

CIVILIZATION AND ITS ENEMIES

Frank Parkinson

We are living in a time of vague but widespread angst about many things that seem to be going wrong in the world and a subliminal fear that some unnamed evil is about to happen, be it economic collapse or even a third world war. Democracy, science, religion, technology and education seem to be failing us. This unnamed fear has been building up for a long time: the poet W. B. Yeats wrote in 1919 a line, often quoted in this regard, about a “rough beast slouching towards Bethlehem to be born”, but it has intensified over the past twenty years or so. Those of retirement age in the UK look back to a time when society was kinder, more reliable and less greedy and politics and religion relatively untainted by corruption. Without falling into the trap of starry-eyed nostalgia, it can be said that these and similar memories add up to a civilization that is passing away, without any idea of what better could be put in its place. Diagnosis is the first step, and this is not easy, because there are several deep historical streams underneath the day to day events and these are not only often difficult to trace but merge in different ways. This paper deals with one of these historical currents, but will note two others at the end. A proper understanding of all factors affecting the present situation would require, quite literally, a whole university degree.

Breakdown of civilization has happened in the past, most notably perhaps in the fall of the Roman Empire, which plunged Europe and the near East into the Dark Ages. These things do not just happen: there are forces, individuals and groups that drive events and the most fundamental driver of world events today is America’s push for global domination with military force and any other forces at its disposal, particularly economic power and black propaganda. The end result, already visible, is a world that was described, often in uncanny detail, in the dystopian novels of George Orwell and Aldous Huxley, in *Animal Farm, 1984* and *Brave New World*. When such things are discussed, it is easy to become a conspiracy theorist in the negative sense (i.e., when there is no conspiracy behind events) but in the present instance the new American plan for world domination might be called a conspiracy in plain sight, for it is laid out explicitly in the document *Proposal for a New American Century*, available on the Internet, which specifies America’s right to police the world and impose its political demands. Specifically, it calls for a military build-up sufficient to fight two major wars simultaneously. The PNAC was published in 1997 by a right wing think tank made up of neoconservatives, usually abbreviated to neocons, and headed by Dick Cheney. The right and moral duty of America to create a global hegemony is argued by Cheney in the most hubristic and indeed delusional way in his 2016 book *Exceptional*, co-authored by his daughter Liz. The PNAC doctrine became unofficial government policy when George W. Bush became president in 2001 and Cheney vice-president. As a manifesto and policy document, it has been called “the American *Mein Kampf*”. Shortly afterwards most of the originators were given high

administrative positions in the new administration. In effect, Cheney had engineered a *coup d'état*. Most of the new appointments were ostensibly made by the president, of course, but Bush was a willing puppet in this unannounced takeover, not a leader. The appointments to high administrative positions are a matter of record, one of particular significance being Paul Wolfensohn who was made deputy Secretary of Defense and then President of the World Bank.

The neocon movement had a history going back to the early post World War II years, its members being drawn from the extreme right wing political and journalistic class, hawkishly anti-soviet and pro-Israel in sentiment and increasingly Jewish in its policy committees. Wikipedia says that “many were from the Jewish intellectual milieu of New York city.” The Jewish bias is of importance for two reasons. The first is that the neocon movement itself largely set out to embody the political principles of Leo Strauss, a Jewish refugee from Nazi Germany who taught political philosophy at Chicago University from 1949-69, where many of the earliest neocons were his students. Strauss’s core teaching was that politics was philosophy in action and that the most effective philosophy from this perspective was that of Nietzsche, whose doctrine of the superman and the power of the will underlay the Nazi movement. Strauss’s doctrine was anti-democratic in tone and principle; he claimed that democracy was ultimately responsible for the rise of Nazi-ism and the Jewish Holocaust in that, as a form of government, it lacked the firm leadership that any country needed. Strauss preached in effect the need for a dictatorship by the enlightened and something approaching totalitarianism. It is perhaps worth noting here that 2,500 years ago Plato used similar arguments against democracy, but saw the answer in having “a philosopher king” as the source of political authority.

The second significance of the neocons’ Jewish bias was twofold. After World War Two Israel became a natural ally of the United States since its geographical position made it a defensive outpost of American oil interests in the Middle East. Also all Jews outside of Israel have a *de facto* dual citizenship insofar they have an unrestricted right to settle in Israel and thus in principle they have a divided national loyalty. If there were to be differences, serious or trivial, between their two nations, the loyalty of any particular individual is not predictable. These two facts created a complex situation of mutual dependency, setting up enormous geopolitical tensions and in effect putting America in a permanently hostile position in relation to Islamic countries. The political co-dependency of the US and Israel has had a profound effect on American internal politics, with policy-making often being for the benefit of Israel rather than the American people. The first notable work to bring this to public attention was Mearsheimer and Walt’s *The Israel Lobby* in 2006, an objective analysis by two respected academics. Despite its objectivity, it was met by a storm of accusations of anti-Semitism, which seems in large measure to have deterred public discussion of the significance of the issue. It should also be mentioned in this regard that the main newspapers and television channels in the US are Jewish-owned and unlikely to favour such discussion. The factuality of these assertions can be easily checked on the Internet, without any judgement made, but unfortunately, since the Nazi Holocaust, society has been over-sensitized to charges of anti-semitism, whether or not it may be present.

The political and military co-dependence of the US and Israel has geopolitical consequences of the first order. Surrounded as it is by Islamic countries and generating hostility internationally through its treatment of the Palestinians, Israel's long term strategy has been to neutralize the military power of those nations which present a potential threat, most notably Iran. This has fitted in perfectly with the American strategy of neutralizing the oil states and as far as possible gaining control of their oil, thus assuring that the pricing of oil continues to be in US dollars. The significance of this economic fact cannot be under-estimated. In a word, any party wishing to buy oil must first buy dollars from America, and since the dollar was cut loose from gold-backing by President Nixon in 1973, the American Treasury in cooperation with the Federal Reserve, is able print dollars more or less at will and exchange this paper money for other currencies with solid value. The end result of this process is that America is able to tax the rest of the world. While precise figures are impossible to compute, using the average European's consumption of oil as a rough guide, it could be estimated at not less than £50 per head per year. It may be appreciated, then, that America has a huge stake in maintaining this state of affairs and, more generally, control of global oil supplies through the giant oil companies, Exxon-Mobil and Chevron particularly. There is therefore a relationship of mutual benefit between the American government and these oil majors.

All this presents a complex global picture and a summary account must necessarily be simplified. Although some of the statements made here may seem to be questionable, and will doubtless come as a surprise to the general public, there is no shortage of corroborating material to hand on the Internet, including the full text of the PNAC (Proposal for a New American Century) document. It is not too much to say that each of us has a moral duty to inform ourselves of these facts, and those who prefer to continue living in ignorance of the deep currents which are moving global affairs are a major element in the crisis of civilization.

Within the limits of the present simplification America's policy of global warfare (overt and covert) can be clearly seen by those who are motivated to look, and a reading of PNAC manifesto will clarify many otherwise confusing events in the world. The invasion of Afghanistan with a "coalition of the willing" was made not to free the country from the Taliban (who had previously been supported militarily by the US during the Russian invasion) but to protect American interests in oil and gas pipelines from the Caspian basin. The invasion of Iraq was not to depose the tyrant Saddam Hussein but, at the least, to put Iraq's oil in friendly hands. The "humanitarian bombing" of Libya in support of "freedom fighters" against Gaddafi's regime was, similarly, to gain control of the oil, but had a wider purpose in the *Africom* strategy to make America a power in Africa, a strategy now continued by proxy through NATO's involvement in Mali. Both the clandestine bombing of Libya, under the cover of a unilateral American "no fly zone" decision, and intervention in Mali were actively supported by President Nicolas Sarkozy as part of a policy of maximizing French influence in francophone Africa, reviving dreams of the old French colonial empire.

Support of civil uprising in Syria and a shameful distortion of the political realities there through all the media, not least the BBC, has a dual purpose. In the first place, it

takes away a potential threat from Hezbollah on Israel's borders but also makes Iran's south western flank vulnerable to war in whatever form it may take. Iran is the last great prize, having a very large share in the world's oil and gas resources. The factuality of this briefest of overviews can be confirmed and given more detail in a Youtube talk by General Wesley Clark (Google "Wesley Clark: US will attack 7 countries in 5 years."). It is of more than passing interest that Clark, a four star general had no idea while he was on active service that this was the government strategy he was implementing.

Overarching all the above facts, which are very selective, is America's global strategy of an endless and open-ended "war on terror". This has been, and still is, justified by the 9/11 atrocity, which seemingly proves that certain Islamic interests – the terrorists – are intent on the destruction of America and, by extension of the "free world". No understanding of America's global ambition is possible without an examination of the evidence for this assumption, which is usually accepted unquestioning. *Prima facie*, it would seem unlikely in the extreme that this highly complex operation was planned and carried out by a handful of young Islamist armed with Stanley knives and with no experience of piloting an airplane other than one who had flown only the smallest Cessna. That most of the accused can show they were not even in America on the day, that the third of the "twin towers" collapsed into its own footprint without even being hit by a plane, and that many witnesses report hearing internal explosions as the towers came down are among dozens of anomalies that are not raised, let alone explained, in the official report. Despite this and much other counter-evidence, the great majority of people worldwide accept without question the conclusion put out by the American government it was all perpetrated by "terrorists", and those who call for the evidence to be reassessed are dismissed with abuse as "conspiracy theorists". Again, it must be said that there is ample evidence in books and on the Internet that this world-changing catastrophe was engineered, in the most literal sense, by parties within the American government, and those who deliberately avoid looking at the evidence must be counted as part of the problem they wish to solve. For evil to happen it is enough for good people to do nothing.

The other two main streams which are moving world events will call for a separate treatment, but should be mentioned here. The first is the so-called Deep State, which is a shadowy alliance of various special interests which control American democracy behind the scenes, of which the defence, banking and energy industries are the most obvious. Political and financial interests go hand in hand are usually hard to separate, but one of the most important drivers of world political events, which now seem to be outside of any government's control, is the Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA was set up by President Truman to counter the threat of Soviet Russian espionage and "dirty tricks" but before he died he was to regret that he had brought into existence an agency which threatened American democracy. The necessary secrecy with which the CIA must operate has become a justification for unaccountability and resulted in a situation where its *de facto* authority is often greater than that of Congress or the president himself. The underlying Catch 22 is that because their operations are, and must be, secret hard evidence is not always easy to come by and critics, or even enquirers, can be fobbed off with an all purpose excuse of "national security". There can be no doubt

that the CIA in important respects operates as a government within a government. Sometimes it cooperates with the semi-secret Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), sometimes in opposition when one or the other feels their “turf” has been encroached upon.

The third historical stream is the takeover of political structures by financial interests, a process which began with the first Rothschild some two centuries ago and has resulted today in a situation where global banks which have failed through gambling on a huge scale – the word gambling is not an exaggeration – must be recapitalized by public money. The reason that is always given is that they have become too big to fail, since a bankruptcy on this scale would wipe out private savings, businesses and pensions on an equal scale. A solution to this problem cannot be proposed here, but it is to be noted that the mega-banks, however respectable their façade, have become to all intents criminal enterprises. HSBC has been found guilty of laundering a billion dollars of drug money in North America, and their defence that it happened through oversight beggars belief. That this defence has been accepted legally and a minimal fine imposed leads to the even more alarming conclusion that the justice and regulatory system in the US is not performing its necessary function. Perhaps the most worrying symptom of all that civilization is now under terminal threat is that the judiciary is revealing corruption at the highest levels.

However noble and inspiring a nation’s constitution may be, if those to whom its operations are entrusted are dishonest, it will be dysfunctional and decay into cronyism of the worst kind. A good system cannot be built from inadequate or self-serving individuals. That is why the survival of civilization is in the end a matter of an educated spiritual reform.