

## **DO YOU WANT FREEDOM FRIES OR SOMETHING THAT WON'T CLOG YOUR ARTERIES?**

All Bush ever promised us was a war on terror. How much did we really expect from a war on an abstract noun?

After 9/11, the American people wanted a war on other people. Something like the Doolittle raid would have been very popular. They could wrap their minds around that one. If the White House couldn't find a target, then plenty of American citizens would have been happy to phone in suggestions.

If they had been told that we would fight back by bringing democracy to our enemies after we had vanquished them, they might have grumbled their agreement, albeit reluctantly. Few would have asked for a definition of democracy. Some might remember that something like that worked rather well after world War II.

However, if they had been told we were going to bring democracy to our enemies before victory, the American people might have been confused. Many would remember that the Marshall Plan did not exactly coincide with D-Day.

The Bush style was John Wayne but the Bush policies were Eleanor Roosevelt.

Defenders of the Bush worldview like to bring up history. That is not their smartest move. It tends to make some of us do our homework.

When Hitler invaded Poland, the response of Great Britain and France was not to declare war on blitzkriegs.

After the Japanese bombed the hell out of Pearl Harbor the United States did not declare war on sneak attacks.

During the Cold War when we resisted the international Communist conspiracy in general, and the Soviet Union in particular, we did not declare war on espionage and covert operations.

In fairness to the present occupant of the White House, he is not the first to use the meaningless rhetoric of “terrorism.” They have all been guilty of that for quite some time. As to when the non-concept of terrorism first entered the public arena, some have said the term was coined by none other than Lenin to politicize guerilla activities that he dubbed counter-revolutionary. Tracking down proof of this is beyond the scope of this broadside. Maybe the claim is true and maybe not. There would be something terribly ironic—in the true sense of the word—if the Free World has no other way of expressing itself except in the shopworn boilerplate of retro-Communism.

(American military men have appeared on television and referred to winning the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. Do Marines need to carry around *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-Tung* in case they need another handy phrase or two?)

One thing is absolutely true. Terrorism is a product of the modern era because the idea is simply too ridiculous for earlier generations

to have manufactured. In the good old days, they knew about pirates and criminals and outlaws and heretics and THE ENEMY.

But it never occurred to the masters, or the slaves, or the lords, or the servants, or the rich, or the poor, or even the early, funny stages of the Middle Class, that there were punishments their opponents dished out that they could not return in full measure—unless some devious noble or theologian redefined the terms. Honest men used to resist the evil that has conquered the modern world. People used to call things by their proper names.

In resisting the language of Hell, C. S. Lewis wrote in *The Great Divorce* that, “we will not call blue yellow to please those who insist on still having jaundice.”

In the same vein, Ayn Rand simply quoted Aristotle. “A is A.”

We live in a world so opposed to sanity that Noam Chomsky and everyone in the American government actually *agree* on the definition of terrorism! Chomsky likes to use the U.S. Army Manual. Anyone with common sense or a dictionary can pretty much figure out what the word means. Add up all the definitions and this is what you get:

Terrorism is the use of violence or the threat of violence against a civilian population for political purposes. Throw in surprise and fear for good measure. In international law a distinction is drawn between terrorism and “acts of aggression.” Guess which one is worse? We didn’t hang the Nazis at Nuremberg for ter-

rorism! The ones we hanged were found guilty of acts of aggression.

Therefore, our enemies since 9/11 can only be so bad, right? Bush has yet to accuse them of a hanging offense. This is not hyperbole.

The one creep we tried as an Al-Qaeda operative—or an Al-Qaeda wannabe—was put in front of a civilian jury (!) and was not given the death penalty(!!!) Unbelievable. Think about the full implications.

Bush said that the man got off easier than the victims of 9/11. What splendid leadership. He can always count on votes from those who believe in the Culture of Life. Maybe he should apologize for the executions on his watch when he was Governor of Texas.

As for those who say terrorism has no national boundaries and can't be fought in a traditional manner, the proper response is: THEN WHY DID WE INVADE TWO COUNTRIES?

Getting back to the problem of rhetoric, Chomsky uses the concept of terrorism against America. He especially hates everything we've ever done in the name or fond memory of the Monroe Doctrine.

The American State uses the concept against any foreigner who doesn't go along with its policies. Defenders of this highly restrictive definition also oppose what they sneeringly refer to as "moral equivalency." (More on that later.)

The mystery is how America's greatest critic, Chomsky, as well as those who run our Demo-

cratic Isolationist Interventionist Imperial Republic agree that we must all fight the big “T”! Why do America-haters and American policy wonks and politicians and professors on the left (and the still further left) love the “T” word?

Maybe the big “T” that really deserves attention is the ever unpopular concept of THINKING. Let’s glance at a few pages from the History everyone says we must study so that we won’t be doomed to repeat everything that we repeat regardless of what we read.

The Nazis terrorized civilians first in Spain and later in Poland by bombing open cities, one of their contributions to Western Civilization.

Hitler’s enemies loved the idea and envied him! By the end of World War Two, we had bombed German open cities to a rubble never imagined by the freelance geologists of Afghanistan who spend their lives in something that resembles a granite quarry regardless of what Russian or American planes drop on them.

World War II was educational. The world treated it as a blueprint for the future. The motto of the Second World War should be: ALWAYS AGAIN AND AGAIN!

Anyone on the receiving end of saturation bombing knew the meaning of terror. Mr. and Mrs. Miniver may have seen a glimpse of the future with von Braun’s rockets hitting London, but Mr. and Mrs. Schmidt died in far greater numbers from conventional air raids on Berlin, day and night. Tell any of these real life survivors (who don’t belong to the Council

on Foreign Relations) that they weren't experiencing terrorism and they would wonder what you're smoking. Especially tell it to the surviving citizens of Dresden.

Meanwhile, in the mysterious East, other horrors marched onto the stage of World War II. For every Chinese and captured Allied soldier who knew terror from the Japanese Empire, there was a Japanese civilian who knew terror from the Tokyo firestorms and those who lived long enough to suffer in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The whole world has been punished (or rewarded) ever since with Godzilla films.

If there is a God, you can bet your immortal soul (if you possess such a thing) that He/She/It understands that War *is* Terror. If the Super Aesthete of the Old Testament turns out to be the ruler of the universe, then we know that the Deity approves of Terrorism. Ask the first born of Egypt. Ask the millions drowned in the Deluge. Ask any flawed pot found wanting by the potter right before he smashes it.

Terror is simply one more weapon in the arsenal of any tribe, clan, race, class, religion, nation, international group, or individual who is not a pacifist. Secular critics of the world's great faiths might argue that all the traditions excreted by the great religious leaders converge on this point, the one true pantheism. Religious critics of materialism might counter that removing the gods from systems of human thought did nothing to reduce brutality but actually increased the body count.

If America is to survive, then we have as much right to use terror as our opponents. We always have! Ask the Native Americans who gravely underestimated the inscrutable imagination of the White Man.

A War on Terror is a purely Utopian conception every bit as unrealistic as anything cooked up by Karl Marx, the original author of the War on Poverty. (For those who would grant that honor to Jesus Christ, it should be remembered that the Son of Man promised that the poor would always be with us.)

With this true understanding of—what is it called?—*basic values*, we can begin our assessment of the poor bastard currently in the White House during what the Chinese used to call “interesting times.”

The President of the United States is one of the few honest figures in American politics today. God help us. He should not be confused with the solipsists on Reich-Wing radio. It’s not his fault that they rarely pay attention to what he actually says or does. They have their own agenda, and he is often obtuse.

Thanks to the endless blather of the Talk Shows we have been subjected to so much nationalist propaganda that some of us thought the military actions after 9/11 had something to do with American nationalism! It was an easy mistake to make.

That’s because we imagined that Bush said things he never said. We took our cues from blowhards on the right who were no more elected to anything than we were. We literally

brainwashed ourselves! We wrote a script and pretended it was reality. We had to edit out anything that didn't fit.

The reason it took so long for some of us to wake up was that the *Blah Blah Woof Woof* Left would never stop shouting their childish insults long enough for us to hear ourselves think. We mistook our opposition to Michael Moore as support for Bush.

The left is the best ally Bush has. As long as crazy Democrats scream at corrupt Republicans, our glorious leader will have support from the center. Even now, Bush has approval for his foreign policy over and above what it deserves.

(The one exception has to do with the non-violent threat from Mexico, concerning which Bush is currently hated by his rank and file because he doesn't even pretend to be worried about the borders. Mexico combines domestic and foreign policy, a perfect issue for someone who loves to deal in gray areas.)

Bush is not the only honest member of his administration. Condoleezza Rice is not bad. Think of her as the State Department in a dress. The piano-playing is just a bonus. She almost lied about the phony freedom of religion we brought to the barbarians of Afghanistan; but she was sincere when she begged them not to kill their single Christian convert because it would make American policy look like the barrel of goat cheese it really is.

Rumsfeld is honest enough for government work. Behind his Cheshire Cat grin lies a paradoxical truth for the more attentive members

of the Press Corps. He keeps describing what is required for the actual Iraq operation instead of coming up with a plan for an entirely different war that only the American people think this is about. The Iraqi majority (glad to be rid of Hussein) don't see Americans the same way as Americans see Americans. Iraqis are probably thinking back to the good old days of the British Empire.

Not everyone in the shining city on the hill is aflame with veracity. An administration encompasses lots and lots of busy jobholders as well. The Bush administration possesses plenty of True Non-Believers. The doctrine never matters. For them, the enemy consists of Democrats who are jealous that they don't have a war of their own.

But the Dems have nothing to be ashamed of. Their guy got in a few good licks (if you know what I mean). Clinton did what he could to bring the full weight of American force in a nice NATO package to the Balkans. Hell, he bombed Yugoslavia, didn't he?

And he didn't forget the exotic locales. He bombed Sudan and Iraq.

Clinton was busy in his two terms. He even sent troops into Haiti. Admittedly, he got a little confused at one point and declared war on Waco, forgetting that Texas is ostensibly part of the United States—a fact still not admitted in Hollywood. He did his best, but despite his love of FDR he never had as great an FDR moment as George W. Bush did with his Axis of Evil speech.

Liberals have a legitimate reason to hate Bush because the man is guilty of plagiarism.

Adding insult to the injudicious, the propagandists hired by the Bush team have been incapable of genuine Orwellian newspeak worthy of the Greatest Generation. These second-rate rabble rousers are not capable of actual dishonesty but only petulance.

This may be another reason that members of the disloyal opposition are so unhinged by the Bush administration. They see what passes for the American right today as a nightmarish funhouse-mirror distortion of their own worst tendencies. The Democrats are certain they could do it better!

This isn't the fault of Bush or Cheney. It is the fault of profoundly dishonest people who have hitched a ride on the "War on Terror." These people have no loyalty to any ideology or religion. They worship power—and happily borrow from the template of all previous wars to distort the current realities. These worms in the woodwork are the true ideologues behind Bush, the non-ideologue. They are minor villains in the story of why our current wars might help us lose the American Nation.

The primary villains are, of course, the Islamo-Fascists and Islamists (i.e., militant Theocrats). But we all know about them, *ad nauseum*.

The minor villains are the reason for this broadside. They whispered in Clinton's ear when he was Caesar. Now they whisper in Bush's ear as he takes on the imperial purple.

To borrow from the Good Book: by their fruits ye shall know them.

(A lot is made of the Bible in these times. The war between the truly religious remnant and the largely secular masses is greatly exaggerated. In America, most religious people and most secular people get along just fine when given half a chance. No one should be trusted who stirs up trouble between these usually harmonious groups. The ACLU should do us all a favor and evaporate.)

Getting back to the specific villains of this broadside, they are the ones who prefer hiring inferior propagandists instead of good ones. This is because of a contempt for the American people not shared by conservatives, liberals, moderates, libertarians, the apolitical, or even our enemies in Arabia. These soon-to-be-named characters think Americans are so dumb that they don't have the attention span for thoughtful and credible propaganda.

An example of how the second-rate propagandists do their job for the worms in the woodwork is in the way the English language is tortured. Enemy combatants may not be treated well enough to satisfy the aforementioned ACLU but they get off easy compared to what our propagandists did to the words "Freedom" and "Suicide" early in the hostilities.

Sometime in the summer of 2002, the verbal horror began. The French behaved as the French always do and pretended that they still have an Empire. During World War II, both

FDR and Churchill humored De Gaulle even though they could barely stand him. During the Cold War, NATO humored the French. That's just the way it was.

But when the French decided not to go against their own economic interest regarding Iraq (a point made by genuine conservative William F. Buckley, Jr.) our propagandists decided to punish the Froggies by calling French Fries in the good old USA—it's hard to believe now—Freedom Fries.

Somebody who thinks he's smarter than he actually is probably took this idea from World War One when sauerkraut was renamed Liberty Cabbage so as to de-Germanize the food. Dumb as that was, it took the Bush years to be dumber than the Woodrow Wilson years.

Why?

**BECAUSE WE ARE NOT AT WAR WITH FRANCE, YOU EMPTY-HEADED PIG-DOG SONS OF SILLY PERSONS AND BEDWETTING TYPES!**

We went to war with Saddam Hussein's Iraq. If we were going to screw around with descriptions of food we should have chosen a dish from Iraq.

The other example is worse and more insidious. Back before 9/11, everyone in the world knew what a suicide bomber was, the same way we all knew what suicide pilots were in World War II. No one ever said that we should stop calling Kamikaze pilots suicide pilots.

For some reason, the idea of a suicide bomber was suddenly too difficult a concept

for the American people to understand. Why, they must think the person just goes off into the desert and blows himself up like the Judean People's Front Crack Suicide Squad in Monty Python's *Life of Brian*!

Who didn't know that suicide bombers kill other people? You know, the same way suicide pilots kill other people? This assault on the English language took place shortly after we'd had a dramatic demonstration of twenty-first century suicide pilots.

Who in the entire world had to be told that suicide bombers are actually *homicide bombers*? Gee, you mean they blow up *other people*, as well? Reich-Wing Radio spewed out this newly minted phrase with the same robotic style as the politically correct drivel that comes off Pacifist Pacifica Radio.

This is brainwashing. This is like living in Castro's Cuba. Treating the American people like drooling imbeciles is not a good style of patriotism. The rhetoric of the War on Terror has infantilized the nation.

There were some of us supporting the administration who should have questioned what was going on right then. Freedom Fries? Homicide Bombers? At least Bush himself was uncomfortable with this silly word game and used the phrase "suicide bomber" several times after it became politically incorrect.

Even more dramatically, now that American forces have killed the truly evil al Zarqawi (current with the writing of this chapter),

Rumsfeld just made a statement detailing the bastard's crimes, including how the man was behind a lot of suicide bombings. Yes, the secretary of defense used the "S" word.

There are good reasons for military action after 9/11. Bush may have chosen the right targets. But what good is it to win the war over there and lose it at home? If Vietnam taught us nothing else, it should have taught us that. At least Nixon and Kissinger didn't start making up odd catch-phrases and mocking other countries that didn't feel like kissing our great American posterior.

We don't win at home by treating the American people with contempt. This war was not sold correctly to the Nation. The critics of Bush cannot be blamed for that.

The American Left spends very little time criticizing the real policies of the occupants of the White House. They prefer arguing with the dog and pony show of the "alternative media." And who is behind this so-called alternative media? Why, a seedy group of intellectuals leading us to ruin. They are ... oh, wait a little longer before a name is put to the pain.

It is only because the bovine American center has finally lost faith in George W. Bush that his poll numbers are headed down to where Truman found himself before electing to return to civilian life. The center cannot hold; but we won't be lucky enough for mere anarchy to be loosed upon the world.

Will Bush pull a rabbit out of his hat?

Will his numbers rise and fall like a yo-yo?  
Will Bush once again prove that everyone underestimated him?

Will he fire a nuclear missile at Iran?

Whatever he does, you can rest assured he'll be listening to the last people on Earth who deserve his attention. They are the reason we'll be stuck forever in a War on Terror that can never formulate an exit strategy. They are why in fifty or a hundred years the American province of the World State will continue to provide security forces for the rest of the planet, which is doing all the manufacturing. They will have their own perpetual war station on what passes for cable or satellite in the Cyber Info-stream. Americans will be able to tune in when they are bored with the Dominoes and Darts Sports Channel. "The War on Terror" will simply be another TV show—a more intense version of *Survivor*.

They will give us what Harry Elmer Barnes called Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace and around which Gore Vidal built a book.

They are what used to be called the New Dealers in the time of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Then, by the time of Eisenhower, they discovered that they could control both parties. (The price of admission for Republicans into a formerly "Democrats Only Club" was sacrificing Joe McCarthy before he could prove all the Communist subversion that took place in America with the knowledge of FDR even during the Hitler/Stalin pact.)

They were the Rockefeller Republicans who helped the Democrats destroy Barry Goldwater. They taught Nixon how to be a Keynesian in economics even while he thought he was fighting the Eastern Establishment.

They were largely ignored by Reagan and have been trying to take credit for his achievements ever since.

They treated George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush as one uninterrupted presidency with minor differences. Clinton got to do a few liberal things and Bush the younger got to do a few conservative things.

They pretend to be conservatives, but have none of the “live and let live” attitudes of real conservatives. They despise libertarians because that is the one strain in the American right they can’t control.

Reagan wanted to free the world. They want to run the world.

Bush gives them his full attention. Kerry would have done the same.

They are the neo-conservatives, and they are slouching toward Bethlehem to be born.

