populist democracy attained international supremacy. But the pursuit of power is not a goal that commands popular passion, except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being. The economic self-denial (that is defense spending), and the human sacrifice (casualties even among professional soldiers) required in the effort are uncongenial to democratic instincts. Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.” --- (pgs. 35,36)

“Public opinion polls suggest that only a small minority (13 percent) of Americans favor the proposition that 'as the sole remaining superpower, the US should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems'. ... Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification. ... Mass communications have been playing a particularly important role in that regard, generating a strong revulsion against any selective use of force that entails even low levels of casualties In brief, the U.S. Policy goals must be un-apologetically twofold: to perpetuate America's own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer,” --- (pgs. 211-215)

Under that type of demographics of a superpower forging Pax Americana to “*perpetuate America's own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer,*” Dr. Brzezinski even brazenly suggested that social engineering the domestic public's mind is part and parcel of the exercise of imperial power abroad: “*The economic self-denial (that is defense spending), and the human sacrifice (casualties even among professional soldiers) required in the effort are uncongenial to democratic instincts. Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization. ... More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification.*”

Doctrinal motivation is needed for each of the demographics, those who think empire good, and those who think empire bad. Each group is appropriately fed the doctrinal motivation that is best suited to their psychology and political convictions, to ultimately “United We Stand” each group with

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

their own respective pied pipers. The type-2 has no more sense to see the Big lie than type-1 does, and thus both groups are held together United We Stand on the Big lie. Despite their opposite propensities to respectively believe empire is bad vs. empire is good, they are each led to the same pastures by their respective pied pipers. This architecture of total behavior control of the population irrespective of their demographics was most elegantly captured by essayist and novelist Aldous Huxley in his talk at the University of California, Berkeley, in 1962 as the ultimate in malevolent revolution:

“You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.” --- (Aldous Huxley, [The Ultimate Revolution](#), 1962, minute 04:06)

There is, in fact, no effective solution for this social malady, that type-2 shall always exist right alongside type-1, and both minds must be expertly engineered according to their respective natural inclinations to conform to the imperial axioms du jour. It is indeed the demographics of humanity from time immemorial. Previously, both these types were easily controlled by the absolutist rules exercised at the point of the bayonet, and as Brzezinski captures it, “*The bulk of the populations of the imperial states were either politically indifferent, ... or infected by imperialist emotions*”, whereby, Machiavellianly engineering the consent of the masses wasn't much of an issue for either the throne or the pulpit. The onset of the so called liberal democracy under its illusions of freedoms has mushroomed the numbers of each in proportion to population growth, such that type-2 exercising their vocal chords can no longer be ignored and must be treated as an entirely separate constituency for social engineers. This requires its own control architecture, templates and first principles, which anyone is invited to exercise to come into the notice of empire as being voluntarily part of either side of the Hegelian Dialectic, engineered consent vs. manufactured dissent, to be foisted upon the public mind. The political acumen of these camps is pretty much identical qualitatively, the only difference being they each are now led by different styles of pied pipers best suited to their native genius. In the age of universal deceit, both these demographics remain ripe for harvest. In earlier

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

ages they were united in following just one king. Now they merely have different kings who lead them to the same effective outcome: fait accompli of the agendas of “history’s actors”. These kings are only doing their jobs for their own king-makers, the real powers behind the throne. And both doing it quite expertly too. This is how “history’s actors” work, by their own admission:

' "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do." ' --- (Ron Suskind, New York Times, Oct. 17, 2004)

Noam Chomsky has played his own part in the many acts of these “history’s actors” from the very emergence of his dissent. His first one JFK assassination during president Johnson’s administration which firmly established him in the camp of empire as the in crowd to be relied upon to corral those skeptics who may not buy the official “lone gun-man” version. And his crowning glory, 9/11. What a way to go for empire!

And what a self-sacrifice too, to have played the great antagonist of Pax Americana in disguise, from her Vietnam War to South America’s extortion to Palestine’s occupation, for which none of the plaudits will accrue to him as the great benefactor of empire in the official annals of the history of the Fourth Reich in world government. Its historians and narrators and children will sing songs in praise of their founders, but continue to celebrate their Machiavellian moralist in his theatrical costume as “arguably the most important intellectual alive” during those early period of trials and tribulations on the hard road to world order when the world was forced to endure the genocidal transition between two ages. None shall notice how cleverly the propagandist kept all the presuppositions and axioms of empire in tact in his vigorous moral voice of dissent. That, he was in fact, the empire’s own asset to mislead the type-2 demographics and was amply rewarded for it with lifetime employment in empire’s most prestigious university, and with lucrative book publishing contracts, and lofty anointment from empire’s own newspaper lending him credibility as the leading moral voice of the superpower, all of which were used to help set him up as the lead pied piper of conscience of the West. The dispossessed rushed to adopt him, and that includes the most dispossessed of them all in our times, the Palestinians.

What a way to be remembered --- for one’s costume and stage shows and not for one’s true self, all in the service of empire. That is indeed a self-sacrifice par excellence. I doubt if my good professor ever intends to take his costume off --- for that is indeed a nice remembrance, a Life of Dissent,

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

when there may or may not be too much else of such global significance to show for the true self out of costume. But as Shakespeare put the perceptive words in his own thespian's mouth: "Yet I have known those which have walked in their sleep who have died holily in their beds." (MacBeth 5:1:47-49).

Perhaps these words apply to Noam Chomsky as much as they apply to the *Nietzschean Übermensch*.

We have now been made painfully aware that in fact, Dr. Noam Chomsky is not a moral singularity for his vigorous voice of dissent against US foreign policy. But rather an integral part of the Democratic system of the West which propagandistically permits dissent in the name of freedom and relies on the system of controlled dissent to diabolically limit its effectiveness as much as it relies on the system of engineered consent to make the public mind. These perception management systems, ostensibly opposing each other, have their own well defined thought control principles by which they each function to sustain the necessary illusions of freedoms for the different types of demographics of the public mind. The superpower du jour, by the fiat of its un challengeable imperial power, promulgates its own values and control systems worldwide backed by the supremacy of its military, economic and intellectual armadas, and that has necessitated fabricating and universalizing different types of preeminent pied pipers for narrative control worldwide. Narrative control automatically leads to thought control, which in turn naturally leads to behavior control. The latter outcome is ultimately what is diligently sought by empire through full spectrum perception management. The public consenting to follow their respective pied pipers, marketed to them as experts and authority figures. The exercise of modern statecraft hinges on that paradigm for effective governance of the public mind. Noam Chomsky is one of those imperial pied pipers. Preeminent as a linguist, expertly skilled in both sophistry and political theory, and willing to do empire's dirty work of corralling the recalcitrant public mind without the encumbrances of a disturbed conscience.

No hemlock for this Socrates of empire for his lifetime of dissent; only lifetime of accolades, protection from misery with lifetime of employment, made Institute Professor in empire's own most famous institution, anointed "arguably the most important Intellectual alive" by empire's own mouthpiece, becoming the citation champ of empire, his books insulting empire's foreign policy waived from podium to podium by the victims of empire as the voice of the preeminent moralist of empire. The Nobel peace committee in Oslo hasn't been reading the cues properly for some reason, choosing the teenager Malala last year over Noam Chomsky. And Time too has repeatedly failed to put the good professor on its cover. Perhaps all that has been reserved for doling out in world government to create moral heroes in *future history* (when it is written) from the ashes of *past history*

for the new starry-eyed generations of the future.

None sound of mind may doubt today that the noble pied piper of empire is anything but a Pax Americana fellow. Noam Chomsky's *sacred axioms* and the concomitant rewards for upholding *imperial truths* speak louder than his vigorous protestation of American foreign policy and Israeli settler policy. Just the pecuniary gain from dissent is warning sign sufficient – profiting from selling morality is a profession as old as hegemony, and bolder in vulgarity than the oldest profession on earth. For there is deceit in the “moral agent”, none in the prostitute. These simple standards alone are sufficient to adjudicate Dr. Noam Chomsky's standing in the all encompassing thought control system highlighted in this essay and examined in much greater depth in the references.

Thus, in fair conclusion based on the uncontested factual evidence before us, all such public challenges to Noam Chomsky et. al. by those no longer enamored of them, are in fact meaningless gestures. Except, when tried under the absolutist powers of “victor's justice” as was displayed at the Nuremberg and Tokyo Military Tribunals by the victors of World War II. The leading vulgar propagandist as I recall was [to be] offered the gallows by the victorious Allies, and he only just cheated the hang-man's noose by swallowing cyanide taking his wife and six children with him. But I think dissecting all propaganda craftsmanship in public in complete context of the system can help others make up their own mind on whether or not they wish to be part of the imperial scam that presents wolves in sheep clothing who become the public's shepherds. Which is why I have so boldly written this tract without mincing words. Dr. Noam Chomsky is still living among us (and may he continue to live long and prosper), and if he wishes to refute a fact that he finds in error here (lest it be said that I challenged my teacher when he could not offer any rebuttal), I will be happy to receive any corrections. The rest is only my opinion of course. I don't expect my teacher to be happy about it or respond to it. The reference lists my efforts since 2003 where I have deconstructed the omissions and expert propaganda craftsmanship of Noam Chomsky. And you can read more about where *the powers that be* and their vulgar propagandists are cunningly taking the world one baby-step at a time, one Big Lie at a time, one fait accompli at a time, but which is never opposed by Chomsky as far as I am aware, in [Some Dare Call it Conspiracy](#) on the [Hard Road to World Order](#).

And no, you did not read any of that from the tireless and prolific pen of Noam Chomsky – but you ought to have! He would have done a far better job of exposing the lies when out of his thespian costume, and with far greater panache and syntactic eloquence, than his lowly student ever can. And I do thank him for teaching me. I hope I have lived up to his impeccable high standards of the [Responsibility of Intellectuals](#): “It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies.”


References

[a] *Noam Chomsky: A Life of Dissent* by Robert F. Barsky, The MIT Press, July 1998, “Because Chomsky is given ample space to articulate his views on many of the major issues relating to his work, both linguistic and political, this book can also be seen as the autobiography that Chomsky says he will never write.”, <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/noam-chomsky>

[b] *Chomsky Is Citation Champ*, MIT news bulletin, April 15, 1992, “Recent research on citations in three different citation indices show that Professor Chomsky is one of the most cited individuals in works published in the past 20 years. In fact, his 3,874 citations in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index between 1980 and 1992 make him the most cited living person in that period and the eighth most cited source overall—just behind famed psychiatrist Sigmund Freud and just ahead of philosopher Georg Hegel. Indeed, Professor Chomsky is in illustrious company. The top ten cited sources during the period were: Marx, Lenin, Shakespeare, Aristotle, the Bible, Plato, Freud, Chomsky, Hegel and Cicero.” <http://news.mit.edu/1992/citation-0415>

[c] *Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist*, by Peter Schweizer, Hoover Institution, January 30, 2006, Essay is adapted from the author’s book *Do As I Say (Not As I Do): Profiles in Liberal Hypocrisy* (Doubleday, 2005). The conservative Hoover Institution critic quotes Noam Chomsky: “If you look at the things I write—articles for Z Magazine, or books for South End Press, or whatever—they are mostly based on talks and meetings and that kind of thing. But I’m kind of a parasite. I mean, I’m living off the activism of others. I’m happy to do it.” Peter Schweizer further observes: “Chomsky’s marketing efforts shortly after September 11 give new meaning to the term war profiteer. In the days after the tragedy, he raised his speaking fee from \$9,000 to \$12,000 because he was suddenly in greater demand. He also cashed in by producing another instant book. Seven Stories Press, a small publisher, pulled together interviews conducted via e-mail that Chomsky gave in the three weeks following

the attack on the Twin Towers and rushed the book to press. His controversial views were hot, particularly overseas. By early December 2001, the publisher had sold the foreign rights in 19



different languages. The book made the best-seller list in the United States, Canada, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, and New Zealand. It is safe to assume that he netted hundreds of thousands of dollars from this book alone.” <http://www.hoover.org/research/noam-chomsky-closet-capitalist>

[d] *9-11* by Noam Chomsky, Seven Stories Press, November 2001. “9-11 was practically the only counter-narrative out there at a time when questions tended to be drowned out by a chorus, led by the entire United States Congress, of ‘God Bless America.’ . . . it is possible that, if the United States goes the way of nineteenth-century Britain, Chomsky's interpretation will be the standard among historians a hundred years from now.” —The New Yorker, quoted by Seven Stories Press, <http://catalog.sevenstories.com/products/9-11-was-there-an-alternative> . The New York Times Books review, “*THINK TANK; Surprise Best Seller Blames U.S.*” by Micheal Massing, May 4, 2002, concluded: ‘Hate the book or love it, readers keep buying it. As Mr. [Greg] Ruggiero of Seven Stories observed: “People want alternatives. In times of war, that's when people trust the media the least.”’ And so the people turn to Noam Chomsky! <http://nytimes.com/2002/05/04/books/think-tank-surprise-best-seller-blames-us.html>

[e] *Noam Chomsky interviewed by Evan Solomon*, CBC, December 9, 2003 “... now, until Bernard Lewis tells us that, and that's only one piece of a long story, we know that he is just a vulgar propagandist and not a scholar. So yes, as long as we are supporting harsh brutal governments, blocking democracy and development, because of our interest in controlling the oil resources in the region, there will be a campaign of hatred against us”, part-2, minute 5:50, <http://youtube.com/watch?v=bieFwutoqvA>

[f] *Noam Chomsky interviewed on Channel 2 News of Israel, 5/23/2010 (1/2)*, conducted in Amman, Jordan, May 23, 2010, after Chomsky was denied entry into the West Bank to speak at Birzeit University. “I don't regard myself as a critic of Israel. I regard myself as a supporter of Israel. The people who are harming Israel in my opinion, and I have said this many times, are those who claim to be supporting it. They are helping drive Israel towards moral degeneration, and possible ultimate destruction. I think support for Israel should be support for policies which are to its benefit.” (beginning 3:30) Chomsky went on to say: “Let's go back a step: you said I am calling for the destruction of Israel, or some words like that. I don't think it should exist as a Jewish state. Yah, I don't think the United States should exist as a Christian state. I don't think that Pakistan should exist as an Islamic state.” (beginning 5:30). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pb1Abfx2MPg>

Zahir Ebrahim's writings in chronological order on Dr. Noam Chomsky's fabled dissent

- [1] *Prisoners of the Cave*, Zahir Ebrahim, maiden book written April-June 2003, <http://prisonersofthecave.org> ; sympathetic reference is made to Noam Chomsky's anti-war intellectualism throughout the book, but the beginnings of shrewd *au contraire* challenge to Noam Chomsky echoing the same narrative as officialdom on 9/11 is in Chapter 2: <http://prisonersofthecave.blogspot.com/2007/04/chapter-2.html#Challenging-Noam-Chomsky-911> ; *au contraire* challenge on Israel-Palestine is in Chapter 3: <http://prisonersofthecave.blogspot.com/2007/04/chapter-3.html#Question-for-Noam-Chomsky-Israel-Palestine> ; download PDF: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/prisonersofthecave-7th-anniversary-edition-ch9-abridged-04172010-print.pdf>
- [2] *The endless trail of red herrings*, Zahir Ebrahim, February 28, 2007, formal and extensive deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's controlled intellectualism on Israel-Palestine, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/endless-red-herrings.html#Chomsky-Ambiguities>
- [3] *Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux: As seen by a Plebeian*, Zahir Ebrahim, March 03, 2007, the first formal deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's narrative of the responsibility of intellectuals as “moral agents”, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/responsibility-of-intellectuals-redux.html>
- [4] Zahir Ebrahim's Letter to Noam Chomsky: *Steven Jones seminal paper on the destruction of WTC towers*, April 21, 2008, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/04/letter-noamchomsky-jones-paper.html>
- [5] *Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science*, Zahir Ebrahim, June 01, 2008, outlines the need of statecraft for Machiavellianly controlling dissent to channel the type-2 demographics in Western style Democracy which constitutionally permits dissent, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/06/wmd-master-social-science.html>
- [6] *The Enduring Capitalist Conspiracy For World Government*, Zahir Ebrahim, September 25, 2008, and its *Addendum: The Monetary Conspiracy for World Government*, November 23, 2008. <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/09/capitalist-conspiracy-world-government.html#Addendum> Note what Noam Chomsky had perceptively observed of the instinct for primacy, as being principally natural rather than necessarily “conspiratorial”, in what I called the Chomsky-Ebrahim nomenclature of primacy:

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

Begin Excerpt

Noam Chomsky had once observed an insightful nature of such “conspiracies”, as the open shared natural goals stemming from the very nature of its definition, which could therefore, no more be termed a conspiracy than both GM and Ford endeavoring to maximize their profits at all cost be termed a 'global corporate conspiracy'.

I have always added to that, the equally un-remarkable observation that a hungry lion anywhere in the world pouncing upon a lamb is similarly no global conspiracy by the world's lions to eat up all the lambs on the planet.

So when these 'divine' beings behave in their primal predatory natural manner across time and space, across evolution or creation, are they being “conspiratorial”? In the Chomsky-Ebrahim nomenclature, perhaps not.

End Excerpt

Also note the following key passages in the Addendum which show Dr. Noam Chomsky deliberately, and repeatedly, failing to connect the dots of the past to the dots of the present by speciously adding two plus two to equal five. He does so by way of crafty omissions such that he tells only half the story laboriously belaboring that which is already visible to all and sundry, and staying silent on matters not readily visible to the public mind which require an imposing intellect to unravel and for which the public mind looks up to their intellectuals for guidance. But alas, when the salt used for defrosting the road ice itself corrodes (a Persian proverb):

Begin Excerpt

Now, if Rep. Lucco of the Illinois legislature in 1978 can endeavor to “collate what you are talking about -- 1912 -- with 1978”, surely a sensibly learned person today might try to collate the same to 2008? How might one forensically bring to bear all such historical knowledge, including revelations by Norman Dodd, on the present financial crisis and the role of the Federal Reserve System? How does that relate to the blatantly undisguised drive for world government today? How does that relate to 911? But no! Not the Federal Reserve System Chairman, nor any of the Nobel Prize winning economists waxing more economics gibberish, will go there! [a7]

And forget about the mainstream presses, erudite pundits, and even lauded dissent-space politicians like Ron Paul, [a8] and intellectuals like Noam Chomsky [a9] [a10] and Howard Zinn [a11] – forever

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

only rehearsing the crimes of the “rogue state” and 911 its “blowback” – doing so either. Their laudable emphasis on the facts that are visible like: (i) the American F16s and Apache Helicopters bombing civilians, or (ii) the crash of the stock market as a result of casino capitalism, and lamentable silence on the ones which are not readily visible like: (a) that which remains shrouded in conspiratorial secrecy for an overarching agenda and must be forensically uncovered from rational thinking and analysis, or (b) official narratives that are required to be kept intact, only ends up circuitously leading their own fawning flock, amidst great applause, to the pastures dutifully bounded by the same fences as the mainstream scholars! [a12] [a13] Their intellectualism, apparently, only extends to the government mandated axioms of “Bin Laden” and “Al-Qaeeda”, which are most obligingly, implicitly retained by them in their very learned dissenting discourses that valiantly document and courageously standup to the crimes of their own nation. [a14] [a15] And these intellectual are this scribe's own respected teachers! [a16]

Perhaps all these gadfly historians and men and women of letters who mainly delight in rehashing histories which are already faits accomplis, and in waxing moralizing sermons on being the privileged minority to whom “Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ... through which the events of current history are presented to us”, [a17] be graciously reminded of George Bernard Shaw's famous maxim “We are made wise not by the recollections of our past, but by the responsibility for our future”.

One wishing to learn more may review the pertinently culled reading list in the Monetary Reform Bibliography, and minimally peruse: “Monetary Reform: Who will bell the cat?”, and the Press Release “This may be a psy-op!”.

As Noam Chomsky once wrote, and quite correctly too, that “it takes a sentence to repeat lies and deceit, while it takes considerably more space to unravel them.” [a18] Elsewhere, he also wisely noted “It's always a good idea to start by asking about the facts. It's whenever you hear anything said very confidently, the first thing that should come to mind is, wait a minute, is that true?” [a19] Fortunately, many dedicated and quite ordinary peoples have learnt from Noam Chomsky's teachings, and have already done just that. They have diligently asked about the facts for all the official myths which are axiomatically rehearsed “very confidently” from the highest to the lowest pulpits across the land, and some of their truly intellectual works are cited in the Monetary Reform Bibliography.

The reader is also invited to ask the same question, “is that true”, of the 'who-dunit' axiom of the first

911 which “very confidently” narrated of an invasion from abroad; of the axiom of 'macro economics inevitability of this financial meltdown' that Warren Buffet termed “an economic Pearl Harbor”; and finally, of the axiom of 'the only solution for avoiding both types of 911s in the future, is world government controlled by the private central banks at the top of the pyramid'. The same pyramid-top which keeps the watchful-eye upon the world from the back of the world's reserve currency, the one dollar bill! It is an important question to ask, who effectively controls this reserve currency? For their identity is the identity of the watchful eye, the real emperors of the world! Upon their feet, lie the seeds of all the crimes against humanity in modern times. And upon whose beck and call, lies the “imperial mobilization” of the sole superpower state to preside over its own calculated demise, to create 'one world'!

End Excerpt

[7] *Response to Press TV's Interview with Noam Chomsky 'No change coming with Obama'*, Zahir Ebrahim, January 25, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/01/respto-chomskys-nochange-obama.html> . The Press TV interview is also evidence of how Dr. Noam Chomsky operates to serve the establishment. By lending credence to the presuppositions of the system that it is a “democracy” when it is most essential to bear witness to its mendacity – when the voting masses can actually take a stand against the presuppositions of the corrupt system itself during elections – and only ex post facto making the obviously ineffective statement of “no-change”, after the matter is already a fait accompli, after the new president has been elected with much fanfare, after conferring much legitimacy to the public's notion of “democratically” elected and representative government. Is the “no-change” really a surprise to Noam Chomsky, to the one anointed as “arguably the most important intellectual alive”? Did the foremost scholar of the West actually expect a significant change from the presidential elections that had him calling the American people to vote in them (with or without illusions)? What's wrong with this picture? Noam Chomsky evidently never found the opportunity to read this scribe's humble editorial: *Some Dare Call it Conspiracy! Are You Among Them?* by Zahir Ebrahim, April 19, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/04/some-dare-call-it-conspiracy-garyallen.html> . This abstruseness is a verifiable Noam Chomsky brand of dissent. It is observable in the lead-ups to American elections where the dissent-chief linguist dubiously argues that elections are somewhat meaningful playing word games (with or without illusions), and people should come out to vote, and not waste their vote on third party candidates but to only vote from among the candidates put up by the two largest political parties in the official two party American democracy! Ex post facto, the cunning scholar makes the banal back-peddling statement of “no-change”! See the alternative that surely leads to *change dramatis* if dissent-chiefs would only act their own self-proclaimed role as genuine “moral agents” and guide the public

correctly on where the ruling power actually resides – not in the White House: *Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!* by Zahir Ebrahim, October 22, 2008, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/not-voting-is-yes-vote-to-reject-system.html>

[8] *A Note on the Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare* by Zahir Ebrahim, May 31, 2009, see the two subsections in the Case Study on Dynamics of Mantra Creation: *The Hegelian Dialectic Militant Islam vs. Moderate Islam*, and: *The Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html#Case-Study-Mantra-Creation-Islamofascism>

[9] *PAMPHLET: HOW TO RETURN TO PALESTINE THIS DAY FORWARD*, by Zahir Ebrahim, 1st Edition May 15, 2010, 2nd Edition November 2012, expanded into the *PAMPHLET: Undoing The Theft Of Palestine - From Genocide to Genesis in Zero Compromise*, First Edition October 2013, 2nd printing September 2015. This Pamphlet takes the deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's dissent on the Zionist state a step further down the rabbit hole. It brings to light his omissions on the Balfour Declaration which virtually granted the Jewish State to the House of Rothschild; a most sacred name to the Jews that neither appears in the public presses, nor evidently appears to escape from Noam Chomsky's very vocal dissent chords; download pdf: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/pamphlet-undoing-the-theft-of-palestine-zahirebrahim.pdf>

[10] See Zahir Ebrahim's *Letter to Jeff Blankfort in response to 'Chomsky and Palestine: Asset or Liability?'*, July 22, 2010, for the common axiom shared between Chomsky and his prolific critic, smacking of a rigged wwf-wrestling match among the tribe members who present the illusion of vigorous challenge to each other while observing silence on topics that their tribal bosses want to keep away from the dumb goyim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/07/let-jeffblankfort-rothschilds-palestine.html> .

The letter straightforwardly inquired of Chomsky's prolific critic: “*Why does most everyone in the West ignore or outright downplay the Rothschilds' role in current affairs? ... The name Rothschild is almost a litmus test of co-option, at least to my mind. See who omits any analysis of the role of the Rothschilds; see who mentions them but not in current modernity context – only in past historical context like most anyone who dares mention their name today, including Quigley; and see who mentions them but also sullies their own punch – like the proverbial toad in a punch-bowl – by interjecting specious speculations and kookish conspiracy theories of blood-drinking lizards (David*

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

lcke), merovingian blood-lines (Grace Powers), gross generalizations of 'sky is falling' while blow-horning revolutions (Alex Jones), etc."

Noam Chomsky never mentions the House of Rothschild, or bothers to perceptively analyze the question begging for the attention of intellectuals especially those who advocate for the Palestinian cause: *"why should the Balfour declaration be addressed to a Rothschild?"*. And neither does his critic Jeffrey Blankfort who offered this riposte in a posted comment on July 23rd, 2010: *"Forgive me for not reading this all the way through but you give the House of Rothschild, now in its decline, far too much discredit for Israel's role and what might be called the Zionist International {ZI}—the combined organized Jewish communities too little."* And this reiteration of his silence on the elephant in the bedroom via emailed letter of Nov 10, 2010: *"I do not mention the Rothschilds because I have yet to see a single shred of evidence that they control the world's money supply, the CFR, or anything else of such substance as to influence the way the world works. As far as I can tell whereas once members of the Rothschild banking family ran the banks of Western Europe, I see no evidence that they do so today. There are a number of other Jewish bankers who have surpassed them in influence and if the Rothschilds were as powerful today as you claim them to be, there would be some kind of trail to find at least a hint of what they have been doing."* See Pamphlet *The Invisible House of Rothschild* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/rothschild.html> .

This tribe must really think that the goy is dumb jackass who needs Jewish pied pipers to help it navigate the world! As one Palestinian friend observed: *"We run from Jew to Jew, they create the problem, and also argue the solution, they control the full spectrum of our discourse as well as our existence."* <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/rescuing-thestruggle-for-palestine.html> .

Noam Chomsky has time and again made it very clear himself how narrative control works in democratic societies: *"The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum - even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate."*

But of course it is not practiced by the elders of his tribe when their own dissident views are prominently splashed across the alternate media --- perish that thought! That bold effrontery before the dumb goy is reserved only for mainstream media. So don't be a dumb jackass regardless of who

The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky

you are. Stop following your pied pipers. That goes for all foot soldiers and useful idiots of power, including Jews, Zionists, and Gentiles. The indoctrination is examined in:

<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/pamphlet-how-to-return-to-palestine.html> .

[11] See Zahir Ebrahim's *Response to Francis Boyle's '2011: Prospects for Humanity?' – Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!*, January 07, 2011, for some uncanny resemblance between the two foremost dissent chiefs of United States of America, the noble Christian warrior of conscience rising to match wits with his Jewish moralist counterpart. And what truths do they share in common? The sacred truths of empire! <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/resp-francisboyle-2011-prospects-for.html>

[12] *Masters of Dissent and The Dying Songbird* by Zahir Ebrahim, September 15, 2013, outlines the architecture, principles and techniques of thought control underlying Manufactured Dissent: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/dying-songbird.html>

[13] *Noam Chomsky: Songbird or Superman – You Decide!* September 15, 2013. Zahir Ebrahim's analysis of the Top Ten Dissent Superman of the West and their Top Ten counterparts in the colonized East who follow in their massa's footsteps. Number One Dissent *Superman* in the contemporary world: Dr. Noam Chomsky. Judge for yourself: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/songbird-or-superman.html#Noam-Chomsky>

[14] *Open Letter to Noam Chomsky* by Zahir Ebrahim April 09, 2014, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/04/open-letter-noam-chomsky-by-zahirebrahim.html>

[15] *The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky Revisited in 2015* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2015/12/noam-chomsky-revisited-in-2015-by-zahir.html>

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter IV

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

Masters of Controlled Opposition

Let's begin with some basic definitions to contextualize the term House Nigger – it's not about race.

What is a White Man?

“White” in White Man is not about skin color or complexion. It is about attitudes towards another. First, permitting Malcolm X to describe it in his own eloquence:

'It was when I first began to perceive that “white man” as commonly used, means complexion only secondarily; primarily it described attitudes and actions. In America, “white man” meant specific attitudes and actions toward the black man, and toward all other non-white men.' -- (Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, 1964, 1999 hardcover edition, Chapter *Mecca*, page 364)

Project Humanbeingsfirst's usage of the word “white man” denotes an overarching attitude of a superiority complex which is best captured by the union of several nuanced concepts:


- Malcolm X's aforementioned description of attitude rather than skin color;
- the term '*Hectoring Hegemons*' – imperialism; the attitude of physically

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

imposing one's self-perceived superiority complex upon another, to physically invade, conquer and enslave another in the name of god, glory, *Lebensraum*, or just for the opportunities to profit;

- the term '*la mission civilisatrice*' – the attitude which came to be defined by the colonizing European Christians in the preceding centuries, to rob and plunder the natives throughout the world bequeathing them the invaders' "Christian" culture as a gift of "civilization" to the "dogs" and "barbarians" to "save" them from eternal damnation as heathens;
- the term '*Orientalism*' – the attitude of prejudice, at times in the sub-text, betrayed in Western scholarship of the Orient, i.e., the East, that Western civilization is inherently superior to all the Eastern civilizations;
- the term '*pious virtue*' – the hypocritical attitude which comes about by harboring any of the above in one's psyche while pretending to be fair and sympathetic to the 'lesser people'. It is the unstated common assumption in the backdrop when dealing with the 'lesser people'. It is most easily discernible when rushing to the aid of the victims of the white man's *la mission civilisatrice*, sometimes with all the best intentions, but deeming the native victims inherently less worthy in comparison to when the "white man" is made victim. It is ably captured in Noam Chomsky's "worthy victim" vs. "unworthy victim" nomenclature with all its attendant semantics. Its manifestation is most stark in the differing standards for seeking compensation and punitive damages which are sought on behalf of the victims by those representing the victims, often from the victimizer's own civilization, or suitable lackeys chosen from among the 'lesser peoples' who are put up there as proxies for the "white man" now so magnanimously providing the 'lesser people' with the "white man's" justice. The end result exactly betrays that the "white man's" victims are deemed inherently superior to those from among the "barbarians". The whole transaction is couched in "pious virtue".

What is The White Man's Burden?



Caption The White Man's Burden appears Uniformly Distributed; Judge for yourself – The foolish 'untermenschen' better understand the insidious breadth and depth of the common 'la mission civilisatrice' bond among the white man (and including their 'house niggers' who are often more white than the white man) when they come, individually, and in groups, wearing different colored labels of Left, Right, Liberal, Conservative, Progressive, Atheist, Christian, Jew, etcetera, bearing gifts of pious virtue in various *Hegelian Dialectics*. Zbigniew Brzezinski justified the primacy of the powerful with "Hegemony is as old as mankind" in *The Grand Chessboard* only as the latter day secular version of that same *white man's burden*. Unless the 'untermensch' nations of the East indigenously come to our own common self-defense against these almost superhuman global forces arrayed against the world for fashioning world government from the ashes of civilization, no one else will. See [The White Man's Burden](#). (Image source Library of Congress via umd.edu)

'In February 1899, British novelist and poet Rudyard Kipling wrote a poem entitled "The White Man's Burden: The United States and The Philippine Islands." In this poem, Kipling urged the U.S. to take up the "burden" of empire, as had Britain and other European nations. Published in the February, 1899 issue of *McClure's*

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

Magazine, the poem coincided with the beginning of the Philippine-American War and U.S. Senate ratification of the treaty that placed Puerto Rico, Guam, Cuba, and the Philippines under American control. Theodore Roosevelt, soon to become vice-president and then president, copied the poem and sent it to his friend, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, commenting that it was “rather poor poetry, but good sense from the expansion point of view.” Not everyone was as favorably impressed as Roosevelt. The racialized notion of the “White Man’s burden” became a euphemism for imperialism, and many anti-imperialists couched their opposition in reaction to the phrase.’ --- ([historymatters](#))

Take up the White Man's burden--
Send forth the best ye breed--
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild--
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.

Take up the White Man's burden--
In patience to abide,
To veil the threat of terror
And check the show of pride;
By open speech and simple,
An hundred times made plain
To seek another's profit,
And work another's gain.

Take up the White Man's burden--
The savage wars of peace--
Fill full the mouth of Famine
And bid the sickness cease;
And when your goal is nearest
The end for others sought,
Watch sloth and heathen Folly
Bring all your hopes to nought.

Take up the White Man's burden--
No tawdry rule of kings,
But toil of serf and sweeper--
The tale of common things.
The ports ye shall not enter,
The roads ye shall not tread,
Go mark them with your living,
And mark them with your dead.

Take up the White Man's burden--
And reap his old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard--
The cry of hosts ye humour
(Ah, slowly!) toward the light:--
“Why brought he us from bondage,
Our loved Egyptian night?”

Take up the White Man's burden--
Ye dare not stoop to less--
Nor call too loud on Freedom
To cloke your weariness;
By all ye cry or whisper,
By all ye leave or do,
The silent, sullen peoples
Shall weigh your gods and you.

Take up the White Man's burden--
Have done with childish days--
The lightly proffered laurel,
The easy, ungrudged praise.
Comes now, to search your manhood
Through all the thankless years
Cold, edged with dear-bought wisdom,
The judgment of your peers! --- ([source](#))


What is a Negro?

Let's begin by studying the very basic types of mental servitude. Let's start with Malcolm X's version of the ['Negro'](#):

"There was two kind of slaves.

There was the house Negro and the field Negro.

The house Negro, they lived in the house, with massa. They dressed pretty good. They ate good, cause they ate his food, what he left. They lived in the attic or the basement, but still they lived near their master, and they loved their master, more than their master loved himself. They would give their life to save their master's house quicker than their master would.



The house Negro, if the master said 'we got a good house here', the house Negro say 'yeah, we got a good house here'.

Whenever the master would said we, he'd say we. That's how you can tell a house Negro.

If the master's house caught on fire, the house Negro would fight harder to put the blaze out than the master would. If the master got sick, the house Negro would say 'What's the matter, boss, we sick?' We sick!

He identified himself with his master, more than his master identified with himself.

And if you came to the house Negro and said 'let's run away, let's escape, let's separate', the house Negro would look at you and say 'man, you crazy! What you mean separate? Where is there a better house than this? Where can I wear better clothes than this? Where can I eat better food than this?'

That was that house Negro.

In those days, he was called a house nigger. And that's what we call him today, 'cause we still got some house niggers runnin around here.

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

This modern house Negro loves his master. He wants to live near him.

He'll pay three times as much as the house is worth just to live near his master, and then brag about 'I'm the only Negro out here. I'm the only one on my job. I'm the only one in this school.' You're nothing but a house Negro!

And if someone come to you right now and say 'let's separate', you say the same thing that the house Negro said on the plantation: 'What you mean separate? From America? This good white man? Where you gonna get a better job than you get here? I mean this is what you say. 'I ain't left nothing in Africa'. That's what you say.

Why, you left your mind in Africa!

On that same plantation, there was the field Negro.

The field Negro, those were the masses. There was always more Negroes in the field than there was Negroes in the house.

The Negro in the field caught hell. He ate leftovers.

In the house they ate high up on the hog. The Negro in the field didn't get nothing but what was left of the insides of the hog.

They call them chetlands nowadays. In those days they called them what they were, guts!

That's what you were, a guteater. And some of you are still guteaters!

The field Negro was beaten, from morning till night.

He lived in a shack, in a hut. He wore cast-off clothes.

He hated his master. I say, he hated his master.

He was intelligent.

That house Negro loved his master. But that field Negro, remember, they were in the majority, and they hated their master.

When the house caught on fire, he didn't try to put it out, that field Negro prayed for a wind. For a breeze!

When the master got sick, the field Negro prayed that he died.

If someone come to the field Negro and said 'let's separate, let's run.' He didn't say 'Where we going?' he said 'Any place is better than here'.

We got field Negroes in America today.

I'm a field Negro.

The masses are the field Negroes.

When they see this man's house on fire, you don't hear these little Negroes talkin bout 'Our Government is in trouble'. They say 'thee Government is in trouble.'

Imagine a Negro, 'our Government'. I even heard one say 'our astronauts.' They won't even let him near the plant, and 'our astronauts'. 'Our Navy'. That's a Negro that's out of his mind.

That's a Negro that's out of his mind!

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

Just as the slave master in that day, used Tom, the house Negro, to keep the field Negroes in check.

The same 'ol slavemaster today, has Negroes, who are nothing but modern Uncle Toms. 20th century Uncle Toms, to keep you and me in check.

Keep us under control. Keep us passive and peaceful. And nonviolent. That's Tom making you nonviolent.

It's like when you go to the dentist, and the man is going to take your tooth. You're going to fight him, when he start pulling. So they squirt some stuff in your jaw called Novocain, to make you think they are not doing anything to you. So you sit there and because you got all that Novocain in your jaw, you suffer peacefully. Hahahaha.

There's nothing in our Book, the Qur'an, as you call it, Koran, teaches us to suffer peacefully.

Our religion teaches us to be intelligent. Be peaceful. Be courteous. Obey the law. Respect everyone.

But if someone puts his hand on you, send him to the cemetery!

That's a good religion. In fact, that's that old-time religion. That's the one that Ma and Pa used to talk about.

An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, and a head for a head, and a life for a life.

That's a good religion.

And then anybody, no one resist that kind of religion being taught but a wolf, who intends to make you his meal.

This is the way it is with the white man in America. He's a wolf, and you're sheep.

Anytime a shepherd, a pastor, teach you and me not to run from the white man, and at the same time teach us don't fight the white man, he's a traitor, to you and me.

Don't lay down our life all by itself. No! Preserve your life. It's the best thing you got.

And if you got to give it up, let it be Even Steven." --- (Malcolm X, House Negro vs. Field Negro [Speech](#) Transcription by Project Humanbeingsfirst.org)

In his [autobiography](#), The Autobiography of Malcolm X, Malcolm X further fleshed out the modern Negro who thinks like the massa. He is black, brown, red or yellow in skin color, but is pure white in mind color:

"Today's Uncle Tom doesn't wear a handkerchief on his head. This modern, twentieth-century Uncle Thomas now often wears a top hat. He's usually well-dressed and well-educated. He's often the personification of culture and refinement. The twentieth-century Uncle Thomas sometimes speaks with a Yale or Harvard accent. Sometimes he is known as Professor, Doctor, Judge, and Reverend, even Right Reverend Doctor. This twentieth-century Uncle Thomas is a professional Negro ... by that I mean his profession is being a Negro for the white man." --- (Malcolm X, The

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

Autobiography of Malcolm X, 1964, 1999 hardcover edition, Chapter *Black Muslims*, page 265. See [The Unknown Transformation of Malcolm X](#))

Well, that description of the colonized mind turns out to be not all that modern, even though it accurately captures the modern Uncle Tom among all peoples. Witness the following statement in his speech before the English Parliament in 1835, by Lord Babington Macaulay who devised the new education policy for the Indian sub-continent – the Jewel in the Crown of the British Empire:

“We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, --a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.” --- (Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay, Minute on Education, [2nd February 1835](#))

Martin Luther King Jr. also offered a timeless description for the Negro which today transcends skin color and complexion in its empiricism:

“The white establishment is skilled in flattering and cultivating emerging leaders. It presses its own image on them and finally, from imitation of manners, dress, and style of living, a deeper strain of corruption develops. This kind of Negro leader acquires the white man’s contempt for the ordinary Negro. He is often more at home with the middle-class white than he is among his own people. His language changes, his location changes, his income changes, and ultimately he changes from the representative of the Negro to the white man into the white man’s representative to the Negro. The tragedy is that too often he does not recognize what has happened to him.” --- (Martin Luther King Jr., A Testament of Hope, [page 307](#))

What is “Intellectual Negro”

Many more complex shades of the ‘Negro’ have been cultivated in modernity than the ones Malcolm X and MLK had been exposed to. One new shade that I have been grappling with for some time is the “Intellectual Negro”.

This new shade of the servile Negro which escaped the experiences of the civil and human rights struggles of the American black leaders, has become ubiquitous among Muslims today, especially among Pakistanis, Afghanis, and Arabs. Indeed, among all nations along the *'arc of crisis'* in the

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

'global zone of percolating violence'.

This kind of Negro is familiar to us under the nom de guerre **'fabricated dissent'**, a pernicious variant of ['native informant'](#) (See [The Native Informant: Fouad Ajami is the Pentagon's favorite Arab](#) By Adam Shatz, April 10, 2003).

This Negro, the "Intellectual Negro", is very sophisticated, and often very intelligent with advanced academic and/or public credentials. This Negro will appear to hector (to play the bully) the white man and the white man's establishment, while still managing to echo the white man's core-axioms.

In other words, the intellectual Negro will appear to be an outspoken voice of dissent in favor of the downtrodden and the oppressed, typically from the 'left-liberal' nexus, but will still devilishly manage to echo the massa's core message. The 'right-conservative' nexus that usually align openly with the massa class and its primacy imperatives, also dabble in engineering consent among the minority in their own flock who refuse to tow the massa's line, by playing WWF wrestling with the massa.

These cheer leaders round up their respective flock around the core-axioms and presuppositions of the massa while playing vigorous dissent with the massa. This WWF exercise requires considerably more intellectual prowess and sophistication than typical propaganda with big lies.

For instance, while vehemently critiquing the empire's war on terror and its devastating impact upon the innocent victims across many civilizations, the intellectual Negro will craftily manage to echo the empire's core message that Al Qaeda is the global terrorist menace which carried out the 9/11 attacks on America.

That retention of the core-axiom of empire from which all the evil that followed after 9/11, and which enabled all its subsequent aggressive wars and crimes against humanity that he critiques, reduces the intellectual Negro to an absurdity. But he is treated as the most avant-garde in intellectual thought and praised by both, the hegelian instruments of the white man instrumenting its dissent-space, as well as the brain-washed field Negroes themselves to whom he laboriously carries the white man's burden displaying much personal anguish.

Thus, the facade of hectoring, i.e., challenging the visible narratives of power, serves the function of appearing to be on the side of the 'field Negro', but in reality he is still a 'house Negro' without speaking in that 'we' vernacular noted by Malcolm X.

These vulgar house Negro types, spanning the full gamut of the colonized mind so ubiquitous

among the Western educated *likkha-parrha jahils* ruling the Muslim mind today as the surrogate of the Mighty Wurlitzer, are employed, or co-opted, by the massa to cunningly manipulate the perspectives and consequently the behavior of the field Negros.

What fundamentally causes this malfunction of the human psyche such that neither the massa class nor its vile surrogates harbor any moral compunction before the fact, nor any shame or remorse after the fact, as they continue to exercise their unfettered primacy upon the public mind rather openly?

Here is a bold look into the Ubermensch Sociopathic mind and what ought be done to preempt its primacy before it is *fait accompli*.

What is the Ubermensch Sociopathic Mind

A few years ago I accidentally stumbled on to the study of modern psychopathy and sociopathy. My first exposure to the latest developments in this field was to a book called *Political Ponerology* by a polish social scientist, Andrew Lobaczewski. Subsequently, my interest and study in neuroscience also contributed a measure of deeper understanding of the involuntary impact of DNA and neuro-biochemistry on pathological behavior. What had immediately attracted my attention to Lobaczewski's study however, was the bold claim made by its author and the editor of the English version of the book, that Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Jimmy Carter's National Security Advisor (1976-1980, d. 2017), had tried to suppress its publication.

Now, why would the late Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski want to do that --- apart from the fact that he is himself a Polish Catholic immigrant to the United States and has been the key architect of *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (which is also the title of a book which he wrote in 1996) since 1972, when he founded the Trilateral Commission with International banker David Rockefeller?

So, like a child who is always curious when someone says “don't”, I read the book. Followed by other works on the subject, such as Martha Stout's *The sociopath next door*.

None of you in Pakistan are likely aware that the recent advances in psycho-sociology in the study of evil, betray that there is an element of it in a significant number of cases which may transcend moral choice.

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

Hitherto, good and evil have always been viewed from moral and religious perspectives. And it is still true for the vast majority of “normal” people.

But empiricism has also shown that it has never been true for the vilest psychopaths among mankind throughout history who have felt no internal need for the abstraction of good and evil.

Now a new empirical theory is evolving which is lending powerful explanation for these observations which appear to be as old as mankind. From time immemorial, it is a fact that remorseless fiends have risen to become leaders of men. Just like a snake bites, and a lion rules by might is right, which are also not moral choices for the beasts – because to exercise their primacy, for food, for hunger, or for territory, is in the very nature of these creatures.

Psychopathy is now being viewed in new light as a physical/emotional/neurological disorder where the person is physiologically unable to feel empathy, unable to feel remorse. The neurological or cellular material which generates empathy is suspected to be entirely missing in them, or severely atrophied for some reason.

The psychopath is often highly intelligent, very ambitious, very cunningly deceptive. He is able to disguise his primacy instincts with an affable smile and platitudinous nod to morality. As some might cynically observe in Pakistan, he often comes in uniform, with a broad smile, or with *sajda* (piety) stamped upon his forehead. And it is evidently independent of caste, color, ethnicity, creed, sex, sexual orientation, and political affiliation (which changes easily in any case).

These abnormal people don't appear *prima facie* abnormal. In fact, they tend to gain easy acceptability among their peers, sometimes even well liked, and often have the instincts to rise to the top of their profession by any means necessary. As they say in popular vernacular in Hollywood movies: sleep their way to the top!

But in reality, the sociopath next door adopts any method that will get him or her to the top in whatever he might be interested in. The notion of shame, remorse, hesitation, etc., which normal people feel when transgressing moral limits, or when caught, is alien to their nature in the same way as it is alien to a snake which strikes the unsuspecting victim that happens to come in its path.

No one really expects the snake to feel remorse, or admit guilt, or resign from its hunting grounds in a show of moral gravitas that it bit an innocent doe.

Well, it is being discovered that the most audacious psychopaths, often the sociopath next door, are

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

physiologically equally unable to feel remorse.

What is most frightening about this is that the number of such abnormal people who prey upon normal people from their perches is disturbingly higher than previously thought by sociologists.

The number disclosed in the book *Political Ponerology* is 6%.

According to these insane demographics, about six people in a hundred are potentially psychopathic. He or she will prey upon you as nonchalantly as the rest ninety four might step on a harmless bug while taking a walk in the park. But while you won't go to the bug's funeral or show any hypocrisy in the matter, it's only a bug after all, the psychopath will come to your funeral with a dozen roses and a wet handkerchief.

And these psychopathic people typically also tend to be the ones who invariably rise to all positions of power in society – from corporate to political to religious to yes, education too, all across the power spectrum in modern institutionalized society in every corner of the world.

They tend to congregate together in a fraternal bond and support each other just like a pack of wolves. They wash each other like Peter and Paul. How they actually recognize each other is rather obvious – even brief associations can betray who shows moral compunction and who does not.

Most normal people for whom good and evil are moral choices, even when they might choose evil, feel the guilt-pangs of that choice which manifests in a number of anxiety inducing ways from superficial guilt to stress, to PTSD.

And for all normal people, even if they were some how habitually desensitized through long years of immersion in the *banality of evil*, their physiological makeup is not averse to feeling remorse. And once it is brought to their attention and explained how they are complicit in the evil, they at least feel some guilt, some remorse, some anxiety, some shame.

That ability to feel shame, remorse and pangs of conscience is what makes us characteristically human.

I am not really making any of this up as I go along. Just outlining here my understanding of this fascinating subject which uncannily appears to meet the acid test of empiricism. Please refer to the cited books if even your own everyday commonsense observations disagree with any of this.

What is apparent to me, and should be to you as well, is that the rulership of Pakistan, like the

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

rulership of most nations including the United States', are outstanding empirical evidence of this psychopathy lending great substantive import to these new researches into the study of evil. There is neither any moral compunction before the fact, nor any shame or remorse after the fact.

The only sensible way to control this evil is not to talk to it, or try to tickle its conscience – for that would be as effective as trying to talk to a viper to stop “dussing” (Urdu word for a snake striking a prey) or to feel guilt or remorse afterwards.

The only rational and effective approach to deal with psychopaths (those who look the part) and sociopaths (those who don't) is to detect and preempt them before they “duss” and cause their disproportional havoc; to seek legal entitlements under appropriate laws and statutes rather than with platitudes. If some laws are wanting to deal with this abnormal group effectively, than appropriate ones have to be legislated. While the natural predatory instinct of the rest of the normal ninety-four percent population can be modified to live by self-policed ethical standards, principally by nurturing them through education systems and expecting the same at all tiers of social intercourse, the remaining six percent shall always require legal dispensation, both before and after the fact.

However, leaving aside both the sociopath and psychopath, what causes their victims, the majority of the public, the unwashed masses, hoi polloi, in the mainstream as well as in the dissentstream, to accept becoming such easy morsels of their Machiavellian manipulations? Especially the Muslims who have been amply endowed with Great Divine Guidance to overcome false gods? What causes their mass dysfunction? Once again, it is not lack of intrinsic morality.

One of the psychological forces that so easily disarms its victims appears to be the commonplace notion of [Waiting for Allah](#), Divine Intervention. In that dissection of fatalistic eschatology, I take a bold look into the believing mind and how its resignation to fate is cunningly harvested by the Mighty Wurlitzer playing its specious epistemological tune on religion.

The Machiavellian machinery of the Mighty Wurlitzer, which is now global and ubiquitous across all cultures and civilizations controlling virtually every domain of human belief systems, and consequently aggregate human behavior, is systematically deconstructed in a detailed report on psychological warfare operations on civilian populations using all aspects of modern media and official narratives. Pakistanis, while harboring a more healthy skepticism of power than their Western counterparts, must still pay particular attention to this diabolical cunning that is making their mind on virtually every matter pertinent to their lives and times. In the age of universal deceit, to learn the truth is indeed, a revolutionary act – the ultimate *jihad*.

However, having learned what the whole truth of any matter is, does not mean it will make any difference in one's behavior beyond armchair commentaries. [The Art and Science of Co-option](#) often leads to willingly becoming *Summun Bukmun Umyun* for differing reasons for us all. Resistance to evil, interdiction of evil, the desire to alter one's condition by standing up to the Ubermensch manipulating our mind and controlling our behavior at the risk of existentialism, all become mere platitudes to write great books about. It is easiest to Wait for Allah. And thus we become willing victims of confirmation bias when we draw upon beliefs that speak to eschatology, the end of time.

So now let's look at the manufactured dissent con-artistes, the intellectual house niggers, specifically among Pakistanis, who lead its public astray playing controlled opposition and WWF wrestling with empire.

The Niggers of Pakistan

Here is an example: the first article hectors the white man, the second one echoes its core axioms:

- [Cached PDF Between imperialism and Islamism By Pervez Hoodbhoy, October-November 2007 Himal Southasian, pgs. 26-31](#)
(<https://tinyurl.com/hoodbhoy-between-imperialism>)
- [Cached PDF Pakistan – The Threat From Within By Pervez Hoodbhoy, 23rd May 2007, Pakistan Security Research Unit \(PSRU\) Brief Number 13](#)
(<https://tinyurl.com/hoodbhoy-threat-from-within>)

And here is another one which does the same all in one article:

- [Cached PDF Between Military and Militants FROM AYESHA SIDDIQA IN ISLAMABAD PAKISTAN, Associated Press, March 19, 2007](#)
(<https://tinyurl.com/AyeshaSiddiqa-between-military>)

And here is deconstructing another intellectual Negro who ostensibly hectors power while still managing to echo its key message:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Project Humanbeingsfirst unravels Hamid Mir's and Geo TV's bullying of a little blog – The Real Agenda](#)

Here is the latest variant who shamelessly sides with power spinning absurdities:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Zahir Ebrahim Responds to Rafia Zakaria's and Amnesty International's Call for 'prosecution of Taliban leaders for war crimes'](#)
- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: The Enduring Power of Machiavellian Political Science](#)

While the above illustrative examples are typical of the “Left-liberal” nexus carrying the mantra of Secular Humanism and reviling the “Right-religion” nexus, the following is an illustrative example of the “Right-religion” nexus. After villainously condemning each other during the day in “noora kushti” (Urdu word for a WWF style wrestling match where both combatants entertaining the audience by a show of vile antagonist wrestling, work for the same promoter and drink from the same trough after the match), they both congregate at the same white man's table for supper:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Response to the Fatwa on Terrorism in the Service of Empire](#)

The diabolical omissions and selective story-telling, a crime common to all Negro penologists of Pakistan serving the massa's interests, including its news media, its NGO based glittering literati clamoring [Secular Humanism](#), its virtuous politicians picking whichever side leads the quickest to power and graft, its mercenary military slaughtering its own peoples with American payments, and its religious zealots either burning American flags in protests or echoing the massa's own condemnations, is in my 692-page book “[The Pakistan Decapitation Papers](#)” 4th Edition, June 2011. A quick examination of these omissions which never see ink in the erudite penmanship of the intellectual Negro picking the “good” side in the Hegelian Dialectic of “militant Islam” vs. “moderate Islam” is here:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Between Imperial Mobilization and Islamofascism: Bribing the Maggots and the Soul Extractor](#)
- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Saving Pakistan from Synthetic 'Terror Central'](#)

Since Pakistan and Afghanistan share more than just an ill-fated arbitrary boundary of imperial fiat, the same niggers gallantly extend across its long borders of common history. The following is an example drawn from Afghanistan but just as ubiquitous in Pakistan. An Afghani-born, American-naturalized, Stanford and Columbia university educated professor of education playing loud dissent

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

with empire: *“I think it was absolutely wrong for the United States to attack and invade Afghanistan, because Afghanistan as such had nothing to do with 9/11”*, still managed to echo the core-axioms of empire that 9/11 was an invasion from abroad and the work of vile terrorist Muslims: *“In fact people now think that the Taleban had no idea that Al Qaeda had a plan to attack the United States”*. The good Samaritan educator has continued to labor since the invasion of Afghanistan in October 2001, to bring the same sort of Education system of the colonizing white man to Afghanistan as was crafted by Lord Macaulay to cultivate house negroes and Uncle Thomases in the Indian sub-continent:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Afghanistan: Letter to Professor Zaher Wahab from Zahir Ebrahim](#)

The aforementioned example is illustrative of the quintessential modern intellectual Negro – highly intelligent, un-afraid to speak up against the massa, yet fully subservient where necessary, laboring with missionary zeal in carrying the white man's burden, its *'la mission civilisatrice'*, in full sympathy to the victims. The resume of the intellectual Negro is notably representative of the most successful native informants today:

'He was born and schooled in Afghanistan, received a B.A. in sociology from The American University of Beirut, an M.A. in comparative education from Teachers College, Columbia University, and an M.A. in anthropology and a Ph.D. in international development education from Stanford University. Dr. Wahab was the first person in his family's history to attend the village school, a boarding school in Kabul, and receive scholarships to attend college in Lebanon and the US. Thus far, Dr. Wahab is the only Afghan with a Ph.D. from Stanford University.'

My aforementioned letter to the Afghani scholar was greeted not with stone silence as I had feared, but with the following short encouraging statement: *“Dear Mr. Ebrahim, Greetings from Portland, and many thanks for your insightful, passionate, informative, thoughtful, and thought-provoking e-mail. I will respond in detail, or call you, as soon as I have some time and peace of mind. Regards, Zw”*. I look forward to such exchange.

The good Afghani professor may well be the rare case of genuinely being mistaken in carrying the white man's burden – as inconceivable as that may be to imagine that someone with a masters degree in anthropology and a doctorate in education would be unaware of the modalities of the greatest colonial conquest of all time, that of the Indian sub-continent, partly with the already mentioned Education policy of Lord Macaulay for fabricating “professional Negroes”. In which case,

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

the good professor will cease and desist from carrying water for the white man's "*la mission civilisatrice*". When that transpires, this illustrative example will be appropriately amended.

Here is a similar illustrative example of a stellar high-tech professional resume, one which has proven itself time and again to be unarguably that of an intellectual Negro. This one is a most distinguished resume from Pakistan. It was carried by the Middle East Forum, a Zionist neo-con Quarterly, presumably of the Jewish Islamophobe Daniel Pipes. They love to promote any intellectual Negro who will profoundly echo, in any convolution, the white man's burden encapsulated in the doctrinal craftsmanship of Jewish scholars like Bernard Lewis, in books such as: "*Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror*" and "*What Went Wrong? The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East*":

'Pervez Amirali Hoodbhoy (b. 1950) is one of South Asia's leading nuclear physicists and perhaps Pakistan's preeminent intellectual. Bearer of a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he is chairman of the department of physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad where, as a high-energy physicist, he carries out research into quantum field theory and particle phenomenology. He has also been a visiting professor at the University of Maryland, College Park, and was visiting professor at MIT and Stanford. For some time, he has been a frequent contributor to Britain's leading intellectual journal, Prospect. His extracurricular activities include a vocal opposition to the political philosophy of Islamism. He also writes about the self-enforced backwardness of the Muslim world in science, technology, trade, and education. His many articles and television documentaries have made a lasting impact on debate about education, Islam, and secularism in Pakistan. Denis MacEoin interviewed him by e-mail in October 2009.'

[Here](#) is that interview with Pervez Hoodbhoy, titled "*Islam and Science Have Parted Ways*" promoted by MEF. And [here](#) is Hoodbhoy's column in the UK Guardian "*Islam's arrested development*", echoing the same theme. The deconstruction of the crafty linguistics for the seemingly careless usage of the word "Islam" which enables crafting the public discourse on "Islamism" and its variants such as "militant Islam", "moderate Islam", etc., is in my response to the CAIR Report:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: CAIR Documenting Islamophobia on the rise in the USA – Calling CAIR to Account for its Omissions](#)

The Hijacking of the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation which unites Pakistani Niggers with the Jewish neo-con masses like Bernard Lewis, Samuel Huntington, Daniel Pipes et. al., is fully fleshed out in:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Faith - To Inspire And To Indoctrinate: Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation](#)

Once I wrote to Pervez Hoodbhoy suggesting something to the effect that: *“if your essays didn't have your name on them, I might have thought the author is Daniel Pipes.”* Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy, my co-alum from MIT, fellow Pakistani, and many years my senior, has not talked to me since then. I continually wonder why:

- Is it because of my possessing the few skills, the commonsensical knowledge, and the foolish boldness to call a spade a spade continually confronting the “preeminent intellectual” rather than being co-opted into silence?
- Or, is it that I am so egregiously mistaken in my conclusions that I am not worth interlocuting with for the lofty “preeminent intellectual” – ubiquitous in the massa's dominion – who only contends with finding major faults with “Islam”, argues willy-nilly with other Uncle Toms of various shades, presents himself prominently in massa's various gatherings ostensibly representing the field Negroes, and just eschews the field Negroes themselves as being just too ignorant to teach?

This is a perennial mystery which repeats itself everyday, as my every unmasking of the intellectual Negro is stoically greeted with the thunderous sounds of silence. Ignoring the field Negro skilled enough to unmask both the massa and their house Negro, has been the most effective way of silencing the field Negro.

For indeed, all the freedom of speech in free space (no air) still naturally leads only to asphyxiation! The massa knows it, and has groomed his house niggers rather well. This leaves the ubiquitous Uncle Toms and his owner free to spin their doctrinal craft unfettered, over all the air which they already own outright.

Thus, while denying the field Negro air to expound, the massa and his “professional Negroes” incestuously reinforce each other unhindered and unchallenged, spanning the full gamut of intellectual and psychological warfare upon civilian populations worldwide.

The “**Hegelian Mind Fck**” behind such “[cognitive infiltration](#)” is to:

- manufacture consent and dissent as part of the social engineering of mass persuasion;

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

- spin clever red herrings (a smelly fish that a fugitive drags across the path in order to put the pursuing dogs off the trail) through Machiavellian interjections of fabricated “diversity” and fabricated dissent;
- synthesize controlled clashes of fabricated opposites for raising a new phoenix from its ashes.

I fear one would be very hard pressed to find an exception to the “intellectual Negro” in Pakistan and the Middle East from among our uber-educated literati, from among our well-funded 'humanist' NGOs, especially the Human Rights Organizations, the Left as well as the Right, and the new [*Plague of Occidentosis from the West*](#) we seemed to have picked up: think-tanks staffed with our finest Negroes of all shades, including brain-washed 'field Negroes', assorted useful idiots, dupes and patsies, employed as cover as well as useful labor.

Just as there was the government-private partnership between the British Empire and the East India Company to maintain the empire upon which the sun once never set, the empire du jour too similarly thrives on government-private partnership for its “imperial mobilization” and for the maintenance of its extended empire.

The line between government and private sector is merely one of who writes the final paycheck to the employees, for they both share the same common goals of empire, and work hand in glove. The Jewish grandmaster of *The Grand Chessboard*, Zbigniew Brzezinski, self-servingly admitted this modus operandi when he wrote in his 1970 book *Between Two Ages*:

“The trend toward more coordination but less centralization would be in keeping with the American tradition of blurring sharp distinctions between public and private institutions. Institutions such as TVA or the Ford Foundation perform functions difficult for many Europeans to understand, since they are more accustomed either to differentiate sharply between the public sphere and the private (as has been typical of the industrial age) or to subordinate the private to the public (as is favoured by the socialists and some liberals) or to absorb the private by the public (as has been the case in communist states).” --- (pg. 99)

And the Jewish columnist, Thomas Friedman, truthfully confirmed what is already obvious, in the New York Times of March 28, 1999:

“The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist -- McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.”

The professional intellectual Negro typically earns his paycheck from the private sector of the Military-Industrial-Academe-Non-profit-Thinktanks-Foundations half of empire while he critiques the public sector half comprising “*the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps*”, and of course, including the White House which controls that not so “*hidden fist*”. That separation of employer name on the paycheck stub evidently provides the much needed soothing balm to the modern intellectual Negro's conscience.

It would be a grave mistake to surmise that the House Negro phenomena is only peculiar to the few professional craftsmen of the Mighty Wurlitzer (see link above). Ordinary peoples are just as much participant in it. The following anecdotal case is in fact rather typical of new Uncle Toms in America.

When I was describing to a very dear friend of mine who only recently became a naturalized US citizen, how Malcolm X taught himself in the prison library, how he read constantly to become the unchallengeable orator and spokesperson for his peoples' cause, my friend's immediate interjection was, “*see, even their prisons have such great libraries!*” My new Uncle Tom, which I of course immediately addressed my long-time friend as, betrayed empathy with no one else except with prominent house niggers and the massa. Well, at least my friend was honest about his feelings of gratitude for the massa, having observed previously that the white man had given him far more than his own nation. The good fellow, who wears the stamp of remarkable piety on his forehead, and is one of the best in morals and friendship among all the people I know, never stopped to reflect what the white man took from our nations by cultivating fools, useful idiots, stooges, patsies, and mercenaries which he implanted in key positions in our nations to ensure that we stayed rudderless. That fact that our nations became more and more corrupt by villainous means in the post colonial era which the massa had cleverly instrumented for us, has amply been discussed elsewhere (see [John Perkins](#)).

To make centuries long colonized nations blind and steeped in servility by methods of neo-colonization in the ostensibly post-colonial period, and then to complain we are still blind, is the characteristic of the house nigger who blames the field niggers for all of their desperate state.

This self-deluding co-option is not atypical. Apart from the fact that it is the story of mental slavery in every epoch, today it is most visible – to those who wish to see it – in virtually every mosque and “mai-khana” (bar, a figure of speech to indicate secular Muslims) in the West. While the latter caters to the spirit of Secular Humanism of the white man in his ongoing “*la mission civilisatrice*” upon the

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

world, the former, a place of ritual piety, evidently also only succeeds in fabricating the “Good Muslim” and the “Good American” – sort of counterparts to the “Good Christian” and the “Good German” in the Third Reich – for 'United We Stand' in the Fourth Reich!

The massa has always understood this psychology of servility of the colonized man, and all too well. He has always cultivated and harvested from this colonized crop, the most able bodied, the most talented, and turned them into the most credentialled “professional Negroes” as described by Malcolm X in his Autobiography. Due to its immense pertinence to our times, it begs further emphasis: **“This twentieth-century Uncle Thomas is a professional Negro ... by that I mean his profession is being a Negro for the white man.”** (pg. 265)

The key psychological processes to construct this servility among most immigrant communities in the massa's world of gainful employment, and other material benefits denied them in their native country, is all of that which also went into making the good house negro short of actual physical slavery. Studying Malcolm X therefore, reveals a great deal about many of us today.

Almost 90 percent, that not being an exaggeration, perhaps even an underestimate if anything, first and even second generation immigrants to America, just like the vast majority of elites in all Muslim and formerly colonized lands, are infected with this de facto mental colonization.

Layered atop this foundational layer of de facto mental colonization of the 'Negro' of every flavor, is the layer of fabricated deception purveyors based on shared ideology. And on top of that is another pernicious layer based on apparently our natural trait: our meager price which turns us, not just psychologically, but also physically, into traitors to our own peoples.

These three colonizing mental forces combined in various shades tend to create many more Negro types. The ‘price’ aspect is particularly pernicious – this price today is far more insidious than the mere 'lifafa' (envelope stuffed with bribe money), the bottle of whiskey, or even the trip to Disneyland of yesteryear as narrated by Brig. Tirmazi in his book “Profiles of Intelligence” Ch 3, page 45. His exact words:

'A lot has been said and written by some of our American friends about the price of a Pakistani. Dr. Andrew V. Corry, US Counsel General at Lahore, once said, **“Price of a Pakistani oscillates between a free trip to the US and a bottle of whisky.”** He may not be too far wrong. We did observe some highly placed Pakistanis selling their conscience, prestige, dignity and self-respect for a small price.'

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

This is why the aforementioned Pakistani intellectual Negro can blithely claim with a straight face: '[Is the Check in the Mail? The Confessions of a Groveling Pakistani Native Orientalist](#)'! While he also publicly admits to the intangible benefits in '[An End to Hypocrisy](#)': "*I belong to the fortunate few who can get a visa,*". The professional intellectual Negro might do well to stare in the mirror while he echoes the massa's message admitting to its benefits. It would surely assist him in comprehending the full import of that Biblical word which he has evidently mastered so well without understanding its real meaning:

"My green passport requires standing in a separate immigration line once my plane lands at Boston's Logan Airport. The "special attention" from Homeland Security, although polite, adds an extra two to three hours. I belong to the fortunate few who can get a visa, but I am still annoyed. Having traveled to the United States frequently for 40 years, I now find a country that once warmly welcomed Pakistanis to be quite cold. The reason is clear.

Foreigners carrying strong negative feelings—or perhaps harmful intentions—are unlikely to find enthusiastic hosts. I know that the man who tried to bomb Times Square, Faisal Shahzad, a graduate of the University of Bridgeport, is my compatriot. So is Aafia Siddiqui, our new-found dukhtur-e-millat (daughter of the nation). Another Pakistani, Farooque Ahmed, with a degree from the College of Staten Island, made headline news in November 2010 after his abortive attempt to blow up DC Metro trains.

If such violent individuals were rarities, their nationality would matter little. But their actions receive little or no criticism in a country consumed by bitter anti-Americanism, which now exceeds its anti-Indianism."

If I might be permitted a bit of narcissism here to draw a valid comparison, I too possess only the "*green passport [which] requires standing in a separate immigration line once my plane lands*", despite over three decades of permanent residence in the United States with the permanent resident card (green card) which my first employer in Silicon Valley got for me. They claimed before the US Department of Labor (or something similar) that they couldn't find any white man in America to replace my engineering skills which they wanted badly at the time. Yet, compare my Realitiespeak (my neologism) to the Newspeak (a term from George Orwell's novel *1984*) of both the massa and his obliging Niggers! That's because I am a "field Negro" – figuratively speaking – and that's something which I have proudly earned by dint of my own study and observations, not a misery I was

born into like Malcolm X and others birthed on the wrong side of the railroad tracks. Any “house nigger” today, irrespective of their skin color and national origin, would do well to study Malcolm X's Autobiography in some depth. The fate of those who follow in that footsteps of the real gadfly, to genuinely challenge unjust power and its villainous narratives, is surely the early graveyard. It is written in the indelible pages of history. A choice one knowingly makes – because, despite the overt choice, there is really no choice for the intellectual who is not a sociopathic ubermensch:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux](#)
- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization](#)

As for Pervez Hoodbhoy's lofty demonstration of leftwing compassion for “*Aafia Siddiqui, our new-found dukhtur-e-millat (daughter of the nation)*”, see its deconstruction identifying all the omissions in the professional intellectual Negro's narratives in deep servility to the massa – when he could have been the strongest ally for its victim:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: FLASHBACK: Remembering Aafia Siddiqui in 2011 – 38 years old, frail victim of Imperial Mobilization](#)

Pervez Hoodbhoy's show of fearless rebellion against the forces of imperialism is of course predicated on his theory of “leftwing politics”, which he most articulately expounded in his already mentioned ode to the Hegelian Dialectic: [Between Imperialism and Islamism](#). Like a learned physicist Hoodbhoy first postulated the problem, thusly:

“Many of us in the left, particularly in Southasia, have chosen to understand the rise of violent Islamic fundamentalism as a response to poverty, unemployment, poor access to justice, lack of educational opportunities, corruption, loss of faith in the political system, or the sufferings of peasants and workers. As partial truths, these are indisputable. Those condemned to living a life with little hope and happiness are indeed vulnerable to calls from religious demagogues who offer a happy hereafter in exchange for unquestioning obedience.

American imperialism is also held responsible. This, too, is a partial truth. Stung by the attacks of 11 September 2001, the United States lashed out against Muslims almost everywhere. America's neoconservatives thought that cracking the whip would surely bring the world to order. Instead, the opposite happened. Islamists won massively in Iraq after a war waged on fraudulent grounds by a superpower filled with

hubris, arrogance and ignorance. 'Shock and Awe' is now turning into 'Cut and Run'. The US is leaving behind a snake pit, from which battle-hardened terrorists are stealthily making their way to countries around the world. Polls show that the US has become one of the most unpopular countries in the world, and that, in many places, George W Bush is more disliked than Osama bin Laden."

That Pakistani house nigger's problem articulation of course exactly parrots the blowback mantra of the massa in the West. See my response to Chris Hedges where the massa's controlled dissent is carefully dissected and dismantled:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Zahir Ebrahim's Response to Chris Hedges' amalgam of half-truths 'A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe'](#)

Having firmly played the massa's own [Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent](#), which incidentally is what makes getting visas and sabbaticals a trivial matter for Pakistan's most favored leftwing brown-sahib of the American Embassy in Islamabad: ***"I belong to the fortunate few who can get a visa,"*** Hoodbhoy offered his specious solution space of "leftwing politics" --- the key purpose of the Americans for cultivating this house nigger in Pakistan. The main task of "*cognitive infiltration*" to introduce "*beneficial cognitive diversity*" (sic!) among Pakistan's Muslim public, right alongside "[Moderate Islam](#)" as the Hegelian counterpoints to "Militant Islam", to orchestrate internal clashes and divisions in the name of being peace-makers (see verse 2:11 of the Holy Qur'an which warns of precisely this age-old villainy: "*And when it is said to them, Do not make mischief in the land, they say: We are but peace-makers.*"), in Pervez Hoodbhoy's own words:

"The role of the left

Between the xenophobes of the West and the illogical fundamentalism in Muslim societies, the choices keep getting grimmer. A mutually beneficial disentanglement can only be provided by humane, reasoned and principled leftwing politics.

Looking down at planet Earth from above, one would see a bloody battlefield, where imperial might and religious fundamentalism are locked in bitter struggle. Whose victory or defeat should one wish for? There cannot be an unequivocal preference; each dispute must be looked at separately. And the answers seem to lie on the left of the political spectrum, as long as we are able to recognise what the left actually stands for.

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

The leftwing agenda is a positive one. It rests upon hope for a happier and more humane world that is grounded in reason, education and economic justice. It provides a sound moral compass to a world that is losing direction. One must navigate a course safely away from the xenophobes of the US and Europe – who see Islam as an evil to be suppressed or conquered – and also away from the large number of Muslims across the world who justify acts of terrorism and violence as part of asymmetric warfare.

No 'higher authority' defines the leftwing agenda, and no covenant of belief defines a 'leftist'. There is no card to be carried or oath to be taken. But secularism, universalistic ideas of human rights, and freedom of belief are non-negotiable. Domination by reasons of class, race, national origin, gender or sexual orientation are all equally unacceptable. **In practical terms, this means that the left defends workers from capitalists, peasants from landlords, the colonised from the colonisers, religious minorities from state persecution, the dispossessed from the occupiers, women from male oppression, Muslims from Western Islamophobes, populations of Western countries from terrorists, and so on."**

Pervez Hoodbhoy used that "humane, reasoned and principled leftwing politics" for which: "No 'higher authority' defines the leftwing agenda, ... It provides a sound moral compass to a world that is losing direction" to admirably defend a frail and defenseless woman he cynically called "our new-found dukhtur-e-millat" in sympathy with his massa's verdict on her without an iota of "humane, reasoned and principled" examination of the matter. We see that Pervez Hoodbhoy goes right along parroting his massa, he reproduces their facts, their data, their analysis, and their conclusions, in the guise of being their antagonist – the clever Intellectual Nigger! But not cleverer than even an ordinary field negro who can administer a single knock-out punch with one hand tied behind his back. Which is why the house niggers tend to lurk only in the shadows of the massa, only dare to engage in WWF style wrestling with their confreres beholden to the same massa and its many instruments who all know how the game is played, and not venture out into *free space* where the field negroes dwell. As the lovely Pakistani singer [Sanam Marvi](#) boldly remarked without hesitation on mainstream Pakistan television to the bs of her interlocuter: "*chootia bana rahe ho?*" (Indelicate Urdu phraseology for "trying to make a fool of me with your fcking bs?")

Whilst the case of Pervez Hoodbhoy has been examined in depth here as holding the most distinguished and legitimate white man's credentials of them all, all Intellectual Negro assets and useful idiots of empire employ the same modus operandi – each playing their assigned role in minor

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers

variations. *“They have their exits and their entrances; And one man in his time plays many parts, His acts being seven ages.”* It is easy to spot them in their fabricated dissent – they tend to “belong to the fortunate few who can get a visa”!

Moving right along, it is a shame that few people understand the import of crafty omissions. Which is why I have to continually emphasize it. While the reader may have seen similar passages in many of my writings cited here, it is necessary to restate again because the indictment of the Intellectual Negro playing dissent to the massa, is often for his calculated omissions. The art of voluntary persuasion, “to get people actually to love their servitude”, is integral to social engineering of consent. It was most eloquently explained by the famous essayist and novelist, Aldous Huxley on the 30th anniversary of the publication of his allegorical novel *Brave New World*, at University of California, Berkeley. Huxley had very shrewdly observed a half century ago:

“You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.' --- (Aldous Huxley, [1962 speech at UC Berkeley, minute 04:06](#))

Therefore, given that engineering consent of the masses is the objective of social engineering, “*of getting people to consent to what is happening to them*”, Aldous Huxley explained the role of calculated omissions in systems of propaganda which accomplish just that, in his Preface to *Brave New World*:

“The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. **By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more**

effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.” --- (Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

Let's just pause here for a moment to deeply reflect, and to keep reminding oneself afterwards when one encounters any material in the New York Times and CNN, and in the so called alternate media which has ostensibly risen to challenge mainstream, that they all work for the same bosses echoing the same core lies by way of both omission and commission. That, these propaganda organs in the twenty-first century do both, the crucial omissions (the negative side using silence on key matters), and the facile mantra recitations (the positive side), which Adolph Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, Edward Bernays in *Propaganda*, and Aldous Huxley had written much about in the previous century. See the already cited link for the Mighty Wurlitzer report for a detailed study of how such persuasion actually works in practice.

One other thing to also continually reflect upon – perhaps more so for the professional intellectual Negro enjoying lifetime visa to visit the massa and often finding refuge/tenure/sabbaticals in massa's institutions – is that when finally defeated, Dr. Joseph Goebbels, the Reichminister for Propaganda, only cheated that hangman's noose reflecting: *“For us, everything is lost now and the only way left for us is the one which Hitler chose. I shall follow his example”*. Witness the ultimate fate of all propagandists who try to make *“chootias”* of their nation (but only under the threat of victor's justice):

The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers



The Cunning Dissent of House Niggers



Caption The Goebbels family --- evidently, only defeat or victory adjudicates who is a propagandist and who isn't, not evidence. Hitler had asserted at the eve of World War II from his mountain top in Bavaria to his generals that he would *'give a propagandist reason for starting the war'* and admonished them not to *'mind whether it was plausible or not'*. *'The victor'*, he had told them, *'will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not the right that matters, but victory.'* That unexpected "victory" of hubris eventually caught up with the propagandists. (Source of quote is William Shirer's *Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*)

“ 'Don't Be Afraid' ”

May 1, 1945, in the evening. The daughters and the son were already in bed, but were not asleep yet. "Don't be afraid," their mother said. "The doctor is going to give you a shot now, one that all children and soldiers are getting." She left the room, and Kunz injected the morphine, "first into the two older girls, then the boy and then the other girls." Each child received a dose of 0.5 cc. It "took eight to 10 minutes."

When the children had fallen asleep, Magda Goebbels went into the room, the cyanide pills in her hand, as Kunz testified. She returned a few seconds later, weeping and distraught. "Doctor, I can't do it, you have to do it," she said. The dentist replied: "I can't do it either." "Then get Dr. Stumpfegger," she said. Ludwig Stumpfegger, who was slightly younger than Kunz, had been one of SS chief Heinrich Himmler's personal doctors.

A week later, Russian coroners performed autopsies on the bodies of the children and concluded that their deaths had "occurred as a result of poisoning with cyanide compounds." The Goebbels themselves had committed suicide outside the bunker, and Stumpfegger died while attempting to break through the Russian lines in Berlin." --- (Murder in Hitler's Bunker: Who Really Poisoned the Goebbels Children, [Source Der Spiegel](#))

'Don't Be Afraid'.

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter V

Gatekeepers of Dissent From Left to Right

Response to Chris Hedges' amalgam of half-truths 'A

Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe'

“Our brutality and triumphalism, the byproducts of nationalism and our infantile pride, revived the jihadist movement. We became the radical Islamist movement’s most effective recruiting tool. We descended to its barbarity. We became terrorists too. The sad legacy of 9/11 is that the assholes, on each side, won.” --- Chris Hedges, Truthdig.com, September 11, 2011, [A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe](#)

What rubbish. I have been convinced for a long time that prominent dissent-artists like Chris Hedges are part of the problem. Why? Because people like him continually lend credence to something called “*Islamist movement*” and its “*most effective recruiting tool.*”

With Chris Hedges award-winning brand-name, all websites publish him, including Truthdig.com which incidentally has never published any submission of my original writing that I have ever submitted to them. With his brand-name, Chris Hedges has continually [manufactured dissent](#) since 9/11 while retaining the core-lies and core-axioms of empire.

Thus, while decrying “*Our brutality and triumphalism*”, he manages to lend credence to its [counter-insurgency operations](#) against “*the jihadist movement*” as something existential rather than diabolically manufactured, lamenting: “*The sad legacy of 9/11 is that the assholes, on each side,*

won.”

One side Chris Hedges discloses as: “*Our brutality and triumphalism*”. That is the truth. Which is the other side? According to Chris Hedges, it is “*the radical Islamist movement*”! That is a full lie. Together it constitutes a half-truth for perception management. As per a Jewish proverb, *a half-truth is a full lie!*

The journalist par excellence, Mr. Chris Hedges, in his full lie, did not state the empirical fact that the Western oligarchy is using “*Our brutality and triumphalism*” to usher in one-world Government by inventing both sides of the Hegelian Dialectic. This fabrication is subsequently openly used to justify global governance – even the [Financial Times](#) is calling for it using the Hegelian Dialectic as the most natural justification, and both empiricism and the [EU president](#) coldly confirming it.

Perhaps Chris Hedges is only blind? After all, only morons, the deaf, the dumb, and the mute win prizes and accolades from empire... right?

Niet!

Empire also fabricates dissent-chiefs to lead the dissentstream just as much as they fabricate pontiffs to lead psyops dissemination to the mainstream. They are both merely the contrasting tunes of the [Mighty Wurlitzer](#). It is the Mighty Wurlitzer that spins the yarn that 9/11 was an invasion from abroad reinforcing the core-axioms of the Pentagon, the White House, and the Western State Allies in the 'War on Terror', that there is some natural reality to “militant Islam” which attacked America. While echoing that core-lie, the dissent is the *blowback mantra*, and the bold admission of reactionary excesses that because of “*Our brutality and triumphalism, the byproducts of nationalism and our infantile pride*”, “*We [have] become terrorists too*”.

That show of conscience collects many conscionable people in the society around them who also object to “*Our brutality and triumphalism*”. It is empire which lends these collection-agents respectability and credibility.

Indeed, the reactionary excesses of the sole superpower leading to domestic police-state and international barbarism, is the foundational mantra of virtually all respectable Western dissent. I.e., dissent which is officially anointed and not dismissed outright as '[conspiracy theory](#)'. In the tightly controlled Left–Right discourse space, it is deemed high-minded scholarship to challenge these reactionary excesses of the sole superpower and to lay them at the doorstep of short-sighted escalation of chauvinistic foreign policies fueled by the war-profiteering motives of its military-

industrial complex.

Virtually one hundred percent of what is deemed respectable Western dissent espouses this foundational axiom. It works well because it draws upon selective empiricism couched in omissions to demonstrate its veracity. But a half-truth is still only a full lie. That full lie works like this:

“The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. **By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain”** between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.” --- (Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

Both sides of propaganda are thus put into effect. The mainstream chiefs enact the big lie and repeat it endlessly for the positive side of propaganda. The dissent-chief enact the negative side of propaganda by calculated omission of certain subjects, and by omitting to draw logical conclusions from them because they no longer have to --- the facts have been omitted from the “respectable” discourse space altogether. It is wonderful how this is used to provide the illusion of the free press and free society by both the mainstream press and the so called alternate press:

“The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there’s free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.” — Noam Chomsky

This is exactly the same controlled-dissent genre of lauded pontiffs of dissentstream spanning the gamut from Messrs. [Ron Paul](#) to [Noam Chomsky](#) himself et. al. on the Left-Liberal-Libertarian nexus to Foxnews-Right-wing-Religion-Intelligence-State-worship-Patriotism nexus. I am not sure which compartment [Francis Boyle](#) falls into but it is just as systemic there as elsewhere. They all play controlled opposition role in the Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent as gatekeepers of dissent.

I invite Truthdig to publish the examination referenced below written by a Muslim, yours truly, belonging to the 'untermensch' civilization bearing the full brunt of Chris Hedges' admission that “*We became terrorists too,*” and “*We Are What We Loathe*”.

Such banal statements can perhaps win Mr. Hedges multiple Pulitzer prizes for their profundity --- precisely because these neither inform nor educate to the degree necessary for unraveling the entire Hegelian Dialectic, lest it spawn a real resistance movement with teeth singularly focussed on the puppetmasters orchestrating the “*clash of civilizations*”. This style of dissent-lite only enables introducing and sustaining *beneficial cognitive diversity* for the purpose of defocussing the energies of conscionable peoples – its primary objective – until fait accompli.

This same learned journalist, and his other confreres in the news media, academe and think-tanks, will be writing all about it in the one-world government and laughing their way to more accolades for their ex post facto brilliance. This is the quid pro quo offered by *history's actors* to the scribes for playing along with platitudes and inconsequential punditry:

' “We’re an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you’re studying that reality — judiciously, as you will — we’ll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that’s how things will sort out. We’re history’s actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.” ' --- (Senior Bush Advisor, The New York Times, October 17, 2004)

The real sad legacy of 9/11 is the matrix which intelligent people like Chris Hedges et. al., have woven to keep the American public perpetual *prisoners of the cave*.

While it is true that the martial military-industrial culture created in the United States can superficially be characterized by “*War Is a Force that Gives Us Meaning*”, that meaning is neither accorded by its peoples, nor by the unnatural puppetshows they are forced to endure from body-bags to bankruptcies, but enforced upon America by its ruling oligarchy which profits from the mayhem enroute to accomplishing their global governance. The dissent which echoes the axioms of empire is working for the same interests.

Here is a link to my article which takes a forensic look into the **Dynamics of Mantra Creation: Islamofascism**, to demonstrate the villainous half-truth and outright deception embedded in Chris Hedges' manipulative narrative:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation](#)

Gatekeepers of Dissent From Left to Right

I hope that minimally at least, the same websites will publish my forensic counterpoint analysis in response to this emotional fluff piece they have put up on the tenth anniversary of 9/11 so that their vaunted pontiffs like Chris Hedges, if genuinely misled themselves, will become more informed and stop unwittingly mis-informing other people. That's a stretch of course --- for how can an award winning NYT reporter be misled on any matter? Surely the awards aren't for "*lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an 'iron curtain' between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable*"?

And the world wonders why Americans are the most ignorant peoples on earth! These *prisoners of the cave* can perhaps do with a little bit less protection by the guardian angels of high-morality who decide for them what's fit to print and what isn't. Only the New York Times admits to it openly --- all else are damn liars and hypocrites who do the same under the pretense of freedom of the press. I am sure they also *sleep holily in bed*. (Reference to Macbeth 5:1:47-49: 'Yet I have known those which have walked in their sleep who have died holily in their beds.')

Finally, I hope Chris Hedges will offer a riposte other than his characteristic silence to my analysis if I am mistaken. He had previously replied with the same eloquent exuberance for this challenge: [Letter to Editor: Chris Hedges omits key truths in 'It's Not Going to Be OK' February 04, 2009](#).

Gatekeepers of Dissent From Left to Right

This page is intentionally blank

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter VI

Controlled Dissent – Lying by Omission on Oligarchic Rule Behind the Scenes

Response to Francis Boyle's '2011: Prospects for Humanity?'

Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government

After reading Francis A. Boyle's missive with the overarching title "[2011: Prospects for Humanity?](#)", I now perhaps begin to fathom why the Ph.D. professor of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law, author of two of my favorite books on informed activism from which I have learnt a great deal: "[Protesting Power: War, Resistance, and Law](#)" and "[Biowarfare and Terrorism](#)", does not recognize the real prime-movers of hegemony and 'unlimited imperialism'.



By his own admission that he is a Hans Morgenthau protégé, the fog is gently lifting on why Dr. Boyle always only focuses on the state's actions and crimes, never on those who control the state from behind the scenes with their hired front-men and errand boys serving only their narrow interests in the guise of Elected Representatives of the People.

I never understood this before, and wrote letters upon letters to Dr. Francis Boyle rationally pleading

with him to focus on the prime-movers, to obviously no avail. Letters like these:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Open Letter to Francis Boyle, the Moral Law Professor, on the Ignored Iraqi & Afghani Victims of Imperial Mobilization](#)
- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Response to Francis Boyle's Jewistan – What Elephant?](#)
- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Letter to Francis Boyle - A Case for Treason](#)

Well, it is now clear why Francis Boyle never responded to appeals to look behind the puppetshows of statecraft to directly spotlight the puppetmasters.

Hans Morgenthau, his teacher, principally saw nation-states as the key actors of power. The errand boys running the Pentagon and the White House and the Congress were deemed the real players of power projection. They were implicitly defined as the ruling elite in the military-industrial complex. The calculus of power realism therefore, was principally to be understood in the context of nation-states exercising 'unlimited imperialism' by these power-brokers alone, never the financial oligarchy ruling the super-power nation-state, the United States of America, from behind the scene for their own narrow interests which had nothing to do with nation-state's best interests, let alone the nation's people's best interests.

A strategic omission?

Was this error in calibration of foreign policy calculus deliberate?

Well, where did Francis Boyle study? Chicago and Harvard of course. Do they mention the Federal Reserve System over there? Do they mention *money as debt*, or ever wonder why the hell does a super power have to pay private bankers the interest on the national currency? Do they mention the names of the Rockefeller family donors, unless laudatorily, as when David Rockefeller recently donated \$400 million to Harvard? Do they mention the House of Rothschild, heaven forbid, except when ordering their champagne by the cart full? Is there some on-going discussion at the Kennedy school of government, or in the political science departments of Chicago, Harvard, and Princeton, of how tax-exempt foundations hiding the immense wealth of the Black Nobility, whom I call the financial oligarchs, actually fabricate the policies for the elected errand-boys and appointed ministers at the Pentagon and the Treasury to execute? Policies which are designed at the CFR and the Trilateral Commission, at the AEI and the hundred think-tanks along the Potomac, to incrementally,

and diabolically, lead to Global Governance by breaking up the United States and all nation-states by stages: *“In short, the ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion’ to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.”* (See *Hard Road to World Order*, Foreign Affairs, 1974)

And this subversive agenda of diabolically eliminating national sovereignty in make-break-remake cyclical stages to piece-meal create the new global empire of the oligarchy on earth wasn't known in the aftermath of World War II? Not in the aftermath of World War I? The super learned Americans hadn't heard of the Round Table and its many children dispersed into tax exempt foundations and supra-national bodies for engineering that very singular outcome in the most diabolical way imaginable?

Oh really!

“We are at present working discreetly with all our might to wrest this mysterious force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local nation states of the world. All the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local nation states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or publicist can perhaps not quite be burned at the stake but certainly be ostracized or discredited.” --- Arnold J. Toynbee, Director, Royal Institute of International Affairs, (Chatham House) London, *The Trend of International Affairs Since the War*, International Affairs, November 1931, pg. 809

See my article:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order](#)

And by Francis Boyle's own revealing disclosure elsewhere of his experiences at America's finest universities, it is all the more evident what imperial institutions pursue and omit to pursue in the service of empire. Why would students who study in these imperial institutions, and the professors who teach there, be any more immune from the core assumptions and axiomatic presuppositions of empire which subsequently become the backdrop for their intellectual output and future careers, than the rest of the well-paid intellectuals, engineers, and scientists who willingly help construct empire in the vast military-industrial-think complex of the West? All share common presuppositions

that have been inculcated in them most carefully throughout their educational careers. These are indoctrinated assumption which they almost always leave unexamined as subsequent goods producing members of Western society, and vigorously belittle as “conspiracy theory” when brought to the fore by an odd truth explorer. Here is the latest example from the modern epoch, of a Harvard engineering professor seeking greener pastures at Google corporation, [The Master Builders of the Technetronic Era](#) – sharing common axioms of empire everywhere one looks among the high-achieving crowd in the university-corporate-nonprofit nexus of the West, albeit at different levels of abstraction based on each individual's role in the imperial system.

Thus, in the dissent-space located in Hans Morgenthau's axiomatic world of which Francis Boyle is evidently a zealot member by his own admission, when nation-state's international policies go awry, or become criminal, as in America's many senseless wars of imperialism but with little national gain for herself except into the private military-industrial complex coffers due to the expansive military spendings because of it, the elected representatives of the people are the first criminals, alongside the overt bureaucracy, and the rest of the visible officialdom. Thus, the analyses of just those visible imperial policies gone awry, and the criminal errand boys enacting them, in just that singular context of nation-state's “*negotiating*” their power-interests on the Grand Chessboard, is deemed sufficient to explain the entire calculus of hegemony in that worldview.

But is that really sufficient? Or, like the iceberg that shows itself, is it merely only the 10% agenda visible above the surface?

All the examples of imperialism cited by Prof. Francis Boyle in his missive, from ancient Alexander-Roman-Muslim empires to America's wars today, exactly reflect that principle of officialdom and visible rulers, kings and monarchs, being the main ruling elite of the empire. The overt rulers of empires in all of history that Francis Boyle refers to, were almost always indeed their main ruling elite. They were the real power-base of society. They were not like the iceberg. Thus the Hans Morgenthau world of dissent could have been applicable to them – if dissent against the villainy of power in the name of freedom of speech was permitted to exist at that time under the absolutist powers of the kings. It wasn't for a good reason.

But is that really the case for the sole-superpower, the United States of America, where “democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization”, where “deception is the state of mind and the mind of state”, where pretexts for imperial mobilizations are diabolically engineered and shrewdly harnessed, where the freedoms of Orwell, of Machiavelli, of manufactured consent and manufactured dissent, of social engineering to standardize and uniformize society for “United We Stand”, are its prized gift to

mankind?

Only in absurdities. And only for intellectual savants living in the vast immanent spaces of the academe with no bearing in hard empiricism the honest exposing of which can see them immediately terminated from their over-rated services for which they are paid aplenty as professors spitting in the same plate that feeds them (i.e., critiquing the very empire they draw their lucrative salaries from under the banner of freedom of speech). Dissent of famous professors on the payroll of empire: can they ever honestly penetrate the semi-transparent veil to expose the real corridors of power, by definition, except in enacting the shadowplay as in Plato's cave?

This is the hard price of freedom of speech – freedom that did not exist under the absolutist rule of kings but is permitted to exist in Western democracies. It is permitted to exist only because the end result is crafted to be the same: to be the controllers outside Plato's cave on essential topics that really matter and the honest and accurate revealing of which would be inimical to the real powers that be.

And can those living in that Plato's *underground cave* ever figure out the reality of what is being craftily hidden from them by diligently studying the shadowplay being enacted on the screen for their benefit, under the well-kept illusion of freedom and liberty of Western democracy to pursue truth and justice as a constitutionally protected endeavor?

“None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.” --- German Philosopher Goethe

That's what the noble jurist Francis Boyle's life's work has evidently been focussed on – the visible puppetsaws enacted on Plato's underground cave and bringing those evil errand boys to justice!

Noam Chomsky easily comes to mind as the one who most closely resembles Francis Boyle when I read statements like these in [“2011: Prospects for Humanity?”](#):

“By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire from the Muslim states and peoples living in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf under the bogus pretexts of (1) fighting a war against international terrorism; and/or (2) eliminating weapons of mass destruction; and/or (3) the promotion of democracy; and/or (4) self-styled

"humanitarian intervention." Only this time the geopolitical stakes are infinitely greater than they were a century ago: control and domination of two-thirds of the world's hydrocarbon resources and thus the very fundament and energizer of the global economic system – oil and gas."

But I don't think Noam Chomsky's teacher was Hans Morgenthau.

I suspect Noam Chomsky is almost entirely self-taught in his controlled and very measured dissent, especially of 9/11, **that it was an invasion from abroad**, directly echoing the Pentagon's core-message, with soulful inspiration of dissent drawn from the likes of atheist like Bertrand Russell and the fabians, anarchists, and every brand of rebel except the one who can spell Rothschild, Rockefeller, 'inside job'.

And like the distinguished Noam Chomsky, the rebel leader extraordinaire who is even billed by the empire's own mouthpiece, the New York Times, as "*arguably the most important intellectual alive*", the much respected and internationally renowned Dr. Francis Boyle of the controlled dissent space, also pretends by way of careful omissions that such evergreen statements of the Rothschild's: "*give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws*" is merely folklore. That the tortuous political science underwriting that subversive philosophy of full spectrum control of society from behind the scenes is of no immediate pertinence in comprehending the real calculus of real power-projection of nation-states for the exercise of its 'unlimited imperialism'. Because, as it's now clear, his mentor, Dr. Hans Morgenthau, too acted in precisely that way, sharing in the same pretenses that nation-states are the principal prime-movers in the exercise of hegemony, and teaching his student the same profound sense of justice for its errand boys while carefully guarding the very existence of the oligarchy and its role in international affairs.

Indeed, un-remarkably, all three lauded intellectual savants, Morgenthau, Chomsky, Boyle, as leaders of Western democratic dissent whom the conscionable intellectuals of the world vie to emulate as the epitome of intellectual integrity, share the same core-axioms regarding power inflexion – all deny, by omission, the hidden power of the oligarchic elite that piggy-backs upon the facade of Representative Government to pursue their own private globalist agendas.

The following paper by Ola Tunundar of Oslo, quotes Hans Morgenthau presenting an ostensibly empirical, but in my view a rather distorted model of the American governance system characterized as such by what it omits more than what it actually states:

"After September 11, the US 'democratic state' (characterised by openness, legal

procedures and free elections) is forcefully supported by or rather subsumed under a US 'security state' (characterised by secrecy and military hierarchy). Much of public life is 'securitized'¹² and the president and his close advisers are focused on the War on Terror, not on civilian matters. 'I am a war president. I make decisions ... with war on my mind', President Bush said.¹³ The security aspect of the state is invading the public sphere as if we were entering a creeping state of emergency. 'Emergency power'¹⁴ is used to direct the policy of the democratic state. In 1955, Hans Morgenthau wrote about a US 'dual state' in a study of US State Department.¹⁵

According to Morgenthau there was both a 'regular state hierarchy' that acts according to the rule of law and a more or less hidden 'security hierarchy', or what I will call a 'security state' (in some countries called 'deep state'¹⁶) that acts in parallel to the former, while it monitors and controls the former. The latter 'exert an effective veto over the decisions' of the regular state, to quote Morgenthau.¹⁷ The 'democratic state' and the 'security state' always 'march side by side',¹⁸ and while the 'democratic state' offer legitimacy to security politics the 'security state' intervenes if necessary by limiting the range of democratic politics.

Others would argue that the activity of the 'deep state' or 'security state' not just concerns the veto of democratic decisions but also the 'fine tuning of democracy',¹⁹ for example by 'fostering' the war or the limited war in order to externalize conflicts and provide internal stability. The 'security state' is able to calibrate or manipulate the policies of the 'democratic state'.

The 'security state' decides over life and death, it is always present, and it will act in case of 'emergency'. This apparatus defines when a 'state of emergency emerge'. This is what Carl Schmitt would call the 'sovereign',²⁰ and by 'securitizing' the political life, the democratic state loses its influence.

After September 11, the US administration has securitized what used to be public and tilted the balance in favour of the 'security state'. To many Europeans, the new US policy is difficult to understand. The Guardian and BBC say that the 'Big Brother will be watching America'.²¹ --- Ola Tunundar, 2004, [The Use of Terrorism to Construct World Order](#)

Even in that admission of 'security state', there is no admission of an oligarchy. Is it even implied that it exists, and works in its own private interests, as opposed to the nation's it piggy-backs upon? That

entire construct is visibly absent from Hans Morgenthau's formulation, just as it is absent from his student's formulation, that a ruling oligarchic power works for its own private agenda, openly proclaiming at the Council on Foreign Relations (bears repeating): *"In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion' to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."*

The apparatus of the militarized 'security state' in Hans Morganthau's world is evidently still only within the construct of the publicly proclaimed well-defined nation-state and its patriotically hoisted flag. Which, in order to effectuate unpopular policies abroad when pretenses of "democracy" have to be upheld – as *"democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization"* – engages in a-moral acts in its own imperial interests by resorting to the non-democratic means afforded by its secretive national 'security state' apparatus.

Thus, in Hans Morganthau's world of international affairs, it is still only the nation-state which is the principal actor, whatever its other formulation ('*security state*'), and not the hidden in plain-sight oligarchy which rules it with an iron fist from behind the scene under the pretense of periodic elections and democracy. Furthermore, Morganthau presumes, like every other patriotic American imbued with the spirit of Americanism, that the construct of the democratic nation-state itself is genuine:

"The 'democratic state' and the 'security state' always 'march side by side',¹⁸ and while the 'democratic state' offer legitimacy to security politics the 'security state' intervenes if necessary by limiting the range of democratic politics."

Not wanting to write a pedantic Ph.D. dissertation here on what subversive forces principally govern *Pax Americana* from behind the visible facade of superpower hegemony that is egregiously exercised for all to see from the White House using its much publicized military-industrial complex and its national security state apparatus, if there is any doubt that American Democracy, whether as the '*democratic state*', or the '*security state*', is entirely stage-managed by the errand boys of the oligarchy for their own private agenda, all dutifully enacting the policies handed them by the privately funded, unelected, tax-exempt foundations and think-tanks of the oligarchs, please see my analysis and advocacy written before the 2008 elections which examines this virtuous and pious presumption of the scholars of empire spanning the gamut of Left and Right:

- [A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document: Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt](#)

[System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!](#)

In these artificially constrained formulations of Hans Morganthau, all these are very nuanced but very significant omissions. Permit me to enumerate their import lest it be lost on the '*likkha-parrha jahils*' of modernity (uber-educated Ivy League morons):

1) These omissions entirely distort the picture of reality because they fail to identify the real prime-movers who run the superpower under varying abstractions of democracy which the academic pundits, and political scientists, love to write their lofty theses on. Witness Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* for instance, which carries the same bogus spirit of America is a '*democratic state*'.

2) These omissions mask the real causes of world wars, the real causes of '*clash of civilizations*' and other dysfunctions, and the real purpose behind the apparatus of the national '*security state*' which can freely employ extra-constitutional means when the '*democratic state*' reaches its limits of operation, as they '*march side by side*'.

3) These omissions entirely mask the diabolical baby-steps undertaken by both flavor of '*state*' in synchronous lockstep to achieve only a common agenda, the '*democratic state*' by signing treaties and enacting laws and statutes, and the '*security state*' by creating international pretexts and controlling domestic politics.

And what is that common agenda? Is this such a state-secret that brilliant academic savants need a plebeian to inform them?

Since each of the two state abstractions work for the same oligarchy, their common purpose is primarily the implementation of the oligarchic agenda.

Empiricism confirms that it is for destroying the existing world order in systematic stages through domestic and international crises creation – "*what is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times*" as David Ben-Gurion explained the Jewish theft of Palestine and the key Machiavellian modus operandi for all unpopular transformations, re-echoed by PNAC's Rebuilding America's Defenses as "*the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor*" – in order to seed a new world order exclusively controlled by the bankster oligarchy!

It was the '*democratic state*' which enacted in the United States the abhorrent Federal Reserve

System in 1913 after the manufactured banking crises of 1900s in the name of banking reform. That gave away the store to the banksters, as per their own admission: “**give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws**”. It was the 'security state' which carried out the 9/11 false-flag operation upon its own nation, like Hitler's 'operation canned goods', in response to which the 'democratic state' declared war on the world with “**either you are with us, or with the terrorists**” and enacted police-state laws labeled 'Patriot Acts' to fight terrorism. But the real purpose of such “*revolutionary times*” is betrayed in Bertrand Russell's *Impact of Science on Society* where, as the preeminent scholar of the oligarchs, he glibly created justifications: “**World government could only be kept in being by force.**”

As one can glean from this brief deconstruction, it is only to serve the oligarchic agenda of diabolically seeding World Government, and not the national interest of the nation-state's politics, which drives the 'security state' and the 'democratic state' to 'march side by side'.

Evidently, this lesson has been well un-learned by the student of Hans Morgenthau.

Continuing further with the listing of common grounds among these intellectual savants, all deny, by omission again, the existence of black-ops and false-flag events employed to deceive the peoples of the world in order to mobilize for the agendas of the oligarchic elite which often has nothing to do as the long-term best interest agenda of the superpower nation-state itself. From the off-shoring of jobs to the criminal wars since 9/11, all leading America to enormous debt, moral and physical bankruptcy, laid at the helm of the White House! But the terrorist act of 9/11 itself? Oh, that was the foreign invasion because of which America had to hunker down into *Fortress America*! And whom is Francis Boyle pursuing for Justice? See his *Bush To The Hague campaign for War-Crime: Extraordinary Rendition*, noted in my [letter](#). Whom is Chomsky calling criminal? That's right, only the White House and the Pentagon for their imperial war-making upon Afghanistan and Iraq – and making a fair buck peddling the 9/11 fiction of blowback invasion from abroad in the true spirit of enterprising capitalism. See [Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist](#) by Peter Schweizer at the Hoover Institution.

Finally, all deny, by omission once again, that the superpower merely acts as the vassal of the elite, just like the neo-colonized developing nations run by petty dictators and the facade of electoral democracy, act as the vassals of the superpower! Hans Morgenthau, like George Kennan, did not recognize that the Soviet Union was a fabricated Hegelian Dialectic. See George Kennan's PPS 23 for how he staged the Cold War principles in 1948, which later came to be called the Truman Doctrine. But when one reads Antony Sutton and W. Cleon Skousen, as many others including

Carroll Quigley, one begins to understand the *National Suicide* and Communism-Capitalism nexus being run by the same oligarchy attempting to create World Government along Karl Marx's manifesto! Never learnt these aspects from Chomsky, even though I learnt of George Kennan's PPS 23 from his writings. Half-truth telling in dissent narratives is a characteristic trademark of these lauded scholars who become de facto dissent-chiefs. Recalling my favorite sociologist and novelist Aldous Huxley's insights on crafty silence from his *Brave New World*:

'The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an "iron curtain" between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.' — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

Similarly, today Chomsky and Boyle not recognizing 9/11 was another staged '*operation canned goods*' to seed another World War, a lifetime of perpetual war, the *World War IV*, and continually holding that Islamofascism attacked America from outside, but that America, in its unbridled imperialism, "**By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire ...**", make them both out to be cut from the same imperialist cloth as Morgenthau.

But I could not ever comprehend how some stellar scholars of high moral conscience become controlled dissent spewing red herrings – cleverly cultivated by empire to head-off all efficacy in protests by having them focus on the 'effects' and not the prime-mover 'cause', or, identifying the causes incorrectly or somewhere lower in the hierarchy than the root – despite the fact of the matter that they often appeared to be employed and handsomely paid from the same military-industrial-academe coffers they dared to call criminal, and thus, obviously enjoying the quid pro quo!

Now I finally begin to understand, at least in Dr. Francis Boyle's case, why almost all of this moral jurist's public quests for justice remain so severely emasculated. And why does he persist in fingering only the visible flag-bearers of the hidden-only-in-plain-sight-oligarchy who can forever

comfortably remain behind the scenes as always, secure from his and everyone else's legal and conspiratorial scrutiny.

Finally I seem to have penetrated the dark mystery of why such a distinguished, moral, and fearless professor, Dr. Francis Boyle, can exhibit such severe myopia that he begins to resemble my former professor Noam Chomsky.

**The key which has surely unlocked that transparent door past which I could not see earlier:
Dr. Francis Boyle had Hans Morgenthau as his main teacher in life:**

'So I commenced my formal study of International Relations with the late, great Hans Morgenthau in the first week of January 1970 as a 19 year old college sophomore at the University of Chicago by taking his basic introductory course on that subject. At the time, Morgenthau was leading the academic forces of opposition to the detested Vietnam War, which is precisely why I chose to study with him. During ten years of higher education at the University of Chicago and Harvard, I refused to study with openly pro-Vietnam-War professors as a matter of principle and also on the quite pragmatic ground that they had nothing to teach me.

In the summer of 1975, it was Morgenthau who emphatically encouraged me to become a professor instead of doing some other promising things with my life: *"If Morgenthau thinks I should become a professor, then I will become a professor!"* After almost a decade of working personally with him, Morgenthau provided me with enough inspiration, guidance, and knowledge to last now almost half a lifetime.' --- Francis Boyle in [2011: Prospects for Humanity?](#)

Would it be rude to suggest: Dr. Francis Boyle – get some new teachers!

Lest this cynical Realityspeak injure priceless sensibilities, appear arrogant, not exude enlightened moderation, nor be deferential enough, it might help one to remember who is daring to speak up while others applaud the dissent-chiefs – the 'untermensch' whose devastated nations and peoples are bearing the full brunt of the moral silence on the first-cause primemovers of all crimes against humanity. Silence on the prime-movers is not only a betrayal, but makes one complicit in the continuation of crimes against humanity and the elongation of the suffering of the victims. By focussing on the effect, the errand boys, and leaving the first-cause, the puppetmasters, entirely occulted from scrutiny for whatever reasons of expediency, only enables more war-mongering, and more crimes against humanity to be committed by the new set of errand boys to come on stage after

the current ones have served their term. This is entirely empirical going from President Bush to President Obama.

And where has Dr. Francis Boyle laid his justice eggs at the International Criminal Court? Right – chasing the old retired errand boys, and for what crimes – *Extraordinary Rendition* – never mind indicting the new ones perpetrating new abhorrences as we speak, forget ever mentioning the puppetmasters, and 9/11 as an *inside job* orchestrated to create the right sequence of crises to launch the oligarchs' transformation towards Global Governance. If calling these absurdities of lauded dissent-chiefs which make a mockery of the pursuit of justice, ill-mannered, then, so be it – it is the least a plebe can do as no one who is someone pays any attention to the prime-movers who keep on bleeding the 'untermenschen' to death!

[“Protesting Power: War, Resistance, and Law”](#) is surely a categorical imperative of all moral men and women when power is instantiated criminally.

But, solely paying attention to the henchmen and the trigger-pullers while ignoring the prime-movers, is the core unsolved problem. It is what makes protest futile. It is what lends zero efficacy to all moral activism for justice and peace. See [“Who is more guilty of monumental war crimes - the prime-movers or trigger pullers?”](#). This same blindsight is what makes all attempts at meaningful reform destined to fail so long as the prime-movers are left intact to protect their turf. See [“Letter to Bill Still – Director of The Secret of Oz – How”](#).

Now, just imagine, if only for a fleeting moment, moral and upstanding citizens, scholars and jurists, activists and rebels, statesmen and congressmen, seeking justice and reforms to benefit all 'untermenschen' and not just their own particular clique and clan, all focussing solely on the prime-movers for a change, each according to their expertise and capacities! I dare say we might yet have an even battlefield. We might be minnows, but, as nature demonstrates to us humans repeatedly: **sharks need minnows more than minnows need sharks.**

The following statement of Hans Joachim Morgenthau (February 17, 1904 – July 19, 1980) sums up the RealitySpeak behind his prized protégé Francis A. Boyle's moral activism visible in the above deconstruction:

“The statesman must think in terms of the national interest, conceived as power among other powers. The popular mind, unaware of the fine distinctions of the statesman's thinking, reasons more often than not in the simple moralistic and legalistic terms of absolute good and absolute evil.” ([wiki](#))

It is a tad convenient that *ubermensch* Hans Joachim Morgenthau did not perceive the elephant in the bedroom – the puppetmasters behind the scenes – in his amoral calculus of power, as most of them post World War I and II down to today, in fact ever since the founding of the Federal Reserve System in 1913, happen to be the Jewish banking power, Morgenthau himself being a Jew. Even a cursory read of Colonel Edward Mandell House's fable "[Philip Dru: Administrator; A Story of Tomorrow, 1920-1935](#)" would have revealed to both Morgenthau and his brilliant law protégé from Harvard, that statesmen and politicians in modern America are mere puppets of the financial oligarchy, the so called *Money Trust* – even if empirical data of hard reality, never mind that establishmentarian academics like [Caroll Quigley](#) themselves boldly revealed the behind the scenes power nexus, was lost upon them. Among other matters Morgenthau taught his prized student goy, were the following "Six Principles of Political Realism" (from [wikipedia](#)):

1. Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.
2. The main signpost of political realism is the concept of interest defined in terms of power, which infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics, and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible. **Political realism avoids concerns with the motives and ideology of statesmen.** Political realism avoids reinterpreting reality to fit the policy. A good foreign policy minimizes risks and maximizes benefits.
3. Realism recognizes that the determining kind of interest varies depending on the political and cultural context in which foreign policy is made. It does not give "interest defined as power" a meaning that is fixed once and for all.
4. Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action. It is also aware of the tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action. Realism maintains that universal moral principles must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place, because they cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract universal formulation.
5. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe.
6. The political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere; he asks "How does this policy affect the power and interests of the nation?" Political realism is based on a pluralistic conception of human nature. The political realist must show where the nation's interests differ

from the moralistic and legalistic viewpoints.”

Like teacher like student! Dissent emanating from these brilliant American minds remain an integral part of engineering consent --- as this type of dissent in Western society is ab initio designed to be a “collection agency”; to collect the ordinary dissenting popular mind *“unaware of the fine distinctions of the statesman’s thinking, reasons more often than not in the simple moralistic and legalistic terms of absolute good and absolute evil.”*, around them. It is intended to be ineffective as a measure of democratic public opinion no differently than the palliative which only treats symptoms rather than root cause. To understand why dissent must be manufactured in realpolitik based democratic governance for the type-2 crowd who willingly follow any dissenting pied piper with great moral glee even if on the treadmill of inefficacy, see the extensive case studies by this scribe titled [Manufacturing Dissent](#).

This page is intentionally blank

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!


Chapter VII

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

The Mighty Wurlitzer Engineering Consent

Edward Bernays, the nephew of Sigmund Freud, began his seminal 1928 book simply titled *Propaganda*, with these ominous words:

“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.” --- (Edward Bernays, 1928, pg.1, [Propaganda](#))



Aldous Huxley, on the 30th anniversary of his own seminal 1931 allegorical novel *Brave New World*, made the following dreadful observations in the very opening segment of his talk on the Ultimate Revolution upon which mankind and modernity are perilously perched:

Caption The Public Mind in the Making (Book cover 1928)

“You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say." --- (Aldous Huxley, [1962 speech at UC Berkeley, minute 04:06](#))

In order to understand how the comprehension of Edward Bernays and Aldous Huxley, though both long dead, still manifests itself in these times, we must begin with the Mighty Wurlitzer.

However, first, a *gestalt shift* in perspective is necessary. Please stare at the image below for a few moments of reflection before proceeding. Ask yourself: what would it take for the baby to see the world from the predatory feline's point of view? Are you that baby when it comes to predatory reality?



Caption Perspective: Oh what a difference even a slight shift can make! (Image [source](#))

What is the 'Mighty Wurlitzer'?

It used to be the honorific of Frank Wisner, the first chief of political warfare for the Central Intelligence Agency, used to describe the C.I.A.'s plethora of front organizations and newsmedia stooges that he was capable of playing (like a great organ with many keyboards) for synthesizing any propaganda tune that was needed for the day. See **Operation Mockingbird** ([html](#)) ([PDF](#)).

The fact that such an omnipresent Message-Machine is not ancient history but very much current affairs, is underscored by this NYT headline **“Behind TV Analysts, Pentagon’s Hidden Hand”**, Sunday, [April 20, 2008](#). Also see [Jessica Lynch](#) Media Myth-Making in Iraq War during **Operation “Iraqi Freedom”** in Further Study.



Caption The Mighty Wurlitzer Organ: Metaphor for the Multi-Modal Propaganda Message-Machine which can Play Many Perception-Molding Tunes Simultaneously to Make the Public Mind

Therefore, today, I use the term **'Mighty Wurlitzer'** as a metaphor to pluralistically refer to the same message-machine, i.e., the intelligence apparatus for manufacturing consent and controlling dissent, and its concomitant conscious manipulation of peoples' thoughts, feelings, actions and in-actions, in order to serve the primacy interests of the behind the scene governing oligarchy. The latter are, invariably, also the de facto owners of the complete messaging-system now even more globally ubiquitous than when Frank Wisner played the world for a fool.

This 'grand organ' is now able to even more effectively synthesize, implant, and reinforce, all the right set of beliefs (myths) among the entire world's public – by suitably combining 'events' with imaginative 'expos' writing – which

appropriately primes the world populations to acquiesce to the oligarchic agendas. While playing this orchestra is now an integral part of all state-craft, its major musical themes are entirely determined by the behind the scenes owners of the system. While some might refer to the underlying techniques as propaganda and psy-ops, 'Mighty Wurlitzer' singularly captures the messaging-system controlled under a unified purpose of command which is both highly compartmentalized and cellularized. Only the Mighty Wurlitzer knows the entire tune.

What this means is that not all who willingly cooperate with the Mighty Wurlitzer in synchronistically humming its themes are knowingly being purveyors of its myths and deception. Many of its most shrill echoers are often well intentioned functionaries who are fed different motivating myths at different levels in the hierarchy – sometimes the lie is different at every level – such that it suitably motivates each according to their own predilection, professional station, and mission statement.

The Mighty Wurlitzer operates on the core premise which has been empirically shown to psychologically motivate most human action. That premise was elegantly captured in the following insightful observation made by the so called “[Terrorism Study Group](#)”, that

“ 'Public Assumptions' Shape Views of History: Such presumptions are beliefs (1) thought to be true (although not necessarily known to be true with certainty), and (2) shared in common within the relevant political community. The sources for such presumptions are both personal (from direct experience) and vicarious (from books, movies, and myths).”

Successfully implanting such presumptions and pre-suppositions among any group is to motivate its overall actions in accordance with those implanted beliefs. Thus, many intelligent peoples for whom it is otherwise inexplicable to understand why they persist in 'United We Stand' with absurdities, are motivated to react sympathetically to those absurdities.

The Secret Team

To barely catch a glimpse of how it's partially done, the following description by Col. Fletcher Prouty from the Preface to the first edition of his 1973 book “[The Secret Team](#)” is instructive ([PDF book](#)):

“There is another category of writer and self-proclaimed authority on the subjects of secrecy, intelligence, and containment. This man is the suave, professional parasite who gains a reputation as a real reporter by disseminating the scraps and "Golden Apples" thrown to him by the great men who use him. This writer seldom knows and rarely cares that many of the scraps from which he draws his material have been planted, that they are controlled leaks, and that he is being used, and glorified as he is being used, by the inside secret intelligence community.

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

Allen Dulles had a penchant for cultivating a number of such writers with big names and inviting them to his table for a medieval style luncheon in that great room across the hall from his own offices in the old CIA headquarters on the hill overlooking Foggy Bottom. Here, he would discuss openly and all too freely the same subjects that only hours before had been carefully discussed in the secret inner chambers of the operational side of that quiet Agency. In the hands of Allen Dulles, "secrecy" was simply a chameleon device to be used as he saw fit and to be applied to lesser men according to his schemes. It is quite fantastic to find people like Daniel Ellsberg being charged with leaking official secrets simply because the label on the piece of paper said "top secret," when the substance of many of the words written on those same papers was patently untrue and no more than a cover story. Except for the fact that they were official lies, these papers had no basis in fact, and therefore no basis to be graded top secret or any other degree of classification. Allen Dulles would tell similar cover stories to his coterie of writers, and not long thereafter they would appear in print in some of the most prestigious papers and magazines in the country, totally unclassified, and of course, cleverly untrue.

In every case, the chance for complete information is very small, and the hope that in time researchers, students, and historians will be able to ferret out truth from untruth, real from unreal, and story from cover story is at best a very slim one. Certainly, history teaches us that one truth will add to and enhance another; but let us not forget that one lie added to another lie will demolish everything. This is the important point. Consider the past half century. How many major events -- really major events -- have there been that simply do not ring true? How many times has the entire world been shaken by alarms of major significance, only to find that the events either did not happen at all, or if they did, that they had happened in a manner quite unlike the original story?"

Coldly implicit in Col. Prouty's afore-quoted empirical statement: "**and the hope that in time researchers, students, and historians will be able to ferret out truth from untruth, real from unreal, and story from cover story is at best a very slim one**", is the underlying Machiavellian modus operandi of buying time for sewing faits accomplis (new unalterable realities on the ground). By straight-jacketing all public discourse in deception when its timely revelation and unraveling can in fact derail the exercise of hegemony, new realities are constructed in the guise of responding to catastrophic events while the shell-shocked people remain dazed, confused, and frightened. They

accept any solution offered by the authority figures as Americans did for instance in the aftermath of 9/11 when the catastrophic act of terrorism tore their world asunder. Ex post facto, and years down the road, separating myths and falsehoods from the calculus of hegemony will still remain only an academic exercise entirely irrelevant to reversing the faits accomplis already sewn! For Col. Prouty to not recognize this rather straightforward fact of the matter, the key modus operandi of Machiavelli for constructing new unalterable reality on the ground, as he nonchalantly observed the above quoted statement says something about the cunning spymaster himself. See [Convince People of Absurdities and get them Acquiescing to Atrocities: The Enduring Power of Machiavellian Political Science](#). Also see [Unlayering the Middle East War Agenda: Making Sense of Absurdities](#).

Wikileaks and the Mighty Wurlitzer driving Imperial Mobilization

A pertinent example of Col. Fletcher Prouty's fabricated leaks noted above, is the Wikileaks' July 2010 disclosures of 'The Afghanistan Papers' which revealed nothing new.

Wikileaks has always been a rather transparent Mighty Wurlitzer ops. It is trivial to see through the absurdity of its protected existence despite it promoting itself as being a sort of dissenting watchdog upon empire. And therefore, ostensibly, being inimical to its unbridled quest for **“full spectrum dominance”**. Just like Al Jazeera television based in Qatar, which too, absurdly enough, is permitted to function unhindered in the same nation as America's CENTCOM headquarters.

Would it not be trivial for an armed to the teeth National Security State waging perpetual wars on civilians from Afghanistan to Iraq to Pakistan to Palestine to take-out either apparatus rather trivially if they were troublesome to its primacy and geostrategic imperatives? And that may happen once the useful idiots have outlived their utility, *for he who sups with the devil must have a long spoon!*

The reason each is allowed to function is of course social engineering, the sine qua non for waging modern warfare upon civilian populations by way of deception. It spans the entire gamut of engineering consent. From mantra creation in the mainstream, and diabolically controlling dissent in order to control all opposition in the dissentstream, to actually fabricating the plainly visible pretexts (such as acts of terror) which can naturally ripen the conditions for the mantra of **“clash of civilizations”** to be called real in order to sustain the otherwise untenable **“imperial mobilization”**.

Backed by the Mighty Wurlitzer's compositions, inflicting state terror upon civilian populations as

counter-insurgency, and military invasions of defenseless third-world nations for imagined or contrived threats in “preemptive self-defense”, automatically create and promote natural resistance among the victims thus breeding a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The director of the CIA, Michael Hayden, called this modus operandi of self-fulfilling prophecy, “[tickling](#)” the enemy: **“We use military operations to excite the enemy, prompting him to respond. In that response we learn so much”**.

Zbigniew Brzezinski most succinctly summed up the core political motivation for resorting to such Machiavellianess in his 1996 book *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostategic Imperatives*: **“Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization”**. (see [Brzezinski's full quote](#) below)

This, all this, is the real fact of the matter that makes the Mighty Wurlitzer so indispensable in military strategy. This is once again underscored by the [April 20, 2008](#) NYT article mentioned at the very beginning, **“Behind TV Analysts, Pentagon’s Hidden Hand”**.

How can one tell manufactured reportage and fabricated leaks that are ab initio designed “to promote a self-fulfilling prophecy” from the real facts of the matter when it is most pertinent to averting its fait accompli?

How can one see through the psyops of the Mighty Wurlitzer?

As daunting as it might appear to the mainstream television watcher, it is in fact rather straightforward for those unencumbered by blind faith in governments and its statecraft.

[Wikileaks Announces Osama bin Laden is alive and playing a key role in directing the war in Afghanistan, leaked US military files suggest](#)



'Multiple intelligence reports on the whereabouts of the al-Qaeda leader are contained among the documents. They disclose publicly for the first time **that bin Laden is thought to be personally overseeing the work of suicide bombers** and the makers of Taliban roadside bombs which have had a devastating effect on British and US troops. A secret “threat report” drafted by the Nato-led International Security Assistance Force (Isaf) in 2006 locates bin Laden as well as the Taliban leader Mullah Omar to the Pakistani city of Quetta as well as several villages on the Afghan border'. --- [UK Telegraph 27 July 2010](#).

Just look for the core-lies and unquestioned axioms of empire that are typically retained in the “leaks” and reportage which, in order to sound credible, often openly expose what is mostly already known anyway or judiciously employ some variation of “[Limited Hangout](#)” wrapped in a veneer of dissent, ‘freedom of the press’, and often accompanied by the facade of angst and opposition from the state.

Furthermore, look for some of the lauded dissent names rushing to support the Limited Hangout – just as it was with Daniel Ellsberg for his infamous *Pentagon Papers* – to afford a veneer of legitimacy to the whistleblowing revelations of supposed state-secrets having caused some great harm to the state. The extravagance enacted in the mainstream media, alternately making heroes of the whistleblowers and demonizing them, is a giveaway to the circus show being enacted for plebeian consumption.

For, it matters not which side one takes, as both sides are patently false, crafted of calculated omissions and half-truths that retain core-lies, right out of the text book of the [Technique of Infamy](#) : **invent two lies and keep the public busy debating which of these is true!**

The role of crafty omissions in fabricating propaganda was best captured by Aldous Huxley in his Preface to *Brave New World* thusly:

“The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about

[President Obama warns not to challenge the official narrative of 9/11](#)



'I am aware that there is still some who would question, or even justify the offense of 911.

But let us be clear. Al Qaeeda killed nearly 3000 people on that day.

The victims were innocent men, women, and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody.

And yet Al Qaeeda chose to ruthlessly murder these people, claimed credit for the attack, and even now states their determination to kill on a massive scale. They have affiliates in many countries, to try to expand their reach.

These are not opinions to be debated. These are facts to be dealt with.' ---
President Obama, Cairo Egypt, June 4th 2009, [911 and Imperial Mobilization Redux](#)
[By Zahir Ebrahim](#)

truth. **By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain”** between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.” --- (Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to Brave New World, 1931, Harper, pg. 11)

To uncover omissions in a discourse is very difficult for the public who do not often have command over the domain in which the falsehoods are being perpetuated. As the psychological insight already quoted above from the Terrorism Study Group betrays, **“Public Assumptions' Shape Views of History. Such presumptions are beliefs (1) thought to be true (although not necessarily known to be true with certainty), and (2) shared in common within the relevant political community.”**

Which is why inculcating ignorance, especially political-historical ignorance pertaining to international relations, and being made trusting of authority figures and the state, are the pre-requisites for any vile propaganda to succeed! A well bred lack of skepticism to authority figures, to experts in scientific disciplines, and to dissenting chiefs playing controlled opposition, thus becomes the heart of social engineering for 'United We Stand'.

This surfeit of blind trust in authority is what is ultimately harvested by the Mighty Wurlitzer. For a skeptical public, the tunes of the Mighty Wurlitzer would fall on very deaf ears and public governance for private agendas would be well-nigh impossible in democratic nations. This is qualitatively no different than the power exercised by the religious clergy upon their faithful flock in any religion. Except that modernity has perniciously replaced them with multi-faceted secular clergies, the

[President Obama Announces Osama bin Laden is dead](#)



“Good evening. Tonight, I can report to the American people, and to the world. The United States has conducted an operation that has killed Osama Bin Laden, the leader of Al Qaeda.” --- [President Obama, May 1, 2011](#)

“experts”, each demanding obedience from its own 'United We Stand' trusting flock in all aspects of modern life.

This is also why “leaking” information from “experts” and “insiders” commands such a premium in Machiavellian democratic statecraft. When used judiciously so as not to dilute its impact, it can herd the flock in pretty much any direction that is desired.

As further empirically evidenced in the forensic analysis presented here, these so called whistleblowing of *leaky buckets* also succeed in accomplishing two important elements of statecraft:

- vicariously reinvigorate in the short-term public memory, the already established-by-fiat facts and core-axioms of empire;
- establish new convenient facts on the ground which are subsequently accepted as revealed gospel truths because of the already established thought-stream by the scholars of empire that when something is held in secret or is classified and subsequently declassified, or is prematurely leaked to the public, that it must contain some genuine “state secrets”, and never red herrings. Such thought-streams enable the directives of NSC 10/2 for plausible deniability (and those like it which we do not know about) to be trivially impressed upon the public mind (see [Anatomy of](#)

ZERO: An Investigation into 9/11
Interview with Giulietto Chiesa,
Journalist, Member of the European
Parliament



'In the summer of 2005, the commission of the European parliament for security and defense, of which I am a member, was invited to a special screening created by the Washington Center for Strategic Studies

We were asked to watch a film which depicted what would happen in Europe, if Brussels was hit by a nuclear bomb.

Fifty thousand deaths, hundred thousand injured. The reactions of various European governments.

Suddenly, footage of Osama Bin Laden claiming responsibility for a nuclear attack on NATO headquarters comes on screen.

All members of the parliament, myself included, were rendered speechless.

Then a parliamentarian finally said:

[Conspiracy Theory](#)). These revelations of presumed “state-secrets” subsequently become the new unquestioned backdrops for both state policies and public discourses – the new “*doctrinal motivations*” – with copious help from the Mighty Wurlitzer's refined machinery.

This enables the successful deployment of already pre-planned policy prescriptions which craftily impel the various incantations of hegemony forward in baby-steps. Both, domestically by incrementally clamping down hard on rising discontent in the name of “national security”, and internationally by continuing to wage unpopular wars of preemption upon the 'untermenschen'. The infernal enemy has now been (re)confirmed to exist (despite popular skepticism) since even empire's own henchmen in their secret documents also affirm that belief (sic!). Speak of self-servingly suffering from a incestuously self-reinforced “*crippled epistemology*”!

ZERO (Contd.)

“Today we were shown a convincing demonstration of how Osama Bin Laden's image can be completely manipulated.

All the Osama's we have seen over the years, may never have existed.

Just as a nuclear attack on NATO Headquarters in Brussels has never taken place.” --- [ZERO](#)

The grandmaster of *The Grand Chessboard* himself, in his volt face half-truth laced testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 2007, strangely confirmed the deconstruction of the sole superpower's Machiavellian statecraft being done in this report: “To argue that America is already at war in the region with a wider Islamic threat, of which Iran is the epicenter, is to promote a self-fulfilling prophecy.” (see [Brzezinski's full SFRC quote](#) below)

But earlier, the same Polish-American [Catholic](#) (see [Zbigniew Brzezinski footnote](#)) architect of inflicting America's hegemony upon the world, Zbigniew Brzezinski, in his 1996 book *The Grand Chessboard*, had unabashedly examined the need for such invigorations of the public mind, and the very promotion of self-fulfilling prophecies as a basic primacy tactic in order to assert *American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*. As the former National Security Advisor under President Carter, and think-tank advisor to all subsequent occupants of the White House without prejudice, a diabolical strategist for the one-world oligarchic agenda in cahoots with the international banker David Rockefeller who appointed him the first executive director of the Trilateral Commission, Brzezinski with his imposing resume (see [Zbigniew Brzezinski](#)) betrays a shrewd comprehension of Machiavellian statecraft's reliance on engineering consent. Here is a snippet for the absolute necessity of controlling the public mind for “imperial mobilization”:

“It is also a fact that America is too democratic at home to be autocratic abroad. This limits the use of America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation. Never before has a populist democracy attained international supremacy. But the pursuit of power is not a goal that commands popular passion, except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being. The economic self-denial (that is defense spending), and the human sacrifice (casualties even among professional soldiers) required in the effort are uncongenial to democratic instincts. Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.” (pgs. 35-36) ;

“Public opinion polls suggest that only a small minority (13 percent) of Americans favor the proposition that 'as the sole remaining superpower, the US should continue to be the preeminent world leader in solving international problems'. ... Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. More generally, cultural change in America may also be uncongenial to the sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power. That exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification.” (page 211 and onwards, [PDF book](#))

The diabolical utility of planting of “Public Assumptions' [that] Shape Views of History” and therefore of current affairs, as the “doctrinal motivation” which can create “intellectual commitment”, and is rewarded by “patriotic gratification”, in this 'War on Terror' against the vile Militant Islam's torch bearers, the Islamofascists, cannot escape the careful reader's attention. It has wonderfully enabled “America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation.”

Catastrophic Terrorism

The [Terrorism Study Group](#) in fact took up the future foretelling in 1997-1998 where Brzezinski's self-serving clairvoyance had left off in 1996 with his pithy diabolical wisdom in *The Grand Chessboard*: “Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.” Phil Zelikow, the future 9/11 Commission Executive Director, led the so called study on [Catastrophic Terrorism](#). It presaged, on October 15, 1998, a full three years before 9/11, how that instinctual aversion of America's democratic public to “*imperial mobilization*” would be overcome by the United States striking out in

response to catastrophic terrorism on its soil:

“An act of catastrophic terrorism that killed thousands or tens of thousands of people and/or disrupted the necessities of life for hundreds of thousands, or even millions, would be a watershed event in America’s history. It could involve loss of life and property unprecedented for peacetime and undermine Americans’ fundamental sense of security within their own borders in a manner akin to the 1949 Soviet atomic bomb test, or perhaps even worse. Constitutional liberties would be challenged as the United States sought to protect itself from further attacks by pressing against allowable limits in surveillance of citizens, detention of suspects, and the use of deadly force. More violence would follow, either as other terrorists seek to imitate this great ‘success’ or as the United States strikes out at those considered responsible. Like Pearl Harbor, such an event would divide our past and future into a ‘before’ and ‘after.’” --- [History Commons](#)

The reality du jour exactly matches the doctrinal presaging done years in advance. America today is a police-state continually “pressing against allowable limits in surveillance of citizens, detention of suspects”, “the use of deadly force” is ubiquitous, and is fully engaged in a perpetual war of “imperial mobilization”, ahem, 'war on terror' against some Ali Baba, which its own former director of the CIA calls “World War IV” (see CNN report Thursday, April 3, 2003: [Ex-CIA director: U.S. faces 'World War IV'](#)). Its next target: Iran.

Predictably, with rising skepticism among the public on the utility of pursuing endless wars against illusive enemies that is making their own nation go bankrupt, more “harmful leaks” from assets like Wikileaks will occur, but understandably none which are actually substantial. Like, blowing the lid on *9/11 as an inside job*, directly naming the top beneficiaries who shorted the Airline stocks raking in billions, or revealing how BBC came to report the demolition of WTC-7 a full 20 minutes before it actually transpired, never mind lending confirmation to any of the forensic detective work by independent researchers from the debris of 9/11, etceteras. And the main leaker du jour, Mr. patsy Julian Assange, like Mr. patsy Lee Harvey Oswald before him, will be sacrificed, perhaps with a new 'lone gunmen' enactment, or perhaps juridically, to lend the hoopla even more public respectability.

Mr. Edward Snowden's NSA whistleblowing story is qualitatively the same and has the same underlying template of being the Mighty Wurlitzer's asset. Just because something is stamped “secret” does not make it so. The fact that NSA is doing full spectrum surveillance of the world, never

mind of the American public, since the invention of satellite communication, of which smart phones are now the ubiquitously deployed Trojan horse of data gathering and data mining, is not really a deep or closely held secret. It has been public knowledge throughout the world. It is even popularized by Hollywood movies for decades. Perhaps it is only news for the American public, I don't know. It is quite a dog and pony show “miracle” how this young man has “managed” to elude the entire intelligence apparatus, including the NSA, the CIA, the DIA, and the drones, of the sole superpower on earth which spends upwards of a trillion dollars on its defence budget annually, but cannot capture one “rogue” who outwitted that entire spy apparatus in “leaking” their most cherished “secrets”. Thus they must now spend more money and resources one imagines. Almost parallels with how the same apparatuses could not interdict Ali Baba wielding box cutter knives on 9/11, and therefore the state not only had to clamp down harder on its national security with the Patriot Acts, but also increase its defence spendings. A *Manchurian Candidate* or a *useful idiot* is irrelevant. To his own mind this new addition to the whistleblower clique may well be taking a courageous stand to defend his nation against enemies, both foreign and domestic, like his predecessor Sibel Edmonds. But he may also meet the patsy's inevitable fate someday after his usefulness has expired.

As for Ms. Sibel Edmonds, the dissent-darling of America who collects a large body of its brilliant consciences around her for her FBI whistleblowing, see [The Sibel Edmonds Story Revisited - How Manufactured Dissent contributes to War Crimes](#). There are more whistleblowers from other Western intelligence agencies as well, none of them having gained such outlandish celebrity status or notoriety. It is redundant to dissect them all since they all are, more or less, automatically unmasked by the Mighty Wurlitzer's template demonstrated here. They all, without exception, lie by omission, tell half truth, three quarter truth, and Limited Hangout variants, to implant or reinvigorate public beliefs without revealing anything substantial that can lead to overthrowing the villainy they endeavor to speak out against. It makes for manufacturing great dissentchiefs. As the final example, see the “former” CIA's own, Philip Giraldi, now leading the so called Council for the National Interest that routinely speaks out against Israel's influence in Washington, without ever mentioning who owns the Jewish state, [Dismantling the Fiction of 'Former' and 'Ex' Intelligence – Zahir Ebrahim's Response to Philip Giraldi](#).

It's the exact same recipe as is used by all the other fabricated and controlled dissent assets of empire when they are not outright spinning patent lies, for spinning half-truths requires far more brilliance. One can already see the main dissent-chiefs of the West, like the venerable professor Noam Chomsky, anointed by the New York Times as “*arguably the most important intellectual alive*”, and the distinguished Daniel Ellsberg, excitedly supporting these Wikileaks exposés as if something ethereal was “*revealed in the Sinai*” (borrowing that diction from Elie Wiesel). Snowden and

Edmonds too find great support among dissentchiefs. What remarkable narrative control through repeated incestuous self-reinforcement --- keeping all the core axioms and presuppositions of empire intact!

There is no detectable difference among Assange, Snowden, Edmonds, and Ellsberg on the one hand as whistleblowers of “state secrets”, and Chomsky, Hedges, Brzezinski, Bernard Lewis, Ron Paul, the Left, the Right, Republicans, Democrats, Libertarians, Catholics, Protestants, Baptists, Jews, Zionists, neocons --- on the core lie of empire which has principally enabled all the rest of the evil that has followed from that catastrophic day of *Operation Canned Goods Redux*. They publicly claim, or believe, in grand unison that America was attacked on 9/11 by “militant Islam”! The Muslim *house niggers* equally rise to applaud that absurd narrative of the *massa*. Speak of “*crippled epistemology*”! The *raison d'être* of the Mighty Wurlitzer.

It is not for nothing that James Jesus Angleton, Head of CIA Counter Intelligence 1954-1974, is quoted in the 1992 BBC-2 Documentary on [Operation Gladio](#): “**Deception is a state of mind and the mind of the State**”. See: [Angleton \(1917 - 1987\)](#) [CIA at Yale University in: *Spooks in Blue* by Doug Henwood,1988]. Manufacturing Dissent with controlled opposition is an indispensable core construct of that very statecraft of deception. See: '[Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science](#)'.

With the preceding backdrop for overarching context, wherein we straightforwardly witness that empire's own strategists and scribes reveal years in advance with considerable chutzpah, *American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*, and under what dystopian sociological conditions it could be mobilized with the democratic public being none the wiser, let's examine what I believe has been accomplished by Wikileaks in its service to empire's “War on Terrorism”.

Please see “[What is War on Terror?](#)” and [Postscript 'War on Terror' is not about 'Islamofascism' – Please get with the real agenda you people!](#) before proceeding further if you are only familiar with its insanity in empire's manufactured dissenting *Newspeak*. Meaning, the 'War on Terror' is neither irrational nor insane. It is firmly rooted in Machiavelli, the rational political science of “*imperial mobilization*”.

The core-lies retained in the Wikileaks' July 2010 disclosures – which I call 'the Afghanistan Papers' – is to once again reaffirm that there is a real nemesis called “Osama Bin Laden”, that the “war on terror” is real, that it is being inflicted upon the West from Pakistan-Iran nexus, and to re-substantiate the handoff of former President George W. Bush's clairvoyance to the Obama Administration that “*If another September 11 style attack is being planned, it probably is being plotted in Pakistan, and not*

Afghanistan!” That, when such a “*planned*” attack transpires, it “*will make Sept. 11 pale by comparison*”. See: [‘Bin Laden’: Key enabler of “imperial mobilization” and nuclear attack on Iran-Pakistan](#).

The successful handoff of “*imperial mobilization*” to Pakistan and Iran, now further sprightly underscored by Wikileaks' documents, is once again demonstrated by President Obama's Secretary of State Hilary Clinton's July 2010 remark to the [BBC](#) as quoted by [Reuters](#): “*There are still additional steps that we are asking and expecting the Pakistanis to take. But there is no doubt in anyone's mind that should an attack against the United States be traced to be Pakistani, it would (have) a very devastating impact on our relationship*”. And that is merely just another echo from the Obama Administration of what the Pakistanis themselves have been made to parrot the past 9 years, as demonstrated by its own Ambassador's remark in 2008:

[On] Wednesday, a media report quoted Pakistan's envoy to Washington as saying that US leaders had warned Islamabad that if the United States suffered an attack that was traced back to Pakistan Washington would retaliate. “Those (statements) have been made,” Ambassador Hussain Haqqani told editors and reporters at The Washington Post. “We want to make sure that it doesn't come to that.” -- DAWN, June 12, 2008

To show Pakistan's unflinching willingness to do as much more as was asked, the Ambassador of Pakistan had further stated in an interview to Reuters in 2008:

'Pakistan would attack Osama bin Laden the moment it had reliable intelligence on the Al Qaeda leader's whereabouts, Ambassador Husain Haqqani said on Wednesday. Haqqani also said he was confident Pakistan could help foil any Al Qaeda plans to attack the United States, although he did not know of any right now. “*A cooperative effort between all the allies, and that includes Afghanistan, Pakistan and the United States and NATO – I think we can thwart any potential plans for an attack,*” Haqqani said in an interview with Reuters.

He said Pakistani intelligence had helped defeat many of the “several dozen” Al Qaeda plots detected worldwide since the September 11, 2001, attacks, but government officials knew of no immediate threats to the United States. Haqqani said Pakistan would act on its own against Al Qaeda if necessary. “*If Pakistan, Afghanistan or the United States had specific intelligence on the location of Osama bin Laden, they would have acted on it. No reservations*

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

would have come in the way of action on that, and none will even in the future,” he said. *“If any of us had that actionable intelligence we would all act. We would act separately, we would act in tandem, we would act cooperatively – we would act.”* -- DAWN, June 12, 2008

So, could these self-serving 'Afghanistan Papers' have been any more convenient as a casus belli, carrying forth the same core-lies now entering its tenth year? If Wikileaks' dramatization grabbing all the world's headlines isn't an officially sponsored **“modified limited hangout”** for exactly that purpose of reinforcing the core-lies, then the White House not even bothering to stop the New York Times – whose own motto is 'All the news that's fit to print' – from publishing it, even giving it **“all got gold stars”** as the [Salon](#) put it on July 26, 2010, is downright inexplicable:

“So, uh ... why was all of this information classified and top secret? If it's old news, and it just confirms what "everyone" already knows, what was the rationale for keeping it classified and calling WikiLeaks all sorts of mean names for publishing it?”

What would it matter afterwards, after Iran and Pakistan have been bombed, what were lies and what was truth? Did the bogus mea culpa by the 2005 Presidential Commission on intelligence failure, the [Iraq Study Group's disingenuous conclusion](#): **“We conclude that the intelligence community was dead wrong in almost all of its prewar judgments about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. This was a major intelligence failure,”** reverse the decimation of Iraq? Did the New York Times 2008 revelation of [Pentagon's Message Machine](#) after 'all the barbers in town already knew it', return back to its silos each and every cruise missile that was dropped upon the innocent civilians of Iraq? Did Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski's bizarre testimony of [February 1, 2007](#) before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee undo the grotesque and criminal reality of *“imperial mobilization”* to which he now openly admitted? Even his bold public admission concerning the plausible false pretexts which could be found by the United States to attack Iran never made it past CSPAN, and in fact disappeared into the vast void of the Mighty Wurlitzer. What was Brzezinski's motivation for ratting on his own henchmen is anyone's guess. As a grandmaster strategist of The Grand Chessboard, he publicly issued a dare to the hawks in the Bush Administration to subvert or delay an imminent attack on Iran at this time.

Here is what Brzezinski publicly admitted in his SFRC testimony on [February 1, 2007](#):

“If the United States continues to be bogged down in a protracted bloody involvement in Iraq, the final destination on this downhill track is likely to be a

head-on conflict with Iran and with much of the world of Islam at large. A plausible scenario for a military collision with Iran involves Iraqi failure to meet the benchmarks; followed by accusations of Iranian responsibility for the failure; then by some provocation in Iraq or a terrorist act in the U.S. blamed on Iran; culminating in a “defensive” U.S. military action against Iran that plunges a lonely America into a spreading and deepening quagmire eventually ranging across Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

A mythical historical narrative to justify the case for such a protracted and potentially expanding war is already being articulated. Initially justified by false claims about WMD’s in Iraq, the war is now being redefined as the “decisive ideological struggle” of our time, reminiscent of the earlier collisions with Nazism and Stalinism. In that context, Islamist extremism and al Qaeda are presented as the equivalents of the threat posed by Nazi Germany and then Soviet Russia, and 9/11 as the equivalent of the Pearl Harbor attack which precipitated America’s involvement in World War II.

This simplistic and demagogic narrative overlooks the fact that Nazism was based on the military power of the industrially most advanced European state; and that Stalinism was able to mobilize not only the resources of the victorious and militarily powerful Soviet Union but also had worldwide appeal through its Marxist doctrine. In contrast, most Muslims are not embracing Islamic fundamentalism; al Qaeda is an isolated fundamentalist Islamist aberration; most Iraqis are engaged in strife because the American occupation of Iraq destroyed the Iraqi state; while Iran—though gaining in regional influence—is itself politically divided, economically and militarily weak. **To argue that America is already at war in the region with a wider Islamic threat, of which Iran is the epicenter, is to promote a self-fulfilling prophecy.”**

That admission requires no further elaboration from this scribe except to point out the smug hubris, that none among the senate committee members will rise to challenge his own role in that “self-fulfilling prophecy”, and none among the public's watchdogs of democracy will deconstruct it in the newsmedia, and in the academia, despite it being broadcast live on CSPAN. And they didn't!

Brzezinski's bold chutzpah of blaming the Bush Administration for their self-serving myth-making demagogic narratives to enable wars of aggression as “*self-fulfilling prophecy*”, when the sole

superpower in every government is only following his own recipe to fabricate “*doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification*” in order to pursue his previously outlined “*imperial mobilization*” agendas for “*American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*” on The Grand Chessboard, and the “*self-fulfilling prophecy*” only overcomes his own principal lament “*that America is too democratic at home to be autocratic abroad*” which “*limits the use of America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation*”, is outright disingenuous. It's like Hitler blaming his generals for following Mein Kampf and conquering Europe, and Goebbels for being the Reichminister for propaganda!

Such ex post facto disingenuousness is evidently part and parcel of full spectrum “*imperial mobilization*”. Without all techniques of deception underlying modern statecraft, which is itself never homogeneous and is plagued by competing narrow political self-interests no differently than Mafioso families in bloody turf competition while also agreeing to rob and plunder the public at will, just as we see in Brzezinski's SFRC testimony against his own lieutenants, nothing unpopular can be mobilized in a “democracy”.

The common man today is as averse to projects of imperial mobilizations of the elite as in the yestercentury. He must be deceived into paying for these projects, both with his toil, and with his life. Machiavelli's thin book, *The Prince*, which is read by most high-schoolers in Westerndom, is surely the most misread book of all times. It is evidently read as a fairytale rather than as a most pertinent political science key to the cryptogram of current affairs --- for, the vast majority of these learned masses many of whom eventually graduate from Western universities with high-falutin credentials, demonstrate at best only a passing acquaintance with that strangely popular sixteenth century Italian name. The handful who may comprehend it, mostly go to work for statecraft and thinktanks. The remaining do nothing with any of its insights into how the elite must rule by way of deception and secrecy when they do not have autocratic and dictatorial open authority over the masses like that of kings and feudal lords in centuries past. In the modern fiction of “democracy”, the elite can only govern by way of engineering the public's consent, by keeping secrets, and by adopting covert means, especially for carrying out long-term unpopular agendas. The common man's attention span is just too short to think about these agendas, and to sensibly relate them to current affairs on a canvas any larger than his own immediate time and space which is almost always bounded by his very narrow immediate self-interests.

There is, however, a very tiny minority of intelligent ones among the public not so easily fooled. Some do learn from the lessons of history and are able to relate it to the present. There is surely something to be gained by examining what transpired during the recently defunct Cold War in its

“demand creation” techniques (in marketing terms), and its four decades long continuance via global fear mongering, and relating that to the present. Otherwise, what's the grand purpose of studying history, especially forensically studying it by shrewdly treating it as the narrative of a crime scene written by the Mafioso families' own scribes. The modern history scribes, often paid for by the establishment, rehearse facts and figures ex post facto from official documents without addressing the secret, and the not so secret, motivations and behind the scenes forces that give birth to these facts and realities constructed by the “history's actors” (see [history's actors](#) quote below).

It's almost like the sly French police Captain Louis Renault in the film *Casablanca*, saying to the gendarmes: “round up the usual suspects” to cleverly deflect attention from the protagonist who has just shot and killed the Gestapo chief – because, it is not in anyone's interest to spotlight the real behind the scenes forces. Especially when they or their legatees are still in control. And also because it is not judged to be “sound academics”. The fear of being seen as “conspiratorial” encourages intellectual self-policing long before the establishment's academe and media policing can kick-in and impact well-paying careers and fame. The only useful purpose of studying history accurately, without self-deception, without contrivance, and without apologetics, was most elegantly captured by the wise playwright of the early twentieth century, George Bernard Shaw:

“We are made wise not by the recollections of our past, but by the responsibility for our future.”

Gladio Surrogate Terror

Witness the following from the period of the Cold War, where synthetic terror was used in Western Europe in order to convince the increasingly skeptical public that the Communist threat was real requiring the continuous heightened state of alert and rising military expenditures at the expense of domestic spending – all revealed ex post facto by the BBC documentary in 1992 on NATO's [Operation Gladio. Part-3](#) of the Gladio documentary has the following lovely statement quoted from the US Army's Top Secret Field Manual:

“Top Secret: There may be times when host country governments show passivity or indecision in the face of Communist subversion ... **US Army Intelligence must have the means of launching special operations which will convince host country governments and public opinion of the reality**

of the insurgent danger ... US Army Intelligence should seek to penetrate the insurgency by means of agents of special assignments, with the task of forming special action groups among the most radical elements of the insurgency.”

Replacing “Communist subversion” in the text above with “Islamofascist terror” makes what is being stated in this report obvious. See [Insurgency vs. Counter-Insurgency](#) in order to relate that US Army Field Manual recipe of yesteryear with the present. In the year 2042, or even as early as 2032, surely by 2052, an updated BBC documentary will confirm it all, with at best, a mere tsk, tsk, and the all knowing characteristic nod at the imperial craftsmanship of empire. A new generation of Noam Chomsky legatees will emerge with new best-selling books waiving their sublime morality at empire (see Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent below) and will get to occupy prestigious chairs in the academe as the new conscience of the world in one-world government.

What appears to be out of control Terrorism worldwide in 2014, and which is continuing to extract its *pound of flesh* from the sovereignty of nation-states faster than any other global crisis to date, can easily be comprehended when NATO's Operation Gladio of yesteryear is employed as the political science template. The motivations and the forces that drive global terrorism is writ large in that most empirical exposure of state sponsored terror disguised as “insurgency”. To make it believable and plausible, real insurgents are created, and existing insurgent groups, especially those with existential discontents, are infiltrated, and their destructive energies channeled in service of larger political agendas of which often the patsies themselves remain unaware of. The evidence from [CIA's MK ULTRA](#) program of yesteryear, and the empirical suicide bombings in the terrorism acts today, indicate to those who can observe rationally with even an iota of brain functioning, that the art of manufacturing the perfect *Manchurian Candidate* has been perfected. And so has its deployment on demand as in Operation Gladio.

No intelligence apparatus in any country, no news media, no establishmentarian politician to scholar to military man, nor any of the touted intellectuals playing dissent with the establishment's narratives, go there. Why not? Because there are always substantial tangible and intangible, as well as existential rewards to be gained by silence. It is always beneficial to continue to play the fool, the patsy, and the willing mercenary. See: [Operation Gladio Yesterday and Worldwide Terrorism Today – Identifying the Enemy](#), and [Imperial Surrogates and 'Terror Central' in Operation Gladio Redux](#). See [The Dying Songbird](#) to comprehend the co-option of the intellectuals and how they diabolically mislead and misdirect the public conscience from [Left to Right](#). They shall all be ceremoniously anointed “arguably the most important truth-tellers and intellectuals” tomorrow for their brilliant ex post facto exposés of the state deceptions of today, just as they are heralded today for their dry

study of yestercentury and its war crimes.

That is the real import of the craftsmanship of the Mighty Wurlitzer! To engineer a fait accompli by manufacturing consent among the gullible masses and controlling dissent among the rabble rousers when “*imperial mobilization*” is still on-going, leaving future scholars, historians, and the odd malcontent to laudingly study the ashes, mea culpae, confessions, documentaries, de-classified documents, and strategic *rattings* left behind by “*history's actors*”. A diabolical modus operandi of democratic statecraft which the Mighty Wurlitzer's operators even brazenly gloat about:

' “We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.” ' --- (Ron Suskind, New York Times, [Oct. 17, 2004](#))

It is now patently obvious with the Obama Administration officially declaring Osama Bin Laden killed in an American raid on May 1, 2011, why Wikileaks had to “leak” the officialdom's belief that he was still alive in July 2010! It is all too evident that some mileage is being derived by officially burying that nemesis at sea, a thousand miles from where they proclaim they killed him in an ambush in Abbottabad, Pakistan. Conveniently, it was in Pakistan and not Afghanistan that mankind's toughest and most resourceful nemesis was found and killed. The color coded threat alerts instantly went up worldwide. Pakistan Navy presumably already suffered a bizarre revenge attack on its naval base in Karachi from Ali Baba's elusive organization still intact, and now even more formidable than ever before. And its base of operation? Of course Pakistan!

Just as George W. Bush Jr., had intimated was the new [Terror Central](#):

“If another September 11 style attack is being planned, it probably is being plotted in Pakistan, and not Afghanistan”!

Brzezinski's unraveling of that *Bushism* in his SFRC testimony quoted above notwithstanding, was the 43rd President of the United States, George W. Bush Jr., just inordinately insightful to predict such matters as he was preparing to hand the presidential charge to his successor on the “change” platform? Carefully dissecting the nature of such self-serving propagandistic clairvoyance can perhaps also help the public to become shrewdly clairvoyant in their own self-defense in these often confusing matters on international relations. Especially on what's likely to come as the next global mythical terror threat in the aftermath of Osama Bin Laden. Let's briefly review how the terrorism of

9/11 was continually foretold by the masters of discourse themselves – for that will surely show the public how to treat their next bit of self-serving fortune telling.

Taking a Deeper Look into the Dynamics of Mantra Creation:

Islamofascism

Let's begin at the very inception of the 'arc of crisis' which Zbigniew Brzezinski laid the groundwork for during his reign of terror upon the USSR as the National Security Advisor to the 38th President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. See [Instrumenting Kosovo in the 'arc of crisis' and the 'global zone of percolating violence'](#) for other details of the epoch and its connections to the present 'War on Terror'. It suffices to quote here the following brilliantly clairvoyant statement attributed to Israeli Intelligence founder from the same epoch in 1979, a full two decades prior to 9/11:

'On Sept. 23, 1979, the founder of Israeli intelligence over dinner told me that America was developing a tolerance for terror. The gentleman's name was Isser Harel, the founder of Mossad Israeli intelligence-he ran it from 1947 to 1963. He told me that America had developed an alliance between two countries, Israel and Saudi Arabia, and that the alliance with Saudi Arabia was dangerous and would develop a tolerance for terror among Americans. He said if the tolerance continued that Islamic fundamentalists would ultimately strike America. I said "Where?" He said, **"In Islamic theology, the phallic symbol is very important. Your biggest phallic symbol is New York City and your tallest building will be the phallic symbol they will hit."** Isser Harel prophesied that the tallest building in New York would be the first building hit by Islamic fundamentalists 21 years ago.' [Source](#)

And Mossad again betrayed its brilliant clairvoyance 20 years later:

'The attacks on the World Trade Centre's twin towers and the Pentagon were humiliating blows to the intelligence services, which failed to foresee them, and to the defence forces of the most powerful nation in the world, which failed to deflect them. The Telegraph has learnt that two senior experts with Mossad, the Israeli military intelligence service, were sent to Washington in August to alert

the CIA and FBI to the existence of a cell of as many of 200 terrorists said to be preparing a big operation. **“They had no specific information about what was being planned but linked the plot to Osama bin Laden and told the Americans that there were strong grounds for suspecting Iraqi involvement,”** said a senior Israeli security official.' --- [UK Telegraph, 16 Sep 2001](#)

Seeded by that “prophesy” from the stellar Israeli intelligence mind, British Zionist Svengali at Princeton University, Professor Bernard Lewis planted the **'The Roots of Muslim Rage'** in 1990 in the Council on Foreign Relations' prestigious magazine *Foreign Affairs*. An influential establishmentarian mouthpiece which is read around the world by those who believe that if you want to know what will happen ten years from now in any remote corner of the world, read *Foreign Affairs* of ten years ago:

“In 1990 Bernard Lewis, a leading Western scholar of Islam, analyzed **'The Roots of Muslim Rage,'** and concluded: 'It should now be clear that we are facing a mood and a movement far transcending the level of issues and policies and the governments that pursue them. **This is no less than a clash of civilizations** – that perhaps irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage, our secular present, and the worldwide expansion of both. It is crucially important that we on our side should not be provoked into an equally historic but also equally irrational reaction against our rival.” --- (Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, 1996, pg. 213)

That 'Muslim Rage' was subsequently transformed in 1996 into a full blown political ideology for governing International Relations of the sole superpower as the infamous 'Clash of Civilizations', by Bernard Lewis' confrere and fellow Zionist at Harvard University, Professor Samuel Huntington:

'The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power. The problem for Islam is not the CIA or the US Department of Defense. It is the West, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the universality of their culture and believe that their superior, if declining, power imposes on them the obligation to extend that culture throughout the world. These are the basic

ingredient that fuel conflict between Islam and the West.' --- (Ibid. pg. 217)

'Some Westerners, including [ex] President Bill Clinton, have argued that the West does not have problems with Islam but only with violent Islamist extremists. Fourteen hundred years of history demonstrate otherwise.... **Islam is the only civilization which has put the survival of the West in doubt, and it has done that at least twice...** The parallel concepts of 'jihad' and 'crusade' not only resemble each other...' --- (Ibid. pg. 209)

This systematic myth construction of 'Islamic Terror' was prime for harvesting as the global 'War on Terrorism' on September 11, 2001 by George W. Bush with the dialectical ultimatum to the world: ***“either you are with us, or with the terrorists”!***

Within 15 minutes of the super terrorism of that day in infamy, the newsmedia had been awash in naming the first terrorist: Osama Bin Laden! The scripted discourse is of course repeated ad nauseam to this very day, the last time by President Obama himself while announcing the boogeyman's demise on May 1, 2011: ***“Good evening. Tonight, I can report to the American people, and to the world. The United States has conducted an operation that has killed Osama Bin Laden, the leader of Al Qaeda.”***

That's of course, after already having reiterated on the heels of his predecessor, on June 4th 2009, who was responsible for 9/11: ***“But let us be clear. Al Qaeda killed nearly 3000 people on that day. The victims were innocent men, women, and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody.”***

And all foretold by the clairvoyance of the Zionist Israeli Mossad founder, and reinforced by other Israeli Military Intelligence Mossad agents in the days just preceding 9/11, of the brilliant Islamic fundamentalists' successful attack on the West's most prominent “phallic symbol”.

Bernard Lewis subsequently justified George W. Bush's launching of the global 'War on Terrorism' in his phantasmic 2003 book *Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror*. First by reinforcing his earlier seeding of the mantra of 'the roots of the irrational Muslim rage', and extending those roots to Islam itself:

'But Islam, like other religions, has also known periods when it inspired in some of its followers a mood of hatred and violence. It is our misfortune that we have to confront part of the Muslim world while it is going through such a period, and

when most – though by no means all – of that hatred is directed against us.' ---
(Bernard Lewis, Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror, pg. 25)

And then clairvoyantly predicting the following self-serving conclusions as his last word:

'If the fundamentalists are correct in their calculations and succeed in their war, then a dark future awaits the world, especially that part of it that embraces Islam.' --- (Ibid. Chapter IX: The Rise of Terrorism, pg. 164)

'If freedom fails and terror triumphs, the peoples of Islam will be the first and greatest victims. They will not be alone, and many others will suffer with them.'
--- (Ibid. Afterword, December 1, 2003, pg. 169)

The Collateral Damage to Language for Synthesizing the Doctrinal

Motivation of Islamofascism

Before we continue further, it is necessary to deconstruct the crafty use of language for synthesizing the aforementioned propaganda to fuel the “War on Terror”. The following is extracted from Project Humanbeingsfirst's very critical response to the CAIR (Council on American Islamic Relations) Report titled [Calling CAIR to Account for its Omissions](#), for their egregiously omitting the most crucial fact of the matter in their otherwise stellar documentation of the rise of Islamophobia in America. The CAIR report (which incidentally underscores the observation that the name Council on American Islamic Relations sounds awfully similar to the Council on Public Relations founded by Edward Bernays to recast systems of propaganda into a new respectable light as “public relations” after World War II, the pathetic report is evidently serving the same function) was issued in collaboration with the Center for Race & Gender at the University of California, Berkeley. The significance of the following dismantling from first principles, beginning with the very use of language and the re-semanticization of words to construct the propaganda system of Islamofascism, will not be lost to the builders of tall totem poles who worry about having plausibly sound doctrinal foundations in order to have propaganda stand at all.

Let's examine the usage of the word “Islam” by Bernard Lewis.

Unlike Christians and Christianity, Muslims have two completely separate words to designate the people who proclaim to follow the religion or are born into that culture (Muslims) vs. the divine religion (Islam). Any time you see one terminology aliasing for another, you might do well to remember that there is some axe to grind somewhere. Bernard Lewis is the venerable master of this obfuscation being amiably carried by CAIR without reservation. Bernard Lewis began his treatise “Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror” with the following gem:

“It is difficult to generalize about Islam. To begin with, the word itself is commonly used with two related but distinct meanings, as the equivalents both of Christianity, and Christendom. In the one sense, it denotes a religion, as system of beliefs and worship; in the other, the civilization that grew up and flourished under the aegis of that religion. **The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity.**” --- (Bernard Lewis, Crisis of Islam, pg. 1)

That last sentence is the diabolical deception with which imperial craftsmanship subverts our religion: *“The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity.”*

According to the Author of the Holy Qur'an upon which the religion of Islam is based, the word “Islam” denotes only, and only, the following:

“This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed My favor on you and chosen for you Islam as a religion;” Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:3	الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتَمَّمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا
--	---

Indeed. Islam is the name of a religion, “deen” (الإسلام دِينًا).

That is the only, repeat only, context in which the word “Islam” can be legitimately used. It is the only context in which Qur'an has used it, indicating a divine religion to which the Author of the Qur'an itself gave the name “Islam”. The people didn't chose that name. Whether or not someone believes in Qur'an's “divinity” is irrelevant to us here; that is what the Book and the Religion upon which Bernard Lewis is proffering his imperial scholarship, itself proclaims.

This is very significant. The word “Islam” is quite distinct from the word used to designate Islam’s followers and the affairs of its followers. That separation of terminology is itself espoused in the Holy Qur’an by virtue of having a separate terminology to refer to the followers. Once again, while this may sound repetitious, but to the Western mind wholly attuned to referring to Christians and Christianity with the same root word devolving from their God named “Christ”, no amount of repetition can ever be sufficient to drive the point home. The Qur’an itself defined a different nomenclature to name its followers; the followers didn’t:

<p>“Our Lord! make of us Muslims, bowing to Thy (Will), and of our progeny a Muslim nation, bowing to Thy (will); and show us our place for the celebration of (due) rites; and turn unto us (in Mercy); for Thou art the Oft-Returning, Most Merciful.” Holy Qur’an Surah Al-Baqara 2:128</p>	<p>رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمِينَ لَكَ وَمِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُسْلِمَةً لَكَ وَأَرِنَا مَنَاسِكَنَا وَنُبِّ عَلَيْنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ التَّوَّابُ الرَّحِيمُ</p>
--	---

This separation of terminology between the name of the religion and the name of its followers is in fact a singular distinction of Islam in comparison to all the other Abrahamic religions. Indeed, in comparison to all major religions of the world including Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Zoroastrianism, none of which feature such a clear linguistic separation of nouns in their own respective scriptures. For instance, while the followers of (prophet?) Zoroastra are called *Parsis*, that word came about culturally rather than scripturally by way of the geographic region, Persia, where his followers originated and flourished.

This is why followers of Prophet Muhammad for instance, are not called “Mohammedans”, nor believers of Islam “Islamic”, “Islamist”, Arabist, etc. except by the prejudicial orientalist.

The word designated in the Holy Qur’an for human beings who are Muslims, regardless of good or bad people, pious or murderers, sinners or saints, is “Muslims”, or to be exact in the transliteration of verse 2:128 quoted above, “Muslimeen” (مُسْلِمِينَ).

The Muslims throughout the world, practicing and non practicing, by mere self-identification alone, without requiring any certification of faith from a pontiff, are referred in the Holy Qur’an as “Muslim Umma”, or to be exact in the transliteration of verse 2:128 quoted above, “Ummat-e-Muslima” (أُمَّةً مُسْلِمَةً); a single Muslim nation bound solely by an ideology named “Islam”, rather than by geography,

race, ancestry, ethnicity, socio-economic class, profession, or gender.

All who misuse the Qur'anic terminology, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, are either ignorant peoples – and there are always plenty of “learned morons” and parrots in every epoch who are deftly planted on the pulpit – or, the respected apprentices of Machiavelli. In the latter case, they deliberately try to subvert the religion of Islam by associating it with the inglorious non Islamic deeds in the rich imperial history of Muslims. Associating empire, imperial history, culture, civilization, etc., with the religion of Islam as defined in its singular scripture the Holy Qur'an, is a bold non sequitur. See the multi-part case study [“Islam: Why is the Holy Qur'an so easy to hijack?”](#) where this Bernard Lewis fabrication: *“To begin with, the word itself is commonly used with two related but distinct meanings, as the equivalents both of Christianity, and Christendom. ... The word Islam thus denotes more than fourteen centuries of history, a billion and a third people, and a religious and cultural tradition of enormous diversity.”* is shown to be a clever *big lie* of a sophisticated, but ultimately, still only a “vulgar propagandist”, in much greater depth even though this brief deconstruction already suffices. (See The Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent below for the source of this accurate epithet.)

One can immediately see the result of such gratuitous binding. It enables drawing false and specious associations by overloading the semantics in an already well-defined nomenclature.

That is the principal basis for subliminally, as well as cognitively, binding something virtuous (the religion) with something abhorrent (the vile deeds of the peoples, their kings, their cultures, their civilization). Thus, when the word Islam is mentioned, the abhorrent, or whatever is deemed abhorrent by Oriental scholarship, naturally springs to the mind of the seduced.

Based solely on that premeditated collateral damage to language that Samuel Huntington, the late circus clown of empire at Harvard, diabolically made the already quoted statement on “Islam” in his treatise “The Clash of Civilizations”. It is reproduced again because now we dissect it from the language point of view:

“The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the superiority of their culture and are obsessed with the inferiority of their power. The problem for Islam is not the CIA or the US Department of Defense. It is the West, a different civilization whose people are convinced of the universality of their culture and believe that their superior, if declining, power imposes on them the obligation to extend that culture throughout the world. These are the basic ingredient that fuel conflict between Islam and the West.” --- (Samuel Huntington, The Clash of

Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order, 1996, pg. 217)

Since when did the word "Islam" indicate civilization? A civilization is an aggregate of peoples, harboring one or more cultures, one or more languages, one or more customs, one or more religions. Like the Western civilization which has the nations of German, French, English, American, Russian, etceteras, that many languages, and many religions are practiced in these nations, including atheism, Christianity, and Islam. Whereas Islam is a religion, a "deen". A religion can be practiced in any civilization, by any peoples, including right here in the USA.

Samuel Huntington's teacher was evidently Bernard Lewis, as evidenced from their common re-semanticization of the word "Islam". This is how Huntington was able to demonize Islam: "The underlying problem for the West is not Islamic fundamentalism. It is Islam," and "These are the basic ingredient that fuel conflict between Islam and the West." We have already witnessed the passage above in which Samuel Huntington cited his Princeton University confrere Bernard Lewis as the author of 'The Roots of Muslim Rage' and the first authority on the "Clash of Civilizations". They incestuously reinforce each other rather well, don't they? Cass Sunstein, the other propagandist Harvard Law professor and President Obama's information czar, referred to such incestuous self-reinforcements in his erudite paper on "[Conspiracy Theories](#)" in the more refined academic jargon, as "crippled epistemology".

As we perceptively observe, it is the diabolical misuse of language which first and foremost enables drafting a thesis like "Clash of Civilizations". (See *Prisoners of the Cave* Chapter 9 which deconstructs Huntington's craftsmanship in more depth.) Such theses, made erudite and plausible sounding with the IVY League stamp, are thence crafted into simple propaganda to seed the Mighty Wurlitzer's many compositions. It is repeated ad nauseam thereafter.

Since Western people's point of reference is mainly *Christianity* where the common root word denotes everything, the people "Christians", the religion "Christianity", the civilization "Christendom", even the God "Christ" – in fact everything that Bernard Lewis falsely and maliciously imputed to Islam on page 1 of his propaganda manual "Crisis of Islam" – the same *kitchen sink* linguistics devilishly attributed to Islam, repeatedly, makes it believable for the un-informed Western public.


Thus, maligning Islam before the un-informed masses becomes a child's play for the Mighty Wurlitzer. Effective propaganda is always targeted only at the ordinary un-informed peoples, "the crowd of simpletons and the credulous", as examined in the report [Manufacturing Dissent](#). Its core purpose is to control public behavior by instilling false beliefs.

And we can see its rich harvest not in just the 'United We Stand' against "militant Islam" and the unfettered "imperial mobilization" and "shock and awe", but in the Qur'an burning, Islam bashing, and other Islamophobic festivities of the ignorant people against Muslims. It is surely not a surprise then, that Islamophobia should have increased steadily in the United States and the West since 9/11. Islamophobia is only the desired and natural effect of the propaganda system of the Mighty Wurlitzer. Like the festering boil on the protesting bride's lip, it is only symptomatic of the real syphilis beneath the virtuous wedding gown.

This crucial analysis unarguably illustrates how imperial scholars incestuously reinforce each other in implanting the "doctrinal motivation" mentioned by Zbigniew Brzezinski as being necessary for "imperial mobilization". It was pretty much the same protocol in the quest for *Lebensraum* of the Third Reich in yesteryear. At Nuremberg, the Nazi Party's chief philosopher, Alfred Rosenberg, was hanged for his mumbo jumbo. The third Reich's chief of propaganda, Reichminister of Propaganda and National Enlightenment, Dr. Joseph Goebbels, committed suicide after administering cyanide to his wife and six young children before the long arm of justice could wring his neck. Just thought I'd mention that in passing.

Such premeditated collateral damage to language, with the concomitant priming of doctrinal fuel for the long gestating mantras of "The Roots of Muslim Rage" years in advance of its catastrophic unveiling, is what so trivially enabled forging a bipartisan political consensus on the US foreign policy of aggression and invasion in the immediate aftermath of the shock effects of 9/11. The Patriot Act I was passed quickly without reading, and the entire United States Congress, save one member, gave its green light to invade Afghanistan. The mightiest and richest nation on earth patriotically savaged the poorest and weakest nation on earth in a broad political consensus. The American peoples 'United We Stand' saluting the flag, and motor car bumper stickers proudly proclaimed "We Support Our Troops".

Please refer back to Zbigniew Brzezinski's quoted passages above to refresh your memory that he had shrewdly stated in 1996: "Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance



Caption The Hegelian Dialectic side A: Reviling Islam (Islam is of The Devil by Pastor Terry Jones)

of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat.” *The Grand Chessboard* effectively blueprints the entire chain of causal linkages which have empirically transpired since 9/11, exactly as it was for Hitler's *Mein Kampf*.

Furthermore, also recall the previously quoted clairvoyant statements made by the so called Terrorism Study Group. These too lend prima facie evidence for how the Mighty Wurlitzer **premeditatedly** harnessed the 'searing' or 'molding' event of 9/11, the “new Pearl Harbor”, to successfully capitalize on the pre-implanted public myths of Islamofascism to launch the perpetual “War on Terror”. For, in all that confusion surrounding the event of Catastrophic Terrorism, fait accompli of the despotic response by the sole superpower was automatically seeded because “Like Pearl Harbor, such an event [divides] our past and future into a ‘before’ and ‘after.’” Now anything goes because “what is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times”, including launching aggressive wars against innocent nations, and turning one's own nation into a police-state. Ex post facto, print all about it in the New York Times!

Thus, also recall the previously mentioned chutzpah of their mea culpa, ex post facto, led by the Iraq Study Group in 2005 blaming “intelligence failure” for the missing WMDs in Iraq, and the New York Times in 2008 blaming the Pentagon, see [Pentagon's Message Machine Behind TV Analysts](#), [Pentagon's Hidden Hand](#), April 20, 2008. More such revelations will continue to occur as world government is incrementally cemented. Someday, even sixth graders will learn about it with a tad more honesty than the public is permitted to know today, just as school children candidly learn today about the genocide of the native American Indians on their own land.

What had appeared to casual observers who had been interested enough to read this stuff before the events of 9/11, to be only academic psychoanalyses of the American public, became the actual reality of “imperial mobilization” exactly as was so boldly foretold in these public writings.

It is also useful to recall at this point that the US Chief prosecuting counsel at Nuremberg, Robert H. Jackson, had declared on hearing the feigned protestations from the Nazi leadership on trial that they didn't know anything about Hitler's plans for *Lebensraum*:

“The plans of Adolf Hitler for aggression were just as secret as Mein Kampf, of which over six million copies were published in Germany” --- (Justice Robert H. Jackson in his closing speech at Nuremberg, on Friday, 7/26/1946, Morning Session, Part 3, Trial of the Major War Criminals before the International Military Tribunal)

Thus, Islamophobia steadily rising even in the tenth year of the catastrophic terrorism of 9/11 as documented by [CAIR and the University of California, Berkeley](#), is a direct descendent of the Dynamics of Mantra Creation for “Islamofascism”. One can no more describe the effects of Islamophobia without also describing its first cause, the American *Mein Kampfs* written by Jewish hands in Muslim blood to launch “*imperial mobilization*”, than one can describe the color of a tree without describing its first cause, the DNA of the tree.

Don't these scholars know their own literature? Can't they judge motivation? Can they not add two plus two to equal four? Will they also brazenly feign on their own day of reckoning that they were just highly paid ignorant morons unaware of the new *Mein Kampfs* rather than the learned scholars they are now presented to be?

Only vulgar propagandists and traffickers in truth will hide the causal linkages between pre-planned doctrines and the unfolding reality. That is a crime against the people! And only fools and useful idiots among them will pretend to not understand that crime. And that is the overarching success of the Mighty Wurlitzer. The myth of militant Islam has been successfully cast into perceived reality for the public.

The Hegelian Dialectic Militant Islam vs. Moderate Islam

The preceding success of the Mighty Wurlitzer effectively enables introducing the Hegelian Dialectic of “moderate Islam”.

Once demonized sufficiently with “militant Islam” and “islamofascism”, with “Islamophobia” sufficiently priming the public, the new propaganda slogan automatically becomes: we want to “reform Islam” for a more “moderate Islam”!

To mobilize this new devil like the previous one for “militant Islam” also requires the same “high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification.” as perceptively observed by Zbigniew Brzezinski in *The Grand Chessboard*. Please refer back to the full quoted excerpt above to remind yourself of this fact.

Thus new comparable works of “doctrinal motivation” become available preaching “moderate Islam”. These works and writings started appearing immediately in the aftermath of 9/11 with learned Muslim clerics making loud proclamations against “militant Islam” and speaking of “good Muslims”

vs. “bad Muslims” (see interview Shaykh Hamza Yusuf Hanson, San Jose Mercury News, Sunday Edition, September 16, 2001, [cached](#)). Clerics most faithfully echoing the core message of empire are immediately invited to the White House and to the Presidential Address in Congress by President George W. Bush Jr. and seated with Laura Bush and Tony Blair for dutifully speaking out against “Militant Islam” (watch [CSPAN](#) Presidential Address, September 20, 2001, see [video image](#) of Shaykh Hamza Yusuf with Laura Bush, Tony Blair, Donald Rumsfeld offering standing ovation to George W. Bush's pending invasions of Muslim nations along with the rest of United States Congress). Religious *fatwas* are issued against “militant Islam” and terrorism by “moderate” clerics in favor of “moderate Islam” (see [Response to the Fatwa on Terrorism in the Service of Empire](#), this [photograph](#) reveals the *fatwa* granting cleric Tahir ul Qadri prominently seated and speaking at the World Economic Forum).

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS
SEP 20, 2001

U.S. Senate | U.S. House of Representatives
White House Travel | DC Event

President Bush addressed a joint session of Congress following terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. He pledged to pursue terrorists around the world, called on Americans to be patient in what could turn .. [Read More](#)

1 hour, 4 minutes | 3,552 Views

[View Program Timeline](#)

[Recommend](#) | [Sign Up to see what your friends recommend.](#)

Share | Embed | 31:52 / 01:04:48

Caption Shaykh Hamza Yusuf Hanson, a fiery Muslim cleric from San Jose, California, convert from Christianity, founder of Zaytuna College in Berkeley to teach “moderate Islam” to American Muslims, attending George W. Bush’s presidential address to US Congress on September 20, 2001, seated immediately behind British Prime Minister Tony Blair, American First Lady Laura Bush, and American Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, giving standing ovation to the American president’s announcement of perpetual war on “militant Islam”. *How does a convert Muslim cleric get such rapid security clearance that within just 9 days of the most catastrophic terrorism on America’s soil, he is seated with the most powerful rulers of the world – and applauding their waging of barbaric wars upon Muslim nations? Only a long cultivated intelligence asset of the Mighty Wurlitzer for cognitive infiltration of the American and Western*

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

Muslim Mind! That manufactured product, in 2012 was graciously anointed 42nd among “The World’s 500 Most Influential Muslims”, two places ahead of even Seyyed Hossein Nasr, the prolific Muslim scholar at George Town University, by some idiotic think-tank setup among Muslims as their *House Nigger* drum-beater for the Mighty Wurlitzer. (Photograph source [CSPAN](#))




Caption Pakistani *house niggers*, Imran Khan and Tahir ul Qadri, seated on the massa's table at the Western super financial elite's World Economic Forum annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland, January 27, 2011. *How did these two political “no-ops” of least significance get invited to world economic forum for the white man's recognition? They are neither financiers, nor industrialists, and nor do they hold any economic or financial ministerial position within the government of Pakistan. Yes, as Western intelligence assets managed by their local counterpart, both are being rewarded for selling the massa's pitch on “moderate Islam” (even in their occasional controlled dissent with the Pakistani establishment which is most dutifully towing the massa's full line on “militant Islam”). And Tahir ul Qadri specifically for his “[600 page Fatwa on Terrorism](#)”. Both house niggers [artfully retain the core axioms of massa on “militant Islam”](#) to continually push the envelope of the Hegelian Dialectic forward as a self-fulfilling prophecy!* (Photograph source: a reader submission)

New translations of the Holy Qur'an are marketed to “bring reform to Islam” by respectable

progressive scholars (see [Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran](#). Shocking eye-catching news headlines in Western world's most prestigious newspapers announce their availability (see The Sunday Times of London, March 31, 2007, [Wife-beating rejected in 'new' Koran](#)).

And the same three ring circus is masterfully conducted by the Mighty Wurlitzer with the “moderate Islam” show added to play concurrently in the same broad arena with many other side shows (switching metaphor for appropriateness). The crucial difference in this instance however is that it is seemingly staged by “reform minded”, progressive, as well as conservative Muslims themselves. Sophisticated and scholarly looking Muslim intellectuals are recruited for this purpose from across the intellectual spectrum (see [FAQ What is an Intellectual Negro?](#)).



Muslim bookstores prominently feature the “reform Islam” authors' works with glowing tributes: “*This is the first edition of the Quran translated by an American woman. This modern, inclusive translation refutes past translations that have been used to justify violence against women.*” (see [Kazi Publications](#), frontpage [cached](#)). Please refer to [Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran](#) where the following commonsense is noted with respect to the preceding statement:

Caption The Hegelian Dialectic side B: Reforming Islam “... Quran translated by an American woman. This modern, inclusive translation refutes past translations that have been used to justify violence against women.” (The Sublime Quran By Laleh Bakhtiar)

'It is your grave misconception that Muslims beat their wives because the Holy Qur'an gives them permission to beat their wives. Muslims also kill their wives, do honor killings of their children and family members, and a thousand other grotesque and equally criminal things in Muslim societies – **and the Holy Qur'an strictly forbids it all.**

And Muslims do no more horrendous acts than the pious Western Christians and holy Western Jews who commit the most heinous crimes, and monumental crimes against humanity which are on-going even as I write this. The white man today is calculatingly killing and raping far more Muslim women on a daily basis

with “shock and awe”, drone attacks, military occupation, to the thunderous silence of Western champions of human rights than any Muslims assaulting their wives in domestic quarrels because of 4:34. **But of course it is Islam which needs to be reformed first with a new translation of the Holy Qur'an.** Daniel Pipes must be feeling rather pleased with himself for this fortuitous gift.' --- Zahir Ebrahim in his letter of critique to Laleh Bakhtiar

It is evidently more effective if respectable looking mainstream Muslims themselves appear to drive the demand to “bring reform to Islam” for “moderate Islam” rather than Jews like Daniel Pipes, David Horowitz, Bernard Lewis, the late Samuel Huntington, the neo-cons at AIPAC, JINSA. AEI; Christians like the 700 Club, Quran burning pastor of the Church in Florida whose book on Islam is pictured above; the White House, the Pentagon; the think-tanks; the Western courts, et. al., appear to be driving it. The synergistic WWF wrestling matches however always only collect windfall profits for the same root promoter.

The revealing thing to observe here is the intriguing background of some of the most prominent among these “moderate Islam” shrill voices in America. They are often converts to Islam from Christian heritage and have become self-taught scholars of Islam in America with imposing command of Arabic. The loud mouth striving to “bring reform to Islam” by writing an entirely new English translation of the Holy Qur'an no less, titled The Sublime Quran (see image above), grew up as a Catholic of mixed Iranian-American parentage. She is Laleh Bakhtiar, Ph.D. in Education Psychology. As a linguist in Arabic and English, she employs the same re-semantification of the word “Islam” as Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington when she pitches “bring reform to Islam”! In the [Critique: Laleh Bakhtiar and The Sublime Quran](#):

'You surely could not have meant 'reform the religion of Islam' for which the Holy Qur'an stated:

“This day have I perfected for you your religion and completed My favor on you and chosen for you Islam as a religion;” Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Maeda verse fragment 5:3	الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتَمَّمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا
--	--

You are going to reform what Allah [perfected]?

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

You surely must have meant to say 'reform the misunderstandings among the Muslims regarding Islam.'

Then why not just say exactly what you mean?

Does the statement "bring reform to Islam" mean the same thing as 'bring reform to Muslims' to a grammarian and linguist who has translated the Holy Qur'an from Arabic into English?' --- Zahir Ebrahim in his letter of critique to Laleh Bakhtiar

And the loudest mouth decrying "militant Islam" from the first day of 9/11 is of course Hamza Yusuf, convert to Islam from Orthodox Christianity. He was studying to be a male nurse in Santa Clara California where I knew him in the 1980s giving fiery Friday sermons to the delight of the pious Muslim worshipers, before he conferred upon himself the lofty honorific of "Shaykh" in the 1990s and started his own institute to teach "moderate Islam" to Americans. Called the Zaytuna Institute, now Zaytuna College in Berkeley. He is well respected among many American Muslims who swear by his scholarship with an almost cult like faith – the "moderate Islam". He has acquired international fame for his oratory and his command of the arcane in the Muslim writings of antiquity so revered by the majority of Muslims. He told the UK Guardian's Jack O'Sullivan in an article titled: ['If you hate the west, emigrate to a Muslim country'](#), October 08, 2001:

' "Many Muslims seem to be in deep denial about what has happened," he says. "They are coming up with different conspiracy theories and don't entertain the real possibility that it was indeed Muslims who did this. Yet we do have people within our ranks who have reached that level of hatred and misguidance." '

Jack O'Sullivan introduced Hamza Yusuf in the lede to his aforementioned article with this description:

'Hamza Yusuf is arguably the west's most influential Islamic scholar. Many Muslims find his views hard to stomach, but he is advising the White House on the current crisis, and today he will be talking to religious leaders in the UK'.

As respected Muslim opinion makers bearing exactly the right credentials to appeal to their respective Muslim constituencies, they make great useful idiots and/or assets for this Hegelian Dialectic just like their "militant Islam" counterparts, whether or not they are themselves aware of it. It is no different than the suicide bombers recruited for "militant Islam" and being handled by local

intelligence handlers who themselves deeply believe in their divine mission quite oblivious to the reality that they are dancing to the Mighty Wurlitzer's tune. Unless of course, also like many of their counterparts in the theater of “militant Islam”, they too were psychologically profiled and directly recruited as controlled sleeper assets of the Mighty Wurlitzer a long time ago for later harvesting.

Empiricism has the bad habit of revealing the obvious. It is especially pertinent to observe how this Hamza Yusuf character immediately sprung into prominent action as if on cue in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. When the rest of American news media was blaming “militant Islam” within 15 minutes of 9/11, Hamza Yusuf managed to get his interview published in the San Jose Mercury News in the very first Sunday's edition after 9/11, September 16, 2001, condemning “militant Islam” with pious indignation. And on September 20, 2001 was in the White House, and seated next to Laura Bush in Congress. And thereafter meeting British leaders selling the empire's story to Muslims in Britain.

No Trojan Horse agent of the Mighty Wurlitzer could have done more than Hamza Yusuf did – contribute directly to build consensus for invading Afghanistan and the 'War on Terror' by driving it from the angle of “moderate Islam”.

It is no accident that each and every prominent proponent of “moderate Islam” and “reform Islam” also promulgates that 9/11 was done by “militant Islam” echoing the core-axiom of empire!

And this is precisely what betrays them, the fact that they are running with the foxes while hunting with the hounds. **Otherwise the Hegelian Dialectic would not work!**

The message to their own flock is simple but effective, drawn right from Edward Bernays text book on Propaganda quoted at the very beginning of this report, and Hitler's Mein Kampf. Just as Dr. Joseph Goebbels had a very simple message for corralling the Germans, these Muslim leaders have an equally simple message for their flock adapted from empire's singular core-axiom. First, in order to refresh one's memory, this is what is reported in Mein Kampf:

“The success of any advertisement, whether of a business or political nature, depends on the consistency and perseverance with which it is employed.

In this respect also the propaganda organized by our enemies set us an excellent example.

It confined itself to a few themes, which were meant exclusively for mass consumption, and it repeated these themes with untiring perseverance.

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

Once these fundamental themes and the manner of placing them before the world were recognized as effective, they adhered to them without the slightest alteration for the whole duration of the War.

At first all of it appeared to be idiotic in its impudent assertiveness. Later on it was looked upon as disturbing, but finally it was believed.

But in England they came to understand something further: namely, that the possibility of success in the use of this spiritual weapon consists in the mass employment of it, and that when employed in this way it brings full returns for the large expenses incurred.

In England propaganda was regarded as a weapon of the first order, whereas with us it represented the last hope of a livelihood for our unemployed politicians and a snug job for shirkers of the modest hero type. ...

I learned something that was important at that time, namely, to snatch from the hands of the enemy the weapons which he was using in his reply. I soon noticed that our adversaries, especially in the persons of those who led the discussion against us, were furnished with a definite repertoire of arguments out of which they took points against our claims which were being constantly repeated.

The uniform character of this mode of procedure pointed to a systematic and unified training.

And so we were able to recognize the incredible way in which the enemy's propagandists had been disciplined, and I am proud to-day that I discovered a means not only of making this propaganda ineffective but of beating the artificers of it at their own work. Two years later I was master of that art." --- (Mein Kampf, Adolph Hitler, Vol. 2, Chapter VI)

Now compare to what is repeated ad nauseam and with great consistency from virtually every "good" Muslim mosque pulpit and from every "good" Muslim institutional soapbox including the most prominent American Muslim civil rights organization CAIR noted earlier, each using their own diction of course to inflict precisely the following Propaganda for "moderate Islam":

- it was "militant Islam" which is responsible for 9/11 attacks,
- these are the "bad" Muslims, we are the "good" Muslims, we don't do terrorism,
- we must fight terrorism,
- we must support our government to fight the militants,
- and we must practice "moderate Islam" which is the true Islam,
- our blessed Prophet was a "moderate",
- he did not kill innocent peoples,
- the Qur'an forbids killing innocent people. --- Propaganda message of "moderate

Islam”

Consequently, religion-based as well as secular-based voices of “moderate Islam”, the lofty bearers of this propaganda feast for the “the crowd of simpletons and the credulous”, are immediately effective in corralling the majority of “good” Muslims. They span the full gamut of persuasions from conservatives (Hamza Yusuf et. al.) to reform oriented progressives and seculars (CAIR et. al., Laleh Bakhtiar et. al.). All “good” Muslims end up “United We Stand” with the empire in its perpetual war against “militant Islam” following their respective pied pipers. This propaganda transcends the sectarian divide among the “good” Muslims in the West. This is the dominant characteristic of the vast majority of the 'United We Stand' mainstream Muslims.

To draw upon empiricism to validate, observe the “good Muslims” inextricably caught in this Hegelian Dialectic in [Muslims against Terrorism](#) (frontpage [cached](#)), and watch the rich and famous make [Proud to be American Muslims](#) videos to distance themselves from “militant Islam”. Joseph Goebbels would be immensely proud of his legatees. At the peak of hubris, [Sieg Heil](#) is the only reality!

The few angry Muslims escaping Sieg Heil like the rest of the few angry citizens, but still caught in the Hegelian Dialectic are corralled by the controlled dissent-space anxiously waiting to welcome them. See Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent below.

The controlled dissent is run very efficiently on a treadmill permitting the angry Muslims along with the rest of the Western public to vent their lungs out shouting in the streets, and their fingers out typing on the internet, before they return back to their jobs Monday morning feeling fresh from the weekend catharsis. The too angry among them who are not so easily placated by “weekend jihad” soon acquire the label “bad” or “terrorist”. There is no escape for them so long as they remain caught in the Hegelian Dialectic.

Please go back a little to the Guardian interview with Hamza Yusuf quoted above and observe the uncanny exactness in the wording which almost mirrors the New York Times' anointing Noam Chomsky. Between “[Noam Chomsky is] arguably the most important intellectual alive” (New York Times) driving the Left, and “Hamza Yusuf is arguably the west's most influential Islamic scholar” (Guardian) driving the Muslim Right, both proclaiming “militant Islam” attacked America on 9/11 in great synergy with the White House and the Pentagon, the field is covered.

One heads the manufacturing dissent factory catching those who escape the Hegelian Dialectic of “militant Islam” vs. “moderate Islam”, the other heads the manufacturing consent factory for

“moderate Islam” against “militant Islam” beating the imperial drums.

Where you gonna go?

Those few who eventually wizen up to it all and fearlessly exit that Hegelian Dialectic altogether are now attempted to be corralled in warmly welcoming “conspiracy” groups strategically cultivated for exactly this purpose as part of “*imperial mobilization*” planning. As Cass Sunstein put it in “[Conspiracy Theories](#)”, these groups lend “beneficial cognitive diversity” to aid statecraft defocus all the angry energies.

If the Hegelian Dialectic didn't get all the morally angry people as it did the vast majority of the public diabolically trapped between the false paradigm of “militant Islam” vs. “moderate Islam” and controlled dissent all sharing the empire's core-axioms, this trap catches the remaining majority. Watch how the most intelligent among this lot soon find themselves in the 9/11 Truth Movement. See [Toronto Hearings: A strange cast of characters among 9/11 Truth Leadership](#).

That treadmill is strategically designed to occupy the remaining morally angry people studying 9/11 mysteries and how the WTC towers came down repeatedly calling for “new investigations”. The “*history's actors*” of course, unbeknownst to these bright lads, have already announced that this is precisely what they shall all be kept busy with: “We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.” In the meantime, the “*history's actors*” have acted again and created “new realities”.

There is no exit from that trap either so long as one is kept occupied with the previous fait accompli leaving the “*history's actors*” free to enact new ones!

The aforementioned set of comprehensive fly traps pretty much ensnare what appears to this scribe to be close to ninety nine percent of the nation's citizenry. About the remaining odd percent (or two), Adolph Hitler had observed in his Mein Kampf: “the value of these [skeptics] lies in their intelligence and not in their numerical strength,”! No one pays any attention to them whatsoever. If they speak, they are first ignored, then reviled, and then made an offer they can't refuse. As part of “imperial mobilization” planning, statecraft ensured via the Patriot Acts, police state laws, “no fly lists”, etc., that there remained no effective means for ordinary citizens to ever effectively mobilize themselves together on a single focussed goal of derailing “imperial mobilization” and therefore pose any threat whatsoever to their plans.

From the propaganda of Islamofascism to domestic police state was one short jump in this slick

game of “*imperial mobilization*”.

The exercise of primacy always is. And the role of the Mighty Wurlitzer, as we can now appreciate, is indispensable across the entire spectrum of social engineering to get people to consent to what is happening to them! Please refer back to the statements made by Aldous Huxley in his talk in 1961 quoted above: ‘Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude!’

The perpetual ‘war on terror’ is not mere happenstance and over-reaction to catastrophic terrorism as some of empire’s leading detractors too innocent of knowledge gullibly argue. The evidence presented here demonstrates it to be diabolically premeditated in no less a measure than the Third Reich’s march to Lebensraum after the full disclosure of their intent in Mein Kampf. In both cases, the public had to be mobilized since “Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.” In our case, Lebensraum is world government, and as reasoned by Bertrand Russell, “**World government could only be kept in being by force.**” (Bertrand Russell, Impact of Science on Society Ch. 2, pg. 37)

The Hegelian Dialectic Militant Islam vs. Moderate Islam will surely go down in history as among the greatest enablers of war, rivaling and perhaps surpassing both Communism vs. Fascism and Communism vs. Capitalism of the twentieth century. It is their legatee for the twenty-first century. As previously noted, it is already called “World War IV”. The blood stains accumulated on all the saintly hands enabling it, as of those prosecuting it, won’t be cleansed by all the perfumes of Arabia while they sleep holily in bed! (Shakespeare MacBeth) Fortunate are those who at least experience PTSD and can’t sleep holily in bed (see Zahir Ebrahim, [Letter: A Cure for America’s War Veterans who have fertilized the 'arc of crisis' in Muslim blood](#)).

The Hegelian Dialectic Militant Islam vs. Moderate Islam however is still designed to play a multifaceted role beyond the prima facie one of each of its individual components.

The mantra of “reform Islam” is the more pernicious of the two. While “militant Islam” has seditiously enabled police states in the West which all can experience themselves without having to read about it, “moderate Islam” is intended to enable the new world religion for these police states which few among the public are able to apprehend just yet.

Many useful idiots who play their role like actors on stage, some believing in the promise of

“moderate Islam”, have little understanding of the entire show, their script only being for Act II. Act I was obviously “militant Islam” in this Hegelian Dialectic.

Acts III and IV which are coming up next after the intermission for which the stage is now being set, is to harvest the calculated subversion of all established religions, specifically the religion of Islam, to pave the way for the introduction of Secular Humanism – the new religion of world Government (see Zahir Ebrahim, [Islam vs. Secular Humanism and World Government](#)).

Full Spectrum Primacy is the underpinning of all power calculus. Be it of the State, just the full title of Zbigniew Brzezinski's aforementioned book betrays what's already obvious: “The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives”. Or be it of the controlling oligarchy, which is also already obvious, and for which books upon books of respected establishmentarian scholars like Professor Carroll Quigley's “Tragedy and Hope”, openly disclose their overarching agenda being world government (see Zahir Ebrahim, [Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order](#)).

Empiricism confirms these facts.

The Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent

Having now perceptively understood the subtle, almost undetectably precise imperial craftsmanship of Bernard Lewis et. al., which forms the crucial seed for implanting the “doctrinal motivation and intellectual commitment” necessary for sustaining “imperial mobilization” via the Hegelian Dialectic “militant Islam” vs. “moderate Islam”, it should not be surprising to discover that even the steward of public conscience for the West, Noam Chomsky, judged Bernard Lewis to be “just a vulgar propagandist”!

In a revealing interview on CBC, at just about that time:

'... now, until Bernard Lewis tells us that, and that's only one piece of a long story, we know that he is just a vulgar propagandist and not a scholar. So yes, as long as we are supporting harsh brutal governments, blocking democracy and development, because of our interest in controlling the oil resources in the region, **there will be a campaign of hatred against us!** ---
Interview to Evan Solomon, CBC, part-2, minute 5:50, [December 9, 2003](#),

But in furthering our forensic and critical study of the Dynamics of Mantra Creation solely on the anvil of empirical political science, it is even more instructional to observe the omissions and commissions in Noam Chomsky's own vaunted dissent as "*arguably the most important intellectual alive*" (NYT). The disease of deception is evidently infectious among that clan.

Noam Chomsky himself continued to echo from the very day of September 11, 2001, and still maintains so in this tenth year of 9/11, that Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda carried out that *day of infamy* upon which all matters 'War on Terror' hinge!

Thus, strangely enough, despite all his famous dissent, Noam Chomsky has exactly managed to echo Bernard Lewis', Samuel Huntington's, the Pentagon's, the White House's, the incumbent as well as all living former presidents of the sole superpower, the Israelis', and the world Zionists' collective mantra of "Islamofascists" being the perpetrators of 9/11.

Noam Chomsky is of course, also the most outspoken champion of Wikileaks in his otherwise erudite disagreements with his opposite numbers in the establishment.

All this public fracas of dissent against the establishment is somewhat akin to the American and Russian spies strategically collaborating with each other despite their often antagonist tactical missions, for the greater common good of the military-industrial complexes of both nations during the Cold War. When we perceptively read the works of Anthony Sutton, Carroll Quigley, and W. Cleon Skousen, it becomes obvious that the uber-capitalists and the uber-communists where in fact covertly collaborating at crucial core nexuses despite all their overt *WWF wrestling* style public antagonisms. Both serving the interests of the same financiers. In other words, at the highest levels of social control, there is evidently no difference of overarching agendas among its seemingly antagonistic players, each one of them merely playing a theatrical public role. Shakespeare aptly dramatized it in *As you like it*:

'All the world's a stage,
And all the men and women merely players:
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his time plays many parts,
His acts being seven ages.'

It should now be self-evident that Bernard Lewis and Noam Chomsky together, while seemingly cogent opposites, in fact represent the class of counterpoint tunes of the Mighty Wurlitzer which nicely bookend all public discourse between the artificial bifurcation of Right and Left, Conservative

and Liberal, Establishmentarian and Rebel, Totalitarian and Anarchist, Consent and Dissent. It is the two antipodes of a fabricated Hegelian Dialectic to respectively engineer both consent and dissent in order to sustain “imperial mobilization”.

Noam Chomsky himself argues the veracity of this observation in his own erudite manner:

'The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum - even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.'

and yet, he just as willingly participates in it.

Thus, observe that Chomsky too echoes that there is a 'Muslim Rage', but instead of it being deemed “irrational” like Bernard Lewis posits in his “vulgar propagandist” scholarship, Noam Chomsky calls it a rational rage, a “blowback” to American foreign policy and the history of American political aggression! See Chomsky's money minting booklet “911” by Seven Stories Press; and how it was cobbled together in “[The Closet Capitalist](#)”, where the Hoover Institution critic observed: “Chomsky's marketing efforts shortly after September 11 give new meaning to the term war profiteer. In the days after the tragedy, he raised his speaking fee from \$9,000 to \$12,000 because he was suddenly in greater demand.” See [The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky Revisited in 2015 by Zahir Ebrahim](#).

While dissent which retains the core-lies of empire when vehemently critiquing its effects is typical of all prominent controlled assets, in this instance of “*arguably the most important intellectual alive*”, it would perhaps be more apropos to give it the same epithet that Noam Chomsky anointed Bernard Lewis with. Just to call a spade a spade – and no more.

Who else echoes that same “vulgar propagandist's” core-lie of empire, of 9/11 being invasion from abroad and the work of “militant Islam”, in deep consonance with Bernard Lewis, the Pentagon, the White House, and the neo-con think-tankers? Surprise, surprise, it is the other patron saint of latter day dissent, Congressman Ron Paul, echoing exactly Noam Chomsky's theme of 9/11 being a “blowback” by malcontent Muslims. Ron Paul's absurdities are dismantled in [My beef with the stellar congressman Hon. Ron Paul](#).

As a Muslim, I hope I might be forgiven if I observe some ground floor reality check to put all this

[specious](#) “blowback” in hegemonic context. I don't see any such naturally percolating “blowback” rage in any significant tenor in any Muslim country despite what the [white man's burden](#) has done to us worldwide, except perhaps in the three nations militarily occupied by Israel and the United States today, Palestine, Iraq, and Afghanistan. Even there, all I see are some manufactured “insurgents” being “tickled” into expressing a manufactured rage on demand. This is deconstructed in great detail in the two comprehensive reports [Manufacturing Dissent](#) and [Insurgency vs. Counter-Insurgency](#). Also see [The Dying Songbird](#).

Suffice it to expose here this sham of “blowback” very briefly. The Director of the CIA, Michael Hayden, openly expressed the empire's modus operandi of “[tickling](#)” terrorists into existence thusly: **“We use military operations to excite the enemy, prompting him to respond. In that response we learn so much”**. When the poor victims and their unfortunate survivors are thus sufficiently “*tickled*” with the inconsolable loss of their loved ones under the world's mightiest superpower's barbaric “*shock and awe*”, they become prime harvest for empire's other long running mantra, “[God is on your side](#)” (where God changes sides at will as expedient – see [Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization](#) for details).

That harvest of malcontents is managed by local intelligence handlers and the Pentagon's Black-ops, to steer the “tickled” patsies natural lust for justified revenge on the aggressors onto pre-selected local targets. The US Army field manual cited above is apropos to quote once again as a reminder that this is indeed how the world of hegemony actually works and this report on the Mighty Wurlitzer isn't a James Bamford novel: *“US Army Intelligence must have the means of launching special operations which will convince host country governments and public opinion of the reality of the insurgent danger ... **US Army Intelligence should seek to penetrate the insurgency by means of agents of special assignments, with the task of forming special action groups among the most radical elements of the insurgency.**”*

Running false-flag operations in this way by setting up diversionary suicidal patsies harvested from “*among the most radical elements of the insurgency*”, while the more precision oriented lethal hit is handled covertly by the skilled Black-Ops, becomes a breeze. This is of course the empiricism of all major assassinations of political leaders worldwide – compartmentalized disposable patsies independently working on narrow tasks for a common boss, often unbeknownst to each other. That is the prime modus operandi to fabricate the terrorist acts – called “insurgency”. That's the sum total of the “blowback” of vaunted dissent narrators like Ron Paul and Noam Chomsky, and the new dissent chiefs like Paul Craig Roberts who, after having his fill of 900 mice, now wants to lead the mice against the primacy of the feline predators (see Zahir Ebrahim, [Rebuttal to Paul Craig Roberts'](#)

['Washington Arrogance has Fomented a Muslim Revolution'\)](#).

Once the “insurgency” is crafted, the organs of state, the military, the police, the intelligentsia, the media, the pundits, all across the world all naturally focus on the visible terrorist act of these patsies and their poor victims! Since that is all that the public is permitted to see by the Mighty Wurlitzer, the empire's next move is naturally sanctioned. That is called “counter-insurgency”. Some call it invasion and occupation. That is also the mechanism of the super-terrorism of 9/11 in a nutshell – diversionary tactics employed as shadow play which was propagandized by the Mighty Wurlitzer worldwide, while the WTC towers were expertly and with military precision brought down with controlled demolition of some kind. The intimate dynamics of mid-wifery between insurgency and counter-insurgency can sustain “*imperial mobilization*” indefinitely!

See [Zahir Ebrahim: Between Imperial Mobilization and Islamofascism](#) and [FAQ: What is an Intellectual Negro](#) for the role played by the villainous Muslim House Negroes in promoting the hectoring hegemons' own propaganda, vs. the pathetic ground realities of the Muslim masses, the so called “revolutionaries”, in the [Preface to Prisoners of the Cave](#), all very patiently *waiting for Allah* for deliverance!

Mining Propaganda to Uncover Agenda BEFORE it is a **Fait Accompli**

Returning back to the “vulgar propagandist” (I keep that epithet in quotes deliberately to emphasize the fact that apart from its veracity, it's also the product of *WWF wrestling*), we already see the empirical results of the uncannily predictive clairvoyance of America's and Israel's greatest establishmentarians concerning 'Islamic Terror' which goes by many names including “blowback”.

The fate of Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, the entire Middle East, the “*arc of crisis*” and the “*global zone of percolating violence*”, all have something real in common today because of such amazing fortune telling by the masters of discourse years in advance: “*the peoples of Islam will be the first and greatest victims.*” (see [Bernard Lewis](#) quoted above) Please refer back to the already mentioned report: [Instrumenting Kosovo in the 'arc of crisis' and the 'global zone of percolating violence'](#).

So, ought the public to take the superlative masters of discourse and the assorted “vulgar propagandist” a tad more seriously when they initially spew new absurdities en route to successful mantra creation years in advance? And, before its eventual harvesting under the cataclysmic shock-

effects of the “new pearl harbor”, makes their predictive boast: “*They will not be alone, and many others will suffer with them*”, an unalterable grotesque reality du jour?

One of course already observes some of that Bernard Lewis' sponsored clairvoyant suffering of the innocent in America itself. While its own body-count is minuscule in comparison to Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, others experiencing 'revolutions' and 'democracy' in the Middle East, not to mention PTSD suffered by its veterans which too pales in comparison to what the valiant have wrecked upon the 'untermenschen' (see [Letter to Editor: PTSD and its Cure](#)), one with eyes wide open substantially notes that:

- the American national debt is soaring because of its perpetual 'War on Terror' and the financial malfeasance of its financial elite;
- its bankruptcies and joblessness have shattered the 'American Dream' of its public;
- its de-industrialization by having off-shored all its manufacturing and production capacity is at an all time peak;
- the mighty superpower is now a police-state the likes of which was hitherto only presaged in fictional narratives like George Orwell's 1984;
- and the once mighty industrial nation may be merged into a larger supra-national regional entity similar to the EU as a consequence of all these crises conditions.

Can one therefore, perceptively not surmise that the deceased Ali Baba's replacement nemesis will be a *Super Ali Baba Plus Plus* to complete the job started by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Israeli Intelligence agents' clairvoyance? What can this new threat possibly be that it will even eclipse Osama Bin Laden in his magical prowess?

Can the public shrewdly anticipate and prepare for the next boogeyman based on the tunes now being played by the Mighty Wurlitzer, rather than be shell-shocked into acquiescence by its phantasmic unveiling? Just as the world was, and still is, shell-shocked into acquiescence due to the [Catastrophic Terrorism of 9/11](#) which, like the Pearl Harbor, inevitably divided our past and our future into ‘before’ and ‘after’.

One often hears it stated in the news and in the Western governments' increasingly draconian regulations to keep their public safe from terrorists, that 9/11 changed everything. Well, the super 9/11 of the Super Ali Baba Plus Plus so clairvoyantly predicted by George W. Bush, “***will make Sept. 11 pale by comparison***” (Bush White House, [Feb. 13, 2008](#))!

Can one intelligently not data-mine propaganda itself, in the backdrop of the Mighty Wurlitzer's

unhidden motivations and agendas, to accurately perceive and preempt what's up next?

The following passage from the 2500 years old [Art of War](#) is pertinent backdrop to the aforementioned chutzpah of empire – a zeitgeist in which the scholars of empire announce their intentions brazenly years in advance, while the detractors of empire excel in the ex post facto narrations of what is already a fait accompli after the “*history's actors*” have acted and created “*new realities*”. The instruments of empire award their own antagonists high honors and great accolades for their bold rehearsal and dissection of histories amidst the fawning adulation of all their followers having their new 'ah hah' and 'never again' moments for the first time in their life. And the cycle repeats again and again for each new act of the “*history's actors*”:

'8. To see victory only when it is within the ken of the common herd is not the acme of excellence.

9. Neither is it the acme of excellence if you fight and conquer and the whole Empire says, "Well done!"

10. To lift an autumn hair is no sign of great strength; to see the sun and moon is no sign of sharp sight; to hear the noise of thunder is no sign of a quick ear.'

Paying particular attention to item 10., one may conclude that to perceive and anticipate in a timely manner that which is not obvious to others leads to many tactical as well as strategic advantages, both in the battle of hegemony and secrecy, and, in the battle against tyranny. Which is why the public and their lauded dissent chiefs are always, but always, kept busy in idiotic puppetshows by the Machiavelli when it is most essential that they be shrewdly sighted.

Public preemption can be effective in [derailing imperial mobilization](#) only BEFORE it becomes a fait accompli. Ex post facto, when the public eventually wakes up to ascertain that it was indeed all a puppetshow, it is inevitably too late to do anything about the matter except to “study” what the “*history's actors*” have left behind! [Obsessing with the previous fait accompli](#) when dissent chiefs lead the effort, evidently, is also a calculated part of Machiavelli. The principle of temporal urgency in maintaining utmost deception (and secrecy) while “*new realities*” are being planned, orchestrated, and harvested, was articulated by Niccolò Machiavelli in [The Prince](#). The modern day version of this predatory statecraft is the National Security Council Directive NSC 10/2 for creating cover stories and red herrings alongside covert operations. See [Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory](#).

As part of that plan to deflect public attention, those attempting to see through its fog of deception

when a fait accompli can still be averted – before missiles have left their silos, before pen has been put to tortuous legalisms to sanction tyranny – are variously labeled as 'kooks', 'conspiracy theorists', 'delusional', '[denier](#)', etc., their efforts infiltrated and subverted (as in cointelpro), and their energies defocused by introducing what's cynically called "*beneficial cognitive diversity*" (see [Cass Sunstein](#), and this [counterpoint](#) to dissent-chief David Ray Griffin's "eureka" moment on Cass Sunstein's "Conspiracy Theories").

So What's Next according to Project Humanbeingsfirst?

The Alien-UFO Agenda is one such future fait accompli in the works which can still be averted by the public becoming rationally informed about the demonic art of the Mighty Wurlitzer. The fact that:

- references to UFOs even made it into one of [Wikileaks whistleblowing disclosures](#) ;
- the fact that the FBI recently made available a 1950 [Roswell UFO memo](#) lending "UFOs" a legitimacy in the gullible mind by way of it being held as a supposed "state-secret" for these past sixty years ;
- the fact that US military is even playing war-games to [interdict UFOs](#) (USAF couldn't interdict 9/11 airplanes and are therefore determined, one surmises, to not fail against an alien UFO technology that is advanced enough to visit earth from another

[The Mighty Wurlitzer Cultivating the Next Hegelian Mind-Fck: A Super Ali Baba++ to Seed the Clash of Planets](#)



Caption Earth must prepare for close encounter with aliens, say scientists **UN should co-ordinate plans for dealing with extraterrestrials – and we can't guarantee that aliens will be friendly** Evolution on alien worlds is likely to be Darwinian, which may mean extraterrestrials share our tendencies for violence and exploitation. (Image via UK Guardian Photograph: Rex)

Caption Earth must prepare for close encounter with aliens, say scientists UN should co-ordinate plans for dealing with extraterrestrials – and we can't guarantee that aliens will be friendly Evolution on alien worlds is likely to be Darwinian, which may mean extraterrestrials share our tendencies for violence and exploitation. (Image via UK Guardian, 10 January 2011 Photograph: Rex)

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare


galaxy) ;

- the fact that there is a pertinent office at the United Nations, [UNOOSA](#), with *“the plan to make Unoosa the co-ordinating body for dealing with alien encounters [which] will be debated by UN scientific advisory committees and should eventually reach the body’s general assembly”*, and a special [UN Ambassador](#) has been *“tasked with co-ordinating humanity’s response if and when extraterrestrials make contact”* ;
- and the uptick in other [bogus and absurd conversations](#) on Aliens and UFO even appearing in the mainstream media, not to mention its unrelenting repetition in the so called “alternate media” and on the internet ;

all indicate that its unveiling time is likely approaching near.

The reaction to this super nemesis too will surely also be launched with *“either you are with us, or with the aliens”* false dialectics!

If the public can preempt that propaganda by focussing on unraveling the many facets and scenarios on what they Machiavellianly plan to do BEFORE they enact them, the vile psy-ops can surely be defeated BEFORE it becomes the new established “facts” on the ground for the globalists' coup de gr ace: **the final restructuring of the planet into [world government](#)**.





Caption The Next Global Threat? A Super Ali Baba Plus Plus arriving in UFOs to terrify all mankind into uniting under the rule of one-world government? (The U.S. Air Force first began experimenting with flying saucers in the 1950s. Why - to deceive the former USSR, or, to induce global [mass panic](#)? See [Hadley Cantril](#))

ASK YOURSELF TO TEST YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT YOU HAVE JUST LEARNED

Is it not strange that the US Military is openly playing “war games” for the absurd possibility of an [Alien Attack](#) (National Geographic 2011 Documentary When Aliens Attack) within just 25 years of [President Ronald Reagan](#) expressing the *Beneficial Consequences of a Hypothetical Alien Threat From Outside This World* speaking at the UN General Assembly, Sept. 21, 1987?

Is it not absurd that they even appoint a UN Ambassador to greet the aliens with “[souls](#)” *seeking to be baptised* when they ask earthlings in English “[Take me to your leader](#)” (sic!)? What motivation drives the Hard Road to World Order which continually requires crafting new fabled threats, new absurdities, new wars, new crises?

Fabricating a public discourse on an absurd fantasy as if it's something real by couching it in the veneer of science (or declassified State-Secrets / whistleblowing) and then reacting to that invention at supra-national levels from the United Nations to the Catholic Church, only legitimizes such discourse thus setting the stage for the later creation of a new insurmountable global threat, the Clash of Planets.

If political scientists are to be believed on the utility of diabolical protocols for “*imperial mobilization*”, then, “*that exercise requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and*

patriotic gratification.” Its doctrinal seeds must be planted years in advance. This too will surely also be launched with “*either you are with us, or with the aliens!*”! See [The Agenda Behind Aliens and UFOs](#).

With Osama bin Laden officially retired as Enemy No One on May 1, 2011, does it require a Cassandra to foretell What's Next? Please see [What's next after Osama Bin Laden? What can make 'Sept. 11 pale by comparison'?](#).

Can we arm ourselves with perceptive wisdom such that we aren't fooled into 'United We Stand' with absurdities again and again?

Please see [Letter to Kerry Cassidy on the Alien-UFO Agenda](#). If still unconvinced about the overarching motivation for all this Hegelian mind-fck – [WHY do they try so damn hard to convince you of absurdities](#) – see [Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order](#).

The Psychology of Fear

In order to perceptively comprehend the psychological basis of such absurd and fabricated threats which instill existential fears:

- whose import to enabling “*imperial mobilization*” was clearly envisaged by Zbigniew Brzezinski in 1996 in [The Grand Chessboard](#):

“It is also a fact that America is too democratic at home to be autocratic abroad. This limits the use of America's power, especially its capacity for military intimidation. Never before has a populist democracy attained international supremacy. But the pursuit of power is not a goal that commands popular passion, except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being. The economic self-denial (that is defense spending), and the human sacrifice (casualties even among professional soldiers) required in the effort are uncongenial to democratic instincts. Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization.” (pgs. 35-36) ;

- whose raison d'être as the primary method for advancing “*the "national interest" by means of organized violence*”, was taken as axiomatic in the 1963-64 secret study reported in the 1967

book [*The Report From Iron Mountain*](#):

“It must be emphasized that the precedence of a society's war-making potential over its other characteristics is not the result of the "threat" presumed to exist at any one time from other societies. This is the reverse of the basic situation; "threats" against the "national interest" are usually created or accelerated to meet the changing needs of the war system. ... The military, or ostensible function of the war system requires no elaboration; it serves simply to defend or advance the "national interest" by means of organized violence. It is often necessary for a national military establishment to create a need for its unique powers—to maintain the franchise, so to speak. And a healthy military apparatus requires "exercise," by whatever rationale seems expedient, to prevent its atrophy.” (pgs. 31,33) ;

- whose utility for effectively embarking on the “*military transformation*” required to achieve “*full spectrum dominance*” that wasn't “stillborn”, was openly declared in the Project for the New American Century (PNAC) report titled [*Rebuilding America's Defenses*](#):

“Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor. ... Until the process of transformation is treated as an enduring military mission – worthy of constant allocation of dollars and forces – it will remain stillborn” (pgs. 51,58) ;

- and whose necessity for rapidly transforming an entire society, nation, or the whole world, in the direction desired by the controlling oligarchy, was even discovered in the 1908 minute books of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace by the Congressional Reece Committee investigator Norman Dodd in 1954, and related by him in an interview before his death in 1982, [*The Hidden Agenda of Tax Exempt Foundations for World Government*](#): (https://youtube.com/watch?v=16_4Sgluk4Q)

“We are now at the year 1908, which was the year that the Carnegie Foundation began operations. In that year, the trustees, meeting for the first time, raised a specific question, which they discussed throughout the balance of the year in a very learned fashion. The question is: “Is there any means known more effective than war, assuming you wish to alter the life of an entire people?” And they conclude that no more effective means than war to that end is known

to humanity. So then, in 1909, they raised the second question and discussed it, namely: 'How do we involve the United States in a war?";

please refer to social engineering principles in [Further Study](#) for [Operation Gladio](#), [Edward Bernays](#), [Human Resources](#), and [The Prisoner](#) television series fable of the 1960s on mind control. That topic was at the time clandestinely being experimented upon in secret military laboratories as in what was later revealed of the American version of it in [CIA's MK ULTRA](#). The Prisoner fable uncannily captured the entire essence of behavior modification, from hard techniques of brain chemistry manipulation to soft techniques of Machiavelli and perception management. Especially watch episode "[It's your funeral](#)". To realize that mind manipulation and behavior control is not new, that it is in the very nature of the Ubermensch's primacy instinct to want to control the untermensch, see [Myth of the Cave](#) in Plato's 2500 years old classic *The Republic*, Book VII, pg. 300 ([book PDF](#)).

Closing Arguments

There is a lot to learn here on deliberate Machiavellian social engineering that is not taught even in the best universities in America (and the West), nor ever makes an appearance on CNN Headline News (and Time or Newsweek)! What we are speaking of here, of engineering the consent of the masses to get them to love their own servitude, far transcends the corporate advertising and marketing techniques taught in MBA programs which were principally pioneered by Edward Bernays. These techniques of course also attempt to bypass the cognitive mind and target manipulating the subconscious mind directly to sell a product, a lifestyle, or an idea.

However, while most recognize that advertising is a multi-billion dollar business and accept it as a matter of for-profit corporate modernity, few are aware of an order of magnitude more resources being perversely spent by tax-exempt foundations, and the tax-payers (quite unbeknownst to themselves of course), on far more diabolical aspects of social engineering for ***"getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude!"*** (please once again refer to Aldous Huxley quoted at the very beginning to refresh your memory that I haven't made all this up)



Advertising Age's [2008 Marketer of the Year award](#) to President Obama for his election campaign of the "Change" mantra, and the Nobel committee's awarding him the [2009 Nobel Peace Prize](#) testify to the empiricism of this observation. The American nation easily bought that fiction of "[Change](#)", which was once again underscored by President Obama [bombing Libya](#) on the same day in 2011 that his predecessor bombed Iraq in 2003!

How did the American public buy that fiction? Once again, please refer back to the very beginning of this report and to Edward Bernays: "We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of."

Only a tiny handful in America did not buy that fiction. Among those handful who defied the wisdom of the entire American nation and their controlled dissent chiefs, see: [Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!](#) And [Mr. Obama – The Post Modern Coup.](#)

This ignorance and gullibility among the college-educated modern public is despite the fact that Western academe is at the forefront of the vast majority of behavior control and social engineering research studies, often funded by, or in collaboration with, Western intelligence, military, and private tax-exempt foundations such as the Rockefeller Foundation, Carnegie Endowment, and Ford Foundation. The highly compartmentalized nature of such research ensures that few students and professors in on the ground breaking studies into human behavior can ever glean the bigger picture towards which they work so diligently to respectively earn their Ph.D. and research funding! Those few who do comprehend are invariably engaged with empire in the largely unhidden orchestration of social engineering. Or, are quickly recruited as agents and assets of the Mighty Wurlitzer.

Mighty Wurlitzer has no limit for its territory. The newsmedia, entertainment, academe, political parties, religious institutions, think-tanks, private foundations, government-funded organizations, and non-governmental organization (NGOs) alike, all house its agents and assets. And they each play

their own tunes on their own specialized instruments under the supreme conduction of the Mighty Wurlitzer. The most notable among these is religion. Although the layman does not normally associate the pastor, rabbi, alim, mullah, swami, etc., with propaganda organs of state, but religion is in fact the most affected by the Mighty Wurlitzer – all throughout history. If we just reflect on the fact that more than three quarters of the world's people espouse some faith, the easiest cognitive infiltration and behavior control is directly through faith. The report: [Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization](#), and the following challenge to a pious Muslim cleric who issued a [600-page Fatwa on Terrorism in the Service of Empire](#), indubitably illustrate this universal fact.

Today, fact and fiction have been merged to such an alarming degree with adept perception control that to be able to rationally separate them, to tell what is mere imagery of the Mighty Wurlitzer vs. the actual interconnected causal reality (cause and effect) of statecraft, can be as uncongenial to the cognitive mind as depicted by Plato for the prisoners bred in the underground cave since birth. The fact that the most brilliant minds remain unable to tell that 9/11 was an 'Operation Canned Goods' even ten years into its vile enactment while America descends into a police-state in presumed reaction to it, demonstrates that it is not the brain hardware which is malfunctioning, but the brain software!

The inculcation of belief in authority figures and “experts” has reached pandemic proportions in the West. Indoctrination is today perhaps the greatest public plague afflicting the mightiest superpower on earth, a direct consequence of “dumbing down” the public in the name of higher education to craft self-obsessed economic widgets, narrow specialists, and superficial generalists for the Technetronic Era. The continued success of the Mighty Wurlitzer in “persuading” the public to accept absurdities to get them 'United We Stand' singularly relies on, and feeds off, this aspect of modernity. See [The Ivy League Morons Syndrome](#). Also see the deconstruction of Bernard de Mandeville's “The Fable of the Bees” in [The Seduction of Science and Technology](#).

There is an undeniable categorical imperative before the Western peoples today. With the escalating belligerence towards Iran and the strategic dismantling of Pakistan palpably on the visible horizon, will the profoundly *innocent of knowledge* in the West allow themselves to be fooled once again into more criminal aggression upon civilian populations in the name of 'war on terrorism'. Or, will the people choose to not be (willingly) deceived by the Mighty Wurlitzer's many ruses at every level which continually justify the core axioms of “imperial mobilization” by way of deception? See [Peoples' Guilt and America's Profound Shame](#).

It is precisely to invoke that *acquiescence* to premeditated fait accompli that Zbigniew Brzezinski

self-servingly quoted in the opening pages of his seminal 1970 book *Between Two Ages – America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, the following specious rationalization for the turmoil to be purposely inflicted upon the 'lesser' humanity. The diabolically fabricated Hegelian Dialectic as the means to usher in [one-world government](#), and attributing that manufactured zeitgeist to just the nature of transformation between two ages (for which nothing could be done about since the human misery which it entailed was natural and inevitable):

“Human life is reduced to real suffering, to hell, only when two ages, two cultures and religions overlap. . . . There are times when a whole generation is caught in this way between two ages, two modes of life, with the consequence that it loses all power to understand itself and has no standard, no security, no simple acquiescence.” --- HERMANN HESSE, *Steppenwolf* (lede quote by Zbigniew Brzezinski in *Between Two Ages*, pg. 7, [book PDF](#)).

As an establishmentarian hectoring hegemon, Brzezinski again invoked the same sort of self-serving rationalization to perpetuate American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives. He began his subsequent 1996 book *The Grand Chessboard* with the chauvinist sentence: “Hegemony is as old as mankind.” Thus, by the logic of it, making the rest of the book a recipe for the exercise of America's uniquely unchallenged global power, and “especially its capacity for military intimidation”, as the most natural human legacy for any supremacist nation to pursue. Nothing could, or ought, to be done about that predatory instinct for organized violence since “Hegemony is as old as mankind.” And therefore, Brzezinski naturally proffered in his chauvinist conclusion, “In brief, the U.S. Policy goals must be un-apologetically twofold: to perpetuate America's own dominant position for at least a generation and preferably longer,…” (Ibid., pg. 215; see [Prisoners of the Cave, Chapter 1](#)).

The report [Of Ostriches and Rebels on The Hard Road to World Order](#), examines how that specious recipe book for America's predatory primacy, as syntactically sugared war-mongering as it is, is itself only half the truth. As the Jewish proverb suggests, **'a half truth is a full lie'**. And as the Mighty Wurlitzer knows, in order to be effective, **the lie is different at every level**.

Contrary to Zbigniew Brzezinski's erudite prose which underlies the many compositions of the Mighty Wurlitzer, as the generation caught between two ages on the Grand Chessboard, we, the bearers of “*Human life*”, have neither lost the power to “*understand*”, nor lost the power to overturn the coercive “*simple acquiescence*” to artificially induced transition period of “*real suffering*”. That understanding, and overturning, is the *raison d'être* for this document.

When [Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives](#) to orchestrate a [one-world government](#) is the

ingrained doctrine among the 'ubermensch' and their instruments, it is trivial to come up with any logic, any rationalism for even the most atrocious barbarism inflicted upon the 'untermenschen'. Convince the public of absurdities and one can get them to acquiesce to any atrocity – from outright murderous invasion of other nations to torturing their civilians in the most horrendous conditions, to getting their own citizens to accept giving up their civil liberties without a sigh. Nothing new here – 'standard 007 issue' of the hectoring hegemon! That same Mighty Wurlitzer and its paymasters however, would be chewing on cyanide capsules in another situation. It is best not to forget that.

Baboons wear no clothes – even when they steal the sunglasses.

Sociopathy of Hegemony is the First-cause of all Evil

Referring back to Zbigniew Brzezinski's ode to hegemony in *The Grand Chessboard* quoted earlier, the indispensability of the Mighty Wurlitzer's media machinery in circumventing all domestic impediments to the ***“sustained exercise abroad of genuinely imperial power”***, should now be self-evident and conclusive:

“Moreover, as America becomes an increasingly multicultural society, it may find it more difficult to fashion a consensus on foreign policy issues, except in the circumstance of a truly massive and widely perceived direct external threat. ... [Because] the pursuit of power is not a goal that commands popular passion, except in conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being.” Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard*, pgs. 211, 44

Sociopathy of Hegemony is the first-cause of an enslaved public mind. A problem that is as old as hegemony, as old as mankind.

It is the root problem from which all the macro social evils of imperial societies naturally follow. The sociopathy of hegemony, by definition, must extract all awareness and consciousness from the public mind to make it sheepish, gullible, malleable, and obedient to authority figures. The facile public mind is thus easily kept occupied in bread and circuses while living under the illusion of exercising personal control in free societies. Making the public mind is naturally the first art of all governance, both good and bad, otherwise no society can function cohesively, but it is necessarily

pernicious when the illusion of freedom and free choice is to be maintained.

This mass behavior control technique spans the gamut from *caliphate* (rule in the name of God) to *democracy* (rule in the name of the people) --- for, unlike a blunt dictatorship which is often at the point of the bayonet, *caliphate to democracy* must depend on a measure of consent from the governed. The public must be made willing participants in their own enslavement. This report has conclusively demonstrated how that perversity is accomplished with the help of the Mighty Wurlitzer. What is tragically criminal about our modernity being rapidly driven towards one-world government, is that the entire world's public is being made to love its own servitude under the myriad tunes of the Mighty Wurlitzer.

Unless this corrupted global governance model is forcibly changed first, the Mighty Wurlitzer shall continue to exist just as it has always existed in every empire from time immemorial, and all Books of Wisdom and Platitudes from antiquity to modernity shall remain constricted, impotent! I.e., “mah'joor”, as the prescient warning given in the Holy Qur'an for instance, in Surah Al-Furqa'an verse 25:30. See the report: [Islam and Knowledge vs. Socialization](#).

Unless the sociopathy of hegemony is forcibly undone first by exposing its pernicious web of control, the public mind shall forever remain chained to its unturning neck in Plato's Cave. See the comprehensive book: [The Poor Man's Guide to Modernity](#).

Further Study

As this is mainly a self-study note – because satisfying one's curiosity and moral imperatives by performing a modicum of due diligence is the order of business rather than merely reading digested excerpts or believing 'experts' – the following suggested minimal self-study will be useful in comprehending the pernicious role of intelligence assets which perpetually infiltrate the media and the academe. You will learn how society is manipulated in the direction of its ruling-elite's agendas, how ordinary peoples serving in positions of influence in the institutions of the ruling-elite involuntarily succumb to freely promulgating the oligarchs' agendas while remaining unaware of it, and most importantly, why it is almost impossible for ordinary decent peoples too busy pursuing their 'American Dreams', to perceive this sophisticated manipulation which goes on 24x7.

1) Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer, How the CIA Played America*, Harvard Univ. Press 2008.

- 1A) Frank Wisner's [Operation Mockingbird](#) (PDF cached [here](#))

- 2) Carl Bernstein, [THE CIA AND THE MEDIA](#), Rolling Stone, October 20, 1977 (<https://tinyurl.com/cia-and-media-CarlBernstein>).

- 2A) [CIA on Campus](#) – compilation of incredible articles and declassified information on CIA's infiltration of America's Top Ivy Leagues and other leading universities. (PDF cached [here](#))

- 3) Richard Keeble, [Hacks And Spooks](#), March 3, 2006 (<https://tinyurl.com/hacks-and-spooks-RichardKeeble>).

- 3A) Col. Fletcher Prouty, *The Secret Team*, (PDF book cached [here](#))

- 4) William Schaap, attorney, expert witness on media disinformation, sworn court testimony, Volume IX, November 30, 1999. [Video](#) (<https://tinyurl.com/jcg5uw9>), [Transcript at King Center](#) (also available [here](#)).

- 5) Zahir Ebrahim, *Prisoners of the Cave*, 2003, Chapter 6: [How does the US News Media end up towing the line?](#). The Military-Industrial-Media corporate complex with interlocked board memberships, and opaque stock ownership by institutional investors the largest of which is the U.S. Government (see Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports at <http://CAFR1.com>), represent the same vested interests which control the Policy Planning of the CIA and the Pentagon as the Primacy Imperatives of the sole superpower, the United States of America. These interlocking for-profit corporations and their majority stock-holders who profit from war, primacy, and hegemony, also own and control the news media, news distribution, the entertainment industry, and essentially all outlets of exercising sophisticated Hegellian Dialectics of Mass Deception upon a not too knowledgeable population. With increasing consolidation of information synthesis, packaging, and delivery into fewer and fewer corporate hands owned and controlled by a handful of people, the ideological alignment of their interests makes a sham of the much touted 'fourth pillar of democracy'. Therefore, operationally speaking, the government is almost trivially able to influence news to manufacture consent for its primacy imperatives in the same way that the oligarchs are able to select the government to implement their agendas in an entirely bipartisan way. Rather than the White House issue daily directives to the editorial staff of major news organizations as in any vanilla dictatorship, the editorial staff and the corporate owners a priori know **“All the news that's fit to print.”** With the right placement of assets and stooges in the news organizations, the tactical synchronization of worldwide propaganda is made superlatively effective – as the 'War on Terror' against 'Militant Islam'. Also see Chapter 4: [The](#)

[Role of Mass Media in Empire Building.](#)

- 6) Additionally, see the watered down 'non-conspiratorial' model of self-censorship to stay gainfully employed, and the self-selection of like-minded blind-sighted journalist-editorial-staff in any news organization as per the often unstated overarching imperatives of the news organization in which one automatically knows what flourishes and what doesn't, in Noam Chomsky's *Manufacturing Consent*, 1986. Chomsky's treatise is applicable more to the incestuous self-censorship of shallow but well-intentioned mental-midgets – the bulwark of the newsmedia – rather than the calculating mercenarial agendists and vulgar propagandists selectively planted in key positions for psy-ops by the 'Mighty Wurlitzer'. More insidious than “manufacturing consent” however, is “manufacturing dissent”, something which Noam Chomsky has unfortunately written little about, leaving it to his nondescript student to unravel in “[Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science](#)”. Witness the manufactured dissent in real action wherein it retains the same core-axioms as manufactured consent, in “[My beef with the stellar congressman Hon. Ron Paul](#)” September 15, 2009. Also see “[Open Letter to Hon. Ron Paul Supporters](#)” October 29, 2008.
- 7) What permits all this manipulation and deception to occur? It is the deliberate gaping-hole left in the '*fourth pillar of democracy*' by the founders of the world's greatest modern Republic on paper – a colossus in practice which has today taken over the world with its systems, values, and [McDonalds backed by McDonnell Douglas](#) (<https://tinyurl.com/mcwwuv>) whereby, the once 'hidden hand' of the market which went so hand-in-hand with its 'hidden fist' is now nakedly un-gloved – as explained in *Prisoners of the Cave*, Chapter 7: [Resistance to Empire – New Directions](#).
- 8) See the Message-Machine in its full-blooming operation today in “[Anatomy of Modern Lies and the Merchants of Death](#)”.
- 9) See the spin on Hugh Wilford's book *the Mighty Wurlitzer* by Michael Warner in *Intelligence in Recent Public Literature*, as if willful public deception for a 'greater cause' was only the moral and categorical imperative of the past very judiciously engaged in by superlative '*presidents and key Congressmen [who] held “a fairly sophisticated point of view” that understood that “the public exhibition of unorthodox views was a potent weapon against monolithic communist uniformity of action.” The CIA subsidized freedom in order to expose the lies of tyrants—and then winced silently when that freedom led to an occasional bite on America’s hand.*' The full URL is revealing: <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol52no2/pdf/U-%20Studies%2052-2%20-Jun08-MightyWurlitzer-Web.pdf>

(<https://tinyurl.com/nrn8yq>) The ex post facto deconstruction of Jessica Lynch Media Myth-Making during the Iraq War, in the aftermath of the fait accompli of Iraq invasion by the [UK Guardian](#) and [Journalism.org](#), tell a different tale from Michael Warner's, one right out of Zbigniew Brzezinski's cookbook for “*imperial mobilization*” which “*requires a high degree of doctrinal motivation, intellectual commitment, and patriotic gratification.*” As pointed out by the UK Guardian, “*Jessica Lynch became an icon of the war. An all-American heroine, the story of her capture by the Iraqis and her rescue by US special forces became one of the great patriotic moments of the conflict. It couldn't have happened at a more crucial moment, when the talk was of coalition forces bogged down, of a victory too slow in coming. Her rescue will go down as one of the most stunning pieces of news management yet conceived. It provides a remarkable insight into the real influence of Hollywood producers on the Pentagon's media managers, and has produced a template from which America hopes to present its future wars.*”

- 10) This self-study would be incomplete without acquiring some familiarity with the name Edward Bernays. See his 1928 seminal classic on the art of behavior manipulation and involuntary persuasion titled '[Propaganda](#)'. Read it online [here](#). Watch Edward Bernays, the Father of Public Relations upon whose work not only is modern advertising industry, but also modern propaganda warfare programs of advanced militarized nations, clandestine mind control programs like CIA's MK ULTRA, and overall perception management of the masses to keep them continually locked-up in Plato's Underground Cave, are principally based, lucidly describe his mind-craft in less than 30 seconds on [David Letterman](#). With more time on one's hands, watch this four hours long, four-part, BBC4 documentary titled “[The Century of Self](#)” featuring the far reaching work of Edward Bernays, the Freud family, and what are called the *political psychoanalysts*: [part-1](#), [part-2](#), [part-3](#), [part4](#). The full documentary is archived at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eJ3RzGoQC4s>. These mass manipulation techniques for both “[engineering of consent](#)” and its dialectical “[manufacturing of dissent](#)” are part and parcel of the Mighty Wurlitzer's ordinary persuasion toolkit. The 2008 election of President Barack Obama and awarding him the Nobel Peace Prize is an empirical example of putting Edward Bernays' profound concepts on Public Relations into contemporary practice. Read it in the article “[The Answer to the Burning Question du jour: Why was President Obama Gifted the Nobel Peace Prize?](#)” and the Ebook “[Obama: Manufacturing A Savior—A Case Study In Social Engineering](#)”.

Edward Bernays on Letterman: “people will believe me more if you call me doctor”

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i6hH3roMe4w>]

The Century of the Self (Full Documentary)

Episode One: Happiness Machines

Episode Two: The Engineering of Consent

Episode Three: There is a Policeman Inside All Our Heads: He Must Be Destroyed

Episode Four: Eight People Sipping Wine in Kettering

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eJ3RzGoQC4s>]

10A) More specialized psychological tools and advanced manipulation techniques based on Edward Bernays' discovery that the irrational human mind can easily be mobilized by propaganda for both profit as well as nationalism, are continually explored and refined in many think-tank places in the West under the sanitized vernacular of “Human Relations” and “Public Relations”, including presumably at the [Tavistock Institute in London](#). Listen to Aldous Huxley's take on where mind-behavior manipulation techniques are rapidly headed, wherein, with sufficient social engineering control, people will simply end up loving their own servitude, titled “[The Ultimate Revolution](#)”, March 20, 1962, at UC Berkeley.



10B) An ominously prescient depiction of the more advanced state of behavior control and social engineering is in the allegorical British television series of 1967 titled '[The Prisoner](#)'. Watch online [here](#). Its seventeen episodes masterfully enacted many of the psychological techniques of social engineering, behavior manipulation at both conscious and subliminal levels, voluntary and involuntary mass persuasion, and psychotropically induced mind control as in CIA's [MK ULTRA](#), spanning the gamut in theories drawn from Aldous Huxley's '[Brave New World](#)' to George Orwell's '[1984](#)', and from Plato's '[The Republic](#)' to Machiavelli's '[The Prince](#)'. Many of these “soft” (altering the sense of perception) as well as “hard” (altering the brain chemistry) mind/behavior control techniques at macro social levels appear to be in actual play in the West today. See for instance: '[The Sovereign Man is the Real Prisoner](#)', which quotes from the FBI's Counterterrorism Analysis report titled '[Sovereign Citizens - A Growing Domestic Threat to Law Enforcement](#)', the tortuous statement: “*The FBI considers sovereign-citizen extremists as comprising a domestic terrorist movement,*”. Anyone – who is not entirely stripped of commonsense and their powers of

observation that is – can easily witness that to think independently from the herd, to resist manipulation, to challenge official narratives, is almost getting to be typecast as being an “unmutual” committing “thought crimes”, a “conspiracy theorist” exhibiting signs of “mental illness”, a “terrorist” working against the “greater common good”, etc. See [Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory](#) for how it has been orchestrated in plain sight under various guises from national security imperatives to academic eruditeness. Draconian behavior conformance of the individual for the “greater common good” is now directly visible even to the most blind at the US-UK Airports where the majority of travelers, more than 99 percent, willingly subject themselves to the false choice between X-ray radiation or pat-down molestation without a murmur of protest. See [Body-scan Alert - Not Suffering Indignities at Airports](#). Watch it [here](#). Today, fact and fiction have been merged to such an alarming degree with adept perception control that to be able to rationally separate them, to tell what is mere imagery of the Mighty Wurlitzer vs. the actual interconnected causal reality of statecraft, can be as uncongenial to the cognitive mind as depicted by Plato for the prisoners bred in the underground cave since birth (see Book VII, *The Republic*, page 300 [book PDF](#)).



[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=upToH3DSM9E>]

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=duAxAcl-N50>]


- 11) Today, the Edward Bernays led comprehension of mass psychology, and its sophisticated manipulation as an [essential instrument of state-craft](#) – the social “**engineering of consent**” – is empirical, and quite diabolical. See the FAQ: [What is 'Hegelian Mind Fck'](#) and the excellent tutorial on [Hegelian Dialectic](#) ([PDF](#)) which is driving social engineering across the full spectrum of human conditions du jour.
- 11A) The capitalization upon the **Psychology of Fear** to implement the 'War on Terrorism' du jour was best demonstrated in *Operation Gladio* of yesteryear when self-inflicted terror by NATO's Stay Behind Armies was used to keep the fear of Communism alive among the skeptical public in

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

Western Europe. Please watch the BBC Ch 02 Time Watch 3-part series on [Operation Gladio](#): [part-1](#), [part-2](#), [part-3](#). Despite being a much sanitized version, the BBC documentary is still very revealing. As is already examined in "[What is War on Terror?](#)", Part-3 of the Gladio documentary has the following statement quoted from the US Army's Top Secret Field Manual:

"Top Secret: There may be times when host country governments show passivity or indecision in the face of Communist subversion ... US Army Intelligence must have the means of launching special operations which will convince host country governments and public opinion of the reality of the insurgent danger ... US Army Intelligence should seek to penetrate the insurgency by means of agents of special assignments, with the task of forming special action groups among the most radical elements of the insurgency."

As we have now already learned, because fear is such a potent motivator for the masses, its fabrication over the civilian populations is, and always has been, any military's unhidden-secret war-making advantage. Under the military's purview which often transcends mere propaganda and psy-ops, fear-making instruments and orchestrations spanning the gamut from "shock and awe" to false-flag terrorism, serve myriad functions including that of manufacturing the boogymen who must implement the "*doctrinal motivation*" whose intellectual seeds were laid years in advance. I.e., the synthetic Ali Baba is fabricated and/or "[tickled into existence](#)" to kill innocent civilians with deadly terrorism in order to lend credibility to the mantra of "militant Islam". A believable pretext is thus created for the state's never ending "counter-insurgency" operations against them in order to protect itself and its peoples, its allies, and its infinite national interests. Beginning with the pretext of fighting the "New Pearl Harbor" terrorism of 9/11 which led the United States into Afghanistan, Iraq, into the "[Global Zone of Percolating Violence](#)" along the 'Arc of Crisis', how it is being synthesized to turn Pakistan into the new [Terror Central](#) can be straightforwardly gleaned in the report: [Insurgency vs. Counter-Insurgency - The Decapitation of Pakistan by its own Military!](#).



Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

Gladio, Part 1: The Ringmasters BBC Time Watch 10 June 1992

Gladio, Part 2: The Puppeteers BBC Time Watch 17 June 1992

Gladio, Part 3: The Foot Soldiers BBC Time Watch 24 June 1992

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yXavNe81XdQ>]

12) Another immediately pertinent text-book example of Edward Bernays' influence on social engineering with the help of the Mighty Wurlitzer, is the psychological mantras and existential pretexts created to rapidly bring the “Ultimate Revolution” to fruition with microchip RFID implants in human beings. See [Swine Flu: The Ultimate Revolution in the Making](#) and the [Note on Myth Construction](#). Climategate is clearly yet another Mighty Wurlitzer operation: see [Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a ‘Hegelian Mind Fck!’](#). Also see [Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire](#).

13) Metanoia-films.org has a 2-hour video documentary on Social Engineering in the 20th Century, titled '[Human Resources](#)', for those more inclined to [watch](#) than read.



Human Resources: Social Engineering in the 20th Century

[<http://metanoia-films.org/human-resources/#watch>]

The amazing description of the Metanoia-films.org website in its own words entirely captures the essential purpose of Project Humanbeingsfirst as well: 'The Greek term for repentance, metanoia, denotes a change of mind, a reorientation, a fundamental transformation of outlook, of an individual's vision of the world and of her/himself ... In the words of a second-century text, The Shepherd of Hermas, it implies "great understanding," discernment. In Carl Jung's psychology,

metanoia indicates a spontaneous attempt of the psyche to heal itself of unbearable conflict by melting down and then being reborn in a more adaptive form.' I would add that in Islam, the actual process to acquire that “great understanding”, that “fundamental transformation of outlook”, that “melting down and then being reborn”, is the severe path of *jihad-un-nafs*. To overcome one's ingrained worldviews and indoctrinations is never an easy journey even when one becomes aware of the social and psychological forces which naturally construct Plato's *Prisoners of the Cave*. Most will of course remain unaware of it throughout their life, never mind wage a struggle to overcome it, and will continually be manipulated into 'United We Stand' with ruling agendas – a plight which has dogged mankind since time immemorial. A forensic exploration of breaking out of this prison of the mind is in my trilogy on Israel-Palestine which comprise the [Pamphlet: How To Return to Palestine](#). Also see the deconstruction of “The Fable of the Bees” in [The Seduction of Science and Technology](#).

14) Finally, the question of [reform](#) continually arises among the antagonists of the Mighty Wurlitzer, [the idealists](#), and the “[malcontents](#)”. They would rather pretend that some rational “reform” can do away with the Mighty Wurlitzer altogether. The following response to the question raised by Robert Jensen, Professor of Journalism, “**Can journalism schools be relevant in a world on the brink?**”, September 15, 2009, injects a doze of reality-check: “[Re-titling can perhaps make the problem-space more apparent: Can journalism schools be relevant in a New World Order of one-world government?](#)” (<http://www.commondreams.org/views/2009/09/14/can-journalism-schools-be-relevant-world-brink>). Edward Bernays brilliant successes at mass behavior manipulation has conclusively shown that masses are typically not motivated into action, moral or any other, by information alone. Rather, primarily by appeal to their irrational sub-conscious mind, to their fears, to their suppressed desires. And, that they remain quite susceptible to hidden emotional manipulation. Therefore, journalism's utility to statecraft to control the masses cannot be overturned, nor reformed, in any existing structure of governance that relies on war and deception to rule. Journalism today is more a diabolical tool of statecraft than of any benefit to the people. It appears to this cynic that in order to even begin to play its theoretically assigned role in a theoretical constitutional republic, unless the much wanted fourth pillar of democracy – the watchdog upon the corridors of power – adopts similar psychological tactics of the oligarchs to manipulate core human instincts for mobilizing the masses for the “democratic check” that is much theorized in Western democracy, journalism is destined to largely remain a steganographic tool of signaling and communication among the elite themselves! To substantiate this egregious point, please see table 3 titled “APPROXIMATE USE OF MEDIA” in Zbigniew Brzezinski's seminal book: *Between Two Ages – America's Role in the Technetronic Era*, page 14 ([book PDF](#)). The readership data for the printed press like the NYT, while quantitatively dated, is

qualitatively even more attuned to the hypnotic reality of television mass media today whereby, while useful advance information can sometimes be gleaned in the inside pages of the elite's own printed press – provided one has learnt how to parse the elite's language – it is rarely if ever present on mass television.

15) CNN Cold War – Profile of Zbigniew Brzezinski. 'Born on March 28, 1928, in Warsaw, Poland, the future national security adviser to President Carter and son of a Polish diplomat spent part of his youth in France and Germany before moving to Canada. He received a B.A. and M.A. in political science from McGill University, in 1949 and 1950 respectively, and in 1953 earned his doctorate in political science from Harvard. He taught at Harvard before moving to Columbia University in 1961 to head the new Institute on Communist Affairs. In 1958 he became a U.S. citizen. During the 1960s Brzezinski acted as an adviser to Kennedy and Johnson administration officials. Generally taking a hard line on policy toward the Soviet Union, he was also an influential force behind the Johnson administration's "bridge-building" ideas regarding Eastern Europe. During the final years of the Johnson administration, he was a foreign policy adviser to Vice President Hubert Humphrey and his presidential campaign.

In 1973, Brzezinski became the first director of the Trilateral Commission, a group of prominent political and business leaders and academics from the United States, Western Europe and Japan. Its purpose was to strengthen relations among the three regions. Future President Carter was a member, and when he declared his candidacy for the White House in 1974, Brzezinski, a critic of the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy style, became his adviser on foreign affairs. After his victory in 1976, Carter made Brzezinski national security adviser.

Aiming to replace Kissinger's "acrobatics" in foreign policy-making with a foreign policy "architecture," Brzezinski was as eager for power as his rival. However, his task was complicated by his focus on East-West relations, and in a hawkish way -- in an administration where many cared a great deal about North-South relations and human rights. On the whole, Brzezinski was a team player.' --- CNN Cold War - Profile Zbigniew Kazimierz Brzezinski (snapshot from cnn.com on August 25, 2008)

Expert Profile CSIS Counselor and Trustee, Zbigniew Brzezinski. 'Zbigniew Brzezinski is a CSIS counselor and trustee and co-chairs the CSIS Advisory Board. He is also the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, in Washington, D.C. He is co-chair of the American Committee for Peace in the Caucasus and is a former chairman of the American-Ukrainian Advisory Committee.

Architecture of Propaganda and Psychological Warfare

He was a member of the Policy Planning Council of the Department of State from 1966 to 1968; chairman of the Humphrey Foreign Policy Task Force in the 1968 presidential campaign; director of the Trilateral Commission from 1973 to 1976; and principal foreign policy adviser to Jimmy Carter in the 1976 presidential campaign.



From 1977 to 1981, Dr. Brzezinski was national security adviser to President Carter. In 1981 he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role in the normalization of U.S.-China relations and for his contributions to the human rights and national security policies of the United States. He was also a member of the President's Chemical Warfare Commission (1985), the National Security Council–Defense Department Commission on Integrated Long-Term Strategy (1987–1988), and the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (1987–1989).

In 1988, he was cochairman of the Bush National Security Advisory Task Force, and in 2004, he was cochairman of a Council on Foreign Relations task force that issued the report *Iran: Time for a New Approach*. Dr. Brzezinski received a B.A. and M.A. from McGill University (1949, 1950) and Ph.D. from Harvard University (1953). He was a member of the faculties of Columbia University (1960–1989) and Harvard University (1953–1960).

Dr. Brzezinski holds honorary degrees from Georgetown University, Williams College, Fordham University, College of the Holy Cross, Alliance College, the Catholic University of Lublin, Warsaw University, and Vilnius University. He is the recipient of numerous honors and awards. His many books include *America and the World: Conversations on the Future of American Foreign Policy* (2008); *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower* (2007); *The Choice: Global Domination or Global Leadership* (2004); *The Geostrategic Triad: Living with China, Europe, and Russia* (2001); *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (1997); and *The Grand Failure: The Birth and Death of Communism in the 20th Century* (1989).¹ --- Zbigniew Brzezinski, Expert Profile CSIS Counselor and Trustee (snapshot from csis.org on April 28, 2009)

Correction Footnote Brzezinski is Catholic The heritage of Zbigniew Brzezinski is *Polish-*

Catholic and not *Polish-Jewish* as was stated in a previous version of this report. A very unusual open-secret evidently, not mentioned in the many Brzezinski books and articles I have read, nor on his wikipedia page, nor in his CSIS Expert Profile reproduced above, with the presumption flourishing in the public mind that the Polish Brzezinski is just as Jewish as the Frankish Kissinger, but not necessarily espousing the Zionist theology of the neocons. That correction however, of the hectoring hegemon being Catholic instead of Jewish, while necessary to make for the sake of accuracy, harbors no real material change for the calculus of the grand chessboard from its victims' perspectives. As principally, [The White Man's Burden appears Uniformly Distributed among Jews Christians and Atheists – how can one tell the difference?](#) It is just as soaked in the *untermensch's* blood, and just as laden in the deceptive tunes of the Mighty Wurlitzer, irrespective of which *Superman* hums it. It does not matter to the dead and destroyed people of Afghanistan that the murderer who boasted “[giving to the USSR its Vietnam War](#)” in Muslim blood and on Muslim soil with the synthetic doctrinal motivation of “[God is on your side](#)”, is Catholic rather than Jewish. However, that fact does perhaps lend some motivational insight into the infighting among hectoring hegemons witnessed in Bush's White House between Brzezinski and the Jewish neocons in reference to [Brzezinski's SFRC](#) testimony before the US Senate in Feb 2007 quoted above. The primordial allegiances are evidently to different base tribes – and so the godfathers in the different families bicker in public in a good *WWF Wrestling game!* But there is of course more to it than that. As examined above, Brzezinski, the grand architect of the great game in Central and South Asia, and also plugged into the Vatican power-base, for reasons best understood by the oligarchy that he evidently fronts for, appears to have pragmatically intervened in America's invasion of Iran by that most dramatic poker play in public. At least for the time being. That breathing space afforded to Iran is being squandered by her in the pursuit of false bravado in public relations games instead of developing some realpolitik *full spectrum alliances* with her neighbors in real self-defence. See [Hegemony is as old as mankind!](#).

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Chapter VIII

Manufacturing Consent

The Open Democratic Society Free Press Template

Introduction

Manufacturing Consent through the news media from my American War observations. The following sections are excerpted from my 2003 book Prisoners of the Cave, Chapters 4 and 6, and other writings. As cruise missiles were flying over Baghdad and American soldiers and American reporters rode in victoriously on American tanks, the news reportage in the American media is a template to study for reportage in Western democracies which do not enjoy the totalitarian privilege of state run news media but must still be the purveyors of state propaganda in full liberty and free-speech. How do they do that? How do they end up towing the party line in an open democratic society?

It has to do with how financial capitalism works through the interlocking corporate organizational structures and the crafty system of news reportage that maintains all the right illusions of freedom, but which also make it indistinguishable from state run media of totalitarian societies in the end result that is achieved: the indoctrination of the public mind to “United We Stand” on any agenda of the powers that be. The elite classes who rule include the financial and military establishment, its institutionalized permanent deep-state, its periodically elected political front-faces, its corporate military-industrial complex of which not just the corporate news media, but entertainment, sports, healthcare, academe, non-profit corporate organizations, tax-exempt foundations and trusts that fund think-tanks and social agendas, et al are all part and parcel of. That financial control system

Manufacturing Consent

with interlocking ownerships that extends to the free press is far from free to report inconvenient truths despite all the constitutional protection of free speech. It is a crafty illusion. An illusion that is maintained through crafty perception management and social persuasion. Idealism in capitalistic societies is intimately tied to the pursuit of what's come to be known as the 'American Dream'. Even gentle persuasion without explicit authoritarian control is effective when it puts that idealism in existential jeopardy.

The most prominent and respected news paper in the world, The New York Times, has this standard motto on its front-page: **“All the news that's fit to print.”** Someone obviously has to decide what's fit to print and what's not. How do they decide? How do their editors willingly tow the line? It is again important to remember that Nicolo Machiavelli's book *The Prince* was, after all, birthed at the onset of liberal democracy during the Enlightenment era and not during the totalitarian conservative era of the Dark Ages. Few honest intellectuals in the news media themselves understand the modern play-book of engineering consent that enables the freedom-loving public to believe whatever the powers that be want them to believe, but under the illusion that they freely made their own mind.

Making the public mind through the mass media and by vicarious means such as from books, movies, and myths, is today both a crafty art form and an empirical social science. That exercise in perception management and society mobilization is especially necessary for a global superpower that is rooted in open society domestically, wherein, its own public, chasing their proverbial 'American Dream', do not much care for imperial adventures in far away lands. As Zbigniew Brzezinski (ZB) brazenly observed in his book *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*: “Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization”. That requires craftily harnessing the mass media and the free press for imperial mobilization!

The Role of Mass Media in Empire Building (Chapter 4)

What is the first thing one should do if empire building is indeed the goal and the democratic people are blocking the way?

Let's just get rid of democracy and civil rights. We saw portions of that at work in the rise to power (See *Best Democracy Money can Buy*). And once in power, curtail dissent, and have the population patriotically cheer the president every time he comes on TV. But how? Through sustained indoctrination of the masses – sounds like such an antiquated Marxian term doesn't it! But how can

this be done in a democracy, even a subverted one when the media and the press are supposedly free? Use a boogie man to create the perception of an external danger that threatens their domestic well being and that can rally the people around the flag, and get the mass media to comply in perpetuating this threat perception through sustained propaganda. Especially if that threat perception is more than an abstract perception, and actually been observed in reality on television by the masses, as the events of 911 were. Hitler too had needed some physical action as propaganda alone had not been sufficient to rally the public. And he had contrived various pretexts to launch his invasion of Europe as history has amply documented. America too got its own New Pearl Harbor. How or who is not relevant in this chapter, only that it enabled giving reality to the threat perception propaganda, which now could be put into full motion as the actual “war on terrorism” against an irrational and powerful enemy in self defense. The role of the American media in using 9-11 to further the American administration’s “war on terrorism” and thus becoming complicit in expanding empire contrary to the will of the American public, is the subject of this chapter.

Let’s take the media first and observe its complicit behavior

If the media was not complying, why would one get more in-depth analysis and dissent expressed in foreign press than one sees in the local US print and TV media, the occasional courageous and revealing article in the New York Times and Washington Post notwithstanding? Isn’t the main purpose of the Freedom of the Press as enshrined in the sacred Constitution mainly to “*monitor the centers of power*”, as Robert Fisk never tires of quoting Amira Haas (both courageous journalists, former writes for the Independent in the UK currently reporting from Baghdad – how many in the mainstream have seen his reports of vaporized dead remains of the young and old civilians; the latter for an Israeli newspaper)? Why does the US television news media, press, and the vast majority of US journalists (though not every one to be sure) predominantly behave as if they were the TASS news agency of the former Soviet Union, dutifully reporting Pentagon and White House blurbs as their “faithful stenographers” (as Dennis Bernstein prefers to call them)? Read on to understand how corporate America brings what is called “news” to the American public.

Amy Goodman’s appearance on Charlie Rose on PBS

Even Dan Rather, the earnest and respected anchor of CBS news stands up to salute his commander in chief on a late night talk show with an unquestioning show of reverence, then later reveals to Greg Palast in an interview on BBC in London that due to fear and repression at home, he is unable to ask the kinds of questions he should from the American leadership or else he would be

neck-laced with the burning tire of unpatriotism put around his neck! [1]

When Amy Goodman, the award winning journalist and very courageous host of *DemocracyNow* program on the Pacifica Network, repeats this quote from Dan Rather on her maiden appearance on the *Charlie Rose* program on corporate sponsored American public television, what does Mr. Rose do as a reputed commentator himself? Instead of asking Ms. Goodman for further elaboration of what Dan Rather might have meant because he had never heard the quote, and perhaps request a source for that quote, he gets all defensive about how Dan Rather could never say such a thing!

Charlie Rose must be commended for really being the first major talk show host to put such a prominent voice of dissent on any mainstream TV program in the US. However I am a bit puzzled by his interlocution of Amy about Dan Rather. Why did Charlie Rose, instead of asking the obvious follow-up questions about the quote, start defending Dan Rather as if his friend had been insulted or something, when it was a quote of Dan Rather himself that Amy gave him, and she was not making any ad hominem attacks on Dan Rather nor did she bring him up on any other point in the conversation? The same situation had occurred at the very start of the program, almost right off the bat. He introduced Amy very nicely, and then Amy introduced Pacifica network and said: “*we need independent reporting*”, to which Rose seemed puzzled, and rightfully asked what do you mean, by “independent”. Amy then rattled off a list of mega corporations that own various American mainstream television networks: NBC owned by GE, CBS owned by Viacom, and ABC owned by Walt Disney Co. What does Mr. Charlie Rose do? Instead of asking Amy if she could support the underlying allegation that being owned by a corporation implied being influenced by them in the newsroom (and that would have been like asking can you support the allegation that GE, Viacom and Disney are in business to make money – perhaps that is why he did not ask it!), he says, and this quote is from the television broadcast, not the transcript:

“I promise you, CBS news, and ABC news, and NBC news are not influenced by the corporations, it may own those companies, since I know one of them very well, and work for one of them.”

He left Amy looking taken aback, because here was her maiden appearance on such an important show, and in the very first minute, she had run into a potential sticky wicket. Wisely, she did not follow-up right then, perhaps also because Charlie Rose looked down at his desk, dropped the eye contact, and started on the main topic.

Again, I am very puzzled by Charlie's blanket defense of the entire corporate news industry like that, as if he was their “Ari Fliesher”, i.e., their spokesperson! How would Charlie Rose know what the

Manufacturing Consent

corporate board rooms think, or what unwritten criteria they use to hire the senior management, senior producers, and senior editors of their news divisions? When he says he knows them well, what does that mean? Is he privy to their decision making process in their board rooms and corporate head quarters, or does he mean he knows them socially? Even if he works for one of them, where is he in the food chain? Is he the CEO of the news division? On what rational and factual basis can he assert that promise to Amy Goodman?

We see here on two instances, within a matter of minutes of each other, Charlie Rose rising to the defense of the status quo, and that is very telling. Whereas he showed all his extensive journalism skills in asking the right sort of questions of Amy regarding everything else, but any examination that would have led to questioning the status quo position on either the corporations role in the news media, or this war on terrorism that the media is dutifully supporting, he issued the typical denials, and not refutation (former is just saying no it isn't so, latter also offers some evidence to back it up), candidly revealing the style of journalism in vogue in this country, even when it is supposedly public television! This self imposed censorship in the mainstream media is what this essay is all about in its exploration of the prisoners of the cave, of which this is but one manifestation. A uniquely American phenomenon. I would nevertheless, applaud both Charlie Rose and Amy Goodman for not making these sticky wickets a point of contention, as that would have certainly detracted from the value of the show as the main topics were not those points, but the antiwar dissent and exposure to Pacifica that Amy Goodman had come to deliver. This is also valuable learning experience for others who may get other opportunity to present their dissent on mainstream, now that Amy has set a precedent, choose your words carefully and avoid red herrings like the plague. See the Pacifica website for the transcript of this show, and reach your own conclusions.

Any meaningful and fair analysis of the coverage between local mainstream news media and foreign news media will substantiate the claim that the US coverage generally tends to be one sided and faithfully tows the government's policy line **when the subject is one of ideological alignment.**

Whether it be on this fictitious "war on terrorism", or on its unequivocal support for Israel, or other matters, one can plainly see the congruence of views between the mainstream news media and the government du-jour on all ideological issues as if they were the natural extension of the government's Public Relations arm, instead of being the government watchdog they were meant to be by the first Amendment to the Constitution.

For instance, see if you can spot any significant contrarian discourse, dissenting commentaries, or even any substantial analytical coverage in the mainstream media for the following American

Manufacturing Consent

government ideologies and/or policies, quite unrelated to Israel:

- I.1: America has the god-given right to dictate terms to the world and is allowed to unquestioningly have 10,000 nuclear bombs along with a foreign policy that advocates preemptive nuclear first strikes on non-nuclear nations, but other nations not among her favored allies may not claim the same rights, even for self defense; if they do so, then they are “evil doers”;
- I.2: any self defense against America and her “favored” allies is terrorism;
- I.3: unbridled market capitalism controlled by American corporations, is the only sacred religion that all nations must be converted to, and if they don't open up their markets for America, they need a regime change;
- I.4: those against the WTO are terrorists.

To illustrate this concept with an example at the risk of slight digression, how many Americans understand why WTO is bad for the developing countries and only good for large multinational corporations of the industrialized economies; and how the former are being brow beaten to acquiesce to these unfair trade agreements at the expense of adversely affecting their own domestic development – from agriculture to industrial factory production to worker wages? But that is okay, because America will sell it all to them. The American government says WTO is good for everyone, and the American mainstream media complies by not expressing any analysis of it, nor allowing any of the scores of qualified experts a voice on the corporate airways who can explain to the common man in America why they must oppose these unfair trade treaties as only they can help bring justice to the inequity their government is forcing upon others.

Palestine-Israel Conflict and the media mindset

Let us examine Israel in the US media briefly, where there is much confluence of ideological interests between the US and Israel, global Hegemony for the former, and local domination of Arab lands for the latter. Support for Israel is institutional in the United States as was noted by our Martian observer friend earlier in this book.

The systematic “population adjustment” of the Palestinians by Israeli occupation forces, a sick euphemism for the reduction in their numbers through daily killings and infliction of serious crippling injuries, is a matter of open record for most anyone in the world. The daily oppression and dehumanizing treatment of the Palestinian is indescribable, a sustained climate of oppression and

fear with life made so inhospitable and unlivable that if it were any other people oppressing them except the Zionist of Israel, the world would be shamed to come to their rescue. But because of the support Israel enjoys from the US, the world has become impotent to aid them, although the coverage of what is happening to them is seen by almost every country on the planet, except in the US. In America, their plight is generally unknown, the coverage in the media non-existent, or completely de-contextualized. For any other people, at the hands of anyone else, it would be called ethnic cleansing, genocide, and holocaust, right here in the US. But not for the Palestinians when it is at the hands of the Israelis, god's "chosen" people. The media does not show how the Israeli soldier in his twenties deliberately shoots Palestinian children in their eyes. Maiming and killing sprees by Israeli soldiers is of course ignored, as is the torture and arbitrary jailings in the most inhuman conditions of young men between certain ages for months without charges. The daily shelling from US made helicopter gunships and F16s of civilian homes, house demolitions by US made Caterpillar bulldozers, and the systematic destruction of civilian infrastructure, their civil records, and their histories, either totally ignored or covered partially as "*Israeli incursion into the West Bank led to some civilians being killed in the crossfire.*"

How many 'diaries of Anne Frank' must exist in the West Bank and Gaza? Does anyone tell their stories? How many "Nights" of Elie Wiesel get enacted on a daily basis, are there any readings of that in the US mainstream? Or is it only when the victim is burned in an oven that it becomes a holocaust? A Palestinian child in the West Bank in a video documentary eloquently captured it by noting that being a dog in America was perhaps better than a child in Palestine, at least the dog gets to walk twice a day outside his home, gets water whenever it wants, and no one dare terrorize it ever, let alone on a daily basis, lest the police be called for animal rights abuse. But Palestinian rights? Are they less than animal rights? The silence in the media about the plight of the poor beleaguered Palestinians is most deafening, affirming the worldwide impression about America that it perhaps considers some victims inherently more worthy than others. And as Noam Chomsky calls them, the "unworthy" victims, not worthy of media's attention because they only suffer from the policies of the US and its allies. But if they suffer at the hands of anyone else, then they are considered "worthy" victims, courageous freedom fighters, and "*morally equivalent of our founding fathers*" as President Reagan referred to the Afghani Mujahideen invited to the White House not too long ago when they were fighting the oppression of our mortal enemy, the Soviet Union.

Even when a brave and courageous young American puts her young and innocent life in front of a US made armored D9 Caterpillar bulldozer demolishing a Palestinian doctor's home and gets murdered in cold blood by the Israeli soldier driving it, is there any outrage in the public media? When International Solidarity Movement observers (ISMs) get killed by American bullets shot

through Israeli hands, do we see any processions coming out in the streets protesting their murder?

Rachel Corrie – the voice of conscience for humanity

Rachel Corrie, a 23 year old very courageous young Jew American woman, met that fate very deliberately under a D9 Caterpillar Bulldozer on March 16, 2003, as she stood in front of a Palestinian doctor's home in the village of Rafah in Gaza Palestine, trying to protect it from being unjustly demolished. With a megaphone in hand she had been interrupting the Israeli soldier driving the huge machine from demolishing the home. This had been going on for several minutes according to eyewitness testimony, and had succeeded in stopping the bulldozer momentarily as they faced off each other. Then suddenly, getting impatient, he blithely rolled over her as she at the last moment tried to move out of the way and stumbled. According to eyewitness and fellow ISM member Alice, another Jewish American activist who herself puts her life in jeopardy daily in order to bear witness against her own fellow Jewish killing machines, it was a deliberate murder. Alice was also present at the shooting of fellow 21 year old British ISM member Tom Herndel in the head, who is now in a coma. She provided a detailed description live from Rafah to Amy Goodman on DemocracyNow, of how both Tom and Rachel, wearing brightly colored reflective vests, were deliberately executed. The broadcast date was April 14, 2003. Visit their website to hear Alice describe it first hand. Also interviewed were Craig and Cindy Corrie, the bereaved parents of Rachel, and it is very instructive to hear what they have to say. I wonder if the American public got an opportunity to hear Alice or Rachel's parents on mainstream media? Also shot in the face about the same time by an Israeli tank was ISM member Brian Avery from New Mexico, his tongue sliced into two.

These murders were a deliberate and sadistic attempt at sending a message of intimidation to all those foreigners who are witnessing first hand the systematic annihilation of the Palestinians and attempting to report it to the rest of the world. And in many cases providing a human shield to the miserable poor Palestinian family whose Arab life isn't considered to be worth much, but the Internationals perhaps thinking that their European and American heads and passports may command a higher premium and may be able to hold off the Israeli brutality also quickly learn that in the modern day inebriation of Israeli power with American institutional backing, even their Jewish blood isn't worth very much.

The message is quite clear, that your members of Congress, the President, and the media aren't likely to come bat for you, or protest your death too loudly other than perhaps a public relations bark, because we are ideological partners. So begone! Don't interfere in our cleanup operation for our new

settlements and our vision of a greater Israel as we turn our swords into plowshares! Is this just editorializing on my part, all unsupported assertions? Perhaps you can become a better judge of that after reading the following statements from Jewish Israeli Statesmen of their own fanaticism for Zionism, not even letting Jewish blood of conscience stand in their paths of destruction of an innocent population in their murderous quest for “Der Judenstaat”. Thus Rachel Corrie's killing was consistent with this history of Zionist terrorism in Palestine:

'In 1943, current Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir wrote an article entitled “Terror” for the journal of the terrorist organization he headed (Lehi) in which he proposed to “dismiss all the 'phobia' and babble against terror with simple, obvious arguments.” “Neither Jewish morality nor Jewish tradition can be used to disallow terror as a means of war,” he wrote, and “We are very far from any moral hesitations when concerned with the national struggle.” “First and foremost, terror is for us a part of the political war appropriate for the circumstances of today, and its task is a major one: it demonstrates in the clearest language, heard throughout the world, including by our unfortunate brethren outside the gates of this country, our war against the occupier.” [2]

“We must use terror, assassination, intimidation, land confiscation, and the cutting of all social services to the rid the Galilee of its Arab population.” [3]

“We should prepare to go over to the offensive. Our aim to smash Lebanon, Trans-Jordan, and Syria. The weak point is Lebanon, for the Moslem regime is artificial and easy for us to undermine. We shall establish a Christian state there, and then we will smash the Arab Legion, eliminate Trans-Jordan; Syria will fall to us. We then bomb and move on and take Port Said, Alexandria, and Sinai.” [4]

“We must do everything to insure they (the Palestinians) never do return ... The old will die and the young will forget.” [5]

“We declare openly that the Arabs have no right to settle on even one centimeter of Eretz Israel ... Force is all they do or ever will understand. We shall use the ultimate force until the Palestinians come crawling to us on all fours.” and “When we have settled the land, all the Arabs will be able to do about it will be to scurry around like drugged cockroaches in a bottle.” [6]

“We have to kill all the Palestinians unless they are resigned to live here as slaves” [7]

Manufacturing Consent

“If I were an Arab leader, I would never sign an agreement with Israel. It is normal; we have taken their country. It is true God promised it to us, but how could that interest them? Our God is not theirs. There has been Anti-Semitism, the Nazis, Hitler, Auschwitz, but was that their fault? They see but one thing: we have come and we have stolen their country. Why would they accept that?” [8]

“Jewish villages were built in the place of Arab villages. You do not even know the names of these Arab villages, and I do not blame you because geography books no longer exist. Not only do the books not exist, the Arab villages are not there either. Nahlal arose in the place of Mahlul; Kibbutz Gvat in the place of Jibta; Kibbutz Sarid in the place of Huneifis; and Kefar Yehushua in the place of Tal al-Shuman. There is not a single place built in this country that did not have a former Arab population.” [9]

But we don't need the testimony of the older generation of Israeli Statesmen to corroborate the condition of the Palestinians and the fanaticism of the Zionists. Rachel Corrie's own eyewitness testimony on the plight of the Palestinians, published in the U.K. Guardian, in the form of emails to her mother, is sufficient to wake up the conscionable Americans from their ignorant slumber if they are exposed to the pain contained in them.

This is a 23 year old conscientious American Jew talking to her parents after her first exposure to the horrors of Palestine:

“I have been in Palestine for two weeks and one hour now, and I still have very few words to describe what I see. It is most difficult for me to think about what's going on here ... I don't know if many of the children here have ever existed without tank-shell holes in their walls and the towers of an occupying army surveying them constantly from the near horizons. I think, although I'm not entirely sure, that even the smallest of these children understand that life is not like this everywhere. An eight-year-old was shot and killed by an Israeli tank two days before I got here, and many of the children murmur his name to me "Ali" – or point at the posters of him on the walls ... I think about the fact that no amount of reading, attendance at conferences, documentary viewing and word of mouth could have prepared me for the reality of the situation here ... once you have experienced the reality of a world that isn't surrounded by murderous towers, tanks, armed settlements, and now a giant metal wall. I wonder if you can forgive the world for all the years of your childhood spent existing – just existing – backed by the worlds only superpower – in its attempt to erase you from your home ... Currently the Israeli army is building a fourteen-meter-high

Manufacturing Consent

wall between Rafah in Palestine and the border, carving a no-mans land from the houses along the border. Six hundred and two homes have been completely bulldozed ... the wells destroyed last week provided half of Rafah's water supply ... many of the communities have requested internationals to be present at night to attempt to shield houses from further demolition ... If any of us had our lives and welfare completely strangled, lived with children in a shrinking place where we knew, because of previous experience, that soldiers and tanks and bulldozers could come for us at any moment and destroy all the greenhouses that we had been cultivating for however long, and did this while some of us were beaten and held captive with 149 other people for several hours – do you think we might try to use somewhat violent means to protect whatever fragment means remained? ... When I come back from Palestine, I probably will have nightmares and constantly feel guilty for not being here ... Coming here is one of the better things I've ever done. So when I sound crazy, or if the Israeli military should break with their racist tendency not to injure white people, please pin the reason squarely on the fact that I am in the midst of a genocide which I am also indirectly supporting, and for which my government is largely responsible.” [10]

A letter included in her emails from reserve first sergeant in the IDF, named Danny says the following:

“The amount of AWOLS and refusals to serve are unprecedented in our history ... refusal to carry out orders that involve firing on targets where civilians may be harmed ... many career soldiers – among them pilots and intelligence personnel have chosen jail and unemployment over what they could only describe as murder ... I am supposed to report to the Military Justice department – it is my job to hunt down runaway soldiers and bring them in. I have not reported for 18 months. ... I believe that Israel is under the leadership of some very bad people right now. I believe that settlers and local police are in collusion with each other and that the border police are acting disgracefully. They are an embarrassment to 40% of the Israeli public and they would be an embarrassment to 90% of the population if they know what we know ... Please document as much as you can ... the media here serves as a very convincing spin control agent through all of this ...” [11]

Okay, so having read Rachel's own testimony along with that of an IDF soldier, and seeing in our minds third eye the eloquent image that they have drawn for us, now let's examine the coverage in the US media and ponder the enslavement of the American public – is it all that much different from Plato's mythical prisoners of the cave?

Manufacturing Consent

Yes there was some wide coverage of Rachel's life and a brief description of what happened in many US news papers on March 17, some giving it front page coverage (see below for detailed analysis of how it was covered in the San Francisco Chronicle). Where there had been a complete silence before, there was now some explanation of what Rachel was doing there. The next day the story pretty much disappeared, except for some bylines here and there. The question however is, why isn't there a huge public outcry of the scope that we might see, if for example, something similar had occurred to an American at the hands of Sadaam Hussain? They would have been bombs flying all over if it was Sadaam, but since it is Ariel Sharon, the "man of peace" according to the US President, it is treated almost gingerly. What's the difference between the two, one is the butcher of Kurds in Halabja, the other is a butcher of Palestinian refugees in Sabra and Shattila? Neither of them physically pulled the triggers themselves, then why is one of them a killer and the other a "*man of peace*"? What a conundrum!

This is the key question to understand as we honor the memory of Rachel Corrie, who in her superhuman sacrifice of her beautiful young life for a cause that she passionately believed in (while the Palestinians do not have a choice but to suffer, she did have a choice of not going to Israel to bear witness), even left us a further lesson in her martyrdom, as she laid thread bare this hypocrisy in her country, in the hope that where her living couldn't do much to end it, perhaps her death might. So let's understand where this hypocrisy stems from so that we may give the credit where it is due.

Usually (though not always, but the coverage is similar), any mainstream media coverage of the Palestinian plight only comes about when a young Palestinian retaliates for the unbearable and systematic daily Israeli oppression, with a suicide bomb as he does not possess any F16s and cruise missiles or else he certainly would have used them for even more devastating revenge in his struggle for liberation. Surely many innocent lives are lost in this attack. The media coverage gets focussed on its victims as it should, while the human toll on the other side due to Israel's F16 and Apache helicopter attacks on a civilian population is either ignored, or continues to simply be "*caught in a crossfire during Israeli incursion into the West Bank.*" The viewer's attention is drawn by the endless chatter of the talking heads on television on how the Palestinian mother can send her children to commit suicide and what a bad religion Islam must be that it encourages Jihad and this sort of random purposeless violence. Okay, not that the assessment is either fair or sheds any light on the history of the occupation and the reasons for this conflict, but how about also condemning the Israeli mothers at what sort of sons and daughters they are raising that they would systematically shoot to cripple and maim young children and old men without any moral compunction!

Perhaps there is a new declaration of human rights in the media in which some innocent victims are

Manufacturing Consent

more worthy of sympathetic and humanizing coverage than others! De-contextualized from history, the American viewer, generally isolated that he is from what is happening in the rest of the world, and as Noam Chomsky often observes “*the most important things for him always happen down the street*”, is left completely perplexed at the wanton randomness, and utter senselessness of these suicide bombings, and automatically comes to the appropriate and desired conclusions. What might those conclusions be?

Thus is it any wonder that the US public opinion, compared to the rest of the world’s public opinion, so much supports the Israeli adventures in the West Bank and Gaza. Might it perhaps have anything to do with what the American mainstream sees on their televisions and what the rest of the world sees on theirs? And might it also have any basis in the myths that are perpetuated on them in the US media that Israel is fighting for its survival against these unjust and evil forces? Or is it perhaps that the US public is just inherently evil, too stupid to understand, or just do not care? Which proposition sounds more preposterous? You be the judge!

Perhaps now we can begin to see why Rachel Corrie's death has not created outright condemnation of Israel in the US media and the press, and there are no missiles being launched in retaliation. Because Israeli military can do no wrong, the poor guys in their tanks and helicopters are being besieged and harassed by those nasty looking stone-throwing evil jihadis, and yes the bulldozer did run over her. But as the San Francisco Chronicle of March 17, 2003 in its front page paragraph 3 quotes the Israeli military spokesman even before it elaborates on the circumstances of her death thus:

“This was a very regrettable, accident. We're dealing with a group of protesters acting very irresponsibly, putting everyone in danger – the Palestinians, themselves, and our forces.”

Yes it must have been an accident! She was just being reckless being there in the first place. That seed is planted right in your head in the very beginning of the article. And what was the bulldozer doing there trying to demolish the Palestinian home on his own land in the first place? No, we don't ask that question. The fact that it is against the Geneva Convention that an occupying army should destroy civilian homes with bulldozers is not raised either. Again, don't ask the 'why'. Israel can do no wrong. So murder it's not.

The San Francisco Chronicle continues on Page A10:

“State Department spokesman Lou Fintor said the US government 'deeply regrets this tragic death of an American citizen.’”

Manufacturing Consent

Okay there is the American Government's vociferous protest. And it further attempts to provide a context for these home demolitions:

“the army has destroyed dozens of structures in a volatile border zone that is rocked by near constant fighting between Israeli troops and Palestinian gunmen.”

So now one is supposed to be quite enlightened as to why the Israeli army is destroying these 'structures', and just what these structure might be is not mentioned, leaving the impression that perhaps they were some obstructions lying on the road, or empty abandoned buildings with no human beings living there. There was no mention of the hundreds of Rafah civilians including large numbers of children killed by the Israeli army, or the suffering of the Rafah residents such as 70% of its children being anemic because they are too afraid to eat as the Israeli army goes about its demolitions.

It's not just what the papers say, but also what they don't say, that informs the reader. This is why it is so easy to deceive. The uninitiated reader does not know what he does not know, hence has no way of knowing that he is only getting half the story. Perhaps the same thing may apply to the journalist too. Their ignorance however, if indeed it is just that and not deliberate obfuscation, is inexcusable and some might allege positively criminal. Why such ignorance may occur so frequently in US news media, and not as much in foreign and even Israeli press is an interesting subject and Noam Chomsky has dealt with it at great length. It is further discussed from my perspective towards the end of this essay.

To the uncritical eye, this was a pretty decent article, front page coverage and all. After reading it, one cannot but help think that it was perhaps Rachel's own fault that she was there in front of the bulldozer, in her reckless zeal fueled through a bit of idealism and noble motives, and the Israeli army while expressing its regret, is not to blame, or at best it was a tragic accident as the State Department says too. So who are we (the mainstream public) to think otherwise. So no Tomahawk cruise missiles to be deployed here, no equivalence with Tianamen square to be drawn here – the courageous front page picture of Rachel momentarily holding up the gigantic bulldozer with a megaphone in her hand does not remotely resemble the television images of the equally brave Chinese student holding up a tank, so no sanctions to be imposed, no regime changes to be contemplated!

This is the psychological makeup behind Rachel Corrie's front page coverage in the US press! See no evil and hear no evil isn't just a Confucian saying in fortune cookies. Noam Chomsky might say this another way, that Rachel Corrie was an “unworthy” victim, using his “worthy” and “unworthy”

Manufacturing Consent

victim models mentioned earlier. The former of course being worthy of America's wrath as they have been victimized by the enemies of the US or its allies, and the latter being unworthy of America's wrath and retaliation as they have been victimized by the policies of the US itself, or its favored allies and client-states. You can judge this for yourself. Look at all the oppression around the world, then see which victims get what sort of coverage in the mainstream media, and what sort of alliance those governments have with the United States.

Please see the award winning and highly respected journalist Robert Fisk's many articles on this subject in the U.K. newspaper *The Independent* about how the US media sanitizes Israel's coverage with interesting choice of words. Often "occupied territories" is replaced with "disputed territories", "settlements" with "neighborhoods", etc., and not just by the journalists on their own initiatives, but under explicit directives from the corporate board rooms above. And even when the American press borrows stories directly from the Israeli press, and when Robert Fisk's own reports on Israel's misdeeds are run in syndication, these often end up being edited and modified to suit the "American tastes", sometimes even without the original newspapers permission. [12] Please review the foreign press, and even the Israeli press which often carries more unsanitized news and dissenting opinions about Israel's own actions than the US press does. Why should this be the case? Why do you think?

The first response that might occur to the mainstream American reader is denial, that this isn't the case. For such obdurate critics, the grass-roots organization "If Americans Knew" is compiling detailed statistics on American media coverage of Israel-Palestine and a visit to their web site might convince the recalcitrant of the veracity of these observations regarding the gross imbalance and deliberate deception in American reporting. Modern marketing was pretty much invented in America on Madison Avenue in New York (okay London too). However, its deployment is not limited to selling diapers! Why is the American media trying to sell a sanitized Israel to the American public? And how are they able to do it consistently, persistently? Who owns the media, who runs the newsrooms, and who sits on the corporate boards of the parent corporations? Who do you think?

Please also see the two books *The Other Israel – Voices of Refusal and Dissent* edited by Carey and Shainin, and *Israel/Palestine – How to End the War of 1948* by Tanya Reinhart, for a sampling of what enters into Israeli discourse but not in the American discourse. And this is while their own right-wing war criminals in the government continue to annihilate the Palestinians. Refer to my model of apartheid Israel earlier to review how is it that despite having a freer press, Israeli population continues to elect and reelect known killers and war criminals to be their leaders.

The Prime Minister of Israel, General Ariel Sharon, cannot travel to Belgium as he would be arrested

Manufacturing Consent

for war crime charges for his complicity in the cold blooded revenge killing of 1700 to 2000 unarmed Palestinian men women and children in two refugee camps in Southern Lebanon in 1982 by an Israeli backed Christian militia. Condemned by Israel's own inquiry commission for his role in it that led to his resignation as the then Defense Minister – Ariel Sharon is now back as the Prime Minister – some way to recycle garbage! I have very rarely seen this rehearsed on mainstream American television (that should actually read never ever seen on mainstream television), even when the American President called Sharon a “*man of peace*”!

Continuing with the references for self-study in order to form your own conclusions on how the American mainstream mass media has grossly indoctrinated you and purposely misled you by sheltering you from the miserable realities of American power politics outside the shores of the American landscape, please see the voluminous *Pity the Nation – The Abduction of Lebanon* by Robert Fisk for a description of the murderous adventures of General Sharon and reflect on how even the US President could possibly refer to him as a “*man of peace*”. Probably the same way, I suppose, as Menachem Begin, the past president of Israel was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize after he had been the most wanted criminal in Britain for his role in the 1948 blowing up of King David Hotel as a member of the terrorist gang Irgun, killing the British soldiers staying there. Short memories, these power brokers of the West have! Ronald Reagan now appears to be a sagacious old wise man as we revisit his famous quote once again: ~“*I am told politics is the second oldest profession, it seems to have a strong resemblance to the first one*”. Then they write scholarly treatise explaining it all as a “*Clash of Civilizations*”. The erudite Harvard scholar Samuel P. Huntington is only partially right, although many argue that he got it entirely wrong. Some of the boundaries of world conflict may indeed end up aligning around civilizational “fault lines”, but not for the reasons he argues, that other civilizations are naturally incompatible with the Judeo-Christian centric highly developed and culturally dominant civilization of Europe and America, as well as with each other. Huntington's entire scholarship was unwittingly summarized by the highly educated US President (another Harvard alumni) in response to why do they hate us: ~“*because we are good and democratic and they are evil*”. I didn't attend Harvard, so perhaps I am just too naive when I ask the obvious that could it perhaps also have anything to do with the systematic economic oppression and exploitation, as well as the economic and military domination of other emerging nations for the “full spectrum dominance” of the entire planet, also largely being along these “fault lines”?

Please do read Huntington's book alongside ZB's book. I am sure the other mediocre and wannabe superpowers have their own ZBs and George Kennans framing similar policies but more suited to their station in the imperial food chain. Then you be the judge whether it is a clash of civilizations, or a clash of haves vs. have-nots, oppressor vs. the oppressed, developed vs. trying to develop and not

being allowed to be self-reliant and independent? It does not take rocket science to observe this!

Nor does it take a prophet to suggest that were justice to prevail, if resources were justly shared, if relations were justly formed, if no nation tried to exercise its hegemony over another, if no civilization gave itself the license for 'a mission civilisatrice' upon another, if the past exploited were justly indemnified, and if ruthless primal merchants of death like ZB did not prevail over their nation's policies, there would be no clash of civilizations at all!

For a concise understanding of the history of the Palestinian lands that the media denies you, see the wonderful book by the Professor of Biblical History and Archaeologist and past US marine, William W. Baker, *Theft of a Nation* (it might be out of print but the author had told me that he was working on an update; I am lucky to have an autographed version) in which he superbly deconstructs the biblical mythology spun by Israel. And he is a Christian scholar, not a Muslim one! Truth in the hands of an honest broker can sometimes be so religion blind! If we dare to know it, that is. When this book was first published twenty years ago, Baker was issued death threats by the Zionists and Meir Kahane of New York. In his characteristic marine style, he responded to the phone call he received from Kahane, by saying “*okay, where shall we meet, outside your house or mine?*” When FBI offered him protection and suggested he carry a weapon to protect himself, his response? “*InshaAllah!*” And the FBI was confused, “*what do you mean?*”, they asked. Having lived in Jerusalem, both among the Muslims and the Jews, Baker could perhaps speak Arabic, and *InshaAllah* is a typical exclamation from a Muslim when he wishes to signify that he has left matters in the hands of his Creator. While William Baker is not a Muslim, this exclamation from him greatly impressed me as someone not at all afraid of going wherever the truth takes him, even if of alien origin. How about the rest of us?

To further understand the fraud being perpetuated with this mantra of “restarting the peace process” ad nauseum in the mainstream media that parrots both the US and Israeli governments, please see *The End of the Peace Process – Oslo and After* by Edward W. Said, a Palestinian Christian intellectual and Professor of English Literature at Columbia University, again not a Muslim! How many Americans even know that both Christians and Muslims are equally resident of the Palestinian refugee camps dotting Lebanon, Jordan and the slums of West Bank and Gaza, and indeed in the Palestinian Diaspora the world over? Also see Naseer H. Aruri's very critical analysis of America's role in the so called peace process: *dishonest broker – The US Role in Israel and Palestine*. And in accordance with the approach of this essay in quoting the antagonists themselves, see Tanya Reinhart's *Israel and Palestine* referenced earlier, for a lucid description of the plight of the Palestinians post Oslo. While not an antagonist herself but a conscientious critic of the Israeli

government, she writes from within the belly of the beast, as a reputed Professor in Tel Aviv University and regular contributor of a column for Yediot Aharonot, Israel's largest daily newspaper. Finally, see Noam Chomsky's new book *Middle East Illusions*, for a detailed and chronological political history employing his usual insightful and analytical wit, of this conflict pre and post 9/11.

After all this self-study, what do you think? Do I convince the most pigheaded but fair critic of the devious role of the Zionist sympathetic American media in enslaving the American public in the proverbial chains of the prisoners of the cave? Not yet? Don't have time to read and research on your own? Okay there is more. Please read on further.

Empire + Military-industrial complex + Globalization = mind control

It is interesting to observe that one has to exert considerable time and effort to get to hear reasoned arguments and truthful reporting in this country, whereas drivel is always kept one click of the remote control's button away. Who has the time to read all these books in America? I doubt very much anyone reading this essay will ever bother to follow-up on any of the references cited here, unless they happen to be researching something. Thus it's okay to allow publishing them because they are not a big determinant of the majority public opinion, unless the State wants an excuse to get rid of the author, then it will be called anti-Semitic and subversive, the author labeled "enemy combatant", and the Patriot Act will kick in to send him off to Guantanamo Bay. As I had stated earlier in my essay about the FBI's visit to my home, and perhaps it can never be restated enough times for no one seems to be listening: **Free speech only means something when there is someone listening. I can have all the free speech in vacuum and die from asphyxiation.**

This is also why we don't see these debates on television, because everyone watches TV. First amendment free speech has become limited to obscure printed books in this country. When print was the dominant source of information, as in the McCarthy era, what appears in books today could not appear then. Most everyone in this country misunderstands freedom of speech and their own constitution. It is not freedom to speak, but freedom to think differently and freedom to be heard, especially on political matters but certainly not limited to it, that is enshrined in the US Constitution. Unfortunately, while there is some freedom to speak, and to publish, there is no freedom to be heard on the mass media television in this country, especially in matters which conflict with the interests of the elites controlling this country and its corporate mass media. If a voice remains unheard, or can be drowned, publish all you want, talk all you want.

The hijacking of free speech in America to mean the “ability to speak”, rather than “the ability to be heard”, has been the biggest unrecognized public theft since the Pharaohs stole the lives of their peoples who built the pyramids for them.

Note that now, in the emerging police state in America, even the freedom to speak is under attack – lord knows some “evil doers” may hear and do some thinking for themselves. Witness the emergence of the new military thought police on university and school campuses under the auspices of this ultra right-wing ruling party, called the Campus-Watch that monitors what is said and talked about on campus. In addition, a surprising new Orwellian legislation pending in Congress makes it illegal to criticize Israel and Israeli occupation of Palestine in university and school campuses. It is not clear whether only in publicly funded ones or in all of them. Together with campus-watch, this is designed to quell any free speech and open debate on matters critical of Israel in the foremost and highest places hitherto protected from such intrusions, the academic freedom to think and debate freely.

But for other matters, yes there are 500 channels, all the sports you can watch, and all the possibilities for self expression, even self mutilation, and the masses are kept happy and well fed. Even the Roman empire did not have it so good. Attempts are being made to exercise dominance to quell critical debates not just in America, but throughout the world by influencing the world media as the entire planet now gets their news and forms their opinions on television viewing. If it cannot be bought or intimidated into compliance, it is bombed into compliance. An alien observer on Mars monitoring microwave transmissions from earth watching all the Hollywood movies and FOX news might conclude that only Anglo-Saxons live on the third planet, and the third Reich is back in power pursuing full scale military style psychological operations on the denizens.

Even the internet, once heralded as the great equalizer and democratizer in the world is not immune to the slowly encroaching barriers to free, unhindered, and unintimidated speech. But since its penetration in American households, though growing, is not as pervasive as television, its policing through corporate policies and new laws is only growing in proportion to its prominence and ability to affect public opinion in any significant numbers. Thus it remains open to free speech and a good source of alternate information at the present. However, it is routinely being scrounged by law enforcement and intelligence communities for evidence of subversive talk. And who defines subversive? The US Justice department? Several states have enacted laws that makes anonymizing a users web and email submission illegal, on the pretext of safeguarding against identity theft. With regular trolling of the internet by even employers to check what type of comments their prospective employees might have made in the past, and profiling and data mining tools proliferating even in the

Manufacturing Consent

most innocuous operations, it may not be too long before the internet is primarily relegated to another shopping channel for the masses and a transaction channel for businesses, or for the harmless irrelevant non political chatter of the pop culture which will be called free speech in America. Being able to earn a livelihood can be a powerful chiller for political speech as observed during the McCarthy era. Furthermore, ownership of the internet is already beginning to fall in the hands of the mainstream corporate media moguls such a AOL-Time Warner. Before long, the likes of Rupert Murdoch will be owning a big chunk of the internet pie and beaming another 500 websites of entertainment chatter into our home.

A conspiracy at dumbing us down? This is no conspiracy theory. It's far more insidious. It is institutional! A natural outcome of the imperial path to world conquest, dominated by the rise of the military-industrial complex acquiring the rights of “person-hood” and constitutional protections over the past century, and now owning all of the mass media and driven by the new mantra of corporate globalization. Giant oil, auto, and agriculture corporations now dominate Wall Street, and are far richer than majority of nations on the planet – and they have now claimed for themselves constitutional human rights of free speech including the right to influence legislation, politicians, and make donations to political parties. According to Thom Hartmann, before 1886, it was not like this, most states prevented corporations from meddling in politics. If they cannot vote, why should they be talking to the politicians? Now, there is much in common between the fictitious “person” modern corporation, and this fictitious “war on terrorism”.

The interests of these elites now control the planet. They comprise less than a measurable fraction of one percent of the planet and monopolize more than 90% of its resources and its wealth. Just look at the wealthiest people on the Forbes list, look at the wealth commanded by the top few Fortune 500 companies, and compare it to the ownership of wealth and resources of the rest of the nations on the planet including their GDP. [13] Also review the earlier example of young labor sweat shops in Bangladesh run by the Walt Disney Company that pays 5 cents per shirt. And who owns ABC news? Why would ABC news broadcast an exposé of these sweat shops – contrary to what Charlie Rose might unreservedly proclaim? What does your own commonsense tell you?

The “war on terrorism” being waged from the White House is not about battlefield deployments against “Islamic jihadis”. It is mainly about privatization of the world’s resources and public commons into the hands of the military-industrial-corporate-multinational complex of the United States. Even Afghanistan was about oil pipelines and getting physically closer to Central Asia and China. As late as the summer of 2001, months before 9/11, the Taliban were told by US representatives to either accept the US offer of a carpet of gold or they would be buried in a carpet of bombs, that in either

Manufacturing Consent

case the Americans would have their oil pipeline from the oil-rich nations of Central Asia to the Indian ocean through Afghanistan. Again, Iraq is about the control of oil spigots.

In general, America would be very happy to give the whole world their freedom to do absolutely whatever they want, have any kind of government they want, as long as they spend their money to buy American products in US dollars, and sell back all of their natural resources including their labor! Yes sell. Americans aren't thieves. After all, we buy what is under your soil or the fruits of your hard labor, and pay you what we think is a reasonable price for it. It is nothing more diabolical then a race among the corporations of the industrialized world for who can stake their claims first on which resource, with America being the dominant hog as it happens to own the biggest guns. Nor is it any more complex to understand than corporate greed, an extension of the age old human greed. The Enron and other fantastic debacles of late in which the CEOs of those bankrupt companies pay themselves millions in bonuses and even protect their wealth from any reclaim from bankruptcy proceedings is evidence of this greed. [14]

The reconstruction of history by the official mainstream historians that is faithfully reproduced on the minds of the Americans by the media is also mind boggling! What is even more mind boggling is the cavalier attitude with which these texts refer to their sins of at least a 100 years ago (anything closer in time would be too close for comfort). For example, my kids came home talking about how the US army had given small pox laden blankets to the native Indians which killed tens of thousands of them. Okay, many of their descendants still live in appalling conditions on reservations – get them into gambling casinos, but not indemnify them for the sins of the past, nor bring these moral points up for discussion in the text books – but show them from the detachment of the sins of the past of a generation long dead! They did it; it's not our burden.

When is it our burden? When it is happening right at our door steps? Only when we are eyewitness to it? Only when we pull the trigger with our own fingers? I do not see any national contrition, restitution, and accountability, or memorials going up to the victims of America in America. What have I missed? I am 100% certain that in a 100 years the American historians will write text books about the devastation of Iraq and Afghanistan with similar detached regret. Then it will be out in the open, and perhaps my posterity might come home with similar official stories of tens of thousands Muslims dead from bombing the cities, from sanctions, from imposed dictatorships. But today, when this knowledge can be crucial to the American public who still choose or “select” their governments by some sort of voting, and can do something about it to get rid of them and bring them to justice, this information is conveniently not available.

Manufacturing Consent

All this is what inevitably and institutionally leads to mind control of the populace in America like the chained dwellers of Plato's mythical cave, for all sources of education and information are now under the corporate control of the military-industrial complex, including the law makers and the politicians. [15] The corporate influence in the White House, and vice versa, along with a confluence of other ancillary interests such as the Zionists alliance with Israel and their direct and indirect control of large chunks of US economy, its news outlets, and its politicians, make it impossible to hear and see images of the worst atrocities being committed in order to pursue empire.

If the American public saw and read what others in the world are seeing and reading, what would be the public's stance on Israel's occupation and its systematic extermination of the Palestinians? How much should we credit the corporate news media for not asking the 'why', for not showing us the powerful images that tell the story from both sides, and thus enhancing our obfuscation, that allows our government to continue aligning itself with Israel since we don't know any better and do not protest, and that emboldens Israel to carry on its planned genocide of the Palestinians with impunity, even being so emboldened as to kill a young American activist who dared to challenge them?

Thus, how much is the mainstream news media to blame for Rachel Corrie's murder, indeed for the wholesale slaughter and destruction of an entire people, in Palestine, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere in the world, and how much are we, the silent ignorant majority, in whose name and with whose tax dollars, these war crimes are being committed? You be the judge!

Media non-coverage in this “Slaughter On Iraq”

Now let us look at some media non-coverage in this war of conquest and ponder the cause for the ignorance of the mainstream Americans.

Someone might perhaps argue that if the US President were to listen to Pacifica instead of his advisors, he might be less inclined to take Ariel Sharon as his mentor and not call him a “man of peace”! Not so. The Israeli soldiers have been training US soldiers on how to conduct Urban warfare based on the Jenin model! (The US President is quite aware of what is going on, not that it matters now, but on impeachment day perhaps?) Never made it on the mainstream news. There is so much confluence of interest between Israel and this war of aggression in the Middle East and oil that it is quite sinister to not see it even brought up on CNN, ABC, FOX et. al. as experts after experts are paraded before us. In this entire coverage, not one word has been mentioned of the Israeli interest in reviving the oil pipeline between Mosul and Haifa that I am aware of. That Israeli commanders have unprecedented access to the Central Command (CENTCOM) in Qatar, that they monitor and consult

Manufacturing Consent

on real-time developments as they unfold in Iraq, lending their superior expertise in urban warfare that they learnt on innocent Palestinian homes in their own back yard, to the US military is not newsworthy. I guess the historians who will be rewriting the new text books of history will mainly be consulting FOX, CNN, NPR, ABC, CBS, NBC, and the glossy presentations of the Pentagon Generals and the Secretary of State General Colin Powell.

The threat facing the Dollar from the Euro, as Baghdad switched to the Euro for its oil transactions, and potentially Iran, Venezuela and all of OPEC also contemplating this move, which could break the dollar monopoly as an international currency for oil trading and threaten the US economy already loaded with trillions of dollars in debt, has not been raised as a motive for the war. See William Clark's detailed analysis on this topic on the web. A potential warning to these countries of what could come if they persisted in their blasphemy. It would provide an interesting empirical evidence of this motive if now none of these countries switch to the Euro. Retd. General J. Garner, as the new power in Iraq, is now a voting member of OPEC, in full and eager anticipation of falling price of crude oil from \$22 to \$8 – \$10 as Iraq's production ramps up, with the oil companies pocketing that difference as profits. Can you see their stocks going up? Then there are the pipeline development contracts, oil fire put out contracts, military bases development and support contracts, and of course, Iraq rebuilding contracts. There are of course no oil men, or oil woman, and other corporate interests in the White House, right?

But why go to Iraq, why not twist the arm of Saudi Arabia to simply pump more oil if this was indeed the case, don't we own that country anyway? We took that country having no income tax before 1991, and made it one of the most debtor nations in the world by making it pay for the first Gulf War that the US convinced it fraudulently to fight by showing it doctored satellite pictures of Sadaam's supposed armored troops tracks in the sand poised to attack Saudi Arabia. Later, the photos were shown to be of highly questionable merit. Of course we won't bother going into the details at the moment about the late American Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie, who gave Sadaam the proverbial "American green light" under orders from the State Department:

"We have no opinion on your Arab – Arab conflicts, such as your dispute with Kuwait. Secretary (of State James) Baker has directed me to emphasize the instruction, first given to Iraq in the 1960's, that the Kuwait issue is not associated with America." [16]

The internal dispute had been Kuwait continually over pumping more oil than its agreed upon fare share from the disputed region between Iraq and Kuwait thus keeping the oil prices low, apart from the fact that Kuwait was artificially crafted out of Iraq by the colonial imperialist like all the modern

Manufacturing Consent

countries of the Middle East. This “green light” to Sadaam was an obvious trap as the subsequent history is evidence; and within a few hours of Sadaam's invasion of Kuwait, Iraq's substantial dollar assets were frozen in the United States.

The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait enabled the US, under the stewardship of George Bush Sr., to finally enter the land of the Muslims, after years of trying, and finally set up military bases there, all paid for by Saudi Arabia from its oil revenues. And we also won't go into the fraudulent testimonies provided by the teary-eyed daughter of the ambassador of Kuwait to the US Congress about how the Iraqi soldiers were throwing babies out of incubators, to win over the US public opinion about going to war. All of these fraudulent testimonies were televised on all the news channels, without informing the public that the witness was the daughter of the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States having come here begging the superpower to come to its rescue. It has all been documented by others, and is accepted even by the mainstream journalists, but of course never to be rehearsed openly, especially now in the time of war, lest they inadvertently end up asking some really tough questions of the government, as it perpetuated new frauds on the public in the United Nations. Mafia aficionados, take notes on extortion racket.

But if you did ask this question, good job, you are relearning what you were forced to unlearn as a child, not to ask 'why' by giving you Ritalin and diagnosing you with ADD. The response, which the eloquent mainstream media won't give you, Pacifica provides you. Michael Ruppert, publisher of “From the Wilderness” explained it as the cost of producing a barrel of oil. In the rest of the world, the oil production has “peaked”, in other words, more than 50% of the oil has been pumped out from under their soil. The cost of production to pump out the next barrel of oil is now much higher, up to approx. \$10 per barrel. Whereas in Iraq, the oil is floating about 600 feet below the surface, it has not “peaked”. It would cost less than a couple of bucks to pump that deliciously rich Mesopotamian thick black gold. Chink, the Wall Street just rallied! [17]

New intellectual property laws are currently being drafted in Iraq by a representative of the recording industry so that the newly liberated Iraqis may not start copying Madonna songs! Weren't they supposed to be liberating the Iraqi people from Sadaam, now only to have them be under the diktats of the recording industry (courtesy of Pacifica)? Pillage and plunder aren't just words in history text books applied to colonizers past. And it's not just over there, it's right here too. Look at the company called ChoicePoint and watch your next presidential election results! See Greg Palast's new investigative reporting and articles in the U.K. Guardian newspaper available on its website on the many sources of profiteering and their immediate beneficiaries from this “war of conquest” that you will not hear in the US news media. It is a full Mafia ops for dizzying profits.

Perhaps it is not the media's fault – is it the economy stupid?

Mainstream America sees nothing, rallies around the Flag

Is this why the press and the journalism profession were accorded constitutional protection, the “freedom of the press”, so that special interests would push their agendas on the public mind? Especially the TV coverage from all of them, ABC, CBS, NBC, NPR, FOX, and CNN (I love their new acronym Censored News Networks courtesy of Flashpoints) is pro-war and support the troops and support the President – regardless of what war crimes against humanity get committed! That is an observation, and a fact, though frequently denied by the media participants themselves but never convincingly refuted. Compare their TV coverage with foreign broadcasts. Dish antennas are now quite pervasive and cheap – you can do your own experiment!

Remaining ignorant is no longer an excuse for complicity – and the assertion of innocence in the face of these atrocities being committed in our name can at best ring hollow – and at worst stand the same accusation of history that now the world levels at the German nation for their allowing Fascism to rise in their own country. To understand “*why they hate us*”, getting exposed to their story as told by them, not by the media pundits echoing the Pentagon or the White House, is a prerequisite. To understand why someone may lose all compunction in wanting to kill innocent civilians at the expense of their own lives, it is important to see what this country may have done to them in the past so many decades, and to remember one's own history and what Patrick Henry said “*give me liberty or give me death*” when England held sway over the fates and riches of this nation not so very long ago. Not to say it is ever justified to kill even a single innocent person, but do we not ask “why” when Tim McVeigh blows up a building in Oklahoma? Do we not try to unravel the crime in a sea of false trails and red herrings? So if “why” isn't being asked, what should one conclude?

Is the mainstream news media willing to take us there? When the leader of the free world asserts: “*either you are with us or with the terrorists*”, the media actually blocks us from seeing that there is also another alternative, that we can be neither. Hear the wonderful Arundhati Roy's eloquent speech that she made in Porto Alegre in Brazil titled “*How to confront Empire?*” that never made it on the 6 o'clock news on any channel, but was broadcast on Pacifica, and whose transcript is available on the Internet. Her response to the President of United States of America is very simple and rational:

“No thank you.' We can let him know that the people of the world do not need to choose between a Malevolent Mickey Mouse and the Mad Mullahs.”

Manufacturing Consent

Nor was Nelson Mandela's speech ever broadcast on the mainstream media but was heard on Pacifica. Had the American public been allowed to see him on their televisions at prime time, they would have heard the world's most revered leader and acknowledged elder statesman stating that the world's most powerful person "*cannot think properly*", and perhaps pondered on it.

It's not the economy, it's the media stupid!

What were to happen if the television news shows, the Sunday morning and weekday talk shows, the late night comedy shows, and the public radio shows, started featuring commentaries and rebuttals from the large number of very articulate voices of dissent in this country and the world over? Do mainstream Americans even know that these popular voices of dissent exist: Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn, the past US attorney General Ramsey Clark, Asad Abu Khalil, Michel Chossudovsky, Rahul Mahajan, Tariq Ali, Greg Palast, Dennis Bernstein, Arundhati Roy, Amy Goodman, Nelson Mandela, Scott Ritter, Dennis Halliday, Michael Moore, Helen Caldicott, Robert Fisk, Daniel Ellsberg, David Harris, Congress member Barbara Lee, former Congress member Cynthia McKinney, the names of dozens of family members of 9/11 victims who openly state "*not in our name*", leaders of foreign governments, and the list is endless. What if debates are held between them and the members of the government? What would happen if direct coverage from such courageous un-inbedded journalists like May Ying Welch and Robert Fisk (both phoning in their eye witness testimony directly from Baghdad to Pacifica), or the detailed footage of civilian carnage from Abu Dhabi TV or Al-Jazeera is beamed into our homes alongside the made for TV canned coverage of the inbedded reporters showing how US soldiers eat their lunch and how the Iraqi children are welcoming them? [18]

Incidentally, it has been widely reported in the overseas press that these smiling bare footed children greeting the US soldiers at the barrel of their M16 rifles are welcoming them with "\$#@&^%" swear words in colloquial Arabic while enthusiastically shaking their hands. Even the embedded journalists have expressed their surprise privately to un-embedded journalists at why they are not being greeted with open arms, although this is not reported by them in the US mainstream media. They are surprised? Invading a country with "Shock and Awe" terror, right after they have been starved and bombed daily for 12 years, surprise would be the last feeling anyone but a complete moron would have. Just imagine, what would happen if American public saw and heard this stuff that the rest of the world is watching and listening, or heard critical debates instead of the mindless drivel. Would they still tolerate it in their good name? Are they incredibly indoctrinated or are they incredibly self-serving?

Manufacturing Consent

Since such critical debate and meaningful information is non-existent in the American mainstream media, the American public must seek out other sources of information, analyze why there is a difference between what their mainstream media and Government officials tell them and what these alternate sources tell them, and reach their own conclusions. This requires considerable time and effort, and a continuous desire to remain informed despite the immersion in the materialistic consumer culture that keeps most of us perpetually occupied pursuing our “American Dreams.” By the time we get home, there is only enough energy left to throw off our shoes and turn on the television. This is also understood by the ruling elite who incessantly bombard us with further self-reinforcing consumerism in the two hours we will watch television informing us about the newest gadgets and gee-whiz techno-babble in between mindless episodes of “Friends” and captivating new car advertisements. So who can muster such motivation to seek out alternate news sources? Only the nutty few, who can easily be dismissed as “conspiracy theorists” or “fanatics” or “leftists” or a “*focus group*”, and yes, if they become so bold as to voice their courageous dissent loudly with a potential of it being heard and believed, then even “terrorists”!

Not that these alternative sources of information are inherently more reliable or that they necessarily represent the sole truth or even any truth, but only in the differences in perspective, in the public expression of alternate viewpoints and information, and in the open public debate in the mainstream among contrarians, can a polity become informed – for being informed is the lynchpin of any progressive self-empowering human existence under any system, from dictatorships (in order to overthrow them) to democracy (in order to maintain it).

Does mainstream America want to build an empire by subjugating everyone else – with bombs and/or imposed dictatorships? ZB does not think so. I do not believe so either – or writing this book would have been rather pointless. But you can better adjudicate on this question for yourselves!

So now we clearly come to see why it is necessary for the US news media, and especially TV news to be so compliant. Images speak volumes, and in this nation of television junkies, it is the primary source of information for most everyone, with few exceptions. This is also why, it is permissible to occasionally allow critical dissenting articles in the back pages of New York Times et. al., sometimes a few even make the front page – but how many people read these newspapers in this country? So long as it is ineffectual, it has all the freedom of the press and speech! So long as not too many people are exposed to it or believe it, it is allowed to be expressed – for it also aids in the essential propaganda of the *'freedom of speech and the press'* to make the American peoples proud of the accomplishments of their democratic ideals and nationhood. This is also why so many books on current affairs that critically challenge this “war on terrorism” are allowed on the American

Manufacturing Consent

bookshelves – the reading public in America is miniscule, and especially the audience for such works that require critical thinking and reflection is almost non-existent, and roughly the size of the protest marches in American streets that Bush eloquently dismissed as a “*focus group*”. Thus all the freedom to publish books – but not to have them discussed and their authors presented on mainstream media and television!

The preceding suffices to lend credence to ZB's assertion on the role of mass media in a populist democracy in molding domestic public opinion. While ZB presented his argument as the mass media making the public war averse, we have convincingly demonstrated the converse – that mass ignorance perpetuated by the mainstream mass media has molded the US public opinion towards ignorance, and this has allowed America to wage unspeakable wars in the name of national interest against sovereign nations from WWII until today.

“War on terrorism”? Give me a break! But what do you think?

Footnotes Chapter 4

[1] See Greg Palast: *Best Democracy Money Can Buy*, 95 – 96. A must read for all Americans.

[2] See Noam Chomsky: *Western State Terrorism*, Chapter 2. Also available online.

[3] Israel Koenig: “Koenig Memorandum”. Culled from the web.

[4] David Ben-Gurion, 1948. Culled from the web.

[5] David Ben-Gurion, 1948. Culled from the web.

[6] Raphael Eitan, Chief of Staff of the IDF: “New York Times 14 April 1983”. Culled from the web.

[7] Chairman Heilbrun of the Committee for the Re-election of General Shlomo Lahat, the mayor of Tel Aviv, October 1983. Culled from the web.

[8] David Ben-Gurion – Quoted by Nahum Goldmann in *Le Paradoxe Juif (The Jewish Paradox)*, 121. Culled from the web.

[9] Moshe Dayan: *Haaretz*, April 4, 1969. Culled from the web.

Manufacturing Consent

- [10] Excerpted from the pamphlet containing Rachel's letters published by Alison Weir of *If Americans Knew*. This pamphlet was distributed at Rachel's martyrdom commemoration gathering in a small church in Berkeley California which the author attended with his young children.
- [11] Weir, Alison Pamphlet, *Rachel's Letters* published by 'If Americans Knew'
- [12] To gain a better understanding of the choice of words and the use of language in molding public opinion, please see *Collateral Language – A Users Guide to America's New War*, Edited by John Collins and Ross Glover.
- [13] See the book *Unequal Protection: The Rise of Corporate Domination and the Theft of Human Rights* by Thom Hartmann for some interesting statistics and to understand the rise of modern multinational corporations, the primal cause of injustice in American foreign policy after the end of the Cold War. Also see *After Capitalism* by Seymour Melman for an understanding of where unbridled and unfettered capitalism under the market economy of ever expanding corporate globalization without the checks and balances can take us.
- [14] See Vijay Prashad's *Fat Cats and Running Dogs – The Enron Stage Of Capitalism* for details.
- [15] See *The Iron Triangle* by Dan Briody for an eloquent exposé of the revolving door between corporate America, military, and government leaders including past US and European heads of state. The linkages drawn here might be surprising to some, but are nevertheless quite real and easily observable in the American system.
- [16] Excerpt from the transcripts of conversation between April Glaspie and Sadaam Hussain. I found this transcript on the internet, and its authenticity is unknown. However, the occurrence of this conversation and Glaspie showing the green light to Sadaam Hussain is well known. The transcript details are as follows:

Transcript of Meeting Between Iraqi President, Saddam Hussein and U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, April Glaspie, July 25, 1990 (Eight days before the August 2, 1990 Iraqi Invasion of Kuwait)

July 25, 1990 – Presidential Palace – Baghdad

U.S. Ambassador Glaspie – I have direct instructions from President Bush to improve our

Manufacturing Consent

relations with Iraq. We have considerable sympathy for your quest for higher oil prices, the immediate cause of your confrontation with Kuwait. (pause) As you know, I lived here for years and admire your extraordinary efforts to rebuild your country. We know you need funds. We understand that, and our opinion is that you should have the opportunity to rebuild your country. (pause) We can see that you have deployed massive numbers of troops in the south. Normally that would be none of our business, but when this happens in the context of your threats against Kuwait, then it would be reasonable for us to be concerned. For this reason, I have received an instruction to ask you, in the spirit of friendship – not confrontation – regarding your intentions: Why are your troops massed so very close to Kuwait's borders?

Saddam Hussein – As you know, for years now I have made every effort to reach a settlement on our dispute with Kuwait. There is to be a meeting in two days; I am prepared to give negotiations only this one more brief chance. (pause) When we (the Iraqis) meet (with the Kuwaitis) and we see there is hope, then nothing will happen. But if we are unable to find a solution, then it will be natural that Iraq will not accept death.

U.S. Ambassador Glaspie – What solutions would be acceptable?

Saddam Hussein – If we could keep the whole of the Shatt al Arab – our strategic goal in our war with Iran – we will make concessions (to the Kuwaitis). But, if we are forced to choose between keeping half of the Shatt and the whole of Iraq (i.e., in Saddam's view, including Kuwait) then we will give up all of the Shatt to defend our claims on Kuwait to keep the whole of Iraq in the shape we wish it to be. (pause) What is the United States' opinion on this?

U.S. Ambassador Glaspie – We have no opinion on your Arab – Arab conflicts, such as your dispute with Kuwait. Secretary (of State James) Baker has directed me to emphasize the instruction, first given to Iraq in the 1960's, that the Kuwait issue is not associated with America. (Saddam smiles)

On August 2, 1990, Saddam's massed troops invade and occupy Kuwait. _____

Baghdad, September 2, 1990, U.S. Embassy

One month later, British journalists obtain the above tape and transcript of the Saddam – Glaspie meeting of July 29, 1990. Astounded, they confront Ms. Glaspie as she leaves the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

Manufacturing Consent

*Journalist 1 – Are the transcripts (holding them up) correct, Madam Ambassador?
(Ambassador Glaspie does not respond)*

Journalist 2 – You knew Saddam was going to invade (Kuwait) but you didn't warn him not to. You didn't tell him America would defend Kuwait. You told him the opposite – that America was not associated with Kuwait.

Journalist 1 – You encouraged this aggression – his invasion. What were you thinking?

U.S. Ambassador Glaspie – Obviously, I didn't think, and nobody else did, that the Iraqis were going to take all of Kuwait.

Journalist 1 – You thought he was just going to take some of it? But, how could you? Saddam told you that, if negotiations failed , he would give up his Iran (Shatt al Arab waterway) goal for the Whole of Iraq, in the shape we wish it to be. You know that includes Kuwait, which the Iraqis have always viewed as an historic part of their country!

Journalist 1 – American green-lighted the invasion. At a minimum, you admit signaling Saddam that some aggression was okay – that the U.S. would not oppose a grab of the al-Rumeilah oil field, the disputed border strip and the Gulf Islands (including Bubiyan) – the territories claimed by Iraq?

(Ambassador Glaspie says nothing as a limousine door closed behind her and the car drives off.)

[17] Not being an oil expert, I have no idea to the actual validity of this “peaking theory”. The point however is that if this theory is also openly debated in the media by contrarian experts, we might know better.

[18] Also see Asad Abu Khalil's *Bin Laden, Islam and America's new war on Terrorism; Before & After – US Foreign Policy and the September 11th Crisis* by Phyllis Bennis; and *Clash of Fundamentalisms* by Tariq Ali, to help remove some of the obfuscation that the media deliberately helps perpetuate by controlling what is aired and what isn't.

These are all contrarian viewpoints and whether one agrees with them or not is besides the point – what is to the point however is why we have never heard either Asad or Tariq Ali or Phyllis Bennis on mainstream television, on Sunday morning news talk show circuits, and in

Manufacturing Consent

debate with Paul Wolfowitz and Donald Rumsfeld? All three intellectuals are incredible speakers, exceedingly eloquent, highly media literate, and very presentable on television. Depriving the mainstream American public from seeing and hearing them, and seeing and hearing a hundred others like them, is the tragedy of modern America.

Additional Resources

Danny Schechter, *Embedded: Weapons of Mass Deception : How the Media Failed to Cover the War on Iraq*, Prometheus Books, October 2003

Danny Schechter, *Weapons of Mass Deception*, media documentary 2004 – 2005,
<http://www.wmdthefilm.com> , watch online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=07VyQimMonM>

How does the US News Media end up towing the line? (Chapter 6)

America isn't a totalitarian nation, the press is indeed free to print whatever it wants. If one were to deliberately ask them to not publish something or even mention censorship, they will likely go ahead and print it out of sheer indignation, because, they all labor under the presumption of a free press. Then how is the American public the most clueless in the world? How does that work? Perennial gadfly Noam Chomsky has written a lot on this subject in his book “Manufacturing Consent”. [1]

Here however, I am going to share with the reader my own humble and much less profound experience and observations of the American news media based on empirical reality. Some interesting aspects of its manifest coverage have already been examined in earlier chapters. This chapter briefly explains its DNA imprint as I perceive it.

The elephant in the bedroom, so to speak, that all must be able to commonsensically see and yet don't, is the private profit-making ownership of almost all American news media by mega corporations. A national public service intended to keep the public informed as an essential pillar of its democracy entirely in the profit making hands of the ruling elite which also just happens to be part of the same “military-industrial complex” of the nation? How can that ever work when the interests of the ruling elite become aligned with those whom the news media is supposed to watchdog over?

Just as there is a theoretical separation of power into three independent branches of the

Manufacturing Consent

Government, the same co-option that aligns them all “United We Stand” in this fiction of “war on terrorism”, also co-opts the supposed independent public watchdogs upon the democratic process so all in the system can effectively “United We Stand”! Let's see how the latter comes about so darn efficiently.

The single most visible process that enables it, is the immense consolidation of news media from several dozen just 30-50 years ago, into five dominant corporate controlled hands who are now the giant conglomerate parents of: ABC, NBC, CBS, CNN, and FOX, along with more than 1200 local radio stations being owned by the single company: Clear Channel.

Clear Channel's holdings amount to approx. 9% of all radio stations in America, and they are also large donors to the political parties (it is not clear if only to Republicans or also to Democrats, but invariably, most corporations, like special interest groups such as AIPAC, “payoff” both sides as evidenced by public records of their donations to election campaigns and the political aspirants obsequies before the key power-brokers of high office, wherefore, the politicians subsequently serve primarily the interests of those who paid for their ticket and who will also only do so in the future elections if the illustrious democratically elected leaders of the Republic go along in the present).

During this “war on terrorism”, in response to grass-roots antiwar protests erupting all across America, Clear Channel organized pro war rallies and sent its reporters to cover these support marches as news, giving all new meaning to “manufacturing news” by the Ministry of Truth (see the movie 1984 for a reminder).

It used to be “manufacturing consent” through subtle power pyramid structures of ownership and cross pollination of corporate interests where the board of directors of the TV news corp., the printed press, and the magazines, may all have had many common members or common parent corporate ownership that disproportionately increased the influence of like minded people controlling the mass media and thus enabling the preclusion of dissent in a self censorship sort of way, as perhaps the erudite academic pundits might argue, is now evolved to the next step up to active synthesis of “news”.

The biggest beneficiaries of the pending FCC ruling to approve further news media mergers – whose chairman, Michael Powell, is the industrious son of US Secretary of State Colin Powell – will be FOX and Clear Channel. And perhaps you might have noticed that the biggest cheerleader for this “war on terrorism” is also FOX TV news, with the others not too far behind! Despite public uproar in opposition to further privatization and consolidation of public airwaves, the White House is adamant that it should pass.

Manufacturing Consent

Please reflect on why this is being pushed so hard. What happens when the news media, the essential watchdogs for the proper functioning of a “*populist democracy*”, is not only held in the cheer-leading profit-making hands of corporations that are an integral part of the “*military-industrial complex*” that Eisenhower warned us about, but also in very few corporate hands. Essentially a state run media without the need for a totalitarian system? You can judge for yourself too!

The media barons are really a key part of the same military industrial complex whose surplus power needs exuding into the rest of the world. The latter has been demonstrated in the earlier chapters in the words of the hectoring hegemons themselves. Well, the media turns out to be a part of the same infrastructure. Thus it isn't just a coincidence that the parent companies of the mainstream media giants are also defense and military equipment contractor super-giants. **It is not necessary that the chief editor or lead anchor be told what to do. He or she automatically knows what to do! Or else they would not have been in those positions!**

Dan Rather, the distinguished news anchor of CBS for over 40 years, is a living empirical proof of this statement. He openly admitted the fear of being “neck-laced”, and golden silence as “patriotism” (as asking the commonsensical questions he conscionably wished to ask in order to perform his duty as a journalist would have been “unpatriotic”). [2]

How about all those other honest reporters who put their lives on the line to cover the war, and who are not so cowardly or so easily co-opted by board rooms and million dollar salaries?

The military quite wised up to the power of battle field reporting after the Vietnam War, the images and reporting of by a few courageous journalists were a crucial galvanizer of the anti war movement that ultimately brought a halt to that ideological atrocity. Hear Daniel Ellsberg speak of the Pentagon Papers and the Nixon White House and you might also wonder, as Ellsberg did recently in an antiwar speech, whether there are similar scenes being played out in the current Bush White House as they were in the Nixon White House not too long ago? [3]

Hence now we have the Pentagon invention of directly “embedded” news media whose access to the battle field is strictly controlled by the military. This does not need any further elaboration, as the “reporter pools” and “embedded reporters” are self describing. Talk of a cozy relationship. So we don't get to see either the body bags, nor the death and destruction of the “fictitious” enemy, nor the blood of the real civilians, real peoples, real men, women, children, babies, and wedding parties. Much easier now than it was in the Vietnam war era where the sights and sounds of war had become uncontrolled through independent reporters!

Manufacturing Consent

To understand the mindset of the types of journalists who willingly become party to the “reporter pools” and become “embedded” pentagon stenographers (EPS), the testimony of a non-embedded US journalist who reported from Iraq is very telling.

May Ying Welch, an independent reporter and videographer, upon her return from Baghdad after the fighting had ended, stated the following in an interview that I heard on Pacifica: She had gone with an embedded reporter on a visit to the local hospital in Baghdad. The embedded reporter was wearing the army fatigues even though the fighting had ended for at least three days. In the hospital, he seemed the least bit interested in the visible agonies and the heart wrenching stories of the women and children in the hospital, all suffering from the “Shock and Awe” gift from the US Secretary of State. He suddenly seemed to latch onto a small baby who was born the day the American army entered Baghdad. While there, some bombs went off outside and the windows shattered, and the mother of that new baby started screaming uncontrollably.

The reporter looked startled as he had for the first time it seems, witnessed from the inside, the hell being experienced by the citizens of Iraq, and this was just the tiniest exposure as the major war had already ended. But he soon seemed to get over it, and not a word of anything he saw in that hospital made it into his article which he solely focussed on the first liberation baby of Iraq, a fluff piece for the US mainstream public consumption. Later May Ying Welch saw him riding atop an American tank in the streets of Baghdad, and when he saw her, he waved at her and shouted: “*welcome to my country*” in harmonic resonance with the inadvertent moment of truth from Tom Brokaw, the earnest news anchor at NBC when he candidly let it slip: ~“*one of the things we don't want to do is to destroy the infrastructure of Iraq, because in a few days we will own that country.*”

I will leave the analysis of this story to the intelligence of the astute reader, who having made it this far in this long essay, must surely possess a fair degree of critical thinking skills to be able to judge the value of such “journalism” to the expanding empire as their own private, eagerly willing, and obliging spokespersons!

Well, what about the independent and foreign reporters, won't they let the cat out of the bag? These guys have been a real nuisance for the military. How dare they show coverage of death and destruction, of civilian casualties, of US POWs, and hurt the sensibilities of the American audience and interfere with the war effort? Well just bomb and kill them in cold blood and make an example of them. On April 8, 2003, the Al-Jazeera and Abu Dhabi TV reporters in Baghdad were bombed by the US military, killing 3 foreign reporters and shutting off their TV coverage. The description of how it occurred is again quite telling.

Manufacturing Consent

The entire world is condemning it as a deliberate act of murder for the purpose of intimidating journalists to stop reporting the truth. But the coverage in the US is the usual denial, that the military responded in self defense as someone was shooting at them from inside, whereas all foreign eye witness accounts testify that this was not the case, and the US military very well knew who was inside the buildings because they had been given the information ahead of time.

In fact the exact GPS coordinates had been provided to the commanding US officers in triplicate by the head of Al-Jazeera for the static building location of its reporters, and the Abu Dhabi TV station had very large visibly marked signs on its walls and on its roof that we are journalists. After their experience in Kabul, they had perhaps felt that this might protect them from the American missiles. Those very same coordinates were later hit to the utmost guilt and horror of the senior staff who had provided this information to the US army. But the erstwhile guests on NPR (some say it is National Pentagon Radio while others suggest that the acronym stands for National Public radio) argued that the reporters knew that it was a war zone, and hence their death was a calculated risk that they took – not our fault. This is what the US public is seeing and hearing.

Is this an isolated incidence? Al-Jazeera TV was bombed 3 times in Kabul. Oh, the precision guided weapons aren't so precise after all? 10 land in Iran, several in Syria, and of the more than 12000 missiles and rockets and bombs dropped on Iraq, how many hit Sadaam? How many innocent people were maimed and killed, and civilian homes and infrastructure destroyed by the "Shock and Awe" bombings? And who is reporting this? Al-Jazeera of course [they will of course not report on the crimes of their own host nation that also hosts the American military base --- why?]

Similarly, of the 224000 similar munitions dropped on Afghanistan, more than 50% missed their targets. Did they even get the "Osama Bin Laden" or "Mulla Omar"? How many innocent civilians paid the price in the destruction of their nation, their homes, their children, their wedding parties, their environment polluted for billions of years from Depleted Uranium which the US has no plans to cleanup? And even if they tried, they could not clean it up, nor ever bring back the pre-1991 Iraq despite all their claims of reconstruction, which is another way for their corporate interests to make money from Iraqi oil. Who showed this devastation? Al-Jazeera did. The whole world saw it. Except the Americans!

Let's digress briefly to look for Sadaam's body, the only man who supposedly inhabited Iraq given the fury of the indiscriminate bombings in the hope that one of the precision guided bombs might get him. Where is he? There is speculation that perhaps Sadaam cut a deal with the US and was squirreled away somewhere, perhaps into Russia with the last departing Russian convoy. The US

Manufacturing Consent

National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice's visit to Moscow just days before Baghdad fell bespeaks of the Baathist mercifully having cut a secret deal with the Americans that surely prevented the massive civilian casualties that were expected by the US war planners if it got down to street fighting in Baghdad. How else would the heavily defended Baghdad collapse so suddenly without a major fight, when other cities, even the lowly Om Qasr, put up such a spirited defense?

It should not surprise anyone if many members of the old Baathist regime resurface in a new uniform to regain their effective control of the Iraqi population, this time in the service of their new masters! Impossible? The history of United States weapons program after the end of WWII is an undeniable testimony of it, where many of the Nazi scientists were gainfully re-employed in the service of the victors to continue making their killing machines. This is where their now famous remark comes from: ~*“our job is to send it up, what do we care where it comes down”!* The Japanese soldiers after the surrender of Japan in WWII were also re-employed by the victorious Allies to quell the native rebellions for independence in some Asian territories that the Japanese military had been familiar with during their rampage and plunder of that region. *“[D]eal in straight power concepts”* as George Kennan had advocated in 1948. America today is doing just that.

Bombing the journalists and disrupting their coverage is an essential part of this war effort. Another example of preventing the truth from leaking out, is when on April 14, 2003, large demonstrations broke out in Nassiriya protesting the US convening its “invitation only” conference for deciding on the future leadership of Iraq under the auspices of General J. Garner, with crowds chanting “No to Sadaam, No to US”, the US military tried to stop the TV reporters from filming the protests, as reported on Pacifica. Geez, why should they try to stop a free press? As of April 15, 2003, 13 journalists had been killed in Iraq, as reported by Amy Goodman. Or perhaps Pacifica, Al-Jazeera, and all the other foreign and independent correspondents only report lies and misrepresentations? You be the judge!

With this kind of fear and intimidation campaign through the killing of the independent and foreign reporters on the front-line, few may dare to venture. But some still do. May Ying Welch and Robert Fisk, the Indymedia, and many others from several different countries, all bearing witness to the crimes against humanity being perpetrated in our names. However, ZB's fear of mass media spilling the guts on television and encouraging democracy to take action, has indeed been mitigated to a certain extent, at least for the moment. Occasional truth may still leak out here and there, but the well trained audience with a child's attention span can take care of it with some assistance from the media spin doctors.

A case for indicting the news media for treason

It would be interesting to hear what the distinguished TV anchors and other 'star' mainstream American media and press personalities like: Dan Rather, Peter Jennings, Tom Brokaw, Ted Koppel, Jim Leherer, Barbara Walters, Charlie Rose, Tim Russert, Cokie Roberts, and many others like them would have to say about this analysis.

When trying to refute it, as they should indeed try, or else they must accept it and resign – “times up” as Michael Moore might say, would they think of their colleague and mentor I.F. Stone, who taught journalists the importance of questioning powerful governments, by always assuming they lied and having them prove they were telling the truth, rather than the reverse we see now?

Or would they think of one of their own respected colleagues from the New York Times, Chris Hedges, explain in his autobiographical musings “War is a Force that gives us Meaning”, the horrors and depravation of war that leaves everyone a ravaged victim, both soldier and civilian, that there is no clean surgical war, that war in the modern times indeed cannot be, and must not be fought, because the overwhelming majority of its victims have been, and will always be, the innocent civilians?

Or would they continue to fear being neck-laced with burning tires of lack of patriotism put around their necks and think only of their million dollar careers?

Perhaps there ought to be a reckoning day for the press and media too!

The good people of the press and television media, those who are chartered with the responsibility of keeping the citizenry informed, and to allow them to do this unhindered, they have been given the explicit protection of “freedom of the press” in the constitution, what should be their punishment when they fail to do their jobs? Their deliberate or contrived silence from monitoring the centers of power, and thus contributing to the death and destruction of millions that they could have put a stop to had they reported honestly to the public, is inexcusable – because the functioning of a populist democracy fundamentally relies on the watchful eyes of the press. Ask any constitutional or political science expert and he will agree.

Then if it can be proven in a court of law that the news media has shirked it's responsibilities – either through fear and intimidation, cowardice, greed, or simply ignorance, all being equivalent because there can be no excuse for “I did not know” when they could have known – wouldn't that prove that they have willfully subverted democracy?

Isn't that a treasonable offense for a US citizen? Perhaps the USA Patriot Act might get invoked here? Why should this be any different than John Walker Lindh's case?

One fought against his own government, the other fights against their own peoples!

Should the members of the press and news media be brought before war crimes tribunal for the crime of deliberately keeping the good public misinformed, especially in times of war, that allowed further war crimes to be perpetuated on innocent civilians? Who would preside over such a trial? Perhaps a civil or class action law suit in US federal courts against all US embedded journalists might be a good place to start, because the evidence incriminating them is readily available. The defendants would have to prove that they were following orders, as otherwise they would surely hang by default as the evidence against them speaks volumes.

And thus we can see how their superiors could be roped in as those who issued the orders, until we reach the Pentagon, and the White House. Did Al Capone pay for his murders or for his tax evasions? In either case, he sat his life out in jail!

Where are the strategists for peace and justice? It is indeed a grand chessboard similar to ZB's, only the prizes are different. Both require looking ahead many moves, and employing both strategies and tactics to gain control of the ever evolving and changing Chessboard.

But you be the judge! Being a judge however does entail passing judgment you know – sooner or later.

Sigh! Whence the day of reckoning? When people wake up and charge the gates of Bastille!

So now we arrive at the next stage in this analysis – wake up strategies. How to empower the sleeping public and have the proverbial pawns finally gain control of the entire Chessboard?

Footnotes Chapter 6

[1] See Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, co-authored with Ed Herman.

[2] See pages 95-96 of *Best Democracy Money can Buy* by Greg Palast.

[3] See Daniel Ellsberg's autobiographical account of those war years in his new book *Secrets – A*

Memoir Of Vietnam And The Pentagon Papers. I had the privilege of meeting this courageous gadfly and talking to him about the “war on terror”. He graciously signed my first edition copy of his book and dedicated it to my kids upon my request! He unfortunately never got the time to review an earlier manuscript of this humble book that I gave him in exchange. See [Chapter 8](#) for more on our interaction.

Why reforming the press isn't feasible when primacy rules the roost

The question of [reform](#) continually arises among the antagonists of the Mighty Wurlitzer, [the idealists](#), and the [“malcontents”](#). They would rather pretend that some rational “reform” can do away with the Mighty Wurlitzer altogether. The following response to the question raised by Robert Jensen, Professor of Journalism, [“Can journalism schools be relevant in a world on the brink?”](#), September 15, 2009, injects a doze of reality-check: [“Re-titling can perhaps make the problem-space more apparent: Can journalism schools be relevant in a New World Order of one-world government?”](#). Edward Bernays brilliant successes at mass behavior manipulation has conclusively shown that masses are typically not motivated into action, moral or any other, by information alone. Rather, primarily by appeal to their irrational sub-conscious mind, to their fears, to their suppressed desires. And, that they remain quite susceptible to hidden emotional manipulation. Therefore, journalism's utility to statecraft to control the masses cannot be overturned, nor reformed, in any existing structure of governance that relies on war and deception to rule. Journalism today is more a diabolical tool of statecraft than of any benefit to the people. It appears to this cynic that in order to even begin to play its theoretically assigned role in a theoretical constitutional republic, unless the much wanted fourth pillar of democracy – the watchdog upon the corridors of power – adopts similar psychological tactics of the oligarchs to manipulate core human instincts for mobilizing the masses for the “democratic check” that is much theorized in Western democracy, journalism is destined to largely remain a steganographic tool of signaling and communication among the elite themselves! To substantiate this egregious point, please see table 3 titled “APPROXIMATE USE OF MEDIA” in Zbigniew Brzezinski's seminal book “Between Two Ages - America's Role in the Technetronic Era”, page 14 ([book PDF](#)). The readership data for the printed press like the NYT, while quantitatively dated, is qualitatively even more attuned to the hypnotic reality of television mass media today whereby, while useful advance information can sometimes be gleaned in the inside pages of the elite's own printed press – provided one has learnt how to parse the elite's language – it is rarely if ever present on mass television.

A challenge to the aspiring reformers of the Journalism Profession

To what extent do some or many of the following points reflect the state of the press today? In reading the following excerpt from the well known [100 year old document](#) [1] – deemed to be a forgery by many, and blueprint for world conquest by many more – and assuming it merely be an anonymous work of profound literature, of entertaining fiction, or a frightening discourse in political science, its diabolical prescience to reflect what has come to pass in the worldwide press today is incredibly shocking. As in Machiavelli's *The Prince*, the diabolical mechanisms proposed therein to manufacture and control public opinion to serve the interests of a despotic oligarchy bears close study.

The very word “freedom” has been circumscribed in this despotic system from what is deemed “unalienable”, to what is ordained “legal”. And it becomes pertinent to ask the question: Is that state of affairs reflected in the tortuous reality of today? As the text asserts: *“all freedom will thus be in our hands, since the laws will abolish or create only that which is desirable for us according to the aforesaid program.”*

Has that happened in the United States? In whose hands is this freedom? How did that mechanism come to pass in America? In Europe? Without perceptively understanding how this hijacking was orchestrated in the West which itself originated the press, no reform is tenable because the same forces which orchestrated it will continue to sustain it and will subvert all reform including that which sends them to the gallows.

Anyone can benefit from any prose, literature and political science with due diligence, including from studying the Mighty Wurlitzer – whose abominable existence is as empirical as the origin of this nefarious document is mysterious – and from the Chinese Sun Tzu's [The Art of War](#), [1c], and the US Military's [From PSYOP to MindWar](#). [1d]

Therefore, in order to institute any meaningful reforms as wished by [Robert Jensen et. al.](#), [2] how do the journalism savants propose to counter this hijacking of the press by the Mighty Wurlitzer – even under the (highly questionable) premise that an informed polity can be a useful obstruction to despotism – such that giving the press the constitutional protection of “freedom” remains in practice something more than highly polished public relations for social control by any ‘ubermensch’ oligarchs, as for instance outlined in the Machiavellian text below.

It further bears to keep in mind that this highjacking of the press is not in isolation, but situated in a

Manufacturing Consent

larger context that includes the oligarchy acquiring full monopolistic control in society of all that is meaningful, from money to economics to industry to education to entertainment, including acquiring full control over the glorified “[errand boys](#)” [3] who are dutifully elected by the polity only to represent the front faces of the behind-the-scene oligarchy. How are any reforms, be they for the press, or for the monetary system, to be instituted under such an unvarnished reality?

1. The word "freedom," which can be interpreted in various ways, is defined by us as follows -

2. Freedom is the right to do what which the law allows. This interpretation of the word will at the proper time be of service to us, because all freedom will thus be in our hands, since the laws will abolish or create only that which is desirable for us according to the aforesaid program.

3. We shall deal with the press in the following way: what is the part played by the press to-day? It serves to excite and inflame those passions which are needed for our purpose or else it serves selfish ends of parties. It is often vapid, unjust, mendacious, and the majority of the public have not the slightest idea what ends the press really serves. We shall saddle and bridle it with a tight curb: we shall do the same also with all productions of the printing press, for where would be the sense of getting rid of the attacks of the press if we remain targets for pamphlets and books? The produce of publicity, which nowadays is a source of heavy expense owing to the necessity of censoring it, will be turned by us into a very lucrative source of income to our State: we shall law on it a special stamp tax and require deposits of caution-money before permitting the establishment of any organ of the press or of printing offices; these will then have to guarantee our government against any kind of attack on the part of the press. For any attempt to attack us, if such still be possible, we shall inflict fines without mercy. Such measures as stamp tax, deposit of caution-money and fines secured by these deposits, will bring in a huge income to the government. It is true that party organs might not spare money for the sake of publicity, but these we shall shut up at the second attack upon us. No one shall with impunity lay a finger on the aureole of our government infallibility. The pretext for stopping any publication will be the alleged plea that it is agitating the public mind without occasion or justification. I BEG YOU TO NOTE THAT AMONG THOSE MAKING ATTACKS UPON US WILL ALSO BE ORGANS ESTABLISHED BY US,

BUT THEY WILL ATTACK EXCLUSIVELY POINTS THAT WE HAVE PRE-DETERMINED TO ALTER.

WE CONTROL THE PRESS

4. NOT A SINGLE ANNOUNCEMENT WILL REACH THE PUBLIC WITHOUT OUR CONTROL. Even now this is already being attained by us inasmuch as all news items are received by a few agencies, in whose offices they are focused from all parts of the world. These agencies will then be already entirely ours and will give publicity only to what we dictate to them.

5. If already now we have contrived to possess ourselves of the minds of the [untermensch] communities to such an extent the they all come near looking upon the events of the world through the colored glasses of those spectacles we are setting astride their noses; if already now there is not a single State where there exist for us any barriers to admittance into what [untermensch] stupidity calls State secrets: what will our positions be then, when we shall be acknowledged supreme lords of the world in the person of our king of all the world

6. Let us turn again to the FUTURE OF THE PRINTING PRESS. Every one desirous of being a publisher, librarian, or printer, will be obliged to provide himself with the diploma instituted therefore, which, in case of any fault, will be immediately impounded. With such measures THE INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT WILL BECOME AN EDUCATIVE MEANS ON THE HANDS OF OUR GOVERNMENT, WHICH WILL NO LONGER ALLOW THE MASS OF THE NATION TO BE LED ASTRAY IN BY-WAYS AND FANTASIES ABOUT THE BLESSINGS OF PROGRESS. Is there any one of us who does not know that these phantom blessings are the direct roads to foolish imaginings which give birth to anarchical relations of men among themselves and towards authority, because progress, or rather the idea of progress, has introduced the conception of every kind of emancipation, but has failed to establish its limits All the so-called liberals are anarchists, if not in fact, at any rate in thought. Every one of them in hunting after phantoms of freedom, and falling exclusively into license, that is, into the anarchy of protest for the sake of protest

FREE PRESS DESTROYED

7. We turn to the periodical press. We shall impose on it, as on all printed matter, stamp taxes per sheet and deposits of caution- money, and books of less than 30 sheets will pay double. We shall reckon them as pamphlets in order, on the one hand, to reduce the number of magazines, which are the worst form of printed poison, and, on the other, in order that this measure may force writers into such lengthy productions that they will be little read, especially as they will be costly. At the same time what we shall publish ourselves to influence mental development in the direction laid down for our profit will be cheap and will be read voraciously. The tax will bring vapid literary ambitions within bounds and the liability to penalties will make literary men dependent upon us. And if there should be any found who are desirous of writing against us, they will not find any person eager to print their productions in print the publisher or printer will have to apply to the authorities for permission to do so. Thus we shall know beforehand of all tricks preparing against us and shall nullify them by getting ahead with explanations on the subject treated of.

8. Literature and journalism are two of the most important educative forces, and therefore our government will become proprietor of the majority of the journals. This will neutralize the injurious influence of the privately-owned press and will put us in possession of a tremendous influence upon the public mind If we give permits for ten journals, we shall ourselves found thirty, and so on in the same proportion. This, however, must in no wise be suspected by the public. For which reason all journals published by us will be of the most opposite, in appearance, tendencies and opinions, thereby creating confidence in us and bringing over to us quite unsuspecting opponents, who will thus fall into our trap and be rendered harmless.

9. In the front rank will stand organs of an official character. They will always stand guard over our interests, and therefore their influence will be comparatively insignificant.

10. In the second rank will be the semi-official organs, whose part it will be to attack the tepid and indifferent.

11. In the third rank we shall set up our own, to all appearance, off position, which, in at least one of its organs, will present what looks like the very antipodes to us. Our real opponents at heart will accept this simulated opposition as their own and

will show us their cards.

12. All our newspapers will be of all possible complexions - aristocratic, republican, revolutionary, even anarchical - for so long, of course, as the constitution exists Like the Indian idol "Vishnu" they will have a hundred hands, and every one of them will have a finger on any one of the public opinions as required. When a pulse quickens these hands will lead opinion in the direction of our aims, for an excited patient loses all power of judgment and easily yields to suggestion. Those fools who will think they are repeating the opinion of a newspaper of their own camp will be repeating our opinion or any opinion that seems desirable for us. In the vain belief that they are following the organ of their party they will, in fact, follow the flag which we hang out for them.

13. In order to direct our newspaper militia in this sense we must take special and minute care in organizing this matter. Under the title of central department of the press we shall institute literary gatherings at which our agents will without attracting attention issue the orders and watchwords of the day. By discussing and controverting, but always superficially, without touching the essence of the matter, our organs will carry on a sham fight fusillade with the official newspapers solely for the purpose of giving occasion for us to express ourselves more fully than could well be done from the outset in official announcements, whenever, of course, that is to our advantage.

14. THESE ATTACKS UPON US WILL ALSO SERVE ANOTHER PURPOSE, NAMELY, THAT OUR SUBJECTS WILL BE CONVINCED TO THE EXISTENCE OF FULL FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND SO GIVE OUR AGENTS AN OCCASION TO AFFIRM THAT ALL ORGANS WHICH OPPOSE US ARE EMPTY BABBLERS, since they are incapable of finding any substantial objections to our orders.

ONLY LIES PRINTED

15. Methods of organization like these, imperceptible to the public eye but absolutely sure, are the best calculated to succeed in bringing the attention and the confidence of the public to the side of our government. Thanks to such methods we shall be in a position as from time to time may be required, to excite or to tranquilize the public mind on political questions, to persuade or to confuse, printing now truth,

now lies, facts or their contradictions, according as they may be well or ill received, always very cautiously feeling our ground before stepping upon it WE SHALL HAVE A SURE TRIUMPH OVER OUR OPPONENTS SINCE THEY WILL NOT HAVE AT THEIR DISPOSITION ORGANS OF THE PRESS IN WHICH THEY CAN GIVE FULL AND FINAL EXPRESSION TO THEIR VIEWS owing to the aforesaid methods of dealing with the press. We shall not even need to refute them except very superficially.

16. Trial shots like these, fired by us in the third rank of our press, in case of need, will be energetically refuted by us in our semi-official organs.

17. Even nowadays, already, to take only the French press, there are forms which reveal masonic solidarity in acting on the watchword: all organs of the press are bound together by professional secrecy; like the augurs of old, not one of their numbers will give away the secret of his sources of information unless it be resolved to make announcement of them. Not one journalist will venture to betray this secret, for not one of them is ever admitted to practice literature unless his whole past has some disgraceful sore or other These sores would be immediately revealed. So long as they remain the secret of a few the prestige of the journalist attacks the majority of the country - the mob follow after him with enthusiasm.

18. Our calculations are especially extended to the provinces. It is indispensable for us to inflame there those hopes and impulses with which we could at any moment fall upon the capital, and we shall represent to the capitals that these expressions are the independent hopes and impulses of the provinces. Naturally, the source of them will be always one and the same - ours. WHAT WE NEED IS THAT, UNTIL SUCH TIME AS WE ARE IN THE PLENITUDE POWER, THE CAPITALS SHOULD FIND THEMSELVES STIFLED BY THE PROVINCIAL OPINION OF THE NATIONS, I.E., OF A MAJORITY ARRANGED BY OUR AGENTUR. What we need is that at the psychological moment the capitals should not be in a position to discuss an accomplished fact for the simple reason, if for no other, that it has been accepted by the public opinion of a majority in the provinces.

19. WHEN WE ARE IN THE PERIOD OF THE NEW REGIME TRANSITIONAL TO THAT OF OUR ASSUMPTION OF FULL SOVEREIGNTY WE MUST NOT ADMIT ANY REVELATION BY THE PRESS OF ANY FORM OF PUBLIC DISHONESTY; IT

IS NECESSARY THAT THE NEW REGIME SHOULD BE THOUGHT TO HAVE SO PERFECTLY CONTENTED EVERYBODY THAT EVEN CRIMINALITY HAS DISAPPEARED ... Cases of the manifestation of criminality should remain known only to their victims and to chance witnesses - no more.

Footnotes

[1] Anonymous, nineteenth century political treatise on the diabolical methods of subversion for any small cabal to takeover the world, *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/cacheof-three-political-dialogs-to-screw-your-enemy-via-gutenberg-and-aztlan.pdf>

[1c] Sun Tzu, *The Art of War*, <http://classics.mit.edu/Tzu/artwar.html>

[1d] Valley and Aquino, US Military Document, 1980, *From PSYOP to MindWar: The Psychology of Victory*, <https://web.archive.org/web/20091122111046/http://www.xeper.org/maquino/nm/MindWar.pdf>

[2] Robert Jensen, September 15, 2009, "Can journalism schools be relevant in a world on the brink?" <https://web.archive.org/web/20150908021704/http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/11522-can-journalism-schools-be-relevant-in-a-world-on-the-brink.html> ; <https://web.archive.org/web/20191021125950/http://www.commondreams.org/views/2009/09/14/can-journalism-schools-be-relevant-world-brink>

[2a] Zahir Ebrahim, September 15, 2009, *Letter Response to Robert Jensen: Re-titling can perhaps make the problem-space more apparent: Can journalism schools be relevant in a New World Order of one-world government?*, <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/zahirs-response-to-robert-jensen-on-the-question-of-journalism-reform---Can-journalism-schools-be-relevant-in-a-world-on-the-brink-sept-15-2009.pdf>

[2b] Zahir Ebrahim, February 5, 2010, *Letter Response to Richard Keeble 'How Alternative Media Provide The Crucial Critique Of The Mainstream - Richard Keeble Responds To Tim Luckhurst'*, <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/zahirs-response-to-how-alternative-media-provide-the-crucial-critique-of-the-mainstream-richard-keeble-responds-to-tim-luckhurst-february-05-2010-and-article.pdf>

Manufacturing Consent

[2c] Zahir Ebrahim, December 06, 2009, *Letter to the Center for Journalism At the University of Kent 'Where journalists have greatness thrust upon them'*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/12/journalists-greatness-thrust-uponthem.html>

[3] Zahir Ebrahim, *Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/not-voting-is-yes-vote-to-reject-system.html>

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Epilogue

Swallowing The Red Pill

How deep is the rabbit hole?

Since you are reading this book and have reached this epilogue, you have obviously decided to take the “Red Pill”. So let's swallow it to dive deeper into the rabbit hole and see how primacy engages with political philosophy and the making of the public mind without a crisp understanding of which, one can never fully comprehend the apparent madness of this predatory war-mongering World Order that continually transitions from crisis to crisis. Just as Alice could not comprehend her trip down the rabbit hole that transitioned from absurdity to absurdity in her Adventures in Wonderland. This rapidly transitioning World Order is anything but mad --- unless primacy itself is considered mad. It should not be when dealing with its practitioners. Primacy is the natural instinct for unbridled dominance in higher primates. It, arguably, underwrites some evolution of the same species on the natural time scale termed “survival of the fittest” through “natural selection” – the nineteenth century cause célèbre of Darwinianists.

But today's social Darwinianists – the neo-Darwinian cerebral-evolutionists, the Nietzschean Übermensch exercising their “will to power”, who apply “natural selection” through “survival of the fittest” for social evolution to higher more 'intelligent life-form' from the 'useless eaters' – wish to accelerate that natural process unnaturally. Through their unbridled quest for full spectrum dominance over all things, all life, all thoughts, and all control systems. In this technological era, a scientific elite is forcing development to post-human civilization that integrates with Artificial Intelligence. And in this era of Global Governance by the oligarchic financial elite, inter alia, the Chairman of the World Economic Forum, and the founders of United Nations Agenda 21 and United Nations Agenda 2030, are forcing social development to post industrial societies which, they present

to the world public, are in greater harmony with Gaia. That quest for global primacy by the elite and their Machiavellian social engineering pose a real danger to normal peoples and to their civilizations.

That predatory instinct for dominance should be treated as **the most** formidable enemy of mankind and its expression a ruthless virus. Unfortunately, the instinct for primacy has instead been made noble, its expression labeled “foreign policy”, its victims “useless eaters”, its unbridled pursuit “sagaciousness”, its scholars “intellectuals”, its strategists “think-tanks”, its authors “national security advisors”, its stooges “terrorists”, its justification just one short sentence: “Hegemony is as old as mankind.”, and its ultimate prize: one-world government. Who dare stand up to all that “nobility”?

A majority of rational people among the public who are smart enough to recognize this “nobility”, just slink away from confrontation thinking to themselves that that's how all empires work. All empires throughout history have been driven by their so called “divine destiny”; have harbored no concept of morality except for controlling its public; and pursued their own best imperial interests which have only been checked by other empires doing the same. And they have all disappeared on the sands of time. This present empire is going to be no different, even if it flies the indomitable *Stars and Stripes of Pax Americana* today. How long will it last? So why bother with who's behind it? Instead, let's just go back to basics of what it means to be human and the purpose of life: to seek the promised Heaven beyond (if religious) and self-actualization (if secular). Either way, it is far more productive than standing up to the predators of earth who have always existed, and always shall exist, and also far more rewarding if you go along with their agenda or don't oppose them. All you have to do is to make sure you aren't among the “useless eater” category and you are all set. Only fools with nothing to lose wage revolutions. And where has that got us? We are caught up in even more global tyranny today. So they reason, rather effectively too.

This is the pragmatic crowd of sophisticated survivors who well-understand primacy of the uber privileged class and wish to live for their own narrower self-interests without too much selling of their soul. They easily rationalize away their hearing no evil, speaking no evil, and seeing no evil. These are not ignorant or lazy peoples, but are just too poor in time and inclination to dig any deeper than just that general homey understanding. More often, the few pragmatists who understand the system are themselves so dependent on it feeding them that they have no choice but to be a part of it and to defend its very existence. So thanks for choosing the “red pill” --- if you don't know what that is, watch the Hollywood fable “Matrix” where the character *Morpheus* offers to take the character *Neo* down the rabbit hole of reality if he took the “Red Pill”, and to let him stay in his dream world believing whatever he wanted if he took the “Blue Pill”.

As the effect of the “Red Pill” kicks in, which it evidently is since you are still reading this, let's dive straight into the rabbit hole to see how deep it really goes and why escaping from it has become so difficult. However, as the *Oracle* reminds the character *Neo* in the aforementioned fable: **“you have to make up your own damn mind!”**

When the absolute rule of gods on earth was challenged by plebeian norms, whereby individual rights and personal freedoms were equated by the Renaissance philosophers with inalienable rights; whereby the West, only just emerging from its Dark Ages, started to harken back to the democratic ideals developed by the Greeks at the zenith of the Hellenic Civilization of empowering the “demos”; and even young thinkers in the Middle Ages boldly started proposing end to tyranny of the gods on earth (for example, Etienne de La Boétie, in his 1523 *The Politics of Obedience: The Discourse of Voluntary Servitude*); Machiavelli was introduced to the Prince to enable exercising the same prerogatives as absolute kings but under public illusions of “freedom”.

Political theories from Plato to Hegel illustrate how the state can easily take over the public mind to govern it with an iron fist with even a measure of their own consent, if the reins of suzerainty are held in the hands of *Übermensch*. As Goethe, the German philosopher, had trenchantly observed: “None are so hopelessly enslaved, as those who falsely believe they are free. The truth has been kept from the depth of their minds by masters who rule them with lies. They feed them on falsehoods till wrong looks like right in their eyes.” Which is why Plato advocated the “philosopher-king” for governing a republic in the best public interests, with the highest moral standards of truth, striving to reach closest to divine truth, rather than governing in narrow self-interests. Nietzsche trumped Plato by killing God, advocating man become his own god with his *will to power*. Nietzsche's one tiny change to Plato's “philosopher-king” has made all the difference to political theories of primacy. It has lent primacy respectability!

Arguably, Nietzsche is effectively Plato except for that one tiny change to “philosopher-king” rule being closest to divine rule. The *Übermensch*, *superman*, replacing God now defines “truth” itself, and thus its rule is itself “divine”! Reading Plato with that mental substitution of “philosopher-king” being the *superman* leads to the empiricism of today. Plato had warned of it in his *Simile of the Cave* where the controllers outside the cave subjecting the cave dwellers to *total perception management* are indeed *Nietzschean superman*. The controllers outside the cave are beyond the rules and synthetic reality they present to the people in the cave, beyond good and evil that they define for their subjects. Reading Nietzsche with Plato in the backdrop explains a great deal of modernity. It would not be inaccurate to aver that our dystopic modernity is underwritten by the philosophical product of Plato and Nietzsche merged together.

Swallowing The Red Pill

The role of state in *The Republic* was picked up by Hegel with the tiny modification that the state is not defined to serve the people in their own best interest (the platitudinous by the people, for the people, of the people, sold to gullible public), but the people are obligated to serve the state in its best interest. The state is supreme, over the rights of man, and run by *superman*. This is termed statism. Its continuous growth and expansion with the *superman* in the driving seat is only natural, and its culmination is automatically world superstate. But at times: (1) illusions of “demos” self-empowerment have to be maintained (“democracy” is usually a good bet); and (2) conflicts and revolutionary times fashioned and manufactured to destroy existing world order in order to raise a new world order from the ashes left behind in the age-old spirit of raising the Phoenix from its ashes (“Hegelian Dialectic”).

The *superman* often says with his lips exactly opposite to what he does with his hands without any moral compunction. I did not make that up. Here is Arnold J. Toynbee, Director, Royal Institute of International Affairs, (Chatham House) London, in 1931:

“We are at present working discreetly with all our might to wrest this mysterious force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local nation states of the world. **All the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands**, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local nation states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or publicist can perhaps not quite be burned at the stake but certainly be ostracized or discredited.” -- Arnold J. Toynbee, *The Trend of International Affairs Since the War*, International Affairs, Nov. 1931, pg. 809

The alert of mind would immediately ask: (1) what is the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London? And (2) why are they speaking of wrestling away sovereignty in 1931 just as they have dismembered the Ottoman empire into small nation-states after the first World War, and are about to dismember the Indian sub-continent and Palestine in the same way after the next World War?

Well, the RIIA in London is the twin sister of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, both offspring of the defunct Round Table which played a crucial role in international geopolitics. in orchestrating war and peace, in the early part of the twentieth century as the privately funded oligarchic arm of Britannia, just like the East India Company was before it. The Round Table was replaced by its cross-Atlantic twins after the first World War to better coordinate the oligarchy's manipulation of world affairs. And do you know what the Round Table was, if you even heard of it?

Founded with Cecil Rhodes immense largesse to bring the wayward child across the Atlantic that had broken away so impetuously, the United States of America, back into the fold of the British

empire; and to orchestrate world affairs for perpetual rule by the white Anglo Saxon race with the invisible oligarchy at the top of the rule chain. Once again, the financial oligarchy behind the scenes, the unaccountable *superman*, managing world affairs from behind the shadows of their political front-men who are groomed into positions of legislative power to do their private bidding by enacting public legalisms in their favor. That's what the Rhodes scholarship is all about for instance, to select and groom the worthy craftsmen of empire.

As for why speak of extracting sovereignty from nation-states on the one hand while these are being carved into existence from defeated empires and former slave-colonies of the British empire, one has to get deeply into the philosophy of conflict as a means of transformation, and the break-before-remake cycles to incrementally create the ultimate world order in which all nations have lost their sovereignty! Yes, one-world government, and that statement, as a reminder, is circa 1931, well before World War II, the Cold War labeled World War III, and this lifetime of Global War on Terror today which is labeled World War IV.

That should also answer the next question to pop into the alert mind: who is it that the famous British historian Arnold J. Toynbee is referring to as the director of RIIA? Who do they represent who “are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands”? The oligarchy that finances the organization through its tax-exempt foundations and private trusts. An alert mind may also wonder how they can lie like that and openly admit to it so unabashedly in specialized publications like International Affairs (and Foreign Affairs, its New York twin)? Because, these are typically only read by the elites involved in the game of international primacy who are more used to the higher order thinking of the higher order primates than the ordinary common man suffering his morals. But the agenda is not a closely held secret, it's all in the open. Yet the public mind is fed on the fodder of nationalism and patriotism in battle fields across the world while global governance is orchestrated behind the scenes by the oligarchic instruments quite openly.

The rich bibliography on this subject goes back to several hundred years, to the natural philosophers, but I am only aware of the actual evidence of conspiracy being unearthed going back to Adam Weishaupt of Bavaria in 1775, at the very founding epoch of the United States of America, and it shows a remarkable continuity of agenda, motivation, and secret cabals across generations and continents, all sharing in one common goal: global primacy of the *superman*. The empiricism du jour of the unrelenting drive towards global governance under the pretexts of managing crises and conflicts, speaks factually to that long running sport of the gods:

“We are living through exceptionally difficult times. Financial crisis and its dramatic

impact on employment and budgets, the climate crisis which threatens our very survival --- a period of anxiety, uncertainty, and lack of confidence. Yet these problems can be overcome, by a joint effort, in and between our countries. **2009 is also the first year of Global Governance with the establishment of the G-20 in the middle of financial crisis. The climate conference in Copenhagen is another step towards the Global Management of our Planet.** Our mission, our presidency is one of hope, supported by acts, and by deeds.” -- Herman Van Rompuy, EU Council President, press conference Nov. 19, 2009


And why not, as the *superman* argues? As god, the *superman* is at liberty to define the social values, laws, rules, morality, news for others, but not be bound by these himself – for he is no longer beholden to, or bound by, the ordinary moral standards of good and evil. He is beyond all that humdrum normalcy introduced by religions which interferes with evolution to create a higher order being and higher order society based on man's reason. He is above all others who subscribe to any divine prescription since he knows that God is dead. He, as god himself, can define morality for others, termed *Secular Humanism*, but not be bound by it himself as the age-old privilege of gods and supergods. We see that moral relativism in the statement of the United States Supreme Court justice quoted earlier. This is poignantly caricatured in the Greek myths of the pantheon of gods who treated man as sport, to be played with, often for their own rivalries. Doesn't that have an uncanny resemblance to the gods of modernity, secular and religious, on the throne and the pulpit, elected and inherited, who demand obedience from man, create wars, pestilence, pandemics, financial boom and bust cycles, predictable financial collapses, as sport at the expense of the bewildered public who easily comply with their life and labor under illusions which have been carefully fed to them? Instead of rivalry among themselves, the gods today appear to be rather cooperative among each other in playing their game of primacy for the whole earth as the prize.

An episode of this sport of gods was even witnessed on live television in the United States in 2008, when the instruments of the oligarchy compelled the superpower Congress to bailout the financial institutions with trillions of dollars in public debt despite wide spread public resistance to giving such subsidy to the financial oligarchy at the public's expense. Few comprehended the game at that time for none of the financial experts and most read financial rags analyzed the real diabolical purpose for which the bailout was given legally by the United States legislature – to create such unpayable national debt, secured of course with public taxation, that the superpower and its public would forever remain in the clutches of oligarchic control, to be played at will. There is a diabolical Talmudic theory of interest on unpayable debt, forbidden in all religions except in predatory theology, that underlies the empirical control over state and political succession seen time and again throughout

history until today:

“Give me control of a nations money supply and I care not who makes it laws.”

The United States Congress and President participated in that sporting subversion of their own nation contrary to public interest – and it would not have mattered who were occupying those positions. Every set has, since the founding of the Federal Reserve System in 1913, and will in the foreseeable future, comply with the will of the oligarchy. That oligarchy today proudly extols the virtues of national debt on the Treasury website as the price of liberty:



Caption “The United States debt, foreign and domestic, was the price of liberty.”

What can the hens do when all positions to guard the hen house are always held by foxes who legislate for the *superman*? No one can rise to those positions of political power except wolves and foxes beholden to the *superman*. The financial bailout by the venerable American Congress is veritable proof of that empirical statement. Even the blind academic experts should be able to see it. But evidently don't. And for good reason. Here is W. Cleon Skousen, a former FBI agent, commenting on Carroll Quigley's revelations in *Tragedy and Hope* of the financial oligarchy orchestrating world government, and explaining how so few can so easily purchase the silence and cooperation of so many:

“The real value of Tragedy and Hope ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr. Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. **Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were “in on the take” and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes.** As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on a world-wide basis.” -- W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, 1970, pg. 6

Like Plato had argued for his “philosopher-king” being the natural shepherd of the public 2500 years ago because of his virtue of being closer to truth, Nietzsche too argued in the 19th century that this modern *superman* knows best due to his higher intelligence and reliance on reason rather than superstition; except that the *superman* knows best in his own self-interest rather than necessarily public interest now that there is no God and no absolute code of moral conduct. And that is just natural selection at work. The *superman* is more intelligent, more self-empowering, more adept, than ordinary man. Therefore, he is naturally privileged to become the shepherd. Or, as some argue, the wolf, in sheep clothing. It is admitted openly by the wolves themselves: “*some are sheep while others are wolves, we are the wolves*”.

Here is one of the wolves at work constructing our “contemporary history” before our very eyes by putting all the preceding political theory of primacy to good use and expecting only rejoicing by future generations for what is ultimately to be raised from the ashes of “*total war*” – and hopefully you now understand what it is that the wolf claims “*our children will sing great songs about us years from now*”:

“No stages. This is total war. We are fighting a variety of enemies. There are lots of them out there. All this talk about first we are going to do Afghanistan, then we will do Iraq... this is entirely the wrong way to go about it. If we just let our vision of the world go forth, and we embrace it entirely and we don’t try to piece together clever diplomacy, **but just wage a total war... our children will sing great songs about us years from now.**” -- Michael Ledeen, speaking at the AEI (American Enterprise Institute), 10/29/2001, via historycommons.org

Swallowing The Red Pill

For the *superman*, ends justify the means. The calculus of primacy permits no moral considerations to interfere, which are left mainly as a lip-service for those too squeamish or feeble-minded to accept higher order thinking of achieving objectives in the military-style. The ends are therefore beyond the calculus of morality, beyond good and evil, and determined solely by *will to power*. Therefore, any means can be adopted to reach those objectives – because, by definition, the ends are now “noble” since these are defined as such by the new god, the *Übermensch*, using his superior intelligence and reason. Lies, deception, deceit, in that path is merely “noble lies”. Any mayhem is “noble mayhem”. The invasion of Iraq was based on such “noble lies”, for instance, and even admitted and dismissed by empire as merely an “oops – intelligence failure”! All of 9/11 narrative and concomitant acts of barbarism by empire is based solely on this “noble” ideology of the *superman*. It affords those flushed with the hubris of unassailable power the license for primacy as “legitimate” social Darwinianism. As they say, only the king can wear the crown, legally. And the king made that law himself.

Ask yourself: does a shepherd ever worry about slaughtering sheep if he has to supply mutton to his customers or for his own feast? The sheep is just a herd, a resource to be managed, bred, controlled, and harvested. And, for that matter, as the aristocratic British philosopher of the oligarchy, Bertrand Russell stylishly observed of the public mind that is reduced to serfdom: it is as likely to revolt against its chains as the sheep revolt against the habit of mutton eating!

Indeed, virtually all of modernity is run by *supermen* who have killed off God and rule for their own primacy objectives that are now global, by employing diabolical recipes laid out by political philosophers dating as far back as Plato, to Machiavelli, Nietzsche, Hegel, Leo Strauss et. al. These techniques span the full gamut of creating opportunities and situations in the form of crises, catastrophes, war; all harbingers of controlled chaos also called “revolutionary times”. Only during these revolutionary times what is inconceivable in normal times is made realizable. The control of the public mind is key to the successful harvesting of these opportunities for major social transformation. If the *superman* fails to capitalize on these rare moments, a whole world is lost. I did not just make that up. Here is David Ben-Gurion:

“What is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times; and if at this time the opportunity is missed and what is possible at such great hours is not carried out – a whole world is lost.”

There is more empirical reality captured in that short description of political theory of modern primacy than in the venerable platitudes of the Holy Bible and the Holy Quran combined --- that's tabulating

the belief system of close to three quarters of the earth's population. For it explains virtually all of modernity which no Heavenly Book can. The divine theological prescriptions of virtue of every religion which seemingly occupy so much of man's time to escape from reality, do not claim to be political treatise on techniques of primacy. But rather, as for instance, the Holy Qur'an claims itself to be moral guidance for the virtuous, the Bible is claimed to be moral guidance for sinners, etc. You cannot really comprehend how the mind of modern infamy works by studying virtue. Those seeking to understand the twisted times they live in by studying holy books and in holy sermons, which evidently are many if full occupancy of mosques, churches and temples of every sort throughout the world in this resurgence of spirituality in the age of nihilism is any indication of how people are using their free time, may be better off studying political philosophers instead. Beginning with Plato's *Simile of the Cave* in *The Republic*, one would immediately realize that religion in the hand of *superman* is just another tool of primacy. Mosque occupancy since 9/11 for instance has increased many fold --- and what do they rehearse there? The 'good Muslim' vs. 'bad Muslim', 'moderate Islam' vs. 'militant Islam' Hegelian Dialectic (!) without a clue as to how that controlled narrative being broadcast from the pulpit is in fact the imperial narrative manipulating their mind. And consequently, controlling their behavior in getting the Muslim public alongside the world public "United We Stand" with empire's barbarianism.

Obedience is the operative watchword in whatever "ism", statism, barbarianism, patriotism, nationalism, religionism, secularism, globalism, communism, socialism, and yes, also capitalism which is dominated by global MNC sharks today as the corporate army of Western power bloc much like the East India Company was an instrument of power for Britannia for over 200 years. Some argue that MNCs are indeed the new rulers of the world but they misperceive. The MNCs are only the supra-national instruments alongside the UN, the World Bank, the IMF, the WHO, by which the oligarchy rules not just our national but also our daily lives.

Insights as you have hopefully gained in this short space already, you cannot, do not, and never can, get in any normal academic setting, or from the news, or from the intellectuals of empire unless you are being groomed for the role of primacy, for all live off the largesse of empire manufacturing both consent and dissent to control the public mind. Normal people don't read any of that stuff, let alone understand it, but the *superman* does! Which is why it is hard for the public mind to fathom the mind of *superman*, or comprehend its tortuous scripts of mass behavior control.

A straightforward and rather objective litmus test of the real existence of this ubiquitous control system is readily available to anyone. After all, empiricism is an easily verifiable adjudicator of truth or falsity of any falsifiable proposition. Try pursuing a free inquiry into the HolocaustTM in any

academic, professional, or arts and letters setting in any nation in the West. I believe in Europe and Canada you are still put in jail as of 2014 if you reach an intellectual conclusion other than the one legally sanctioned. In the United States you at least cannot find professional employment afterward if you can even survive the ordeal at the hands of the ADL. All the vaunted freedoms of the West which permit burning the Holy Qur'an, making fun of the Prophets of Islam, including Jesus, suddenly stop at the doorsteps of the Holocaust™ gas chambers. The same *sacred cow* sanctification process is being applied to 9/11. Apart from what the public is made to believe through ubiquitous narrative control, what they so easily subject themselves to at American airports is open for all to see. The added force of the President of the United States, Barack Obama, issuing a stern warning to skeptics hasn't quite helped that great intellectual and personal freedoms of the West being shoved down every nation's throat:

“I am aware that there is still some who would question, or even justify the offense of 911. **But let us be clear. Al Qaeda killed nearly 3000 people on that day.** The victims were innocent men, women, and children from America and many other nations who had done nothing to harm anybody. **And yet Al Qaeda chose to ruthlessly murder these people, claimed credit for the attack, and even now states their determination to kill on a massive scale.** They have affiliates in many countries, to try to expand their reach. These are not opinions to be debated. These are facts to be dealt with.” -- President Obama, Cairo Egypt, June 4th 2009

Few comprehend that diabolically scripted play of obedience training for complete conformance to authority in the new world order. In fact, virtually all choose to just accept it as the new fact of life without a second thought --- as expected, that from Act I, if you can get the public mind to accept absurdities, you can get it to accept any atrocity, including its own servitude, and those born afterward will know nothing better. It is already well understood by social engineers that none will even have the inclination to put it all together after it has been in play a few years as it would have become force of habit, sort of like *Pavlovian* training. Taking shoes off at long security check-posts automatically, without being asked, is evidence of the success of this instance of training. So is the number of protests launched with the TSA by the traveling public. The last time I checked the statistics reported on TSA website, which was in 2010 or 2011 I believe, shockingly less than 0.5 percent of the millions of people going through US airport body scanners or enduring the physically intrusive pat-downs and body searches, had filed a complaint.

The easy acceptance of that vile absurdity is an undeniable fact of engineered obedience training, like all the rest of social engineering the world has witnessed since 9/11. And it all began by simply

accepting the official narrative of 9/11 of threat from “militant Islam” spun ubiquitously by the *Mighty Wurlitzer* and its assets. Just like the Holocaust™ before it, this too has quickly become a presuppositional axiom behind every public thought as well as public policy, both domestic and international, in virtually every nation on earth --- even including Iran and Russia which judiciously refrain from calling the *Big Lie* for what it is in all their opposition to the hegemony of the United States. I have never understood this --- if they were real antagonists of the superpower, this *Big Lie* is the singular Achilles' heel of all liars for any nation to call a spade a spade and initiate its effective take-down.

Its absence worldwide only indicates that all international enmities themselves are fabricated, controlled, synthetic, WWF style wrestling having freedoms only in saber-rattling and orchestrated warfare following the convoluted political theories of crisis creation and responding to the crisis with premeditated plans which are pivotal in social engineering for seeding transformation to the new one-world. Whether the manufactured crisis is real and existential, or remains mythological and mainly propaganda, is immaterial as both require that the public mind believe it to be real and posing an imminent danger to its well-being. Its success relies on two plus two making five to the public mind. And all efforts are made in that direction. Therefore, two plus two making four is suppressed, just as we see is transpiring in the ubiquitous narrative control which is now global, across civilization and national boundaries. It is the one thing which unites earth minds today: the threat of 'al-Qaeda', once stateless, now rising in the form of 'IS'. Thus creating more opportunities for “total war” for *Oceania*.

Which is precisely why all of newsmedia, all establishmentarian scholars, and all dissenting con-artist intellectuals controlling the permissible range of opinions to exclude what's not convenient to the ruling powers and their agendas, mainly focus the public's attention at the events themselves wrapped in narratives upon narratives. It's called freedom of speech and democracy, and the public rejoice at the openness of their Western society, while the colonized nations rush to emulate Western standards. Which is how the public mind is made so easily and uniformly across the world.

The drive for the standardization of worldviews and values is no less strident than the drive for the standardization of global laws. Both are necessary predicates for the standardization of human behavior --- from its natural diversity divided into tribes and nations, beliefs and values, all humming and vibrant in their own local cultures like the birds in a thriving forest and therefore difficult to control all at once, to its uniform and streamlined servitude long desired by the oligarchy. The honest to goodness observations made by Aldous Huxley to the students at the University of California, Berkeley, more than half century ago is even more empirical today:

Swallowing The Red Pill

“Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.

And this is a problem which has interested me for many years, and about which I wrote thirty years ago a fable, *Brave New World*, which is essentially the account of a society making use of all the devices at that time available, and some of the devices which I imagined to be possible, making use of them in order to, first of all, to standardize the population, to iron-out inconvenient human differences, to create so to say mass produced models of human beings arranged in some kind of a scientific caste system.”

In all this drive for the standardization of human beings to be ruled just as theologically by an all powerful financial oligarchy from the top of the control pyramid as in any predatory religion which puts man in the service of fellow man while paying all the lip-service to high-minded morality, there is no room in established scholarship, politics, press, or religious fervor, for unraveling truth's protective layers. Duh!

Whereas, the Sherlock Holmes of the day first look for the motivations behind events, and gauge the forces, both near and far, that drive them. They strive to unravel all of truth's protective layers.

On their profound intellectual courage and strength of character to see through the smoke and mirrors, to boldly proclaim two plus two make four and not five, to take the path not taken, to rise above their own narrow self-interests and to make no personal profit from their labors, this scribe humbly stands, and for which he is thankful that his own physical, psychological, and spiritual makeup endears him to their lonely path on the road less traveled. When the empire applauds, one is serving the interests of empire. When the choir applauds, one is preaching to it. When the people applaud, one is serving their interests. This is self-evident; a universal moral truth that is beyond doubt. So who applauds when one serves the interest of truth? There is no applause on this road not taken by others. Only the *hemlock*. The slave of truth always stands alone, lonely, and accepts the *hemlock*. The master of truth is always surrounded by cheers, accolades, prizes, and dies holily in bed. The author is grateful to his fate, destiny, *naseeb*, and all that in his life's experiences which has brought him to its crossroads, for that small share of loneliness on the road less traveled which is his cherished prize.

Swallowing The Red Pill

The author thanks the reader for even reading this far. This work is certainly not intended to be the last word on primacy and mind-behavior control, but the mere introduction to the subject in completely honest terms to the best of the author's limited abilities given the era of universal deceit and the full spectrum control of narratives in support of mantras du jour. No other point of view is permitted to exist outside that narrative space of "respectability". It is neither published by the "respectable" intelligentsia press nor given a fair hearing in their literary review spaces. The author fully expects his point of view to be met with resentment and denigration in some quarters. But the author believes that any such overt intellectual resentment can only translate to fostering a greater awareness and motivate further discovery of the topics only barely dealt herein. This would be a good thing.

Therefore, what the author fears will happen instead is that this work will be completely ignored rather than intellectually refuted --- for silence on truth is the stronger method of controlling the narrative. Why draw attention to these matters even with their most eloquent denunciation and needlessly open the Pandora's box of public consciousness for the new generation growing up in total darkness of the predators scheming behind the scene? Thus, any overt resentment will likely take the un-intellectual form as it took during the French and Russian revolutions: ***"Beware of that man for he has written a book!"*** (heard in the streets of Paris, quoted by Nesta Webster). And: ***"Writers must be proscribed as the most dangerous enemies of the people"*** (Robespierre, quoted by Nesta Webster).

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

About

About the author

He is just an ordinary fellow, a common man. But one who suffers no fools, takes no prisoners, bows before no authority figures as bearers of divine truths, and remains just as unimpressed by the metaphysics of the *turban* as by the scholarship of the *gown*. There is not much else to say about him. He was quite imperfectly educated in the elite secular universities of both the United States of America and Pakistan, which might explain how he managed to escape from these factories of *jahiliya* with his mind still intact and his brain still firing on all cylinders. It is only because of the imperfection of his education, and because of the failure of the system to obedience train him to *United We Stand* with absurdities, that his deconstruction of modernity is able to capture reality the way it actually is, minus all of *truth's protective layers*. At least me thinks so. My name is Zahir Ebrahim, and I am the archetype *plebeian antidote to hectoring hegemons*.

My contribution to making *America great again* can be gleaned at the United States Patent Office (<https://tinyurl.com/Zahir-Patents>).

My contribution to making her almost human can be read at what used to be my hobby website: [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org) (taken down by Google on March 26, 2020 without intimation).

More [About Me and My Little Jihad](#) may be gleaned from the pages of my 2015 *magnum opus* on current affairs: [The Poor Man's Guide To Modernity - Oligarchic Primacy for World Government](#) ; from my 2015 *magnum opus* on social engineering using religion: [Hijacking The Holy Qur'an And Its Religion Islam – Muslims and Imperial Mobilization](#) ; and from my 2003 *maiden treatise* on America's Imperial Mobilization disguised as “War on Terror”, written amidst running tears during the night-time civilian bombings and military invasion of Iraq by the United States: [Prisoners of the Cave](#). My most recent mega contribution to understanding current affairs with emphasis on Pakistan, is the two

About the author

volume [Pakistan Decapitation Papers 2019](#). The following are my two books in 2020 that are a compendium of my work a decade old but which command far more pertinence today as mankind is now visibly being goaded towards one-world government under the pretext of these crises: [The Useful Idiot's Guide To Pandemic 2020](#), and [The Next Global Menace 2020 Ali Baba Plusplus](#). My magnum opus on Zionism and Palestine, released on May 15 2020, is titled [NAKBA 2020: World Order / Zionism Palestinian-Goyim Studies](#). Lastly, this 2022 compilation on [Manufacturing Dissent](#) is a compendium of my over two decades of studying and dismantling this crafty subject of making the public mind in open democratic societies.

I graduated from MIT in EECS. I also studied graduate school at Stanford University through its SITN program in the 1980s. Before that I attended UET Lahore in the mid to late 1970s. While I have lived in the United States for the better part of my life, I left my heart behind in Pakistan. I now belong to two worlds, markedly different from each other, and yet exactly the same --- deceived and controlled by their rulers like Plato depicted in his Simile of the Cave in the Republic.

I belong to that generation that is not only caught between two cultures, but also caught between two ages. I borrow from Zbigniew Brzezinski's lede from his seminal 1970 book: *Between Two Ages*, quoting Hermann Hesse from *Steppenwolf*. It captures a bit of my own unsettlement: "Human life is reduced to real suffering, to hell, only when two ages, two cultures and religions overlap. . . . There are times when a whole generation is caught in this way between two ages, two modes of life, with the consequence that it loses all power to understand itself and has no standard, no security, no simple acquiescence." Except, I do have standards. I know why this *transition age* that we are living through is deliberately made to exist, and what's to come after. I did try to prevent it...

Some hubris huh!

I can be reached via email: zahir AT alum DOT mit DOT edu

This page is intentionally blank

Backcover

Current Affairs / World Order

Manufacturing Dissent

Making the Public Mind

“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits and opinions of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power of our country. We are governed, our minds are molded, our tastes formed, our ideas suggested, largely by men we have never heard of.” --- (Edward Bernays, *Propaganda*, 1928)

“You can do everything with bayonets except sit on them! If you are going to control any population for any length of time you must have some measure of consent. It's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion. An element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them. Well, it seems to me that the nature of the Ultimate Revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: that we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably always will exist, to get people actually to love their servitude! This is the, it seems to me the ultimate in malevolent revolution shall we say.” --- (Aldous Huxley, *The Ultimate Revolution*, March 20, 1962 talk at UC Berkeley)