

The Grand Deception

A Second Look at the War on Terrorism

© 2001 by G. Edward Griffin

The concepts I would like to share with you today were set to paper three days after the terrorist attack against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11. I printed about a dozen copies and gave them to family and friends. Since then I have added historical data, but *the concepts and the message remain unchanged*. Many of the predictions I made have already come to pass; but any pride I might have in being right is far offset by the grim substance of those predictions.

After completing *The Creature from Jekyll Island*, I felt that I still had one more book to write and that it would be called *The Freedom Manifesto*. I also knew that I would need a dramatic issue in the first chapter to capture attention. Well, the terrorist attack on September 11 was certainly that – and more.

I told those on my email list that I would send them my expanded report, but then I became bogged down in structuring and gathering material for the book. By that time, the report had become huge and had to be divided into chapters. All of that took about four weeks. So, what started out to be a four-page report on terrorism metamorphosed into Chapter One of *The Freedom Manifesto*.

At first, it was my intent to keep the material up to date with late-breaking events: but then it occurred to me that it might have more value in its *original* form than if it were continually updated. Writing about news events after they happen is not difficult, but writing about them *before* they happen is another matter. So, I decided to let the overview stand exactly as conceptualized on Friday, September 14, 2001. This is that report.

KNOW THE ENEMY

In the year 500 B.C., a Chinese general and philosopher by the name of Sun Tzu wrote a treatise called *The Art of War*. It has been translated into just about every language in the world and has become a classic of military and political strategy. In it, Sun Tzu said:

If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle.¹

It is now three days after the attack, and I am haunted by the words of Sun Tzu. America has declared war, but her leaders are not even sure who the enemy is. Is it a man called Osama bin Laden? Is it Afghanistan, the nation that shelters him? Is it the Taliban which rules Afghanistan? Is it a terrorist group called al-Qaida? Is it Muslim Extremism? We commit to war but do not know the enemy.

The meaning of this event is far more complicated than the surface facts would indicate. On the surface, we have a group of people in the Middle East who hate America

¹ Sun Tzu, *The Art of War* (New York: Delacorte Press, 1983), p. 18.

and have pledged themselves to inflict severe punishment on her, even at the sacrifice of their own lives. If that is as far as we care to look, then the meaning is simple. It is them against us; we are at war; they are the bad guys; we are the good guys; and we must destroy the enemy.

That is the meaning that was given to the American people by their leaders. President Bush summarized it well when he told the nation, Tuesday, that the attack was an act of cowardice and that America was the target because it was a beacon of freedom. If that is the correct meaning of the event, the logical consequences are that we must fight back; we must defend freedom; and we must not stop until the cowards are wiped off the face of the earth. That is the path of war, retaliation, and, of course, *counter-retaliation*.

There is, however, a deeper understanding of this event, and it has to do with the maxim: *actions have consequences*. To come to that understanding, we must do the unthinkable in moments of crisis. We must ask questions.

LOYALTY AND PATRIOTISM

Asking questions is not popular with some people. When a nation is at war, there is a tendency for its citizens to rally behind their leaders without questioning the wisdom of their actions. For them, the test of patriotism is conformity. Those who ask questions are called unpatriotic. Life is simple for the conformists. All they want to know is “What side are you on, anyway?”¹

When we reach the end of this report, there will be no doubt in anyone’s mind about *my* patriotism or which side holds my loyalty; but, along the way, I definitely will be asking some hard questions about the wisdom of American foreign policy.

Although I may be critical of our politicians and their policies; I want it clearly understood at the outset that I totally support our men and women who will be sent into combat as a result of those policies. When we find ourselves in a shooting war, regardless of how we got into it, at that point we have no choice. We must put all that we have into the fight. But, the other side of that coin is that we must fight to *win*. Our goal must be *victory*, not stalemate – and we should achieve it as quickly as possible to minimize casualties on both sides. That does *not* mean fighting a protracted conflict in which something *other* than victory is the goal. That is what our politicians forced us to do in Korea and Vietnam and Desert Storm and the Balkan War. After the fighting was over, the tyrannical regimes were still there. We left them in place. Some of them are now supporting the terrorists who have attacked us.

In the days ahead, we must be clear on the difference between loyalty and patriotism. The spirit of loyalty compels us to support and defend our country even when she is wrong. That is necessary in time of war, but patriotism is a higher ideal. It compels us, not only to defend our country when she is wrong, but also to do everything within our power to bring her back to the side of right.

When it comes to patriotism, there is no one who has a greater love for country than I do. That is easy to *say*; but when you hear someone make that statement, you have a right to know where is the evidence? My evidence is my life. I did not purchase our family’s flag on Tuesday. It is very old and weathered. We have proudly displayed it on every holiday for

¹ This attitude became official government policy on September 23, 2001, when Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage said, “You are either 100 percent for us or 100 percent against us.”

more than forty years. Often, it was the only flag in the neighborhood. I did not need a terrorist attack to remind me to honor my country and my heritage.

Displaying the flag is important, but patriotism requires much more than that. I have devoted almost the entirety of my adult life trying to mobilize my fellow countrymen to the defense of America from her enemies outside her borders and within. Since 1960, I have left behind me a long paper trail and a mountain of audio and videotapes extolling the virtues of the American system, her culture, her Constitution, and her people. I love America and all that she has stood for in days gone by, but I am saddened beyond words at what has been done to her within my lifetime – and what I fear is *yet* to be done in the days ahead.

There are those who may say that I am anti-government, but that is not true. I am *not* anti-government; I am anti-*corrupt* government. I will do everything possible to defend my government from those who would violate their oaths of office, tear apart the Constitution, or use their positions of trust to oppress our people. *To oppose corruption in government is the highest obligation of patriotism.*

WHY DO THEY HATE AMERICA?

The first question we need to ask is *why*? Why do the terrorists hate America?¹

I am reminded of the story of a young man in medieval times who wanted to become a knight. He obtained an audience with the king and offered his services, explaining that he was an excellent swordsman. The king told him that the realm was at peace, and there was no need for a knight. Nevertheless, the young man insisted that he be allowed to serve. To put an end to the discussion, the king finally agreed and knighted him on the spot. Several months later, the young knight returned to the castle and requested another audience. When he entered the throne room, he bowed in respect and then reported that he had been very busy. He explained that he had killed thirty of the king's enemies in the North and forty-five of them in the South. The king looked puzzled for a moment and said, "But I don't *have* any enemies." To which the knight replied, "You do *now*, Sire."

Do Muslim terrorists hate America because of their religion or their culture? Is it because they are envious of America's wealth or that American women wear short skirts? Or is it because they really do hate freedom? No one with knowledge of Islam believes any of those answers. Some commentators have quoted the more militant passages of the Koran as proof that religion is, indeed, the basis of this animosity, but a careful reading reveals that violence is approved only in retaliation. Of course, there are groups within Islam that have a very liberal interpretation of retaliation, but the fact remains that the terrorists are attacking only those countries that have previously conducted military campaigns against their people. Their hatred comes, not from the Koran or the ancient traditions or from envy. It comes from a desire for *revenge*.

AMERICA BECOMES WORLD POLICEMAN

Ever since the end of World War II, America's politicians have viewed themselves as *global* leaders with a responsibility to manage the affairs of the *world* that outweighs or at

¹ Five days after I wrote these words, *USA Today* carried an eye-witness report from Pakistan echoing the same sentiment. It said: "In Pakistan this week, thousands have demonstrated. They've burned American flags, raised clenched fists, and held aloft banners telling the world what they think of the USA. One, written in English, asked a stunning question: 'Americans, think! Why does the whole world hate you?'" See "Extremists' hatred of U.S. has varied roots," *USA Today*, Sept. 19, 2001, p. 1.

least equals any obligation to their own country. For over five decades, the nation's universities and media have extolled the virtues of internationalism. The old tradition of avoiding foreign entanglements was sneeringly called *isolationism*. We were conditioned to think that the old way was stupid. The wave of the future was shown to us, and it was a *New World Order*. Over the years, we watched with approval as our leaders increasingly entangled our once sovereign nation into a world community called the United Nations. Treaty by treaty, we watched and approved as we became increasingly subject to international edicts and played the role of world policeman.

It is in that role that our military began to wage wars against populations far removed from our shores and even further from our national interests. To justify those wars, we were told that we were defending victim groups against their despotic neighbors or ridding the world of drug lords; but, after the smoke of battle cleared, we discovered that there were hidden agendas that were much less noble. More often than not, the real purpose of the war was to control oil fields, ports, mineral resources, or military supply lines – or even to distract voters from thinking about scandals in the White House. If you roam around the globe shooting and bombing people, and aligning yourself politically with others who do the same, you cannot expect your victims to like you very much. Some may even be willing to die for revenge.

A MOMENT OF TRUTH IN MEDIA

On Wednesday evening (September 12), Henry Sigman, reported on Nightline: “The U.S. is seen as a sort of an insensitive hegemony with arrogance that seeks to impose its own values on the rest of the world. It is seen as an uncritical supporter of the State of Israel in its conflict with the Palestinians, and the combination of the two does not make for U.S. popularity in that part of the world.”

Adding to this theme was Magnas Raisdorff, who also appeared on Nightline while Ted Koppel, the show's host, was speaking from London. Raisdorff, a reporter in the London branch of CBS, and an expert on terrorism, agreed with Sigman. He said:

Many in the Arab world regard the U.S., not as an honest broker, but as protecting and shielding Israel over very important political as well as religious issues. Among these issues are: Israel's control over holy Islamic sites, like the Dome of the Rock;¹ the presence of U.S. troops near Islamic religious places such as Mecca and Medina; the sanctions the U.S. has placed on Iraq are mostly depriving children of drugs and food they desperately need; and, most importantly, Israel's attacks on prominent Palestinian militants are using equipment, like helicopter gun ships, provided by the U.S.

Then Jim Ruden, also in London, came on the program to summarize Raisdorff's report saying: “And *that* is why what happened yesterday, happened, *not* because ‘America is the world's brightest beacon [of freedom].’”

Since the end of World War II, the United States has launched military strikes against Panama, Kosovo, Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, Serbia, Iraq, Kuwait, Sudan, Haiti, Granada,

¹ Although the Dome of the Rock presently has a Muslim mosque built upon it, the Jews and Christians also regard as a holy site. It is the location where it is believed that, according to Scripture, Jacob was tested by God to see if he would obey God's command, even to the extent of sacrificing his only son, Isaac.

Afghanistan, and Somalia – all in the pursuit of stopping drugs, defending freedom, or resisting Communism. In the great majority of cases, these objectives were *not* achieved. The only measurable result has been the creation of hostility toward America. That is what I call the OOPS Factor that has been a dominant feature of U.S. foreign policy for over five decades.

Politicians never admit that they have made a mistake – especially a big one. To do so would imply that they are not qualified to lead. No matter what errors they make, they find something or someone to blame. Their standard excuse is that they didn't have enough money or large enough staff or enough authority. If only we will increase their budget and give them more power, everything will be corrected. Typically, they already have spent too *much* money, hired too *many* people, and exercised too *much* authority, so their proposed solution is more of exactly what created the problem in the first place.

In the case of terrorism, the politicians who create U.S. foreign policy cannot be expected to tell the world they made a mistake. It will be a chilly day in Hades when they announce that they, themselves, have any responsibility for these acts. They will not want the American people contemplating the possibility that Tuesday's attack might have been related to an interventionist foreign policy. They will try to single out a *person* and then demonize him so he will become the central focus of anger and retaliation. That person probably will be Osama bin Laden, so, let us see what *he* has to say about this. (Please remember that these words were written just three days after the attack of September 11 and, at that time, bin Laden had not yet been firmly declared as the responsible party.)

FROM THE MIND OF BIN LADEN

In May of 1998, ABC reporter John Miller interviewed bin Laden at his camp on a mountaintop in Southern Afghanistan. This is what he said:

The Americans impose themselves on everyone. ... They accuse our children in Palestine of being terrorists. Those children who have no weapons and have not even reached maturity. At the same time, they defend ... with their airplanes and tanks, the state of the Jews that has a policy to destroy the future of these children. ... In the Sabra and Shatilla massacre, ... houses were demolished over the heads of children. Also, by testimony of relief workers in Iraq, the American-led sanctions resulted in the death of more than one million Iraqi children. ... We believe that the biggest thieves in the world and the terrorists are the *Americans*. The only way for us to fend off these assaults is to use similar means. ... So, we tell the Americans as a people, and we tell the mothers of soldiers, and American mothers in general, if they value their lives and those of their children, find a nationalistic government that will look after their interests and ... does not attack others, their lands, or their honor.¹

I am not quoting bin Laden because I think he is a nice guy or that I want to exonerate him in any way. In my view, there is never any excuse for terrorism. I include his words only to emphasize what I stated earlier. He and his followers are *not* motivated by hatred of freedom or religious zeal but by a desire for revenge. In the days ahead, as we contemplate how to put an end to terrorism, we had better be clear on that. As long as we follow a foreign policy of interventionism, we will create new enemies faster than we can track down the old

¹ See <http://www.abcnews.go.com>, John Miller Interviews Bin Laden (May 1998), Sept. 27, 2001.

ones and we will never be able to erect anti-terrorist measures capable of stopping them all. If we retaliate against populations or geographical areas, we will certainly unite all of Islam in a holy war against us, and we will light the fire of hatred in the hearts of a billion Muslims who will have but one purpose in life: to seek revenge against us.

The Constitution provides for a much better solution. When the nation is attacked by another nation, the logical response is to declare war. But when it is attacked by an individual or private group that is not acting on behalf of another nation, then Congress is authorized to issue what is called a Letter of Marque and Reprisal. That is an authorization to a private citizen or organization to pursue and eliminate the threatening party. In the early days of the country, Letters of Marque were issued against pirates on the high seas and against notorious bandits. The people who were called upon for these assignments were professional bounty hunters who were exceptionally efficient in their work. They had no interest in starting a war or killing a lot of innocent people. They had a single target and they did not get paid unless they were successful.

If Congress really wants to eliminate bin Laden and his terrorist organization, issuing Letters of Marque and Reprisal would be a much more effective solution than blanketing the Middle East with an armada of planes and tanks and ground forces – and it would be exceedingly more humane as well.

SAGE ADVICE FROM THE PAST

For the past few days, I have found myself thinking about George Washington. At first, I didn't know why. Then it dawned on me. Hadn't Washington warned about all this just before leaving office as first President of the United States? So I dug out a copy of his Farewell Address and, sure enough, there it was. This is what he said:

Observe good faith and justice toward all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. ... Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. ... So, likewise, the passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, ... betrays the former into participation in the quarrels and the wars of the latter. ... Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the cause of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. ...

Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

One cannot read those words of wisdom without sadly realizing how far we have drifted from our nation's moorings. In retrospect, the so-called isolationism of our forefathers is now looking very good.

NO PLACE TO HIDE

In 1982 I produced a video documentary entitled *No Place to Hide; The Strategy and Tactics of Terrorism*. Immediately after Tuesday's attack, I began to get inquiries about the

program. Friends who possessed copies ran them on public-access cable. Suddenly, the video, which had remained almost forgotten in the back pages of our catalogue, became a best seller. There is good reason for that. When I did the research for this topic, I discovered that terrorism involves a lot more than just blowing things up and killing people. There is a well-defined strategy behind it that has to do with the anticipated *reaction* of the target government and its citizens. Terrorists themselves phrase it this way: *The action is in the reaction*. They know that, after repeated attacks, people will become angry with their leaders for not preventing terrorism. This sets citizens against their own government. They also know that terrorist attacks will cause people to curtail travel, business ventures, and the purchase of luxuries, all of which will depress the economy. In our modern age, many people have come to think that the health of the economy is government's responsibility. So, any decline in the market, loss of jobs or purchasing power will also be blamed on the government, making it even more unpopular. The most important reaction, however, is that terrorism causes the target government to respond with police state measures against its own citizens.

Carlos Marighella, was a former leader of the Communist Party of Brazil. His book, *The Mini-Manual for Urban Guerrillas*, has been studied by revolutionaries and terrorists worldwide. It explains that the target government must be deliberately goaded into violating the rights of its citizens. Marighella said:

The government has no alternative but to intensify repression. The police roundups, house searches, arrests of innocent people make life unbearable. The general sentiment is that the government is unjust, incapable of solving problems, and resorts purely and simply to the physical liquidation of its opponents. ... The urban guerilla must become more aggressive and violent, resorting without letup to sabotage, terrorism, expropriations, assaults, kidnappings, and executions, heightening the disastrous situation in which the government must act.¹

The same strategy was expressed in 1968 by Italian Communist Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, in a booklet entitled *Political Guerilla Warfare*. Feltrinelli said that the task of the terrorist was to “violate the law openly ... challenging and outraging institutions and public order in every way. Then, when the state intervenes as a result, with the police and the courts, it will be easy to denounce its harshness and repressive dictatorial tendencies.”²

In Germany, Ulrike Meinhof, a member of a terrorist group called the Red Army Fraction, explained it this way. She said: “It is necessary to provoke the latent fascism in society, ... and then the people will turn to us for leadership.”³

Initially, most citizens will not complain about a repressive government if they are convinced it is necessary for their own safety, but eventually it adds to a growing dissatisfaction with the status quo and sets the stage for a revolution – either a violent one or a political one – in which the target system is stripped of its freedoms with the timid consent of the governed. That is the real goal of international terrorism. Let me to repeat that. *The*

¹ Claire Sterling, *The Terrorist Network* (New York: Berkeley Books, 1982), pp. 20-21.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

goal of international terrorism is a revolution – either a violent one or a political one – in which the target system is stripped of its freedoms with the timid consent of the governed.

Who would want to do that? Certainly, that is *not* the goal of those who sacrifice their lives in acts of suicidal revenge. They care nothing about changing the structure of the target society. But those who encourage them, who finance them, who train them, and who psychologically program them by enflaming their passions, are quite different. Who are they?

There are two powerful groups today that would like to see what is left of the free world brought under totalitarian control. For many decades they have alternated between competing and cooperating with each other in their quest for world dominance. Together, they constitute the greatest threat to freedom that the human race has ever faced. Yet, less than 5% of the population even knows that they *exist*. They have worked very hard to avoid using names for themselves that are commonly recognized. Humans think with words, and if we have no words to identify these groups, then we cannot even *think* about them – which is very much to their liking. If we are to follow Sun Tzu's advice, if we are to know the enemy, it is obvious that the first thing we must do is *identify* him.

In the following three chapters, I will identify the names of these groups. From their own records, I will show their ideologies, their goals, and their tactics. By the end of Chapter Four, you *will* know the enemy.

PERPETUAL WAR

In the meantime, we are told that we are fighting *terrorism*. But terrorism is not the enemy. It is a *strategy* of the enemy. That is like saying the enemy is hand-to-hand combat or air raids or missile attacks or espionage. Since terrorism is not the enemy, a war on terrorism cannot be won. It is doomed to drag on forever – just like the war on drugs and the war against crime. It might as well be a war against sin.

Shortly after World War II, George Orwell wrote his classic novel entitled, *1984*. It was a satirical prediction of what the world might be like far in the future. Orwell envisioned that, if governments continued to expand their power as they were then doing, eventually, they would evolve into a global police state. He described the methods that would be used to keep the masses from rebelling. Thought control was the primary method, but one of the ways they accomplished that was to be constantly at war. In time of war, the populace will accept any hardship and make any sacrifice to defend the homeland. However, to have war, it was necessary to have an enemy, and that enemy had to be despicable in the eyes of the homeland defenders. Atrocities had to be committed and many lives had to be lost. But it was equally important to avoid *winning* the war – otherwise, the hardships imposed by the state would no longer seem reasonable to its subjects.

The world was divided into three geographical areas called Oceania, Eurasia, and Eastasia, and the rulers of these regions agreed to war against each other but never to seek outright victory. The object was perpetual war. Orwell described it this way:

In one combination or another, these three superstates are permanently at war and have been so for the past twenty-five years. War, however, is no longer the desperate, annihilating struggle that it was in the early decades of the twentieth century. ... This is not to say that either the conduct of the war, or the prevailing

attitude toward it, has become less bloodthirsty or more chivalrous. On the contrary, war hysteria is continuous and universal in all countries. ... But in a physical sense war involves very small numbers of people, mostly highly trained specialists, and causes comparatively few casualties. The fighting, when there is any, takes place on the vague frontiers whose whereabouts the average man can only guess at. ... In the centers of civilization war means no more than a continuous shortage of consumption goods, and the occasional crash of a rocket bomb which may cause a few scores of deaths. ... It does not matter whether the war is actually happening, and since no decisive victory is possible, it does not matter whether the war is going well or badly. All that is needed is that a state of war should exist. ... War, it will be seen, is now a purely internal affair ... waged by each ruling group against its own subjects, and the object of the war is not to make or prevent conquests of territory, but to keep the structure of society intact.¹

When we look at the facts surrounding the war on terrorism – particularly the impossibility of victory – we cannot miss the striking parallels to Orwell’s satire. His only error, it seems, was choosing the wrong year for the title of his book.

THIRTEEN PREDICTIONS

It is always dangerous to make predictions – especially if they are put into print. If they prove to be wrong, they can haunt you for the rest of your life. Nevertheless, here are fourteen predictions that I fervently hope *will* be wrong. Unfortunately, I have no doubt that most if not all of them will come to pass.

1. The first prediction is that we will not be given genuine options regarding the war on terrorism. We will have only two choices, both of which are disastrous. It will be similar to the Vietnam War in which Americans were expected to be either hawks or doves. Either they supported the no-win war or they opposed it. They were not given the option of *victory*. Their choice was between pulling out of the war and turning the country over to the Vietcong quickly or doggedly staying in the war and turning the country over to the Vietcong slowly – which is the way it turned out. Likewise, in the war on terrorism, we will be asked simply to choose sides. Either we are for freedom or for terrorism. The wisdom of U.S. interventionism will not be allowed as a topic for public debate.

2. Most American political leaders are now committed to world government, so the second prediction is that they will crow about how America will not tolerate terrorism, but they will not act as Americans. Instead, they will act as internationalists. They will turn to the U.N. to lead a *global* war against terrorism. They will seek to expand the capacity of NATO and UN military forces. Although American troops will provide the backbone of military action, they will operate under UN authority.

3. The third prediction is that the drive for national disarmament will be intensified. This will *not* lead to the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, but merely to the *transfer* of those weapons to UN control. It will be popularized as a means of getting nuclear and bio-chemical weapons out of the hands of terrorists. The internationalists promoting this move will not seem to care that many of the world’s most notorious terrorists now hold seats

¹ George Orwell, *1984* (New York: New American Library/Signet, 1949), pp. 153-164.

of power at the UN and that the worst of them will actually control these weapons. This will be documented in Chapters Five and Six.

4. The fourth prediction is that, if any terrorists are captured, they will be brought before the UN World Court and tried as international criminals. This will create popular support for the Court and will go a long way toward legitimizing it as the ultimate high tribunal. The public will not realize the fateful precedent that is being established – a precedent that will eventually be used to justify bringing citizens of any country to trial based on charges made by their adversaries in other countries. Anyone who seriously opposes the New World Order could then be transported to The Hague in Belgium and face charges of polluting the planet or committing hate crimes or participating in social genocide or supporting terrorism.

5. The fifth prediction is that the FBI will be heavily criticized for failing to detect an attack as extensive and well coordinated as this. In reply, we will be told that the FBI was hampered by lack of funding, low manpower, and too little authority. Naturally, that will be followed by an increase in funding, additional manpower, and greatly expanded authority.

6. The sixth prediction is that, eventually, it will be discovered that the FBI and other intelligence agencies had prior warning and, possibly, specific knowledge of Tuesday's attack; yet they did nothing to prevent it or to warn the victims. This will be a repeat of what happened at the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City six years previously. Why they failed to do so is the topic of Chapter Four.

7. The seventh prediction is that much of the war on terrorism will be waged against Americans inside their own country. New laws, international treaties, and executive orders will severely restrict travel, speech, privacy, and the possession of firearms. Americans have consistently rejected these measures in the past, but there will be much less opposition when they are presented in the name of fighting terrorism. Government agencies will demand to know everything about us, from our school records, our psychological profiles, our buying habits, our political views, our medical histories, our religious beliefs, the balances in our savings accounts, our social patterns, a list of our friends – everything. This will not be unique to America. The same program will be carried out in every nation in what is left of the free world.

8. The eighth prediction is that those who speak out against these measures will be branded as right-wing extremists, anti-government kooks, or paranoid militiamen. The object will be to isolate all dissidents from the mainstream and frighten everyone else into remaining silent. It is always possible to find a few genuine crackpots; and, even though they will constitute less than one percent of the movement, they will be the ones selected by the media to represent the dissident view point. A little bit of garbage can stink up the whole basket. In spite of that, responsible dissenters will still be heard. If they begin to attract a following, they will be arrested on charges of hindering the war effort, committing hate crimes, terrorism, tax evasion, investment fraud, credit-card fraud, child molestation, illegal possession of firearms, drug trafficking, money laundering, or anything else that will demonize them in the public mind. The mass media will uncritically report these charges, and the public will assume they are true. There is nothing quite so dramatic as watching someone on the evening news being thrown against the wall by a SWAT team and hauled off

in handcuffs. TV viewers will assume that, surely, he must be guilty of *something*. His neighbors will shake their heads and say "... and he seemed like such a nice person."

9. One of the few remaining obstacles to the New World Order is the Internet, because it allows the public to bypass the mass media and have access to unfiltered information and opinion. Therefore, the ninth prediction is that laws will be enacted to restrict the use of the Internet. Child pornography has long been the rallying cry to justify government control. Now, the specter of terrorism and money laundering will be added to the list. The real object will be to eliminate the voices of dissent.

10. The tenth prediction is that the war on terrorism will be dragged out over many years or decades. Like the war on drugs after which it is patterned, there will be no victory. That is because both of these wars are designed, not to be won, but to be *waged*. Their function is to sensitize the population with fear and indignation, to provide credible justification for the gradual expansion of government power and the consolidation of that power into the UN.

11. The eleventh prediction is that it will take a long time to locate Osama bin Laden. A TV reporter can casually interview him at his mountain stronghold, but the U.S. military and CIA – with legions of spies and Delta forces and high-tech orbiting satellites – they cannot find him. Why not? Because they do not *want* to find him. His image as a mastermind terrorist is necessary as a focus for American anger and patriotic fervor. If we are to wage war, there must be someone to personify the enemy. Bin Laden is useful in that role. Of course, if his continued evasion becomes too embarrassing, he will be killed in military action or captured – if he doesn't take his own life first. Either way, that will not put the matter to rest, because bin Laden is not the *cause* of terrorism. He is not even the *leader* of terrorism. He is the *icon* of terrorism. If he were to be eliminated, someone else would only have to be found to take his place. So it is best to give each of them as much longevity as possible. That is why terrorists like Arrafat, Hussein, Qadhafi and Khomeini, not only are allowed to remain in power, but receive funding and military aid from the U.S. government. They are the best enemies money can buy. This issue will be covered in Chapter Four.

12. The twelfth prediction is that, when the Taliban is toppled in Afghanistan, a new government will be established by the UN. Like Kosovo before it, the UN military will remain behind, and the country will not be independent. There will be talk about how it will represent the Afghan people, but it will serve the agendas of the internationalists who will create it. The sad country will become just another pin on the map showing the location of yet one more UN province.

13. The thirteenth prediction is that, while all this is going on, politicians will continue waving the American flag and giving lip service to traditional American sentiments in order to placate their constituency who must never be allowed to know that they are being delivered into slavery.

Yes, actions have consequences, and the long-range consequences of this act of terrorism are even more devastating than the loss of life and property that has been the focus of the media so far.

Behold the Grand Deception: The action is in the *reaction*. *The war on terrorism is a war on freedom.*

That is the end of Chapter One, as it will appear in *The Freedom Manifesto*. I cannot predict how long it will take to complete the remaining chapters, but I can tell you that I have made this a high priority project. If you would like to be notified when it is published, I suggest that you visit our web site and request to be added to the mailing list. If you are on line as you read this, [click here](#) to register. If you are not on line, then log on to our web site registration page at www.realityzone.com/register/html.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

In the meantime, the crucial question is what can be done *now*, especially considering the lateness of the hour. This is where it can really get depressing. At the present time, there is nothing that men and women of good conscience can do to alter the forces of destruction that have been unleashed against them. As long as the nations of the world are controlled by politicians with a globalist and collectivist mindset; as long as they use every problem and crisis as an excuse to expand the power of government; as long as the great majority of our fellow passengers on this spaceship called Earth are unaware of these ploys, then absolutely nothing can be done. But notice I said “as long as.”

The “as-long-as” part of the equation contains two elements that underlie all of our problems: (1) We have put the wrong people into government and (2) the public has been denied vital information – which is *why* we put the wrong people into government. Therefore, any realistic plan for eliminating terrorism and recapturing freedom must have two objectives: (1) We must put the *right* people into government and (2) we must see that the public gets the information it has been denied. The political objective is important, but it cannot be reached without first achieving the educational objective, so that is where we must begin.

A WAY TO BYPASS THE MASS MEDIA

The first step is to mass distribute copies of this report. For that purpose, they now are available free from the Reality Zone web site. You can either print them from your computer to be used as handouts and envelope enclosures or you can send emails to your friends inviting them to visit the Reality Zone and read the report on line. That is so simple it can be done with a click of the mouse. At the bottom of the report is a form that reads: SEND THIS REPORT TO A FRIEND. While you are on line, you can enter the names of those you would like to read this report. The Reality Zone will do the rest.

I urge you to send this report to everyone you know. *Everyone*. Don't worry about how they will react. Some have been so sheltered from reality that they will not be able to accept the validity of this information, no matter how much documentation is provided. After all, they are not getting any of this from the mass media. Besides, people don't want to hear bad news. But, as events unfold and as the predictions become historical facts, our friends eventually *will* come on board.

It is my intent to make the Reality Zone a cyberspace information hub where people from all over the world can come for reliable information on the global crusade for freedom. In addition to this report, you will be able to get a printed transcript of the video documentary, *No Place to Hide; The Strategy and Tactics of Terrorism*. Many other items will be added as we expand. Anyone who wants to translate these materials into a language

other than English is encouraged to do so and send it to us for posting. It is our goal to have the documents available in every major language of the world.

With the capacity to send electronic documents over the Internet, we finally have a way to bypass the mass media. Just imagine what would happen if everyone of the 5000 people on my email list would forward a copy of this Report to everyone on their email list. And then imagine that ten or fifteen percent of those would do the same. It would be theoretically possible to reach every person with an email address on the entire planet within a few months.

A GLOBAL FORCE FOR FREEDOM

This is no longer an issue just for Americans. It is now a global battle that cuts across all lines of nationality, race, religion, language, culture, economic status, and level of education. This is a battle in which we are all united by common cause. That includes Christians, Jews, Muslims, Americans, Afghans, Iraqis, Russians, Chinese, Mexicans, Somalians, Croatians, Serbs, Australians, Canadians – literally everyone in the world who seeks freedom. I am not talking about governments. I am talking about *people*.

We must not be tricked into pitting Christians against Muslims or Muslims against Jews, or Jews against Christians, or any other combination of religion against religion. No matter how we may differ over theology, the one thing on which we agree is that it is God's plan for all men to be *free*. That is our common cause, and that is the rallying cry that will bring millions into our ranks. We will not be able to defeat the global force of despotism without building a global *counter-force* for freedom.

We are now engaged in world War III, a war involving every nation and every human being on the planet. You and I are involved whether we like it or not. We cannot escape. There is no place to hide. The only question is when will we commit to battle. If we wait until there is no longer any controversy and all of our friends clearly see that the war on terrorism is a grand deception, then we will have waited too long. The time to step forward is *now*.

G. Edward Griffin

The following items relating to this report are available from The Reality Zone

- ◆ Free printed transcript of this report: www.realityzone.com/granddeception/html
- ◆ Video documentary, *No Place to Hide*: www.realityzone.com/noplacevid/html
- ◆ Free printed transcript of *No Place to Hide*: www.realityzone.com/noplacetrans/html

Reality Zone, P.O. Box 4646, Westlake Village, CA 91359

Web site home page: www.realityzone.com Telephone: (800) 595-6596

If you want to distribute this report, the only restriction is that they must be given, not sold, and nothing may be added or deleted. *The report must be printed in its entirety, including these comments*. It may not be used to promote or imply my endorsement of any group, business venture, or individual without written permission.

End of report