


 Windows Live
Introducing 3D Maps from Live Search.
[Home](#)[Archive](#)[Columnists](#)[Video](#)[Blogs](#)[Discuss](#)[About](#)[Search](#)[Donate](#)
 Get AlterNet in your mailbox!

Advertisement

[Reserve the Premium Ad Spot!](#)

Advertisement

[Reserve the Silver Ad Spot!](#)


Advertisement

A Leader, A Visionary, A

Winner

[Sign Our Petition](#)
[Visit Draft Gore](#)
[Make a Contribution Today](#)
[Read more...](#)

Connect with other AlterNet readers!

[Read more...](#)

War on Iraq

The War on Terror Is the Leading Cause of Terrorism

By **Kim Sengupta** and **Patrick Cockburn**, The Independent UK. Posted **March 1, 2007**.

It's official: A new report shows that the U.S. has made the world more dangerous -- not just for Americans, but for everyone.

Tools

[EMAIL](#)[PRINT](#)[124 COMMENTS](#)

Innocent people across the world are now paying the price of the "Iraq effect," with the loss of hundreds of lives directly linked to the invasion and occupation by American and British forces.

An authoritative U.S. study of terrorist attacks after the invasion in 2003 contradicts the repeated denials of George Bush and Tony Blair that the war is not to blame for an upsurge in fundamentalist violence worldwide. The research is said to be the first to attempt to measure the "Iraq effect" on global terrorism.

It found that the number killed in jihadist attacks around the world has risen dramatically since the Iraq war began in March 2003. The study compared the period between 11 September 2001 and the invasion of Iraq with the period since the invasion. The count -- excluding the Arab-Israeli conflict -- shows the number of deaths due to terrorism rose from 729 to 5,420. As well as strikes in Europe, attacks have also increased in Chechnya and Kashmir since the invasion. The research was carried out by the Centre on Law and Security at the NYU Foundation for Mother Jones magazine.

Iraq was the catalyst for a ferocious fundamentalist backlash, according to the study, which says that the number of those killed by Islamists within Iraq rose from seven to 3,122. Afghanistan, invaded by US and British forces in direct response to the September 11 attacks, saw a rise from very few before 2003 to 802 since then. In the Chechen conflict, the toll rose from 234 to 497. In the Kashmir region, as well as India and Pakistan, the total rose from 182 to 489, and in Europe from none to 297.

Two years after declaring "mission accomplished" in Iraq President Bush insisted: "If we were not fighting and destroying the enemy in Iraq, they would not be idle. They would be plotting and killing Americans across the world and within our borders. By fighting these terrorists in Iraq, Americans in uniform are defeating a direct threat to the American people."

Mr Blair has also maintained that the Iraq war has not been responsible for Muslim fundamentalist attacks such as the 7/7 London bombings which killed 52 people. "Iraq, the region and the wider world is a safer place without Saddam [Hussein]," Mr Blair declared in July 2004.

Announcing the deployment of 1,400 extra troops to Afghanistan earlier this week -- raising the British force level in the country above that in Iraq -- the Prime Minister steadfastly denied accusations by MPs that there was any link between the Iraq war and an unravelling of security elsewhere.

Last month John Negroponte, the Director of National Intelligence in Washington, said he was "not certain" that the Iraq war had been a



Share and save this story:

Also in **War on Iraq**

Iraqi Oil Law Gives Cover for Corporate Profit

Emad Mekay

Why Can't We Talk about Peace in Public?

Matt Taibbi

Kucinich Comes Back for '08

Daniel Sturm

Iraq Replaces Vietnam as Metaphor for Tragedy

Andrew Lam

Chomsky on Why Bush Does Diplomacy Mafia-Style


Michael Shank

More stories by **Kim Sengupta****Patrick Cockburn**
 [War on Iraq RSS Feed](#)
 [Main AlterNet RSS Feed](#)

Get AlterNet in your mailbox!

Advertisement

The Earth in True Proportion



First Atlas with each country at the same scale

Includes 246 thematic world maps

In-depth picture of the state of the world

Mention AlterNet when ordering - get a Free Hobo-Dyer Map (\$6 value)

[Read more...](#)

Sexual Politics With a Twist



Susie Bright's Journal
Always. Something. Interesting.

[Read more...](#)

Be 1 of up to 4 ads in this strip!

Advertisement



Advertisement

recruiting factor for al-Qa'ida and insisted: "I wouldn't say that there has been a widespread growth in Islamic extremism beyond Iraq, I really wouldn't."

Yet the report points out that the US administration's own National Intelligence Estimate on "Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States" -- partially declassified last October -- stated that "the Iraq war has become the 'cause célèbre' for jihadists ... and is shaping a new generation of terrorist leaders and operatives."

The new study, by Peter Bergen and Paul Cruickshank, argues that, on the contrary, "the Iraq conflict has greatly increased the spread of al-Qa'ida ideological virus, as shown by a rising number of terrorist attacks in the past three years from London to Kabul, and from Madrid to the Red Sea.

"Our study shows that the Iraq war has generated a stunning increase in the yearly rate of fatal jihadist attacks, amounting to literally hundreds of additional terrorist attacks and civilian lives lost. Even when terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan is excluded, fatal attacks in the rest of the world have increased by more than one third."

In trying to gauge the "Iraq effect," the authors had focused on the rate of terrorist attacks in two periods -- from September 2001 to 30 March 2003 (the day of the Iraq invasion) and 21 March 2003 to 30 September 2006. The research has been based on the MIPT-RAND Terrorism database.

The report's assertion that the Iraq invasion has had a far greater impact in radicalising Muslims is widely backed security personnel in the UK. Senior anti-terrorist officials told The Independent that the attack on Iraq, and the now-discredited claims by the U.S. and British governments about Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, had led to far more young Muslims engaging in extremist activity than the invasion of Afghanistan two years previously.

Dame Eliza Manningham-Buller, head of the Secret Service (MI5) said recently: "In Iraq attacks are regularly videoed and the footage is downloaded into the internet.

"Chillingly, we see the results here. Young teenagers are being groomed to be suicide bombers. The threat is serious, is growing and will, I believe, be with us for a generation."

In Afghanistan the most active of the Taliban commanders, Mullah Dadullah, acknowledged how the Iraq war has influenced the struggle in Afghanistan.

"We give and take with the mujahedin in Afghanistan," he said. The most striking example of this has been the dramatic rise in suicide bombings in Afghanistan, a phenomenon not seen through the 10 years of war with the Russians in the 1980s.

The effect of Iraq on various jihadist conflicts has been influenced according to a number of factors, said the report. Countries with troops in Iraq, geographical proximity to the country, the empathy felt for the Iraqis and the exchange of information between Islamist groups. "This may explain why jihadist groups in Europe, Arab countries, and Afghanistan were more affected by the Iraq war than other regions," it said.

Russia, like the US, has used the language of the "war on terror" in its actions in Chechnya, and al-Qa'ida and their associates have entrenched themselves in the border areas of Pakistan from where they have mounted attacks in Kashmir, Pakistan and India.

Statistics for the Arab-Israel conflict also show an increase, but the methodology is disputed in the case of Palestinian attacks in the



Ads by Google

Spyware Removal
Upgrades, Installs or
Maintenance Visit
GeekSquad.com today
www.GeekSquad.com

Allocate Tech, LLC
Computer Service &
Repair Free Pick-Up Call
Now (916)396-7335
www.allocatech.com

**Which Spyware
Remover?**
Don't download any
spyware removers until
you read this article.
www.DefeatSpyware.org

Remove Spyware
We Compare and Review
the Top Spyware Removal
Software Sites.
CompareReview.Spyware.net

**Search & Destroy
Spyware**
Free, secure Spyware
scan. Winner of Best Anti-
Spyware. Rated 5 Stars
www.pctools.com

AlterNet Your turn

Support AlterNet
Do you value the information
you're getting from AlterNet?
Please show your support with a
tax-deductible donation.

Feedback
Tell us [how we're doing](#).

Search:

methodology is disputed in the case of Palestinian attacks in the occupied territories and settler attacks on Palestinians.

* The U.S. is joining the Iraqi government in a diplomatic initiative inviting Iran and Syria to a "neighbours meeting" on stabilising Iraq, the Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said yesterday. The move reflects a change of approach by the Bush administration, which previously had resisted calls to include Iran and Syria in such talks.

[Digg This Story](#)

Tagged as: [war in iraq](#), [violence](#), [jihad](#)

Story Tools: [EMAIL](#) [PRINT](#) [124 COMMENTS](#) [War on Iraq >](#)



Comments

[Give Us Feedback >>](#)

Tools: [\[Post a new comment\]](#) [\[Login\]](#) [\[Signup\]](#)

View: [Threaded](#)

it's a simple grammatical rule: replace "on" with "for"

Posted by: [blaine s](#) on Mar 1, 2007 12:27 AM [\[Report this comment\]](#)
we had a war "on" drugs; the situation was exacerbated.
for example students who went through the D.A.R.E. program were actually *more* likely to do drugs...
we had a war "on" poverty; the situation was exacerbated.
for example, well, you probably noticed...
now, we have a war "on" terror: the situation is, SURPRIZE!, being exacerbated...
(no example *necessary*).

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

- » **RE: it's a simple grammatical rule: replace "on" with "for"** Posted by: [jafidler](#)
- » **Let's have a war on stupidity** Posted by: [Bobsays](#)
- » **RE: it's a simple grammatical rule: replace "on" with "for"** Posted by: [buddhamouse](#)
- » **nah, borat said it best** Posted by: [jesusonthedashboard](#)
- » **RE: it's a simple grammatical rule: replace "on" with "for"** Posted by: [Conservasaurus](#)
- » **Use your brain for once conservawhorist....** Posted by: [Michiganman](#)
- » **RE: it's a simple grammatical rule: replace "on" with "for"** Posted by: [moflard](#)

Mark Cartwright

Posted by: [mcartri](#) on Mar 1, 2007 12:31 AM [\[Report this comment\]](#)
Bush/Cheney remain the most dangerous terrorists in the world. The United States Congress remains their greatest enabler.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [kbest](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [staringatthesun](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [ALANHESTER](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [hennep](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [leafsong1](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [yellow](#)
- » **Yes, Kbest.. YOURS was the most idiotic comment. nm** Posted by: [JoshuaLudd](#)
- » **RE: THIS IS MOST IDIOTIC COMMENT** Posted by: [rambleman](#)
- » **18 million people?** Posted by: [mrcentrist](#)
- » **kbest I can see you sitting in your.....** Posted by: [Michiganman](#)
- » **Mark Cartwright Yours is MOST HONEST Comment** Posted by: [freethink7](#)
- » **RE: Mark Cartwright** Posted by: [jesusonthedashboard](#)
- » **RE: Mark Cartwright** Posted by: [ng1944](#)
- » **RE: Mark Cartwright** Posted by: [DonS](#)

Afghanistan is the next Iraq

Posted by: [Moonray](#) on Mar 1, 2007 2:53 AM [\[Report this comment\]](#)
The so-called war on terror in Afghanistan no longer makes sense, and NATO should pack up its guns and

leave. Our five years of slogging around ineffectively in that country have demonstrated that, as with Iraq, only a massive occupation could quash the insurgency, and that's politically untenable.

Oddly, even many progressives have drunk the neocon kool-aid that Afghanistan is the true war on terror and losing there would put the West in grave peril. Sorry, folks, but we lost there some time ago, also. Al Qaeda and the Taliban pretty much move around as they please while the U.S. and NATO stay cooped up in Kabul and a few other places.

Not that it matters. Al Qaeda can plan attacks anywhere, from Pakistan to Sudan to Malaysia, and for them Afghanistan is largely a military training site, with the U.S. taxpayers paying for their very realistic training.

It's sad to see Democratic leaders talking tough about Afghanistan and preparing to get us bogged down there for even more years. We should cut our losses there and beef up our anti-terrorism measures elsewhere around the world.

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) »]

» [RE: Afghanistan is the next Iraq](#) Posted by: xi_people

» [Oh please, just read Peter Bergen or Jason Burke](#) Posted by: brunowe

» [RE: Oh please, just read Peter Bergen or Jason Burke](#) Posted by: yellow

» [RE: Oh please, just read Peter Bergen or Jason Burke](#) Posted by: brunowe

America became a hard target, the rest of the world soft

Posted by: Bobsays on Mar 1, 2007 3:52 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Military planners knew what they were doing: they wanted to make sure th price of attacking the US would be too high. And they did this by making the price of attacking other people just right. And so outside the US people bleed to death in this war.

The solution for other western countries is to mimic the US approach and to substantially ramp up military and police efforts. Outside the US should become as hard as the US.

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) »]

» [Are you missing the point?](#) Posted by: HeroesAll

» [RE: America became a hard target, the rest of the world soft](#) Posted by: ALANHESTER

» [RE: Military Planners Knew what they were doing???](#) Posted by: Carl Street

Oliver Hardy

Posted by: pcushniesr on Mar 1, 2007 3:58 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

If Oliver Hardy were still alive, I know what he'd say: "Well, George, here's another fine mess you've gotten us into!" Certainly there are comparisons to be made bewteen Bush and the bumbling Stan Laurel, but Stanly was was no sociopath. (My apologies to the memory of Stan for the comparison to Bush.)

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) »]

EFFICACY

Posted by: efficacy on Mar 1, 2007 4:05 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The war on terror like the war on drugs "is meant to be waged not won".
Efficacy@msn.com

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment](#) »]

» [RE: EFFICACY](#) Posted by: feduphoosier

» [RE: EFFICACY](#) Posted by: efficacy

» [RE: EFFICACY](#) Posted by: Lauren

The Only Way

Posted by: wawa on Mar 1, 2007 4:50 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

To break the insane cycle of violence for violence

Is to WAKE UP;

ALL life is sacred and ALL people are equal

Good and Evil runs through EVERY human heart

There is no superior race; NO 'chosen ones'

We are all in this world together,

Humans will either evolve/wake up

Or the inhumanity of men will blow the world up.

And for all those rapture fanatics-they ain't going anywhere-we are in this together to learn to love one another and share it

The only way to stop the violence is to STOP it!

If only for ONE day all the daughters of Zion, all of Abrahams sons laid down their guns -took a breather and looked within at their own hearts

Chances are;

sisters and brothers would NOT pick them back up.

IMAGINE the day when a war is called;

And nobody shows up!

"Imagine All the People Sharing All the World."-John Lennon

Only in Solidarity do "We have it in our power to begin the world again" Tom Paine

wearewideawake.org

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

The War on Terror Is the Leading Cause of Terrorism

Posted by: MyLeftFoot on Mar 1, 2007 5:06 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

duh...

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» [RE: The War on Terror Is the Leading Cause of Terrorism](#) Posted by: badkitty

» [Get rid of military](#) Posted by: openhouse

Head in the sand attitudes

Posted by: Poe on Mar 1, 2007 5:09 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

"The war on terror is the leading cause of terrorism."

Ridiculous. This article is bullshit! What is the excuse given for terrorism **before** the "war on terror"?

It's like the battered wife syndrome. Standing in front of the police with a broken arm and an eye swollen shut, she doesn't press charges because it may make him mad.

Don't take the bees nest down from the front porch.....the bees will attack us. We'll just sit here and sip our summer tea and take a sting once in awhile.

There have been hundreds of terrorist attacks across the globe, well before Bush put one foot in the White House.

So now everyone thinks the gates of hell have opened up, as if the gates before were only slightly ajar.

Poe

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: jwc

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: staringatthesun

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: leafsong1

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: roo

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: Poe

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: JoshuaLudd

» [Read 'Blowback'](#) Posted by: feduphoosier

» [RE: Head in the sand attitudes](#) Posted by: ng1944

WHO CARES?!? GORE HAS HIGH ELECTRIC BILLS!!!!

Posted by: David V on Mar 1, 2007 5:26 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

TERRORISM, SCHMERRORISM. AL GORE HAS A BIG HOUSE WITH HIGH ELECTRIC BILLS!! DON'T YOU LIBERALS KNOW A REAL THREAT WHEN YOU SEE ONE?!?!?

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» [RE: WHO CARES?!? GORE HAS HIGH ELECTRIC BILLS!!!!](#) Posted by: amrahne

» [RE: WHO CARES?!? GORE HAS HIGH ELECTRIC BILLS!!!!](#) Posted by: ALANHESTER

whitehouse.gov

Posted by: bookie on Mar 1, 2007 5:33 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

does anyone ever go to this site? It will either infuriate you or laugh depending on your mood I guess. On the link to his middle east policy a large banner proclaims "Peace in the Middle East" Does Bush really believe the dreck put out on this site? Is he is some kind of John Wayne time warp?

I knew we were going to be in trouble when he was appointed office in 2000. But I couldn't have even imagined how bad it would get.

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» [RE: whitehouse.gov](#) Posted by: freethink7

For The Moment

Posted by: joseph_b26 on Mar 1, 2007 5:53 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

For the moment, we have raised our level of knowing what we have done in Iraq. How long has it been since the US has looked at our ugly truths?

I have never scene denial on the scale it exist in our country when it comes to Iraq. The most obvious example of this is the very fact we never found WMDs in Iraq. We initiated a war under the expectation we would prevent a "mushroom cloud." At the point we found no WMDs, the US was supposed to withdraw our troops and make a collective apology to the world and most important, the Iraqi people. Instead, after bombing this country into the stone ages, we decided to deny what we in Iraq for. To make things worse, we invaded the country, changed our reason for going into Iraq, and continued to create more terrorism bv bombina the innocent population. We then decided to use a dehumanizina term.

"collateral damage" to deny are smart bombs was so smart after all.

In a short time, US terrorism was born. The media and the Republican Party continue to fuel this war. Under the false need to "win this thing," the Republican Party and our president continue to beat the war drum of a conflict we deny is a civil war. The media, which has become a dido machine for the Righthwing warmongers, have lost the sense of "fair and balance" and have put its place the unfair and unbalance practice of creating news to match there so-called "special commentators."

Put all this together and you come up with long awaited realization we are acting in the same way as our adversaries.

Joseph

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

» **RE: For The Moment** Posted by: ALANHESTER

» **Tyranny** Posted by: openhouse

And yet 'OUR' writers

Posted by: AdamSelene40 on Mar 1, 2007 6:19 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Continually natter on about 'the real terrorists' and 'winning the war on terror' ... only with Democratic pols and policies.

"We" seem to think it's vitally important ot 'bring ben Laden to justice' ... and 'we' get our knickers in a twist about the Dubai Port dea ... Our "anti-war" candidates are not so much anti-war as they are anti-Bush's Bungling Conduct of THIS war -- It's not so much a desire for peace, as a pragmatic disapproval of waste and failure. (This war cannot be won, any war Democrats fought to keep us safe from terrorists ... well, you can be real sure we'd win THAT one.)

This article was by comparision a refreshing change.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Again with the war on terror...

Posted by: sonex on Mar 1, 2007 6:35 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

The terrorists and the people waging the war against terror are the same people, get it...

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

» **RE: Again with the war on terror...** Posted by: freethink7

» **RE: Again with the war on terror...** Posted by: ng1944

Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader

Posted by: White middleclass male on Mar 1, 2007 6:46 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

I see people of the muslim faith as the biggest terror threat. Why is it muslims of different races and cultures all do the same thing?

These cowards target innocent civilians everywhere.

Palestinian muslims blow up teenage jewish girls at the shopping malls.
Chechen muslims kill Russian school children.
Asain muslims blow up resorts in Bali.
Algerian muslims kill French people eating at bistros.
African muslims killing and maiming other Africans.
Muslim attacks on the civilians in Spain, Italy, Germany, Australia, the US.
I could go on and on

Why do these cowards not attack the military bases and personnel of their enemies, but instead target civilians just trying to live out their lives? Why is islam the problem regardless of the plot of land, the people, or the culture?

I do believe we need to stay out of their countries though. That is why I left them to their own devices when the tsunami hit (I did support Defenders of Wildlife) and the earthquake in Iran that killed 30000 a few years back.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: ALANHESTER

» **They will put you to death** Posted by: openhouse

» **RE: They will put you to death** Posted by: blaine s

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: leafsong1

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: JoshuaLudd

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: yellow

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: babs

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: White middleclass male

» **RE: Thats funny. I would say Islam is the terror leader** Posted by: blaine s

you are joking??

Posted by: robertweed69 on Mar 1, 2007 6:48 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

The attacks on western interests started long before the "war on terror" and sure, once you start a war and fight back, the people you are fighting will fight even more till you defeat them. Dah!

You have to remember, these people have declared war on the western world. They want to convert or destroy. If we don't fight back they will STILL continue to fight us.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

» **RE: you are joking??** Posted by: PopRox80

» **Islam is the 2nd largest religion in the world--So many people can't be all bad** Posted by: sarahk

Antiwar activists call for Encampment to Stop the War

Posted by: rwa on Mar 1, 2007 6:51 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Beginning March 12

On March 12, antiwar activists from across the U.S. will begin an "Encampment to Stop the War" on the National Mall, directly across from the Capitol Building.

Larry Holmes, a spokesperson for the Troops Out Now Coalition, the organization that initiated the call for the Encampment, said, "During the week beginning March 12, Congress will begin voting on Bush's request for \$100 billion more for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. If Congress votes to cut off funds, they can end the war now and bring the troops home. If they approve Bush's war funds, the killing, and dying and occupation will go on just as it has. It is as simple as that. This vote will be the most important war related vote since Congress voted to authorize Bush to invade and occupy Iraq in October of 2002. The antiwar movement must be there to let Congress know that we won't let them get away with it this time.

Organizers with the Encampment say that response to the call has been "overwhelming." Sharon Black, a labor activist and organizer with the Encampment, said, "We are getting thousands of responses. People from as far away as California and Hawaii are telling us that they'll be there. It's clear to all of us that President Bush won't end the war, and neither will Congress."

Daily updates on the Encampment are posted at <http://encampmenttostopthewar.blogspot.com>

Encampment to Stop the War Ride Board

Do you need a ride to DC for the Encampment?
Do you have a ride to offer?

Post your info on the new Encampment to Stop the War Ride Board.

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

It's easy for Al Qaeda to strike America -- NOW, not later.

Posted by: DougScott on Mar 1, 2007 6:52 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Because President Bush left our borders unprotected after 9/11 and invaded Iraq instead of hunting down Al Qaeda, it would be easy for a Bin Laden operative to create widespread terror in the U.S.

Assume the agent, codenamed "Jose," lived in Spain but was not involved in the Madrid railway in 2004 that killed 200 people. Carrying a legitimate Spanish passport issued under an alias with a nonimmigrant visa for visiting the United States, Jose flies on Aero Mexico Flight 2, a Boeing 767-200, from Madrid to Mexico City, arriving as scheduled at 8:25 pm local time.

After a 90-minute layover, he's back in the air again, this time on Aero Mexico Flight 180, ironically a Boeing 757 like the four jetliners hijacked by Al Qaeda on 9/11.

His destination is the Abelardo Rodriguez International Airport in Tijuana south of San Diego, less than 100 yards from the U.S.-Mexico barrier fence. But Jose won't have to climb over the obstruction like Mexican illegals do. Purposively, he had planned his Tijuana arrival for Saturday night when foot-traffic at the official border crossing is the heaviest.

Following a short cab ride to the crossing station, after flashing his Spanish passport and visa to overworked U.S. Immigration authorities, Jose is waved into Southern California where two waiting Al Qaeda operatives pick him up in a Hertz Ford Tarus.

Minutes later, at a commercial storage facility with 24 hour access, the evildoing threesome enter the private rental space and begin preparing an explosive vest

On noon Monday, after a day of prayers to Mecca, wearing the TNT-laden undergarment beneath a jogging jacket, Jose rides with his Bin Laden buddies to Los Angeles, buys a Metro ticket, takes the escalator downstairs and walks onto the crowded passenger platform. When the next train arrives—BOOM!

By nightfall, the United States is more panicked than after 9/11. And all it took was one suicide bomber seeking Paradise, \$700 in airline tickets, two Bin Laden followers in San Diego, 15 pounds of dynamite and a shattered subway station.

What would George W. say with a bullhorn after that calamity? "Whoops?"

PS: I used San Diego because that's where two of the Al Qaeda skyjackers lived prior to 9/11.

Hugh E. Scott --Vietnam vet and creator/editor www.King-George.biz --the only website with hardcopy proof of White House corruption.

[[« Reply to this comment](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» **Scare tactics** Posted by: Aufklaerung_Baboon

A distinction must be made

Posted by: sfortuna on Mar 1, 2007 7:06 AM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The label 'terrorist' is applied with too broad a brush to make this study, or the current dialogue, meaningful. The incidents you lump together under the term "Terror" should be separated into two classes: those attacks aimed against a civilian, non-combatant people, versus those aimed specifically

against those of an occupying military power. Car bombs planted at a street market are acts of mass terror. A Iraqi who detonates an IED under a US army convoy is not a TERRORIST. This is an act of RESISTANCE; defined as guerilla actions intended to weaken and drive out invaders from your native soil. By this definition, US actions that kill Iraqi women and children can be labeled Terrorist as well. It would be interesting to see the quantified results of this study if you factor out Islamist attacks against an invading or occupying military force. Example: One COULD classify the recent car bomb at Baghnan AFB as a direct attempt to kill Cheney, and thus an act of nationalist resistance by an Afghani. One may also classify it as terrorism because it did kill civilians when the bomber had to detonate short of his target. There are many variables, but I think the prime driver would be one of MOTIVATION.

If the US were occupied by a foreign power that has done to us as we've done toward the Iraqis, I'm sure many patriotic and courageous individuals would go underground and attempt to resist in any way possible, including guerilla or possibly even suicide attacks on the invading troops. Our sacrifices in defense of our sovereignty would earn the term Hero or Freedom Fighter or Resister here at home, yet branded as terrorism by the occupying force. Once we get rid of this 'double standard' to apply the term TERROR we may be able to identify and quantify the MOTIVES.

I would be proud to give my life to defend US soil and my fellow citizens from invasion, but waging war to increase the geopolitical influence of our corporate elites is not a cause to die for. Let Exxon and General Dynamics and Haliburton and Lockheed take their humongous tax exempted profits from this war and buy mercenary forces to fight and die for them. It's bad enough they are sucking the life out of our treasury without them profiting from the deaths of the poor kids who join the military to escape poverty and gain an education.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

- » **It is a simple matter of changing the DEFINITION OF TERRORISM** Posted by: Frish
- » **Blame it on the corporations** Posted by: openhouse
- » **Troll Alert!** Posted by: freethink7
- » **Not so free** Posted by: openhouse

9/11 is the foundation of the Global War on Terror

Posted by: rwa on Mar 1, 2007 7:09 AM

[Report this comment]

The 'war on terror' was created by Netanyahu and the Israeli right for three reasons:

- 1) It was supposed to replace the idea that Israel was the ally of the United States in the Middle East in the battle against the Soviets, by the idea that Israel was the ally of the United States in the Middle East in the battle against fundamentalist Islam (the shift was needed when the Soviet Union no longer existed).
- 2) It was intended to create the idea that Israel's struggle against the justified reaction by the Palestinians to Israeli war crimes was the same struggle faced by the United States, and the world.
- 3) It has been extended to include the entire gamut of propaganda weapons which we know of as Islamophobia, intended to create a general fear of Islam which is used to make possible various Zionist outrages.

One of the Israeli spies caught while cheering at the collapse of the World Trade center put it clearly:

"We are Israeli. We are not your problem.

Your problems are our problems.

The Palestinians are the problem."

Netanyahu himself, on being asked about what the September 11 attacks would mean for US-Israeli relations, said:

"It's very good. Well, it's not good, but it will generate immediate sympathy."

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

- » **RE: 9/11 is the foundation of the Global War on Terror** Posted by: yellow
- » **RE: 9/11 is the foundation of the Global War on Terror** Posted by: babs
- » **leave the Jews alone** Posted by: openhouse
- » **In fact all but one Israeli war have been wars of their choice** Posted by: rwa
- » **That isn't accurate** Posted by: brunowe
- » **Misinformed** Posted by: openhouse
- » **RE: Misinformed** Posted by: yellow

no source?

Posted by: reinhold on Mar 1, 2007 7:51 AM

[Report this comment]

Not once did this article mention the report's name that it's citing or the authors. Pathetic that I can't look into this further.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

- » **RE: no source?** Posted by: rwa
- » **RE: no source?** Posted by: yellow
- » **RE: no source?** Posted by: babs
- » **Yellow = Israeli propagandist** Posted by: Aufklaerung_Baboon
- » **RE: Yellow = Israeli propagandist** Posted by: rwa

Need Clarification Please

Posted by: freethink7 on Mar 1, 2007 10:01 AM

[Report this comment]

Who exactly are the "Real" Terrorists?

We just read that Bu\$h Cheney Inc. is funding Al Qaeda groups in the Middle East (AlterNet by Evan Derkacz "Explosive new Hersh scoop: Bush funneling money to Al Qaeda-Related Groups").

If this isn't promoting + persuading terrorism, then I am really perplexed. Aiding and abetting, conspiracy comes to mind.....doesn't that make Bu\$h Cheney Inc. terrorists.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 1

Posted by: maxpayne on Mar 1, 2007 10:08 AM

[Report this comment]

On Tuesday, as part of a post of my thoughts on the Mumbai bombings, I made a prediction.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration has way too much political capital and way too much arms-trade loot invested in Pakistan to do any kind of about face on its relationship with that nation. Expect there to be no mention of the Indian allegations of Pakistani complicity - the possibility just doesn't exist for the Bush White House. Yet again and as usual, foreign policy will be determined by the needs of domestic policy - and admitting such a close relationship with a state sponsor of Islamist terrorism would be a domestic poison pill.

I was mostly right and sort of wrong - the Bush administration itself has been careful not to mention Pakistan in any way whatsoever. However, rightwing pundits, commentators and opinion-makers have been almost zealous in their attempts to exonerate Pakistan of any blame whatsoever - to the extent of being blind to facts and to parallels with other situations in many cases. Amazingly, mainstream liberal comment has also been of the "sweep Pakistan's involvement under the rug" kind. Like being for the invasion of Iraq before they were belatedly against it, establishment liberals are doing their best not to talk about an obvious longterm policy mistake for as long as possible in the hope that it will go away. In so doing they have formed yet another foreign policy 'consensus of errors' with the Bush administration.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

Trolls on the run

Posted by: Knowmad on Mar 1, 2007 10:08 AM

[Report this comment]

The fact that there's so much sad troll activity on this thread is very encouraging. It's means even they are finally realizing their primitive pseudo-rule is coming to an end.

Keep it up honest, progressive Americans. The pathetic reactions from the brain-dead right are no more than desperate attempts to distract and obfuscate, and signs you truly are winning.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 2

Posted by: maxpayne on Mar 1, 2007 10:09 AM

[Report this comment]

That bipartisan establishment consensus has been best articulated by Xenia Dormandy in the Washington Post. Dormandy was director for South Asia at the National Security Council where her main responsibility was the India/Pakistan peace process. She is now an executive director of a broadly liberal think-tank, the Belfer Center, which is part of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. The conclusion of her op-ed runs as follows:

Now is a moment when Pakistan really needs to respond. It wants to be taken seriously as an important player on the international scene. It has repeatedly asked the United States for a nuclear energy deal similar to the one we are working on with India. But until Pakistan -- and this means not only President Pervez Musharraf but also the military, the people and the political parties, including the religious party, the MMA -- gets serious about shutting down, arresting and otherwise dismantling the militant groups that operate from its territory, it cannot expect to be treated as a responsible player in the region. Pakistan is working on it, but it could do so much more.

A good -- or at least stable -- India-Pakistan relationship is one of the most important elements for long-term global stability. Given that both are nuclear powers, their region is one of the most dangerous in the world. And with attacks such as this, it is also one of the most volatile. India has taken great strides to tamp down this volatility. Pakistan needs to do more.

In return, India would need to step up in a real, substantive way on bilateral issues such as Kashmir. The third round of the high-level composite dialogue taking place next week, assuming it is still on, is the place to do it.

In a nutshell, India should offer concessions to a nation which has talked the talk far more often than it has walked the walk. There is no mention anywhere in the piece of Pakistan's intelligence agency, the ISI, and its alleged sponsoring of terror groups in Kashmir, Afghanistan and India. No mention of the tens of thousands of Taliban and Al Qaida trained militants in Pakistan (Jane's estimated 20,000 such in Karachi alone). No mention of Pakistan's inability (reluctance) to capture Osama bin Laden or Mullah Omar - and other major terror/crime figures such as Dahwood Ibrahim - who are certainly hiding on their territory. The establishment simply does not want to talk about these things.

[< Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment >]

Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 3

Posted by: maxpayne on Mar 1, 2007 10:09 AM

[Report this comment]

In a way that's understandable, if reprehensible. For at least six years policymakers from both camps have touted Pakistan as an ally in the 'war on terror'. Hundreds of statements have been made to that effect and have been backed by votes and decisions giving Pakistan billions in taxpayer's funds as well as some of the most sophisticated weaponry on the planet. To do an about-face now and admit that Pakistan is a state sponsor of terrorism - a rogue state which has duped those policymakers into thinking it was an ally with some token assistance on basing, some captures of lesser terror figures who are instantly replaceable and clever rhetoric concealing active backing of terror groups - would be a political disaster of monumental proportions for both parties.

To see how bad it could be, compare the establishment position on Pakistani supported terrorism in India with positions on Iran and Syria's support for Hizbollah attacks on Israel. Or rhetoric over Iran's supposed nuclear weapons program. Very few in the political establishment have any problem in accepting Israel's unsubstantiated allegations of Iranian/Syrian planning and personnel being behind

accepting Israel's unsubstantiated allegations of Iranian/Syrian planning and personnel being behind

Hizbollah or Hamas attacks - because it is clear both nations are funding said terror groups. (Ditto Shia militias in Iraq.) The American political establishment has broadly stepped back from condemning Israel's unbalanced response - an overwhelming invasion of Palestine and Lebanon which has targeted infrastructure and used indiscriminate attacks which have led to many civilian deaths. In the main, both parties have even given Israel a pass to extend their belligerence to Syria and Iran should it wish to. "Intelligence" from the most unbelievable of sources - like the MeK and a discredited former Iranian spy - has been touted as proof positive of Iran's weapons program and formed the basis for broadly bi-partisan policy. Denials are rejected with "well, they would say that, wouldn't they" no matter what evidence points towards the denials being genuine. Yet when the Indian or Afghani governments categorically state that Pakistani intelligence is providing funding, weaponry and planning to various Islamist terror groups their assertions are rejected out of hand (when such statements are considered at all) even though the Pakistani Ministry of Defense admits the ISI is a law unto itself. There aren't even calls for the evidence to be made available for scrutiny. India is told that it cannot use Cheney's One Per cent Doctrine or Bush's Doctrine of Pre-emption at all - instead it should make concessions and accept Pakistan's doubtful word on non-involvement. Indian politicians no doubt see the double standard - it is no wonder they have postponed peace talks indefinitely. One can only wish that Israel would be held to such a high standard of behaviour.

Were America's politicians to publicly accept that Pakistan is indeed a state sponsor of terrorism, much of the "narrative" for policies on Israel, Iran, Syria, Iraq and counter-terrorism would disappear overnight and disappear in an embarrassingly obvious way. Domestic trust in the competence of those politicians would be badly hurt - but on the international stage any such admission and the knock-on effect into parallel issues would be a blow from which American prestige and authority might never recover. No matter which party was in charge. Unfortunately few American politicians, who have backed Pakistan for six years, are going to do the "right thing" when political expediency beckons. It is just so not going to happen.

[« Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment »]

Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 4

Posted by: maxpayne on Mar 1, 2007 10:11 AM

[Report this comment]

Then there is the chattering class of think-tankers, op-ed writers and political bloggers. The main thrust of pundits' writings on Pakistan's support for terrorism, especially from the cheerleading political Right, seems to be outright disbelief. Why, they ask, would Pakistan do such a thing? What's in it for them? By asking this, they reveal an ignorance of the history and motivations of the Pakistani ruling elite - the military - of such a depth that one suspects it is a deliberate ignoring of facts rather than simply not knowing them. Yet again, the potential embarrassment of admitting they were wrong outweighs the actuality and their minds refuse to contemplate it.

Throughout their histories - which have included more than war with their neighbour - India and Pakistan have been burdened by extremists who define themselves in terms of opposition to their neighbour and in supremacist religious rhetoric. Both have always had to cope with militant portions of their own military and political spectrums who define themselves in terms of a perceived military threat from the other nation. In India's case, although oftentimes these factions have gained ascendancy, the democratic process has kept their influence from being total. Pakistan, on the other hand, has been a military dictatorship more often than it has been even slightly democratic and even when a democracy was constantly threatened by coups from one of its two militant factions - the religious and military extremists. Accordingly, the military has made a de facto trade off with the Islamists. The military runs the nation and the Islamists use it as a safe base to preach, recruit and stage their worldwide Jihad. Neither rocks the other's boat all that much and so a balance of power has evolved, teetering on a precipice of civil war which spills over locally from time to time or swings into temporary co-operation (e.g. the A.Q. Khan nuclear syndicate). Neither group has any incentive to change this equation.

The "war on terror" does not presently provide that incentive. Pakistan's military rulers very swiftly discovered that no-one in power in the West is looking all that closely at them as long as basing is provided, a bunch of lesser figures is rounded up from time to time, they eagerly buy Western weaponry and generally keep up a pretense that they are doing everything they can to wage a war against those who could most easily topple them from power. In return for largely preserving the internal status quo, the Islamist militants receive covert aid - which is entirely deniable or can be attributed to "rogue elements" - in their operations in neighbouring countries. They also get largely left alone in the unseen hinterlands to set up training camps and staging areas. In India, Afghanistan and elsewhere, the aims of both factions work in harmony. Pakistan, because of the needs of those factions, is a state-sponsor of terrorism.

[« Reply to this comment] [Post a new comment »]

Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 5

Posted by: maxpayne on Mar 1, 2007 10:14 AM

[Report this comment]

The Pakistani military has always had one primary mission - India. While India must worry about the other regional power, China, Pakistan has always co-operated with China both militarily and politically on the local stage - the two nations develop fighter jets together, exercise together, vote together in local forums. India was the only reason why Pakistan developed a nuclear arsenal (India worried about Pakistan and China) and you can be sure that every nuclear weapon in Pakistan's inventory is assigned to an Indian target and to no other - something that it is doubtful is the case for India's weapons. Recently, Pakistan arranged the purchase of advanced Harpoon maritime weapons from the U.S. - yet the only possible target for those missiles is the Indian Navy. No other potential foe has any kind of navy at all. The current \$5 billion plan to sell Pakistan advanced F-16 fighters is, according to Pakistani public statements, entirely aimed at a possible conflict with the sophisticated Indian air force. The disputed region of Kashmir has always provided an excuse for belligerence rather than being a problem to be solved peaceably. It is noteworthy that in at least three out of the four major armed conflicts between the two nations (1947, 1965, 1971, 1999) Pakistani regular forces have been the first State aggressors.

This isn't to say that India is entirely innocent, mind you - nor are other nations who blithely contribute to the gunpowder pile that is the sub-continent. India has its fair share of Hindu supremacists and military hawks. The current U.S./India nuclear deal is the most dangerously destabilizing development in the region for years. It not only creates a nuclear arms race which even Japan may join but also makes a

mockery of international non-proliferation efforts. Indian hawks are more than happy to push for even greater concessions from America as the deal is processed and have no intention of allowing their political leadership to give up a perceived advantage over Pakistan or China. The U.S. and others have been just as zealous in selling advanced weaponry to India as to Pakistan - and one must surely question the wisdom of any move that arms both sides of such a dangerous potential conflict.

Be it establishment politicians or supposed "watchdogs of democracy", any ability for American opinion-drivers to admit Pakistan is a "rogue state" is terminally undermined by the political, financial and military capital that has been invested in that nation over the last six years and more - all the way back to the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. Further, admitting that status for Pakistan would make decades of Middle East policy seem a black joke at best. Indians wondering at American under-reaction to the Mumbai atrocity should realise that it isn't the color of the victim's skin that makes America uninterested. It is in the vested interests of those who could make America notice that it looks the other way.

P.S.: I might add that the Indian government is no less corrupt either. Can you imagine Israel doing peacetalks with Pakistan after being attacked innumerablely?

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

» RE: Mumbai - Why America Looks The Other Way Pt 5 Posted by: ng1944

And

Posted by: hangman on Mar 1, 2007 10:31 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

go figure, hello?! duh.

I always thought it was more of an agenda of war "and" terror, or "for".

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars

Posted by: mite on Mar 1, 2007 12:29 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

There is a war against the United States and its people since the early 1800's.

Just to put a question in any open brains out there; look at the nearest U.S. Flag flying outdoors. Then walk into any local, state, or federal building and look at the U.S. Flag on display. The flag will have a gold trim, eagle and tassels on the top. While the real U.S. Flag is simple with red-white stripes with a blue background and white stars. Why the difference of flags from outside to inside the buildings????

I know why- how about you.

www.lawfulpath.com www.USAvsUS.com

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Two reasons for terrorism

Posted by: basinjasin on Mar 1, 2007 12:50 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Number one: bullshit religious differences. Crazy superstitions.

Number two: Western exploitation, I mean capitulism.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

the cycles

Posted by: jesusonthekeyboard on Mar 1, 2007 12:57 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

who finds this at least as absurd at GW's war on terror?

"F. Followers of Other Religions: The Islamic Resistance Movement Is A Humanistic Movement:

Article Thirty-One:

The Islamic Resistance Movement is a humanistic movement. It takes care of human rights and is guided by Islamic tolerance when dealing with the followers of other religions. It does not antagonize anyone of them except if it is antagonized by it or stands in its way to hamper its moves and waste its efforts.

Under the wing of Islam, it is possible for the followers of the three religions - Islam, Christianity and Judaism - to coexist in peace and quiet with each other. Peace and quiet would not be possible except under the wing of Islam. Past and present history are the best witness to that."

from the Hamas Charter.

<http://www.mideastweb.org/hamas.htm>

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Then after Iran?

Posted by: jearls on Mar 1, 2007 1:49 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Well, things should really step up after Bush attacks Iran. Perhaps a 3-fold increase in terrorism is in the offing. That would justify a big expansion of Guantanamo and the number of "renditions". Wow, what a future these Washington lunatics are working up.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

The 'War on Terror' is a JOKE -- it's OVERBLOWN

Posted by: Aufklaerung_Baboon on Mar 1, 2007 2:09 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

More Americans drown in their bathtubs each year than are killed in 'terrorist' attacks. This was even true for 2001 when 9/11 happened.

AMERICANS: WAKE UP FROM YOUR FEAR-INDUCED ZIONIST STUPOR AND TAKE YOUR COUNTRY BACK!

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

Why Does America Want to Kill Muslims and Arabs?

Posted by: sofla100 on Mar 1, 2007 2:51 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

When America gives Israel billions of dollars in modern advanced weaponry and Israel uses these munitions to attack civilians in Lebanon, who are the terrorists? When this same US supported country, Israel, routinely kidnaps Palestinians and Arabs, and holds them incommunicado without charges in prisons, who are the terrorists? When the USA for ten years blockades trade with Iraq to "hurt Saddam" and thousands of children die (lack of medical supplies, food), who are the terrorists? When the USA threatens to bomb Iran because she insists on acquiring nukes for legitimate self-defense, who are the terrorists? When the USA kidnaps foreigners in their own countries, and sends them to countries like Egypt (extraordinary rendition) for torture, who are the terrorists? When the USA constructs concentration camps like Guantamo, and holds people there indefinitely, without charges, and subjects them to torture, who are the terrorists? I could go on and on. But, the bottom line, why does America hate Arabs and why does she want to destroy Arabs and Islam?

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

» **Answer: AIPAC Demands "Action" on Iran** Posted by: rwa

911

Posted by: blookanoo on Mar 1, 2007 3:35 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

We all know it was an inside job. Why isn't Altnet reporting on the latest BBC WTC7 story?

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

finally someone said it

Posted by: harinama on Mar 1, 2007 3:54 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Indeed, through our militant and economic strongarm tactics throughout the world, we are the worst "terrorists" (meaning to instill terror on a populace) in the world. Evidence abounds about the US's nefarious activities in every corner of the world in their attempts to force their corporatist fascist vision of "democracy".

America is going to fall HARD. Our social fabric is disintegrating, our infrastructure is crumbling, we are spending more on war than ALL OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD COMBINED, and we are now hated by most of the world for our corporatist imperialist EVIL campaigns of destruction.

I can't wait for the dollar to fall

I can't wait for neocon repigs to die

I can't wait for our cabinet to hang for war crimes

I can't wait for all the corporatist politicians to be recognized for the evil greedy bastards they are.

I can't wait for all of the lobbyists to be thrown out of Washington with a kick in the balls and barely the shirts on their backs

I can't wait for the military industrial complex to lose power and fight each other like dogs for the scraps.

in essence:

I CAN'T WAIT UNTIL AMERICA BECOMES A DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC INSTEAD OF A CORPORATIST FASCIST ENFORCER.

As with Rome, America's time has come. However, I still hold out the small possibility (at approx .000001%) that we may get our heads out of our asses and start treating the other citizens of the world as EQUALS instead of pawns in our selfish games.

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

BOGUS WAR ON TERROR

Posted by: johndoraemi on Mar 1, 2007 3:56 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

"This war on terrorism is bogus."

--former British minister of Parliament Michael Meacher

Last week I posted more than 70 glaring facts that contradict the "official story" of September 11th.

Let's recall some facts about the "terror war" now.

1. Michael Scheuer, head of the CIA bin Laden unit said that Clinton had 10 opportunities to kill or capture bin Laden, yet refused to authorize it. Scheuer includes Richard Clarke and Sandy Berger in his complaints.
2. Sudan intelligence tried to extradite Al Qaeda members to the US, and tried to pass on a thick intelligence file to the Clinton white house. They received cruise missiles on their only medicine plant instead of gratitude.
3. Bin Laden was reported by reputable publications of attending a US military hospital in Dubai United Arab Emirates in July 2001, a Pakistani military hospital on September 10 2001, and he had a working relationship with Pakistani ISI and Saudi Intelligence. The CIA ALSO has a working relationship with ISI and Saudi intelligence.
4. At Tora Bora two escape routes existed for the Al Qaeda retreat. Only one route was blocked by US forces and proxies. People who were there on the US side have come out as whistleblowers on this.
5. One month later, a huge Pakistani airlift removed THOUSANDS of Al Qaeda fighters from Afghanistan to Pakistan right in plain view of the US Air Force.
6. There was a lot of exposure of terrorist financing, yet nothing is done. Michael Chertoff was defending

a bin Laden financier as a private lawyer at the SAME TIME he was heading the Operation Greenquest investigation for the Justice Department(sic). He was accused by DHS investigators of "sabotaging" the Greenquest investigation.

7. That \$100,000 wire transfer business from UAE to Mohamad Atta is linked to the head of Pakistani Intelligence who resigned immediately when exposed.

8. The drug trade from Afghanistan is intimately linked to Al Qaeda and their Balkan operations, the Kosovo Liberation Army, which the government tried to conceal from Congress at the time (1999). We fought a war in Europe to help install radical Islamists linked to Al Qaeda in power in Macedonia, Kosovo and Bosnia.

There's a lot more to this great sham.

Stupid "liberal" pinheads who believe everything the controlled left media tells them don't bother investigating any of this. It's easier to follow the leaders, than to dig into the mess and educate yourself.

The "terrorism threat" is a strategic plan, a paradigm shift that replaces the "communist threat." You'd have to have your head pretty far up your own ass not to see that.

<http://crimesofthestate.blogspot.com/>

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

all part of a larger cycle

Posted by: patrock5000 on Mar 1, 2007 4:31 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

The real problem in America is that most people have no idea what role America truly plays in the world. They do not understand "blowback." To wit:

"As a CIA term of tradecraft, "blowback" does not just mean retaliation for things our government has done to, and in, foreign countries. It refers specifically to retaliation for illegal operations carried out abroad that were kept totally secret from the American public. These operations have included the clandestine overthrow of governments various administrations did not like, the training of foreign militaries in the techniques of state terrorism, the rigging of elections in foreign countries, interference with the economic viability of countries that seemed to threaten the interests of influential American corporations, as well as the torture or assassination of selected foreigners. The fact that these actions were, at least originally, secret meant that when retaliation does come -- as it did so spectacularly on September 11, 2001 -- the American public is incapable of putting the events in context. Not surprisingly, then, Americans tend to support speedy acts of revenge intended to punish the actual, or alleged, perpetrators. These moments of lashing out, of course, only prepare the ground for yet another cycle of blowback."

--Chalmers Johnson

In a civilized country, war should always be the last, worst option. It would only stand to reason that an intentionally misrepresented war, based on doctored intelligence, planned and executed by people who have a substantial financial interest in large scale military action would have disastrous consequences. It should be obvious. Obvious to everyone except this administration and the spineless sheep that support it...

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

[» RE: all part of a larger cycle](#) Posted by: mrcentrist

By this logic.. more terrorism on the way

Posted by: Reader11722 on Mar 1, 2007 5:07 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

Looks like we are in store for a 10% increase in terrorism. Currently, approximately 200,000 soldiers fight for 'democracy' in Iraq [roughly US troops + foreign troops + paid mercenaries (i.e. Blackwater)]. So, the President's solution is to add 10% more (20,000 troops). Even assuming these extra troops perform 100% efficient, things will merely get 10% better in Iraq. Will 10% be worth the continuing carnage of American soldiers? Don't look to the Democrats for help. They will sit idly by as they did when the gov't suspended habeas corpus, opened mail, banned the novel "America Deceived" from Wiki [America Deceived \(book\)](#), conducted illegal wire-taps and continues wars in the Middle East based on a false-flag event known as 9/11. If the Democrats cannot stop the current 10% increase in this war, then they will never stop 100% of this war. But we will certainly increase terrorism by 10%.

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

Look for a "fake incident"

Posted by: sofla100 on Mar 1, 2007 5:50 PM

[[Report this comment](#)]

AIPAC is not going to back off about insisting America take action on Iran. Now, because of the fake WMD justification for the Iraq invasion, Bushes credibility is down the sewer. But, you can bet a solution is on the drawing-board. And, the perfect one, the one that the American flag wavers and big business media will suck up too is the tried and true "Gulf of Tonkin" routine. The experimental version, which mostly flopped, was the Iranian IED thing. Bush has to see now that nothing short of a well staged, complete with American casualties "event" will be enough to justify America invading Iran. Some possibilities are: the lobbed into the Green Zone fake Iranian missile that "takes out" several dozen US soldiers. Complete, of course, with "Iranian markings" on the missile fragments. Another possibility, a "terror incident" in the USA with significant casualties, complete with "Iranians", who after being hauled off to Guantanamo, quickly "confess" to it all, and it was "all planned by the Mullah's," of course. Well, we could go on and on about this. But, who will step up to the plate to carry out such an operation? Not hard to get people at all, the CIA and Mossad are full of "true-believers." Jack Bauer types ready to do "whatever it takes." Such an incident will draw America quickly into a war with Iran, and the resulting carnage will take decades to repair.

[[« Reply to this comment »](#)] [[Post a new comment »](#)]

[» ??????????](#) Posted by: gellero

AGREE 10,000% with this article

Posted by: Michiganman on Mar 1, 2007 7:58 PM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

Is it just me or are others getting the feeling the DEMS are stabbing us in the back. If we invade Iran without a full scale democratic congressional assault on the white house.....all is lost. Lock and load folks!

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)**This article is old news**

Posted by: Lector on Mar 2, 2007 12:00 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

and should have at least shown us where to read the report for ourselves. I find this irritating.

Peter Bergen and Paul Cruickshank are research fellows at the Center on Law and Security at the NYU School of Law and I've seen a lot of Bergen also on CNN and his journalistic columns and I'm sure he's qualified to write this but where can their report be found? What Peter Bergen and Paul Cruickshank should also mention in this article is that this administration's own National Intelligence Estimate on "Trends in Global Terrorism: implications for the United States," circulated within the government in April 2006 and partially declassified in October, states that "the Iraq War has become the 'cause celebre' for jihadists...and is shaping a new generation of terrorist leaders and operatives." The NIE report can be easily Googled but not Bergen's and Cruickshank's.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)**It's still not too late for peace**

Posted by: mtodorov_69 on Mar 2, 2007 5:37 AM

[\[Report this comment\]](#)

I see this young fellow on the video who's skull had to be removed in part because of the swollen brain, and how he is denied medical treatment.

No God is glorified in hating this poor fellow. Neither in (God forbid) rejoicing over his suffering, not even as a return measure for suffering of those who were harmed by Bush's policy. He is simply a fellow human that suffers.

The crucial is misunderstanding between the followers of two revelations of God.

1 John 4:1-3

"This is how you can recognize the Spirit of God:
Every spirit that acknowledges that Jesus Christ
has come in the flesh is from God, ..."

But Koran is not against Jesus: translate the names to Biblical ones and read it again:

1. [3.45] When the angels said: O Mary, surely God gives you good news with a Word from Him (of one whose name is the '. Messiah, Jesus son of Mary, worthy of regard in this world and the hereafter and of those who are made near (to God).

I could give you plenty such examples from Koran, and after replacing Arabic "Allah" for God or LORD which He is, then you get a sound strengthening Scripture, profitable for the fear of God and for correction.

The only thing that you won't find approved in Koran is Constantine's Nicean 325 AD doctrine of Trinity, meaning "Three Equals Gods from the beginning of time", but somehow still being one god, a "Triune God".

You find worshipping of Mary as god either, but Mary has a due credit as a holiest woman and mother of Jesus, the Word.

God bless. One God.

[\[< Reply to this comment\]](#) [\[Post a new comment >\]](#)

[Home](#) [Top Stories](#) [Columnists](#) [Video](#) [Blogs](#) [Discuss](#) [RSS/XML](#) [About](#) [Search](#) [Donate](#) [Contact Us](#) [Advertise](#)

Reproduction of material from any AlterNet pages without written permission is strictly prohibited.
© 2007 Independent Media Institute. All rights reserved.