



January 2013

Who Is The Enemy?

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

“I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations.” James Madison: Virginia Convention: June 16, 1788

“Of all the enemies to public liberty war is, perhaps, the most dreaded, because it comprises and develops the germ of every other. War is the parent of armies; from these proceed debts and taxes; and armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few. In war, too, the discretionary power of the Executive is extended; its influence in dealing out offices, honors, and emoluments is multiplied; and all the means of seducing the minds, are added to those of subduing the force, of the people.” James Madison: “Political Observations” April 20, 1795

When James Madison warned that “armies, and debts, and taxes are the known instruments for bringing the many under the domination of the few,” he was giving voice to the Founders’ well-founded and oft-expressed opposition to standing military establishments.

From their experience in the War for Independence, the Founders took away a deep and abiding distrust of arbitrary power and the institutions used to enforce it. They had seen how cynical and opportunistic figures in the British Government, following the French and Indian War, sought to prolong the “crisis” along the frontier in order to justify the continued presence of British military forces among the colonists. While advertised as a “protective” measure, the true purpose of those troops was to extract revenue for the Crown, and suppress any resistance that might emerge.

In addition to being an indispensable asset of arbitrary power, a standing military is an irresistible target to social engineers. The top-down, authoritarian structure of the military makes it a very useful vehicle for bringing about revolutionary social change – and the U.S. military has been used in that fashion for roughly a century. We've reached the point at which the cultural Marxists who occupy the “commanding heights” of the political and cultural establishment are preparing to use the military against refractory elements of the American public.

On January 17, the *Washington Times* publicized a report compiled by West Point's **Combating Terrorism Center** entitled “**Challengers from the Sidelines: Understanding America's Violent Far Right.**” (1) The West Point report offers nothing new. The document is essentially a pastiche of alarmist publications by the likes of the Southern Poverty Law Center (an organization cited repeatedly therein) and leftist social engineers going back decades to Daniel Bell (2) and, before him, the cultural Marxists organized by Theodor Adorno who published the fraudulent study, *The Authoritarian Personality*, back in 1952. (3)

For at least two generations, the ruling establishment has – in the words of political historian Paul Gottfried of Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania – sought to “*pathologize dissent by claiming that conservatives are either psychologically unfit or concealing bigoted motivations.*” More recently, the regime has signaled its intention to move beyond social engineering into overt, undisguised authoritarian rule – which would include targeting dissidents as enemies of the state and overtly making war on them.

Included among the “**Far Right**” enemies that are considered domestic terrorists, according to the Pentagon's recent report, is a population referred to as “*anti-federalists.*” Historically, that term refers to such figures among the founding generation as Patrick Henry and George Mason, who were skeptical of the proposed Constitution and demanded that it include a Bill of Rights. The writings of the Anti-Federalist faction were voluminous, detailed, and – especially on the subject of potential abuse of judicial power – remarkably prescient.

Nobody with a modicum of historical knowledge and a smattering of honesty would consider the Anti-Federalists to be unpatriotic or criminally inclined. Nor would any honest analysis of contemporary affairs yield similar conclusions about the behavior and motives of those Americans who share the Anti-Federalists' reflexive hostility toward centralized power. Yet here is what the Pentagon counter-terrorism report has to say about the segment of the population characterized as “anti-federalist”:

“The anti-federalist rationale is multifaceted, and includes the beliefs that the American political system and its proxies were hijacked by external forces interested in promoting a ‘New World Order’ (NWO) in which the United States will be absorbed into the United Nations or another version of global

government. They also espouse strong convictions regarding the federal government, believing it to be corrupt and tyrannical, with a natural tendency to intrude on individuals' civil and constitutional rights. Finally, they support civil activism, individual freedoms, and self-government. Extremists in the anti-federalist movement direct most of their violence against the federal government and its proxies in law enforcement.” (4)

Where did some Americans get the idea that the U.S. constitutional system is being abolished and supplanted by an UN-centered geopolitical arrangement? At least some who meet that description – the better-informed among them – are aware of the fact that the federal government itself has promoted that idea, in one form or another, since publication of the report: **A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations: A Preliminary Survey of One Form of a Stable Military Environment**, by MIT Professor Lincoln P. Bloomfield in 1962. (5)

In the Introduction to that report, Professor Bloomfield offered a brief overview of UN-centered policy decisions during the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations:

“On September 19, 1959, Chairman Khrushchev announced to the UN General Assembly his plan for "general and complete disarmament" within four years. The American response was given by Secretary of State Herter on February 18, 1960, in a speech to the National Press Club. Mr. Herter said that the first goal of the United States in the forthcoming disarmament negotiations was the creation of a `stable military environment.' To create such an environment he urged certain arms control actions, such as measures to guard against surprise attack and to curtail the spread of nuclear weapons.”

The second stage of Mr. Herter's counterproposal was that of general disarmament. Two American objectives existed within the disarmament stage. First, the creation of universally accepted rules of law, backed by a world court with effective means of enforcement — *`that is, by international armed force.'* The second objective was disarmament itself — *`to the point where no single nation or group of nations could effectively oppose this enforcement of international law by international machinery.'*

The theme set forth by Mr. Herter was carried into the two proposals made by the United States in the spring of 1960, on March 15 and June 27. Under the latter proposal an International Disarmament Control Organization would be established within the framework of the United Nations in the first stage of disarmament. The second stage would include progressive establishment of an international peace force within the United Nations sufficient to preserve world peace under disarmament. The September 1961 US proposals follow the same pattern.

Here, then, is the basis in recent American policy for the notion of a world *effectively controlled by the United Nations.* It was not made explicit, but *the United States position carried the unmistakable meaning, by whatever name, of world government, sufficiently powerful in any event to keep the peace and enforce its judgments.*” (Emphasis added) (6)

If there is a material difference between what Bloomfield described in 1962, and what the Pentagon is accusing “right-wing extremists” of believing in 2013, it is that the latter supposedly blame “external forces” for the subversion of American independence, while Bloomfield makes it clear that the blame resides almost entirely within the U.S. government itself.

In 2012, fifty years after Bloomfield published his report, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta admitted in congressional testimony that the Obama administration considers the UN – not the Congress – the source of authority for military actions overseas. During an appearance before the Senate Armed Services Committee (7), Panetta was asked by Senator Jeff Sessions:

“Do you think you can act without Congress to initiate a no-fly zone in Syria?”

“Our goal would be to seek international permission,” replied Panetta, adding – as if by way of patronizing afterthought – that **“we would come to the Congress and inform you”** about the progress of the campaign. Once *“legal permission”* had been granted by NATO or *“some kind of UN Security Council resolution,”* he maintained, Obama wouldn’t need authorization from Congress.

Significantly, the Obama administration’s intervention in Libya was coordinated by the NATO alliance (a regional UN affiliate), which acted on the supposed authority provided by a UN Security Council resolution issued in response to a petition from the Arab League. Congress played no role whatsoever in authorizing the action.

It is inconceivable that the people running West Point’s Counter-Terrorism Center are unaware of these developments. In fact, the Pentagon has taken great care to indoctrinate at least the last generation of command-grade officers in the nostrums of UN-centered “peace” operations and “operations other than war.”

One very suitable example of that indoctrination was offered in an essay entitled **“Ambushing the Future,”** which was published in the April 1995 issue of *Special Warfare* (the journal of the JFK School of Special Warfare at Ft. Bragg, North Carolina.) The author of that article, James J. Schneider, is a professor of military theory at the School of Advanced Military Studies at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas.

According to Schneider, *"the U.S. Army of the future will face its greatest challenge since the end of the Civil War"*:

“[T]he future will be dominated by a single overwhelming presence -- the United Nations. The resurgence and the growing influence of the UN will not only affect our soldiers but may change the very structure of the nation-state ... One of the key legal [rights] was the right of the state to declare and wage war. The growing power of the UN is beginning slowly to erode this defining characteristic In the future, war and peace will be re-established on a new conceptual footing, and the idea of the soldier will be redefined.

In the UN-dominated future, "nations will no longer wage war. They will wage peace," writes Schneider. "The purpose of the military in this new scheme will be to conduct "operations other than war" -- specifically "peace compelling, peace enforcement, and peacekeeping." The model for these new missions, Schneider projected, will be the Reconstruction period:

"Reconstruction was, all at once, an effort in peacekeeping, peace enforcement, humanitarian relief, nation-building, and, with the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, counter-terrorism."

In short, Schneider concludes, *"For the Army ... the future will be a period of global reconstruction"* under the direction of the UN. He acknowledged that the Reconstruction period *"represented, from a military standpoint, the darkest days in the history of the Army."* It was a dismal period for individual liberty as well, as Southerners were suffocated beneath a military dictatorship and tyrannized by carpetbaggers. Furthermore, at the end of the Reconstruction period, the transformation of the American constitutional republic into a consolidated, unitary state dominated by Washington was well underway. The concept of *"global reconstruction,"* therefore, presents an ominous prospect to those who cherish individual rights and American independence.

Obviously, Schneider could express those genuinely subversive views in a Pentagon-approved publication, for the instruction of future Special Forces operators, without being branded as a potential domestic terrorist by West Point's Counter-Terrorism Center. Apparently, only critics of these developments are worthy of that designation – not because their assessment is the product of paranoia, but rather because their perceptions are accurate.

A necessary co-efficient to the UN-centered external mission of the U.S. military is its emerging domination of Washington's "internal security" apparatus. Again, this is nothing new; this follows the program described in 1961 in Bloomfield's report, as summarized in State Department Document 7277, *Freedom From War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.* (8) By the

mid-1990s, the military's top-echelon commanders were being taught that their new mission would require, among other things, abolition of the Posse Comitatus Act that forbids the domestic use of the military for law enforcement purposes. (9)

During a visit to Ft. Leavenworth's Battle Command Training Program in 1996, author Robert D. Kaplan attended several round-table discussions involving the officers who now occupy the highest echelons in the Pentagon.

As Kaplan recorded in his book *An Empire Wilderness*, one consistent theme of those discussions was the likely repeal of the Posse Comitatus Act, which forbids the U.S. military from acting as a domestic law enforcement agency.

“Many times in the course of my visit to Leavenworth I heard discussions of the Posse Comitatus Act,” wrote Kaplan. “The implication was that turbulence within the United States might one day require the act to be repealed.” During one round-table discussion, Kaplan continues, “at least two high-echelon commanders ‘suggested that ‘a time may come when the military will have to go domestic.’” (10)

Similar assumptions were woven into a recent homeland security drill in Portsmouth, Ohio, in which elements of the Ohio National Guard's 52nd Civil Support Unit play-acted an incident in which two school employees, angered by the government's crackdown on gun rights, plotted a terrorist attack. (11)

A government determined to treat its population as the enemy will usually create some excuse to do so. And the incumbent administration, which is headed by an unabashed cultural Marxist who is surrounded by dead-eyed Machiavellian advisors, is consciously following a course that will lead to armed conflict.

The Obama administration is openly escalating its campaign against private gun ownership — but is it also preparing to make war on the American population? According to Canadian educator and human rights activist Jim Garrow, the answer to that shocking question is **“yes.”**

In a phone interview, Garrow told me that he received an early morning phone call from a man he identified as a retired high-ranking military officer. That man was upset because a young protégé had resigned his commission to protest the Obama administration's efforts to reconstruct the military. The disillusioned young officer reportedly said the administration's litmus test for officers was a willingness to accept orders from the chain of command that would involve firing on U.S. citizens who refuse to surrender their firearms.

Garrow hasn't revealed his source – either the retired officer with whom he spoke, or the younger officer who reportedly resigned his commission. He told me that both of them are in fear for their lives. This means that independent confirmation of Garrow's testimony is impossible. In light of what was discussed above, however, that account is entirely plausible – and only those cursed with terminal credulity regarding the regime's professed benevolence would dismiss it.

REFERENCES

- 1) "West Point Center cites dangers of 'far right' in U.S.," *The Washington Times*, January 17, 2013.
- 2) See generally *The Radical Right*, Daniel Bell, ed. (New York: Transaction Publishers, third ed. 2001).
- 3) See generally *The Authoritarian Personality*, T.W. Adorno, ed (New York: W.W. Norton Company, abridged, 1993).
- 4) "Challengers from the Sidelines: Understanding America's Violent Far-Right," by Arie Perliger (Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, Nov. 2012), pg. 4
- 5) The Bloomfield report can be accessed at — http://www.un-freezone.org/bloomfield_7.html
- 6) Bloomfield, Introduction
- 7) See — http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=5zNwOeyuG84#!
- 8) For the text of State Department Document 7277, go to — http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/ERC/arms/freedom_war.html
To download an academic version of the document, go to — <http://archive.org/details/FreedomFromWar>
- 9) For the text of the Posse Comitatus Act (18 U.S.C. sec. 1385) – go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/1385>
- 10) Robert D. Kaplan, *An Empire Wilderness: Travels into America's Future* (New York: Random House, 1998), pgs. 7, 13.
- 11) "Mock Disaster Training Exercise in Scioto County," WSAZ Channel 3 news, January 17, 2013; accessible at -- <http://www.wsaz.com/news/headlines/Mock-Disaster-Training-Exercise-in-Scioto-County-187322931.html>

Submitted by William Grigg

Is Jim Garrow's information accurate? Are the lives of the retired senior military officer and the young military officer in danger? Yes! If you are in the U.S. military, a government employee, or a prominent citizen, and you publicly criticize the subversive activities that are taking place, the Brotherhood of Darkness (BOD) will discredit you, or try to eliminate you.

Does the BOD kill people? Yes! If you read the Church Committee Report (The MKULTRA Report) you will discover the CIA assassinated Patrice Lumumba, the president of The Congo, Ngo Dinh Diem, the president of South Viet Nam, Rafael Trujillo, the president of the Dominican Republic, and they tried to assassinate other political leaders.

Does the Brotherhood kill U.S. citizens? Certainly! They executed President Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, and they killed several people I interviewed: i.e. Gary Webb who reportedly shot himself in the head twice because he wanted to be certain he was dead.

Can I document the BOD assassinates U.S. citizens? Yes! I offer a 4-CD set that contains interviews with two government assassins, and an interview with a writer who tracked down a man who was ordered to kill General George Patton. The 4-CD set is titled "Deadly Assassins." It can be ordered by calling 800-544-8927. What happened to the assassins? Lt. Colonel Dan Marvin died, and Chip Tatum disappeared. I haven't heard from him for many years.

We live in a fallen world, and the situation will get worse unless there is a spiritual revival. Will God intervene? I don't know, but I believe the Lord wants me to continue trying to awaken the American people, and I believe He wants you to do the same.

You have my permission to copy and distribute this letter because it is one of the best articles available on the diabolic effort to disarm the American people.

I have had an excellent response to my offer to provide a case of Brotherhood of Darkness (60 copies), with your choice of a free 4-CD set or DVD (\$19.95 or less), for \$149.95. Please respond promptly if you are interested.

Barbara and I appreciate your continued support and your faithful prayers for Radio Liberty.

Yours in Christ,

Stanley Monteith