

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Kurt Nimmo

Busted Dharma Books

Copyright © 2016 by Kurt Nimmo

Donald Trump Declares War on Islam

Donald Trump has made the neocon war against Islam a centerpiece of his presidential campaign.

"In winning the Cold War, President Ronald Reagan repeatedly touted the superiority of freedom over communism and called the USSR the Evil Empire," Trump said during a campaign speech in Ohio. "Just as we won the Cold War in part by exposing the evils of communism and the virtues of free markets, so too must we take on the ideology of radical Islam."

He proposed an "ideological test" similar to the one imposed on immigrants in the 1950s. Trump claimed "extreme vetting" is required to weed out Islamists.

"In addition to scraping out all members of the sympathizers of terrorist groups, we must also screen out any hostile attitude towards our country or its principles, or who believed Sharia law should supplant American law," he said.

Trump believes the War on Islam is a new Cold War. The War on Islam was designed by the neoconservatives, neocons for short. It began in earnest during George W. Bush's administration. For the neocons, who hold the radical and racist anti-Arab (not merely anti-Islam) beliefs of Israel's Likud Party, a "clash of civilizations" is intended to destroy Arab and Persian culture. Although leading American neocons like Bill Kristol, Max Boot, and Robert Kagan oppose Trump, they undoubtedly in private celebrate his Islamophobia. Unlike Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump is all over the board, he speaks off the cuff, his opinions shift and this is problematic for neocons jostling to regain political power after the disaster of Iraq and the rise of the Islamic State, now attributed by Donald Trump to the failures of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton.

The destruction of Iraq was not an accident. The neocons did not plan to bring democracy to the Iraqi people. They destroyed Iraq to make certain it remains a docile vassal divided by religious, social and tribal chaos.

Trump and the "anti-establishment" Republicans insist the virus of radical Islam grew on its own, the inevitable product of its religious dogma. Trump does not make distinctions. He has demonstrated repeatedly a political naiveté. His demand for the exclusion of Muslims is the result of a neocon propaganda campaign waged since September 11, 2001. For more than a decade and a half the neocons have propagandized on the threat of Islam, a religion of 1.6 billion people, approximately 23% of the global population.

"I think Islam hates us," Trump told CNN's Anderson Cooper. He believes it is virtually impossible to tell the difference between radical and non-radical Muslims. "It's very hard to define. It's very hard to separate. Because you don't know who's who."

Trump spokeswoman Katrina Pierson elaborated during an interview with CNN's Wolf Blitzer. She called for a "broader perspective" of Muslims. "We've allowed this propaganda to spread all through the country that this is a religion of peace."

The vast majority of radical Islamists subscribe to Wahhabism or Salafism, a sect of Sunni Islam. It is a small segment of the Muslim faith, estimated at 5 million adherents, mostly in the Persian Gulf region and primarily Saudi Arabia. Wahhabism is the religion of al-Qaeda and the Islamic State.

"It would be a mistake and unethical to criticize all of Islam on the basis of doctrines particular to Wahhabi Muslims," writes Austin Cline. "Modern Islamic extremism and terrorism simply cannot be explained or understood without looking at the history and influence of Wahhabi Islam." Neocon Republicans, however, insist all Muslims want to impose sharia law on non-Muslims and advocate terrorism.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Donald Trump, having failed as a Democrat, is now a Republican. He claims to be opposed to the establishment but this is an illusion, a fraud, a variation on Barack Obama's fraudulent "change" mantra. Instead of ending the wars, as promised during the election, Obama continued the neocon war against Muslims, Arabs, and Persians. Obama is not a progressive working for peace and justice. His legacy is the illegal and unethical drone war. Bush began the drone war and Obama expanded it. Bush conducted less than fifty strikes, Obama 373 as of this writing. More than 4,000 people killed, over 200 of them children. That is the official figure. It is undoubtedly larger.

"In the 20th Century, the United States defeated Fascism, Nazism, and Communism," Trump declared in August. "Now, a different threat challenges our world: Radical Islamic Terrorism."

Trump's comparison of "radical Islam"—again representative of a very small percentage of Muslims—to Nazism and communism is, to say the least, not only absurd but historically inaccurate. Small pockets of Islamic State terrorists in Iraq, Syria, and now Libya cannot be compared to Hitler's Operation Barbarossa, the invasion of the Soviet Union, which included 134 divisions at full fighting strength and 73 more divisions for deployment behind the front. In total three million German soldiers and 650,000 troops from Germany's allies of Finland and Romania, later augmented by units from Italy, Croatia, Slovakia and Hungary, participated in the invasion.

At the end of the Second World War, the Soviet Union had over 11 million men in uniform, and this number was reduced to 2.4 million in 1948, at the start of the Cold War.

In 2014 the Islamic State had, according to the CIA, between 20,000 and 30,000 fighters in Iraq and Syria. The Syrian Observatory for Human Rights estimates the force numbers around 80,000–100,000 total but this number should be taken with a very large grain of salt due to the fact the organization is "virtually a one-man band" and that man, Rami Abdulrahman, is an ardent anti-Assad activist based out of London. Abdulrahman is the establishment media's go-to man for information on the "civil war" in Syria, in fact a proxy war waged by the United States and its Wahhabi partners in the Persian Gulf.

How, in any way, can the threat of the Islamic State be compared to that of the Soviet Union of Hitler's Nazi Germany?

Despite the inappropriateness of the argument, the establishment media marches on. "Sure, ISIS has yet to achieve the military capabilities of Nazi Germany in the 1940s," explains Newsweek. "The number of its victims is also—at least so far—minuscule in comparison to WWII. But ISIS marches from Syria into Iraq, Yemen, the Sinai and Libya, while declaring the goal of confronting 'Rome.' And, according to MEMRI, Libya is considered by ISIS a gateway to conquering Europe."

MEMRI, short for the Middle East Media Research Institute, specializes in disinformation routinely repeated verbatim by the establishment media. It achieves this by distorting translations of film and print media stories originating in Arabic, Iranian and Turkish media. "MEMRI is a main arm of Israeli propaganda," explains the academic Norman Finkelstein. "Although widely used in the mainstream media as a source of information on the Arab world, it is as trustworthy as Julius Streicher's *Der Sturmer* was on the Jewish world." Ken Livingstone, the former mayor of London, accused MEMRI of "outright distortion," while former CIA case officer Vince Cannistraro has written "they (MEMRI) are selective and act as propagandists for their political point of view, which is the extreme-right of Likud."

Islamic State Terrorists or American Psychos?

Trump insists the Islamic State is a direct threat to America.

“This summer, there has been an ISIS attack launched outside the war zones of the Middle East every 84 hours,” he declared during a tirade against the Islamic State delivered in Youngstown, Ohio.

“Here, in America, we have seen one brutal attack after another.

“13 were murdered, and 38 wounded, in the assault on Ft. Hood.

“The Boston Marathon Bombing wounded and maimed 264 people, and ultimately left five dead—including 2 police officers.

“In Chattanooga, Tennessee, five unarmed marines were shot and killed at a military recruiting center.

“Last December, 14 innocent Americans were gunned down at an office party in San Bernardino, another 22 were injured.

“In June, 49 Americans were executed at the Pulse Nightclub in Orlando, and another 53 were injured. It was the worst mass shooting in our history, and the worst attack on the LGBTQ community in our history,” he declared.

Did ISIS fighters from Syria and Iraq commit these atrocities?

None of the attackers were members of the Islamic State.

The Fort Hood shooting that killed 13 and injured 30 was committed by Nidal Hasan, an American serving in the US military as a Medical Corps psychiatrist. Hasan did not claim to be associated to the Islamic State. He described himself as a "Soldier of Allah" who acted alone in the name of his religion, which is the Wahhabi version of Sunni Islam. He attended the Dar al-Hijrah mosque in Virginia. It is funded by the Saudis and its imam was Anwar al-Awlaki, the native-born American from Las Cruces, New Mexico who dined at the Pentagon a few months after the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Joseph Cannon believes al-Awlaki was working for the CIA or the FBI. “After the 9/11 attacks, Awlaki was interviewed by the FBI due to his undeniable ties to three of the hijackers. Nevertheless, on February 5, 2002, al-Awlaki was invited to speak at a formal Pentagon lunch,” Cannon writes.

“Who invited him? Who cleared him? Those questions have never been properly answered. More disturbingly: Why has the western press been so reticent to discuss Awlaki’s Pentagon ties?”

“While the government and media continue to cover-up the role played by the CIA and other secret state agencies in alleged intelligence ‘failures’ leading up to the 9/11 attacks, evidence suggests that the Awlaki killing [he was alleged killed by one of Obama’s CIA drones on September 30, 2011, in Yemen], as with [the] murder of former bête noire and on-again, off-again ally, Osama Bin Laden, may have been a ‘clean-up’ operation designed to remove inconvenient witnesses with knowledge of Agency involvement in the plot.”

The Boston Marathon bombing was allegedly committed by Chechen brothers Dzhokhar and Tamerlan Tsarnaev. Dzhokhar was a naturalized American citizen and Tamerlan’s citizenship was pending at the time of the attack. Again, no connection to the Islamic State, although they were supposedly associated with American citizen Abdul Rahman al-Amoudi, the founder of the Islamic Society mosque in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Like al-Awlaki, al-Amoudi had links to the Department of Defense. He played a role in establishing a Pentagon Muslim chaplain program. He met George W. Bush and donated to his political campaign and that of Hillary Clinton. Al-Amoudi founded the American Muslim Council with the assistance of the Muslim Brotherhood, a known British intelligence and later CIA asset.

On July 16, 2015, Muhammad Youssef Abdulazeez shot up two military installations in Chattanooga, Tennessee. Four Marines and one sailor died. FBI director James B. Comey said the shootings were "motivated by foreign terrorist organization propaganda." He did not implicate the Islamic State or say the

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

perpetrator was associated with the terror organization. Abdulazeez was a naturalized American citizen with alcohol abuse and mental health problems. He also abused sleeping pills, opioids, painkillers, and marijuana along with alcohol. It is said he suffered from bipolar disorder.

Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik were accused of killing 14 people and seriously injuring 22 others at the at the Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino, California on December 2, 2015. Farouk was an American citizen born in Chicago, while Tashfeen Malik was a Pakistani-born lawful permanent resident of the United States. She lived most of her life in Saudi Arabia and studied at the al-Huda International Seminary in Pakistan, a women-only Wahhabi religious academy. The FBI said the couple were "homegrown violent extremists" not connected to any foreign terrorist group. Both allegedly died in a shoot-out with police. Following the shooting, CIA director John Brennan told the Senate intelligence committee the CIA has zero evidence of a connection between Mateen and the Islamic State.

In all the cases cited by Trump, there is no evidence the violent acts were the work of the Islamic State. Instead, the killings were "inspired" by ISIS, according to the government, and the result of "ISIS recruitment" over the internet.

American Omar Mateen is suspected of killing 49 people and wounding 53 others at the Pulse, a gay nightclub in Orlando, Florida, on June 12, 2016. Following the deadly attack the media focused on a 911 phone call Mateen allegedly made swearing allegiance to the Islamic State and its purported leader, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. Although the city of Orlando refused to release the recording the FBI decided under pressure by the media to release a heavily redacted transcript.

Meanwhile, in Chicago, a person is shot every 2 minutes and a person murdered every 12 hours, far outpacing anything an "Islamic extremist" has thus far been capable of doing. On the weekend of the Pulse shooting 30 people were shot and four were killed in Chicago. "The nation won't forget the shock of what happened in Orlando last month. But the carnage that goes on all the time here is tragically susceptible to being ignored," the Chicago Tribune reported in August.

While Trump has cited the violence in Chicago—he claimed in July he will be the "law and order" president and the violence will "come to an end" after he is elected, a specious claim at best—he has yet to advocate rounding up gang members and other violent psychopaths and deporting them. He also has not advocated killing the families of people convicted of homicide as he did with those of suspected terrorists.

"The other thing with the terrorists is you have to take out their families, when you get these terrorists, you have to take out their families. They care about their lives, don't kid yourself. When they say they don't care about their lives, you have to take out their families," Trump said in December.

The Real Founding of the Islamic State

In addition to citing supposed Islamic State violence in America, Trump mentioned attacks in Europe, specifically in France and Germany. He dedicated a large part of his comprehensive plan to “halt the spread of Radical Islam . . . an ideology of death that must be extinguished” to the crises in the Middle East.

Predictably, he blamed the situation on Barack Obama and his presidential rival Hillary Clinton. “The rise of ISIS is the direct result of policy decisions made by President Obama and Secretary Clinton,” he said. “In 2014, ISIS was operating in some seven nations. Today they are fully operational in 18 countries with aspiring branches in six more, for a total of 24—and many believe it is even more than that. . . . With one episode of bad judgment after another, Hillary Clinton’s policies launched ISIS onto the world.”

Obama and Clinton certainly deserve blame for continuing foreign policy directives that have led to the rise of the Islamic State. However, the claim they are “cofounders” of the terror organization is not only incorrect, it displays historical ignorance.

The Islamic State, formerly the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and prior to that Jama’at al-Tawhid wal-Jihad and Tanzim Qaidat al-Jihad fi Bilad al-Rafidayn, was allegedly created by Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a mysterious Jordanian who was the subject of a Pentagon psychological operation during the Iraqi resistance to occupation.

The rise of al-Zarqawi is directly linked to the CIA’s covert war against the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. He traveled to the country as the war against the Soviets came to an end in early 1989. “Zarqawi was young and impressionable; he’d never been out of Jordan before, and now, for the first time, he was interacting with doctrinaire Islamists from across the Muslim world, most of them brought to Afghanistan by the CIA. It was also his first exposure to al-Qaeda. He didn’t meet bin Laden, of course, but he trained in one of his and Abdullah Azzam’s camps: the Sada camp near the Afghan border inside Pakistan,” reports *The Atlantic*.

Azzam was Osama bin Laden’s mentor and instrumental in creating Maktab al-Khidamat (MAK), a private funding network for the Afghan war against the Soviets. It was supported by the CIA. MAK “recruited between 16,000 and 20,000 mujaheddin from 20 countries to Afghanistan, visited 50 American cities to advance his cause, and dispatched acolytes to spread the gospel in 26 US states, not to mention across the Middle East and Europe,” writes Chris Suellentrop.

In 1999 al-Zarqawi traveled from Jordan to Afghanistan where he was set-up by Osama bin Laden to oversee operations at a terrorist training camp. The camp eventually attracted several thousand jihadists, mostly Jordanians and Syrians, and was assisted by the Muslim Brotherhood. Bin Laden repeatedly asked al-Zarqawi to take an oath of allegiance, but he refused. “Under no circumstances did [al-Zarqawi] want to become involved in the battle between the Northern Alliance and the Taliban [during a civil war following the departure of the Soviets]. He also did not believe that either bin Laden or the Taliban was serious enough about jihad,” writes Mary Anne Weaver.

Following the attacks of September 11, 2001 and the start of the U.S. invasion of Afghanistan on October 7, 2001, Zarqawi finally consented to join forces with al-Qaeda and the Taliban, following eight months of negotiation.

During the US invasion, al-Zarqawi He was reportedly wounded during the attack, but escaped to Iran with several hundred jihadists from Jund al-Sham and received medical treatment in Mashhad, the capital of Razavi Khorasan Province near the borders of Turkmenistan and Afghanistan. He continued to run his organization, al-Tawhid, and stayed on a farm belonging to Gulbaddin Hekmatyar, a drug dealer and Afghan jihadist funded by the CIA and ISI, the Pakistani intelligence service.

The birth of the Islamic State can be attributed to al-Zarqawi's teaming up with Ansar al-Islam, an Iraqi Salafist Islamist movement that imposed a strict application of Sharia in villages it dominated around Biyara to the northeast of Halabja, in a Kurdish region near the Iranian border. He held a meeting with Mullah Krekar,[1] the leader of Ansar al-Islam, and they agreed to work together to attack U.S. targets in Jordan and Iraq after the invasion of Iraq the following year. Zarqawi then moved to the area and established the Khurmali training camp in the village of Sargat. An image of the camp would be used by Secretary of State Collin Powell during his United Nations presentation to the United Nations on February 5, 2003. Krekar told al-Hayat newspaper in 2003 he had "a meeting with a CIA representative and someone from the American army in the town of Sulaymaniya (Iraqi Kurdistan) at the end of 2000. They asked us to collaborate with them," an offer Krekar said he refused.

The United States claimed Zarqawi was operating a chemical weapons lab at a site in Iraq and was producing ricin and cyanide. The CIA believed Zarqawi and a number of al-Qaeda fighters were at the Khurmali camp and planning attacks. The Pentagon drew up plans to strike the camp with cruise missiles, but instead of attacking him the Pentagon under Donald Rumsfeld exploited the threat as it ramped up its propaganda campaign ahead of the invasion of Iraq. Al-Zarqawi and al-Qaeda figured prominently in the propaganda used by the Bush neocons to push for an invasion. Rumsfeld said the United States had "bulletproof" evidence of a tie between the government of Saddam Hussein and members of al-Qaeda, including "solid evidence" that al-Qaeda maintained a presence in Iraq. Even though Rumsfeld's allegation was dismissed as conjecture—and he later backed away from the accusation—the Bush administration continued to insist al-Zarqawi and al-Qaeda were in cahoots with Hussein.

Several months after the invasion of Iraq al-Zarqawi became a super-terrorist, despite reports he had lost a leg during a battle. "For the past two years US military leaders have been using Iraqi media and other outlets in Baghdad to publicize Zarqawi's role in the insurgency. The documents explicitly list the 'US home audience' as a target of a broader propaganda campaign," The Sydney Morning Herald reported in 2006.

"Villainize Zarqawi/leverage xenophobia response," a military briefing from 2004 stated and listed three methods: "Media operations," "Special Ops (626)" (a reference to Task Force 626, an elite U.S. military unit assigned primarily to hunt in Iraq for senior officials in Hussein's government) and "PSYOP," psychological operations, The Washington Post reported at the time. Gen. Mark Kimmitt, the U.S. military's chief spokesman when the propaganda campaign began in 2004, said the "Zarqawi PSYOP Program is the most successful information campaign to date."

"Some senior intelligence officers believe Zarqawi's role might have been overemphasized by the propaganda campaign, which has included leaflets, radio and television broadcasts, internet postings and at least one leak to an American journalist."

On February 20, 2005 the US military allegedly came into possession of a laptop computer attributed to the illiterate al-Zarqawi. In addition to photos of Zarqawi and defunct operational plans and cell phone numbers, the computer supposedly held a video of "an entire war-council session, with fly-on-the wall intimacy," writes Joby Warrick. After a poetry recitation "by hardened killers" and stories and jokes, Zarqawi "talked about his vision for Iraq and the region, and how, from rubble and ash, the jihadists would lay the foundation for something that was utterly new, yet as old as Islam. Here Zarqawi departed from the usual jihadi rhetoric. Other radical Islamists spoke vaguely of the restoration of the caliphate from Islam's golden age, when all Muslims lived under a single religious authority that erased the national boundaries imposed by the West. But Zarqawi wasn't talking about the distant future. He spoke of the caliphate in the present tense, with himself as the leader of a liberation army that was already on the march.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

If the Pentagon's story can be believed, al-Zarqawi's rambling marks the beginning of the Islamic State, not during the presidency of Obama, but his predecessor, George W. Bush.

In July, 2005, according to U.S. national intelligence, al-Qaeda's then deputy leader Ayman al-Zawahiri mentioned in a letter to Zarqawi establishing an Islamic authority as a caliphate "or emirate" and spreading it throughout Iraq and to surrounding countries, including Syria.

The caliphate plan was supposedly signed off on by al-Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri and put on the fast-track in October. In January of 2006 Zarqawi's al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI) joined a number of other jihadi groups in Iraq and formed the Mujahideen Shura Council (MSC) in response to 25 of the 31 tribes in the Anbar province teaming up with the occupation government and declaring they planned to hunt down al-Qaeda.

Before AQI could morph into the Islamic State and take the war on terror to a new level, Zarqawi had to be removed, either by the U.S. or al-Qaeda. This occurred on June 7, 2006, while Zarqawi attended a meeting in an isolated safehouse near Baqubah in the Diyala Governorate north of Baghdad. The house was bombed by two United States Air Force F-16C jets that dropped two 500-pound guided bombs, a laser-guided GBU-12 and GPS-guided GBU-38.

The United States claimed it had found a crude map on the body of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. The "Baghdad belts" map described a plan to seize key areas located in "belts" or the provinces around the Iraqi capital. In 2014, ISIS would accomplish this plan.

In October, 2006, the Mujahideen Shura Council, now an umbrella organization composed of eight resistance groups fighting against the occupation, released a video announcing the formation of ad-Dawlah al-'Iraq al-Islāmiyah, also known as the Islamic State of Iraq (ISIS), or Daesh in Arabic. The video was released in the West by the SITE Institute, an organization with close connections to former terrorism czar Richard Clarke and his staff in the White House, and also investigators in the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of Homeland Security.

The MSC swore "to rid Sunnis from the oppression of the rejectionists [Shi'ite Muslims] and the crusader occupiers ... to restore rights even at the price of our own lives ... to make Allah's word supreme in the world, and to restore the glory of Islam."

Leaders of the MSC appear to be as fictional as al-Zarqawi. Abu Omar al-Baghdadi, for instance, was an Iraqi who may have been a fictional character cobbled together for use by the same Pentagon PSYOP that created the super terrorist al-Zarqawi. This was more or less admitted in July, 2007 by Brigadier General Kevin Bergner, the chief American military spokesman, said "the elusive Baghdadi was actually a fictional character whose audio-taped declarations were provided by an elderly actor named Abu Adullah al-Naima." Bergner placed responsibility for the deception on the leadership of al-Qaeda, including Abu Ayyub al-Masri and Ayman al-Zawahiri, the fabled deputy of Osama bin Laden. Since we know the Pentagon also dreamed up other phantom terrorists, there is an equal chance al-Baghdadi was a military PSYOP fabrication.

In 2009 Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi was appointed the new leader of the Islamic State of Iraq. He brought in a raft of new leaders, many of them allegedly former Baathist military and intelligence officers who had spent time in Camp Bucca and other occupation prisons. One former officer, Samir al-Khelifawi, is credited with establishing the foundation that led to the growth of ISIS.

By December, 2010 the Arab Spring—engineered primarily by the National Endowment for Democracy, International Republican Institute, the National Democratic Institute, and the Freedom House in the United States—swept through the Arab world.

The following March the protests reached Syria. AQI recruited fighters and sent them into Syria to battle the security forces of the Syrian leader, Bashar al-Assad. Baghdadi worked with Abu Mohammad

al-Julani, a Syrian from Deir ez-Zor, to establish cells and recruit warriors, many recently released from the Sednaya military prison near Damascus. During meetings in Rif Dimashq and Homs logistics were hammered out and on January 23, 2012, al-Julani announced the creation of Jabhat al-Nusra l' Ahl as-Sham, translated as "Support Front for the People of the Sham." Sham is an Arabic word for the Levant which includes the area encompassed by Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, Israel, Jordan, Cyprus and the Turkish Hatay Province.

Jabhat al-Nusra, also known simply as al-Nusra Front, called for the creation of an Islamic emirate under sharia law, a goal that synced up with a plan outlined in DIA documents.

On May 18, 2015 Judicial Watch posted a selection of formerly classified documents obtained from the Pentagon and State Department through a federal lawsuit. "While initial mainstream media reporting is focused on the White House's handling of the Benghazi consulate attack, a much "bigger picture" admission and confirmation is contained in one of the Defense Intelligence Agency documents circulated in 2012: that an 'Islamic State' is desired in Eastern Syria to effect the West's policies in the region," Brad Hoff reported.

The formerly classified document was circulated widely among various government agencies, including CENTCOM, the CIA, FBI, DHS, NGA, State Dept., and many others.

The report stated, in part: "THE WEST, GULF COUNTRIES, AND TURKEY [WHO] SUPPORT THE [SYRIAN] OPPOSITION... THERE IS THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A DECLARED OR UNDECLARED SALAFIST PRINCIPALITY IN EASTERN SYRIA (HASAKA AND DER ZOR), AND THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT THE SUPPORTING POWERS TO THE OPPOSITION WANT, IN ORDER TO ISOLATE THE SYRIAN REGIME..."

By 2014 ISIS was "larger than the largest terrorist organization in the world. Its number is double the number of Kuwait's army, and its money, arms and hiding places make it one of the richest states in the region. ISIS fighters also surpass the strength of the world's armies as they possess the will to die. One ISIS fighter is equal to ten soldiers from a regular army. ISIS also includes hundreds of fighters who are willing to perform suicide attacks. ISIS can be a rival of the American army, which is the most trained and equipped in the world. The CIA's estimation of the number of ISIS fighters is most likely based on information from the field, aerial surveillance, interrogating prisoners and gathering information from friendly security apparatuses," Abdulrahman al-Rashed wrote for Alarabiya.

According to Jordanian officials future ISIS members were trained in 2012 by U.S. instructors working at a secret base in Jordan. The trainees were allegedly vetted "for any links to extremist groups like al-Qaida," according to the journalist Aaron Klein. "The officials said dozens of future ISIS members were trained at the time as part of covert aid to the insurgents targeting the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad in Syria. The officials said the training was not meant to be used for any future campaign in Iraq."

Klein previously reported the U.S., Turkey and Jordan had operated a training base for Syrian rebels in the Jordanian town of Safawi. Egyptian security officials told the journalist there was large scale international backing for the rebels and Saudi Arabia was sending weapons to the mercenaries through surrogates. These included Druze and Christian leaders in Lebanon such as Druze leader Walid Jumblatt and Saudi-Lebanese billionaire Saad Hariri, the former Lebanese prime minister. Additionally, Syrian sources said Jordan was responsible for smuggling weapons into the country.

In 2013 The Washington Post reported the CIA had expanded a covert effort to train "moderate" fighters. Officials told the newspaper "the agency has sent additional paramilitary teams to secret bases in Jordan in recent weeks in a push to double the number of rebel fighters getting CIA instruction and weapons before being sent back to Syria."

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

By 2013, however, there were few if any moderate fighters in Syria. “Across Syria, rebel-held areas are dotted with Islamic courts staffed by lawyers and clerics, and by fighting brigades led by extremists. Even the Supreme Military Council, the umbrella rebel organization whose formation the West had hoped would sideline radical groups, is stocked with commanders who want to infuse Islamic law into a future Syrian government,” The New York Times reported. “Nowhere in rebel-controlled Syria is there a secular fighting force to speak of.”

The Islamic State was already well established by the time Hillary Clinton became Secretary of State. Obama oversaw the work of his predecessor and the neocons in the Pentagon. As the DIA document states, ISIS, later simply the Islamic State, was encouraged to expand and become “the largest terrorist organization in the world,” trained by the CIA and the Pentagon and funded by the Gulf Emirates.

Donald Trump mentions none of this. His objective is not to reveal the truth about the Islamic State but to use it as a propaganda weapon against Hillary Clinton as the race for the White House narrows.

Donald Trump: Not Exactly Anti-war Material

Donald Trump's warning about Islamic extremism—as noted, cultivated by the CIA through a partnership with fossilized Wahhabi fanatics in the Gulf Emirates, Turkey, and Pakistan—is a regurgitation of the neocon philosophy.

There are key differences, however the similarities are striking. For instance, Trump has recently criticized the invasion of Iraq, a key neocon milestone. He claims to have opposed the invasion from the outset.

“I was an opponent of the Iraq war from the beginning—a major difference between me and my opponent. Though I was a private citizen, whose personal opinions on such matters was not sought, I nonetheless publicly expressed my private doubts about the invasion,” he declared during his foreign policy speech.

Factcheck, a nonpartisan, nonprofit consumer advocate group for voters, investigated Trump's claim and found no evidence he publicly opposed the war prior to the invasion. In fact, he appears to have supported it.

In February, BuzzFeed reported Trump gave his support for war in a radio interview with radio host Howard Stern on Sept. 11, 2002, six months before the invasion. Stern asked Trump if he supported the invasion and he responded, “Yeah, I guess so.”

Trump appeared on Fox News on the night of President Bush's State of the Union address on January 28, 2003. He said he expected to hear “a lot of talk about Iraq and the problems” related to the economy. He urged Bush to make a decision on the invasion. “Either you attack or you don't attack,” he said. He didn't urge Bush not to attack.

Soon after the invasion, Trump appeared on Fox News again. He told Neil Cavuto the war “looks like a tremendous success from a military standpoint,” and he predicted the market will “go up like a rocket” after the war.

The next day the San Antonio Express-News quoted Trump as saying while the war was depressing, “something like the Miss USA pageant is positive and brings you out of that funk.”

His concern over the war had nothing to do with the loss of life and the destruction of Iraq but rather money. “I think the president is doing a very good job,” he told Chris Matthews of MSNBC on July 1, 2003.

While Trump had reservations about the invasion, he expressed none when asked about the war on terrorism. “It wasn't a mistake to fight terrorism and fight it hard, and I guess maybe if I had to do it, I would have fought terrorism but not necessarily Iraq,” he told MSNBC's Joe Scarborough on the second anniversary of the 9/11 attack.

He celebrated the capture of Saddam Hussein in December, 2003 despite the fact Saddam had nothing to do with terrorism and did not pose a threat to the United States. He told Neil Cavuto the capture was “a great thing for the free world... a lot of people [are] questioning the whole concept of going in, in the first place, Neil. But we are in, we went in, you had to find him. If he was alive, you had to find him. And you know, they fulfilled the pledge of finding Saddam Hussein.”

“I would love to see New York City and some of the cities and some of the states get some of the money that's going toward Iraq and other places, because you know, they really need and it they need it badly.”

The United State apparently also needed Iraq's oil. Trump advocated stealing it during his August 15 speech: “I have long said that we should have kept the oil in Iraq—another area where my judgment has been proven correct ... I was saying this constantly and to whoever would listen: Keep the oil, keep the

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

oil, keep the oil, I said—don't let someone else get it. If they had listened to me then, we would have had the economic benefits of the oil, which I wanted to use to help take care of the wounded soldiers and families of those who died—and thousands of lives would have been saved.”

The August 15 speech marked a turning point. After the speech Donald Trump became a war on terror warrior.

“We will defeat Radical Islamic Terrorism, just as we have defeated every threat we have faced in every age before.

“But we will not defeat it with closed eyes, or silenced voices.

“Anyone who cannot name our enemy, is not fit to lead this country. Anyone who cannot condemn the hatred, oppression and violence of Radical Islam lacks the moral clarity to serve as our President.”

“What have the decisions of Obama-Clinton produced?” he asked.

“Libya is in ruins, our ambassador and three other brave Americans are dead, and ISIS has gained a new base of operations.”

He does not mention, as cited above, the DIA document showing ISIS was encouraged to spread its violence and establish a Salafist principality.

“Syria is in the midst of a disastrous civil war. ISIS controls large portions of territory. A refugee crisis now threatens Europe and the United States.”

Silence on the fact the war began as a CIA operation in Deraa, Syria, with the help of Libyan operatives.

“Iraq is in chaos, and ISIS is on the loose.”

Trump does not put this in context. The chaos in Iraq is a direct result of the US invasion.

Prior to the first invasion launched by George W. Bush's father, the country “enjoyed considerable economic progress with electricity and water available to the entire country. Since 1982 the government built 18 new hospitals some of which were renowned in the Middle East. Health care was virtually free and education was universal and free through college. Food was both inexpensive and abundant. People without land were offered low-interest loans on the condition that the land became productive within five years. Malnutrition was non-existent. A strong infrastructure of highways, dams, hydroelectric power, flood control, irrigation systems, and an efficient telephone system contributed to the growing strength of the economy,” writes David Model.

If the Islamic State is on the “loose,” it is because the Pentagon and its total war partners in the Middle East planned it that way.

Donald Trump represents a third wave in the war on terror. While he criticizes the past accomplishments of the neocons and the “liberal interventionists”—the invasion of Iraq and the destruction of Syria—and disingenuously attributes the “failures” to Obama and Clinton, he embraces the evolving war on Islam.

The neocons do not support Trump and prefer the known commodity of Hillary Clinton, a highly accomplished warmonger, although she is on the wrong side of the aisle. Trump's commentary on “radical Islam,” a creation of Wahhabi fanatics in collusion with the CIA and other intelligence services, is a hybrid form of the neocon political philosophy. It is not based on a rising threat of radical Islam.

It is an extension and amplification of the neocon war in the Middle East.

The Neocon War in the Middle East

In 1996 a number of American neoconservatives, including Richard Perle, James Colbert, Charles Fairbanks, Douglas Feith, Robert Loewenberg, Jonathan Torop, David Wurmser and Meyrav Wurmser, devised a roadmap for then-incoming Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. The plan was dubbed “A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm.”

"It provides an early window into some of the [Bush] administration's thinking. For one, it predicted that toppling the Hussein regime could be the beginning of a larger rollback of autocratic, terrorist-supporting states such as Syria and Iran, blamed for supporting Hezbollah guerrillas operating in southern Lebanon and accused of terrorism against Israel and the United States," The Boston Globe reported.

Douglas Feith and Richard Perle, both top members of the Bush administration, urged the new Israeli PM to make "a clean break" from the Oslo accords with the Palestinians and actively seek regime change in surrounding countries, in particular Iraq and Syria

“Israel's hawks have long recognized that the co-optation, or barring that, the destruction of Iraq was necessary for a more permanent approach, the clean break, the assertion of Israel's monopoly of force in the Middle East,” writes Karen Kwiatkowski, a retired U.S. Air Force Lieutenant Colonel who served in the Pentagon's Near East and South Asia directorate.

This monopoly of force will be used in “cooperation with Turkey and Jordan” and concentrate “on removing Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq—an important Israeli strategic objective in its own right—as a means of foiling Syria's regional ambitions.” Israel can “shape its strategic environment” by “weakening, containing, and even rolling back Syria,” the report states. In addition to striking Syrian targets in neighboring Lebanon, described in the report as a vassal state of Syria, Israel will attack selected “targets in Syria proper.”

“In the Perle-Feith-Wurmser strategy, Israel's enemy remains Syria, but the road to Damascus runs through Baghdad,” explains Patrick J. Buchanan. He cites a paper by David Wurmser, who served as Middle East Adviser to former Vice President Dick Cheney and a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, a neoconservative think tank instrumental in the propaganda war leading up to the invasion of Iraq. Wurmser drafted joint war plans for Israel and the United States “to fatally strike the centers of radicalism in the Middle East. Israel and the United States should . . . broaden the conflict to strike fatally, not merely disarm, the centers of radicalism in the region—the regimes of Damascus, Baghdad, Tripoli, Tehran, and Gaza.”

The neoconservatives have thus far realized most of their ambitious plan—Baghdad lies in ruins, Iraq now at best a third world failed state riven by sectarian violence, while Tripoli and Libya have shared a similar fate after the United States and NATO bombed the country to remove its leader, Muammar Gaddafi (who was assassinated in October, 2011). Gaza has been repeatedly targeted by Israel since its occupation in 1967. A “civil war” in Syria—the prime objective of the U.S.-Israeli plan—between the government of Bashar al-Assad and a shifting coalition of U.S. and Gulf Emirate supported, financed and armed “rebels,” now virtually all radical Sunni Salafists, has resulted in between 200,000 and 250,000 casualties, primarily civilians. Iran has endured economic sanctions in response to its nuclear energy program and Israel has threatened several times to launch military strikes against Iran's nuclear facilities despite evidence the country does not have a nuclear weapons program.

The Clean Break plan to undermine and balkanize Israel's Arab and Muslim neighbors harks back to an earlier plan devised by Oded Yinon, an Israeli journalist with links to the Israeli Foreign Ministry. In the winter 1982 issue of *Kivunim*, a “A Journal for Judaism and Zionism,” Yinon published in Hebrew “A Strategy for Israel in the Nineteen Eighties,” an essay rejecting peace through the Camp David accords.

Instead, Yinon suggests the Arab states surrounding Israel should be destroyed from within by exploiting their internal religious and ethnic tensions.

“Lebanon’s total dissolution into five provinces serves as a precedent for the entire Arab world including Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and the Arabian peninsula and is already following that track. The dissolution of Syria and Iraq later on into ethnically or religiously unique areas such as in Lebanon, is Israel’s primary target on the Eastern front in the long run, while the dissolution of the military power of those states serves as the primary short term target. Syria will fall apart, in accordance with its ethnic and religious structure, into several states such as in present day Lebanon,” Yinon writes.

“In Iraq, a division into provinces along ethnic/religious lines as in Syria during Ottoman times is possible. So, three (or more) states will exist around the three major cities: Basra, Baghdad and Mosul and Shiite areas in the South will separate from the Sunni and Kurdish north.”

Yinon borrows an idea from former Labor Foreign Minister Abba Eban who saw the Arab East is a "mosaic" of ethnic dissimilarity and proposed rule based on the Millet system of the Ottoman Empire. The system allowed minorities to rule themselves with little interference from the Ottoman government.

The late Israel Shahak, a Polish-born Holocaust survivor and Israeli professor of chemistry at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, put Yinon’s plan into perspective in a piece titled “The Zionist Plan for the Middle East,” published the same year as Yinon’s essay.

“The idea that all the Arab states should be broken down, by Israel, into small units, occurs again and again in Israeli strategic thinking,” writes Shahak.

The state of Israel has long claimed its response to surrounding nations is based on security considerations and the long-standing hatred of Arabs toward Israel and the Jewish people. This premise, however, is called into question when the writings of prominent Zionists are examined, specifically the personal diary of Moshe Sharett, a former Prime Minister of Israel (1954-55), director of the Jewish Agency’s Political Department and Foreign Minister (1948-56).

“Sharett’s diary reveals in explicit language that the Israeli political and military leadership never believed in any Arab danger to Israel,” writes Ralph Schoenman. “They sought to maneuver and force the Arab states into military confrontations which the Zionist leadership were certain of winning so Israel could carry out the destabilization of Arab regimes and the planned occupation of additional territory.”

In June, 2006, U.S. Army Lt. Col. (ret.) Ralph Peters suggested breaking the Arab world up “along ethnic, sectarian and tribal lines” in order to “ease regional tensions.”

“International borders are never completely just,” Peters writes. “But the degree of injustice they inflict upon those whom frontiers force together or separate makes an enormous difference—often the difference between freedom and oppression, tolerance and atrocity, the rule of law and terrorism, or even peace and war.”

According to Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya, a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization, the “oppression, tolerance and atrocity” mentioned by Peters is “the result of the deliberate aggravation of pre-existing regional tensions. Sectarian division, ethnic tension and internal violence have been traditionally exploited by the United States and Britain in various parts of the globe including Africa, Latin America, the Balkans, and the Middle East. Iraq is just one of many examples of the Anglo-American strategy of ‘divide and conquer.’ Other examples are Rwanda, Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, and Afghanistan.”

Divide and conquer or, alternately, divide and rule, was used in the Middle East by the United Kingdom and France under the Sykes–Picot Agreement after the defeat of the Ottoman Empire during World War I. The secret agreement—subsequently revealed by the Bolsheviks after the Russian Revolution—carved the Arab provinces of the Ottoman Empire beyond the Arabian peninsula into areas

of future British and French control. Divide and rule (derived from Latin *divide et impera*) played ethnic and religious factions against each other to ensure they would not conspire revolt against the ruling imperialists.

While “divide and conquer” has its roots in antiquity, it was perfected by the United Kingdom early in the 20th century.

“British geo-strategists are the masters of political manipulation and subversion,” writes Peter Goodgame. “Even as the physical British colonial empire was declining in the first half of [the 20th century] they were already building the framework for a completely global empire based on the legacy of Cecil Rhodes utilizing the resources of the super-capitalists and financiers of New York and London. These elites may be predominantly British and American in nationality, but they reject democracy and the American Constitution and work against the best interests of British, American and international citizens.”

Cecil Rhodes (1853-1902) is credited with developing the philosophy of British imperialism. His ideas of British global dominance were revealed in his will. In it, Rhodes called for using his fortune to found a secret society that would extend British rule throughout the world and colonize most parts of it with British settlers, leading to the “ultimate recovery of the United States of America” by the British Empire.

Following World War I, the fall of the Ottoman Empire, and the signing of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, the arbitrary boundaries of Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Kuwait were established. The British then used Islam to further its political and territorial goals.

“All political leadership of the time depended on Islam for legitimacy and all political leaders were pro-British. Islam was a tool to legitimize the rule, tyranny and corruption of Arab leaders. To the West, Islam was acceptable; it could be and was used,” writes Arab historian Said Aburish.

After World War II the British and the Americans concentrated on defeating Arab nationalism, particularly in Egypt where Gamal Abdel Nasser led the Egyptian Revolution of 1952 against the monarchy and aligned with the Soviet Union.

“In the 1950s and later, the West opposed the secular Arab nationalist movement for two reasons: it challenged its regional hegemony and threatened the survival of its clients leaders and countries,” Aburish notes. “Specifically, there was nothing to stop a secular movement from cooperating with the USSR; in fact, most of them were mildly socialist. Furthermore, most secular movements advocated various schemes of Arab unity, a union or a unified policy, which threatened and undermined the pro-West traditional regimes of Saudi Arabia, Jordan and other client states. The West saw it as a challenge that had to be met.”

The recently established Central Intelligence Agency collaborated with Britain and engineered the overthrow of a popular leader in Iran, Dr. Mohammad Mossadegh. One of his first actions as Prime Minister was to nationalizing Iran’s oil and take control away from the British owned Anglo-Persian Oil Company.

“As the prime minister had anticipated, the British did not take the nationalization gracefully, though it was supported unanimously by the Iranian parliament and by the overwhelming majority of the Iranian people for reasons of both economic justice and national pride. The Mossadegh government tried to do all the right things to placate the British: It offered to set aside 25 percent of the net profits of the oil operation as compensation; it guaranteed the safety and the jobs of the British employees; it was willing to sell its oil without disturbance to the tidy control system so dear to the hearts of the international oil giants. But the British would have none of it. What they wanted was their oil company back. And they wanted Mossadegh’s head. A servant does not affront his lord with impunity,” writes William Blum.

Winston Churchill and the Eisenhower administration decided to overthrow Iran's government. The previous administration had opposed the coup. "Harry Truman never wanted the CIA to go in that direction [of overthrowing governments]... He used the phrase, 'American Gestapo' to describe what he was afraid the CIA might become if it were allowed to run loose," New York Times reporter Stephen Kinzer told Democracy Now! in 2004.

The CIA drafted a study titled "Factors Involved in the Overthrow of Mossadegh" and, deciding a coup was possible, began a "grey propaganda" campaign to discredit the Mossadegh government. In July, 1953 Britain's prime minister and the Eisenhower administration finalized and approved an operational plan for a coup d'état.

"The CIA's plans hinged on the young Shah of Iran, Reza Pahlavi, a timid and inexperienced figurehead," Mark Zepezauer writes, and "with CIA backing, the Shah ordered Mossadegh out of office and appointed a Nazi collaborator as his successor. Demonstrators filled the streets in support of Mossadegh, and the Shah fled to Rome."

Although initially a failure, the coup—directed by Kermit Roosevelt, Jr., the grandson of president Theodore Roosevelt and at the time a senior officer in the CIA's Middle Eastern division—eventually deposed Mossadegh.

"When this crisis came on and the thing was about to collapse, we violated our normal criteria and among other things we did, we provided the army immediately on an emergency basis, blankets, boots, uniforms, electric generators, and medical supplies that permitted and created an atmosphere in which they could support the Shah," Major General George C. Stewart, director of military assistance, later told the House Foreign Affairs Committee. "The guns that they had in their hands, the trucks that they rode in, the armored cars that they drove through the streets, and the radio communications that permitted their control, were all furnished through the military defense assistance program . . . had it not been for this program, a government unfriendly to the United States probably would now be in power."

By August members of the Mossadegh government were either in hiding or imprisoned and Gen. Fazlollah Zahedi declared himself prime minister. The Anglo-Iranian Oil Company resumed operations the following year.

"For the next 25 years, the Shah of Iran stood fast as the United States' closest ally in the Third World, to a degree that would have shocked the independent and neutral Mossadegh. The Shah literally placed his country at the disposal of US military and intelligence organizations to be used as a cold-war weapon, a window and a door to the Soviet Union—electronic listening and radar posts were set up near the Soviet border; American aircraft used Iran as a base to launch surveillance flights over the Soviet Union; espionage agents were infiltrated across the border; various American military installations dotted the Iranian landscape. Iran was viewed as a vital link in the chain being forged by the United States to 'contain' the Soviet Union."

Arab nationalism and the ideology of pan-Arabism presented the next challenge to Britain and the United States. Beginning in the 1860s prior to British and French imperialism under the Sykes-Picot Agreement, literature produced in the Levant and Mesopotamia extolled the concept of an "Arab Fatherland." Opposition to the Ottoman Empire that had controlled the area since the 1500s also increased.

"It was only in the aftermath of World War I that the 'Arab nation' emerged as a pertinent concept and Arab nationalism gradually took the form of a political movement," writes Avi Shlaim. "Iraq in the inter-war era was in the vanguard of the movement towards Arab unity. Proponents of Pan-Arabism, like Sati' al-Husri, hoped to turn Iraq into the Prussia of the Middle East, into a nationalist prototype for the rest of the Arab world." The realization of a cohesive political movement and the dream of a unified Arab state,

however, was difficult if not impossible to achieve due to the fact the Middle East was carved up into artificial states under Sykes-Picot and there were numerous ethnic and religious hurdles. “In the face of such deep and pervasive divisions, it was a well-nigh impossible task to achieve the two basic objectives of the Arab national movement: unity and independence,” notes Shlaim.

A primary player in Arab nationalism after the Second World War was Nasser. “The U.S. worried that Egypt, under Gamal Abdel Nasser—a nationalist military officer who had come to power, ironically, with the CIA’s blessing after a 1952 coup—might become a pole of attraction for pan-Arab movements.”

According to the CIA operative Miles Copeland, the CIA supported the coup that ousted the British puppet King Faruk and later helped Nasser reorganize the Egyptian Mukhabarat (intelligence service) and the country’s Interior Ministry.[12] Behind the scenes, however, the agency worked with the Muslim Brotherhood to undermine Nasser and “joined the Saudi royals and their Islamic fundamentalist allies, and launched a decades-long effort to use political Islam as a cornerstone of American influence in the Middle East.”

Nasser stood in opposition to British control of the Suez Canal and nationalized the the strategic waterway on July 26, 1956. At the time, nearly all of Europe’s oil passed through the canal. The British government and French stockholders who owned shares in the Suez Canal Company reacted with shock and outrage. Britain, France and Israel responded by attacking Egypt. The combined forces quickly inflicted a decisive victory and the Israelis occupied a large portion of the Sinai Peninsula while the Anglo-French forces occupied Port Said and Port Fouad at the Mediterranean terminus of the Suez Canal.

Nasser also alarmed the West when he entered into agreements with Soviet bloc countries during the height of the Cold War, including a deal to provide Egypt with more than \$250 million worth of modern Soviet weaponry through Czechoslovakia (the deal is considered a major turning point in the Cold War). "At first, Nasser rejected any alliance with the Soviets. But after the United States and Great Britain tried to keep him from getting weapons, he turned to the Soviets for military trades."

In addition, Nasser's independent and anti-imperialist policy was favored by Moscow and earned him the highest Soviet decoration, the star of the Hero of the Soviet Union with the Order of Lenin.

“In their dealings with Nasser the British used any means necessary, including espionage, diplomacy, bribery and even direct military might to retain control over Egypt and the Suez Canal. The newly founded CIA also became interested in Egypt when Nasser showed signs of tilting to the Soviet Union.”

Copeland writes that the British intelligence service MI6 worked closely with the Muslim Brotherhood to undermine Nasser, organized anti-Nasser demonstrations in the south of France and Switzerland, and may have actively plotted an assassination attempt. The British Prime Minister, Anthony Eden, wanted Nasser murdered, according to Anthony Nutting, the British Foreign Office Minister of State at the time.

“At the official level Eden's immediate response was refined both by Whitehall planning, lead by the Foreign Office, and by discussions with the US government,” a BBC presenter, Scott Lucas, explains. “By the end of March the Eden and Eisenhower administrations had agreed a plan, 'Operation Omega'—isolating Nasser through propaganda, economic sanctions, and support of countries such as Turkey and Iraq. ... Britain's foreign intelligence service MI6 wanted to go much, much, further. Under the American Freedom of Information Act I've obtained a CIA memorandum from April 1st 1956. Presented for the first time in a documentary, it records two days of meetings between MI6 Deputy Director, George Young, and his CIA counterparts. In this record, personally approved by Young, he instructs the Americans about Nasser's menace as a Soviet ally.... To deal with this imminent threat Young suggested regime change in not one, but three Arab countries, and for the first time he mentioned the possibility of working with a new Middle Eastern partner. Israel.”

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Britain and the United States decided to use Islam as a counterpoint to Arab nationalism. While searching for a “Muslim Billy Graham” in the mid-1950s to offset Nasser, the CIA began to cooperate with the Muslim Brotherhood.

“The CIA was following the example of British Intelligence and sought to use Islam to further its goals. They wanted to find a charismatic religious leader that they could promote and control and they began to cooperate with groups such as the Muslim Brotherhood. With the rise of Nasser the Brotherhood was also courted more seriously by the pro-Western Arab regimes of Saudi Arabia and Jordan. They needed all the popular support that they could muster against the rise of Nasser-inspired Arab nationalism to keep their regimes intact,” Goodgame explains.

In 1953, the year before Nasser outlawed the Muslim Brotherhood, the US Information Agency invited three dozen Muslim scholars to an academic conference at Princeton University. The objective was to convince Muslim scholars and civic leaders of “America’s spiritual and moral strength, since it was thought that they could influence Muslims’ popular opinion better than their ossified rulers. The ultimate goal was to promote an anti-Communist agenda in these newly independent countries, many of which had Muslim majorities.”

Eisenhower’s appointment book reveals that one of the attendees was “The Honorable Saeed Ramahdan, Delegate of the Muslim Brothers.” Rahman was the son-in-law of the Brotherhood’s founder, Hasan al-Banna. The CIA characterized Rahman as a “Phalangist” and a “fascist interested in the grouping of individuals for power.”

Originally founded as the Society of Muslim Brothers in 1928 by al-Bana, the Muslim Brotherhood was Salafist—an ultra-conservative orthodox movement within Sunni Islam—and intended to restore the perceived purity of earlier Islam. It wielded immense power behind the scene in monarchical Egypt and worked in tandem with King Farouk against his political enemies, including the communists and the Wafd Party, a nationalist party popular in Egypt until the 1930s.

“For the next five decades, the Muslim Brotherhood would serve as a battering ram against nationalists and communists,” writes Robert Dreyfuss. “Despite the Brothers’ Islam-based anti-imperialism, the group often ended up making common cause with the colonial British. It functioned as an intelligence agency, infiltrating left-wing and nationalist groups. But it was also fiercely independent, at times clashing violently with the ruling authorities. On several occasions, Ikhwan assassins [a Wahhabi religious militia] murdered top Egyptian officials, including Prime Minister Mahmoud Fahmi al-Nuqrashi in 1948. (Brotherhood founder Banna was assassinated by agents of the regime just weeks later).”

According to former Justice Department investigator and Nazi-hunter John Loftus, al-Banna “was a devout admirer of Adolph Hitler and wrote to him frequently. So persistent was he in his admiration of the new Nazi Party that in the 1930s, al-Banna and the Muslim Brotherhood became a secret arm of Nazi intelligence.”

The CIA had a well-documented affinity for ex-Nazis. Declassified records show that during the Cold War years Allen Dulles’ CIA—along with the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover—eagerly recruited former Nazis in the battle against communism and the Soviets. According to Loftus, the past of many of these ex-Nazis was unknown to the agency. “I learned that many of the Nazis that I had been assigned to prosecute were on the CIA payroll, but the CIA didn’t know they were Nazis because the British Intelligence Service had lied to them.”

Others insist the CIA was well aware it was recruiting Nazis. One prized recruit was Gen. Reinhard Gehlen, Hitler’s Chief of Intelligence against Russia. Upon his arrival in Washington D.C. in 1945, Gehlen met extensively with President Truman, General William “Wild Bill” Donovan, Director of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and Allen Dulles, who would later head up the CIA.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Details of the recruitment effort, dubbed “Operation Paperclip,” emerged in a memorandum sent to members of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments in 1995 and titled “Post-World War II Recruitment of German Scientists—Project Paperclip.” The special committee was created by President Bill Clinton in Executive Order 12891, issued January 15, 1994, to investigate human radiation experiments by the U.S. government.

By 1967 and the Six Day War between Israel and Egypt, Jordan and Syria, the “power generating Arab nationalism was eventually turned off,” Shlalm writes. “The armies of the confrontation states were roundly defeated, their territory was occupied, their economies were in ruins, and the bluster of Arab nationalism was completely deflated.”

Islam and the Muslim Brotherhood, however, would continue to be used by the West to undermine and further fragment the Arab world.

“The British have always been proud of their tradition of hospitality and asylum, which has benefited Huguenots escaping persecution, European Jewry, and many political dissidents from Marx to Mazzini,” the late Christopher Hitchens wrote in 2007. “But the appellation ‘Londonistan,’ which apparently originated with a sarcastic remark by a French intelligence officer, has come to describe a city which became home to people wanted for terrorist crimes as far afield as Cairo and Karachi.”

The activity of British intelligence in regard to jihadists, however, transcends hospitality and asylum. A number of Islamic radicals, many linked to Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda, have enjoyed the protection and support of the British government and its intelligence services.

“The fact that Muslims from Britain emerge in every hotbed of terrorism and extremism around the world—Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Chechnya, and Bosnia—is no accident. The creation and recruitment of Islamic terrorists is a deliberate British policy... Some of the most notorious terrorists and terror recruiters have... been identified as direct collaborators with the British intelligence services.”

Although denied by British officials, a key al-Qaeda figure, Abu Qatada, worked with MI5 in the late 1990s. Qatada entered Britain in September, 1993 with a forged United Arab Emirates passport and was granted asylum in 1994. He was on al-Qaeda’s fatwa committee and videos of his sermons were discovered in Mohamed Atta’s Hamburg flat. Qatada provided advice to Richard Reid, the convicted shoe bomber, and al-Qaeda associate Zacarias Moussaoui. His MI5 go-between was Bisher al-Rawi, an Iraqi suspected if links to al-Qaeda who would later spend time interned at Guantanamo Bay. In 2000, Italian intelligence claimed Qatada was connected to an al-Qaeda cell in Milan. Following the attacks of 9/11, he was linked to an al-Qaeda cell in Madrid, Spain.

Abu Hamza al-Masri, an Egyptian cleric who was the imam of Finsbury Park Mosque in London, also worked for British intelligence and Scotland Yard. The Finsbury Park Mosque was infiltrated by the militant Algerian Groupe Islamique Armé and a leading member, Ali Touchent, worked for the Algerian intelligence service (the group was later denounced and removed from the mosque). During the war against the Soviets in Afghanistan, al-Masri received paramilitary training at al-Qaeda’s MI5 and CIA controlled Darunta camp and lost his hands and one eye while training with explosives. In 1997 he established jihadi paramilitary training camps at an old monastery in Kent and a farm in Scotland, apparently without objection by the British government. Hamza al-Masri also works with Al-Muhajiroun, a group that praised the 9/11 attacks and ran an al-Qaeda safe house in Lahore, Pakistan.

In 1999 Hamza was implicated in the kidnapping and murder of Western tourists in Yemen. He told police he was following the Koran and was be released. The police returned to Hamza audio tapes “packed with the usual messages of intolerance and hatred, and culminating in exhortations to kill the enemies of Islam.”

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

“In 2003, British authorities raided the Finsbury Park mosque, arrested Abu Hamza, and then released him. Eventually, he was incarcerated, after the blowback from the 9/11 attacks in the United States forced the British to take some cosmetic steps against some of the jihadi recruiters operating with impunity in the U.K.”

Al-Muhajiroun was founded by Sheikh Omar Bakri Mohammed, a Syrian linked to British intelligence. “The British government knows who we are. MI5 has interrogated us many times. I think now we have something called public immunity,” Bakri said. In 1990 Bakri called for the assassination of British Prime Minister John Major, but he was not prosecuted by the British government. He later called for the assassination of Major’s successor, Tony Blair, again without a response by the British government. He set-up a training camp in a forestry center near Crawley, Britain, and preached violence against his British hosts. “There is a time when a military struggle must take place in [Britain]. Jihad. It’s called conquering. One day, without question, [Britain] is going to be governed by Islam.... You must be ready to defend yourselves militarily,” he told recruits.

Haroon Rashid Aswat, a British Gujarati Muslim of Indian descent, is believed to have acted as Bin Laden’s body guard and is allegedly the mastermind of the July 7, 2007 London bombings that killed fifty-two people and wounded over 700. He worked with Hamza al-Masri and recruited British Muslims to participate in terror acts in Jammu and Kashmir. He is believed to have also recruited men for Harkat-ul-Mujahideen, an Islamic militant group with links to al-Qaeda. Counterterrorism expert John Loftus claimed Aswat worked for MI5. “[W]hat’s really embarrassing is that the entire British police are out chasing [Aswat], and one wing of the British government, MI6 or the British Secret Service, has been hiding him. And this has been a real source of contention between the CIA, the Justice Department, and Britain.... He’s a double agent,” Loftus said.

Loftus claimed Aswat was untouchable at the time because he was an MI5 asset. “[W]e’ve just learned that the headquarters of the US Justice Department ordered the Seattle prosecutors not to touch Aswat [because] apparently Aswat was working for British intelligence. Now Aswat’s boss, the one-armed [Hamza al-Masri], he gets indicted two years later. So the guy above him and below him get indicted, but not Aswat. Now there’s a split of opinion within US intelligence. Some people say that the British intelligence fibbed to us. They told us that Aswat was dead, and that’s why the New York group dropped the case. That’s not what most of the Justice Department thinks. They think that it was just again covering up for this very publicly affiliated guy with Al-Muhajiroun. He was a British intelligence plant. So all of a sudden he disappears. He’s in South Africa. We think he’s dead; we don’t know he’s down there. Last month the South African Secret Service come across the guy. He’s alive.”

According to the former president of Pakistan, Pervez Musharraf, Omar Saeed Sheikh, a British national, was also protected by British intelligence. Saeed was tried and convicted for the 2002 kidnapping and murder of U.S. reporter Daniel Pearl. “It is believed in some quarters that while Omar Sheikh was at the [London School of Economics] he was recruited by the British intelligence agency MI-6,” Musharraf wrote. “It is said that MI-6 persuaded him to take an active part in demonstrations against Serbian aggression in Bosnia and even sent him to Kosovo to join the jihad. At some point he probably became a rogue or double agent.”

In 1994 Saeed was arrested in India for his involvement in the kidnapping of three Britons and an American as part of an effort to gain the release of Maulana Masood Azhar, who was serving a seven-year prison sentence for terrorist activity in Kashmir. He was visited by a British diplomat and offered amnesty by British intelligence. He was ultimately released and allowed to live and travel freely in Britain. He was later accused of wiring money to the 9/11 hijackers.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Former British intelligence officer, David Shayler, claimed in 2002 British intelligence agents paid a Libyan cell linked to al-Qaeda to assassinate Colonel Gaddafi in February 1996. Authors Jean-Charles Brisard and Guillaume Dasquié write that British intelligence paid al-Qaeda around \$160,00 to fund an assassination plot against the Libyan leader and the British press was banned from discussing the case. A member of the group, Anas al-Liby, was given political asylum in Britain. He lived there until May 2000 despite being an important al-Qaeda figure who would later be implicated in the alleged al-Qaeda bombings of two U.S. embassies in Africa.

In *The Brutal Friendship*, Said Aburish documents how the British used Islam to help divide and conquer the Arab Middle East.

“The struggle between Nasser and the Muslim Brotherhood and its offshoots and Western and traditional Arab regimes’ supporters continued until the 1967 War. Western support for Islam was provided openly and accepted by the leadership of the Islamic movements without reservation.”

This relationship ended after Israel defeated the Arabs in the war and the the political and military geography of the Middle East was once again redrawn as Israel captured the Sinai, the West Bank and the Golan Heights. The short conflict also strengthened the “special relationship” between Israel and the United States, much to the displeasure and resentment of the Arabs.

“The defeat of Nasser was a defeat for the force he represented, secularism, and with Nasser diminished, the Islamic movements moved to assume the political leadership of the masses of Arab Middle East,” Aburish explains.

Anwar al-Sadat, a former member of the Muslim Brotherhood, stepped in to replace Nasser when he died in 1970. As gesture of peace toward the Brotherhood, Sadat released all the imprisoned members of the organization, reinstated its legal status and encouraged members to take over trade and student union bodies from leftist and pro-Nasser groups. As a result Egypt became a hotbed of Islamic radicalism.

In addition to ties to the Brotherhood, Sadat was close to the head of Saudi intelligence, Kamal Adham. He also developed a relationship with the CIA—it is speculated he was on the agency’s payroll since 1960—and Henry Kissinger, at the time President Richard Nixon’s National Security Advisor.

Eager to convert Egypt into a U.S. client state, Sadat continued to purge the Nasserites with the help of the Muslim Brotherhood and threw pro-Soviet elements out of the Egyptian government. He also attempted to negotiate the return of the Sinai with Israel and talked of reopening the Suez Canal which had been blockaded and closed to shipping since the Six Day War in 1967.

“However, Israel saw no need to negotiate for anything from Egypt, as past wars had shown Israel could take anything it wanted from Egypt without negotiation. The United States... saw no need to be involved with what it perceived as a Soviet puppet state and thereby endanger détente. The Soviet Union perceived Egypt as a client state unable to act on its own and saw no need to change that. Thus, Sadat was denied a chance for a peaceful method of obtaining peace” and regaining Egyptian prestige.

Frustrated, Sadat launched a new war on Israel in 1973 with Syrian support. “At this point the U.S. suddenly became amenable to a negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Egyptian conflict... This eventually led to Sadat’s famous trip to Jerusalem and the Camp David Accords, sponsored by the Carter Administration.”

For the Muslim Brotherhood and other Islamist groups a peace treaty with Israel was nothing short of betrayal. This and Sadat’s failure to institute Sharia law resulted in a plot by the Muslim Brotherhood offshoot Egyptian Islamic Jihad—a group that would eventually merge with al-Qaeda—to assassinate him and launch “a complete overthrow of the existing order” in Egypt. The strategist for the assassination and coup was Abbud al-Zumar, an Egyptian Islamist and a former military intelligence colonel in the Egyptian Army. Al-Zumar’s “plan was to kill the main leaders of the country, capture the headquarters of

the army and State Security, the telephone exchange building, and of course the radio and television building, where news of the Islamic revolution would then be broadcast, unleashing—he expected—a popular uprising against secular authority all over the country.”

According to Tal’at Fu’ad Qasim, the leader of Egypt’s militant Gama’a Islamiyya (“The Islamic Group”), Islamic Jihad was not responsible for the assassination. Qasim claimed his group was behind the murder and they had recruited Khalid Islambouli, an Egyptian army officer.

Islambouli was a member of the same military unit as Ali Mohamed who at the time was taking part in a special program for foreign officers at the U.S. Army Special Forces school at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. He was released from the program due to his radical Muslim beliefs and was recruited by the CIA in 1984 and trained terrorists at the Al-Kifah Refugee Center in Brooklyn, a charity connected to Osama bin Laden and the CIA. Mohamed, a notorious double agent, would eventually work for the FBI and in 1993 investigators would connect him to the World Trade Center bombing. He supplied top secret US military documents to El-Sayyid Nosair, an Egyptian-born American citizen who assassinated Meir Kahane, an ultra-Zionist, and participated in the World Trade Center bombing.

A fatwa approving the assassination of Sadat was issued by Sheikh Omar Abdel-Rahman, aka “The Blind Sheikh,” who is currently serving a life sentence at the Butner Federal Correctional Institution in Butner, North Carolina, for his role in the World Trade Center bombings in 1993.

Sadat was assassinated on October 6, 1981 during the annual victory parade held in Cairo to celebrate Egypt’s Operation Badr, the crossing of the Suez Canal that marked the start of the Yom Kippur War. Sadat was killed instantly when Islambouli stood before the grandstand and emptied his assault rifle into the president’s body. The attack killed eleven others were killed, including the Cuban ambassador, an Omani general, a Coptic Orthodox bishop and Samir Helmy, the head of Egypt’s Central Auditing Agency. The future president of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak, and twenty-eight others were wounded, including Irish Defense Minister James Tully, and four U.S. military liaison officers.

The assassination, however, “didn’t interrupt Western and Arab client regimes’ support for Islamic movements, and Saudi Arabia and Egypt allowed pro-Islamic use of their state propoganda apparatus... And Israel, forever inclined to back divisive movements, surfaced as another supporter of Islam and began to fund the Muslim Brotherhood and the Palestinian Islamic movement Hamas.”

The Islamist war on Arab nationalism and secular governments continued. The Arab nationalist Ba’ath Party in Syria, led by Hafez al-Assad, following a major conflict between the Muslim Brotherhood and the Syrian government at the city of Hama that resulted in 20,000 casualties in 1982, revealed that Muslim Brotherhood forces were armed with U.S.-made equipment. Israel and Jordan also assisted the Brotherhood in Syria by establishing training camps in Lebanon and Jordan near the Syrian border. Although scarcely covered in the West, in 1981 Newsweek reported that “over the past five years the Brotherhood has assassinated hundreds of Alawite members of Assad’s ruling Baath Party along with their relatives, Assad’s personal doctor, and a number of Soviet advisers.”

The late 1970s and early 1980s witnessed dramatic gains by Islamists in the Middle East. “For the first time, political Islam moved to center stage, and the consequences would be profound. In Iran, in Afghanistan, in Pakistan, in widening, concentric circles, the Islamic right was no longer a marginal force but the driving energy behind a potentially region-wide transformation. For analysts of the big picture, it was no longer unthinkable to envisage a string of Islamist regimes from North Africa through Egypt and Sudan to Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia and into Pakistan and Afghanistan.”

The removal of the American client Mohammad Reza Pahlavi in Iran took center stage in the late 1970s. The revolution was accomplished in part by agents of the Muslim Brotherhood who worked with the mullahs and ayatollahs.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

The Shah and others argued that the British had secretly supported Shia mullahs in Iran, the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini in particular, and the staged Islamic Revolution was a Western response to the Shah's "White Revolution," series of reforms launched in 1963 designed to consolidate political power among Iran's peasants and working class at the expense of landlords.

"If you lift up Khomeini's beard, you will find 'made in England' written under his chin," the Shah said.

Dr. John Coleman, a former British intelligence agent and author of a number of books and monographs detailing a plan for a socialist world government, states in a report on Iran's Islamic Revolution that the Muslim Brotherhood was created by "the great names of British Middle East intelligence, T.E. Lawrence, E.G. Browne, Arnold Toynbee, St. John Philby and Bertrand Russell," and that their mission was to "keep the Middle East backward so that its natural resource, oil, could continue to be looted."

"At one time there was even a joke about the mullahs being stamped 'made in Britain,'" Coleman remarked in a report on the revolution in Iran. He would also claim that Ayatollah Khomeini received a "monthly stipend from the British" and was "in constant contact with his masters, the British," after he was exiled to Qom during the reign of the Shah.

Robert Dreyfuss and Judith Wyer contend the revolution in Iran was not only directed by the Muslim Brotherhood, but also assisted by NATO. Dreyfuss and Wyer cite a Financial Times report stating that the Shah's chief of staff, Gen. Abbas Gharabaghi, along with the deputy director of SAVAK, the notoriously brutal Iranian secret police, were part of the revolution and Gen. Robert Huyser, the deputy commander of NATO at the time, was dispatched to Iran by the Carter administration to make sure the Shah's military did not block the revolution. Huyser reportedly worked closely with Gharabaghi.

The Shah commented on the arrival of Huyser in his memoir. He remarked that the visit was strange because the General "had come to Tehran a number of times, scheduling his visits well in advance to discuss military affairs with me and my generals," but this visit was unannounced. "As soon as Moscow learned of Huyser's arrival, Pravda reported, 'General Huyser is in Tehran to foment a military coup.' In Paris, the International Herald Tribune wrote that Huyser had not gone to Tehran to 'foment' a coup but to 'prevent' one."

Prior to sending Huyser to arrange the transition from the Shah to Khomeini and his cronies, Carter put together a task force on Iran. "In November 1978, President Carter named the Bilderberg group's George Ball, another member of the Trilateral Commission, to head a special White House Iran task force under the National Security Council's [Zbigniew] Brzezinski. Ball recommended that Washington drop support for the Shah of Iran and support the fundamentalistic Islamic opposition of Ayatollah Khomeini. Robert Bowie from the CIA was one of the lead 'case officers' in the new CIA-led coup against the man their covert actions had placed into power 25 years earlier," writes F. William Engdahl, an American German historian.

The Shah, while in exile in Egypt and suffering from cancer that would later take his life, mentioned George Ball. "I did not know it then, perhaps I did not want to know? But it is clear to me now that the Americans wanted me out. Clearly this is what the human rights advocates in the State Department wanted. What was I to make of the Administration's sudden decision to call former Under Secretary of State George Ball to the White House as an adviser on Iran? Ball was among those Americans who wanted to abandon me and ultimately my country."

The plan to turn Iran over to Khomeini was based on the ideas British Islamic expert Dr. Bernard Lewis who argued that the Muslim Middle East should be balkanized along ethnic, tribal and religious

lines, an idea later advocated by neoconservatives in their “clean break” document submitted to the Israeli government.

Lewis served in the British Army in the Royal Armored and Intelligence Corps. during the Second World War and later “played a critical role as professor, mentor, and guru to two generations of Orientalists, academics, U.S. and British intelligence specialists, think tank denizens, and assorted neoconservatives.”

By the late 1980s he was “was hobnobbing with top Department of Defense officials” and in 1992 wrote an influential article on the subject for *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations: “Rethinking the Middle East.”

In the article he suggested “Lebanonization” as a policy for the Arab Middle East. “Most of the states of the Middle East—Egypt is an obvious exception—are of recent and artificial construction and are vulnerable to such a process,” Lewis writes. “If the central power is sufficiently weakened, there is no real civil society to hold the polity together, no real sense of common national identity or overriding allegiance to the nation-state. The state then disintegrates—as happened in Lebanon—into a chaos of squabbling, feuding, fighting sects, tribes, regions and parties. If things go badly and central governments falter and collapse, the same could happen, not only in the countries of the existing Middle East, but also in the newly independent Soviet republics, where the artificial frontiers drawn by the former imperial masters left each republic with a mosaic of minorities and claims of one sort or another on or by its neighbors.”

The Lewis strategy on Iran was presented to the secretive, elitist Bilderberg Group during its 1979 meeting held at the Grand Hotel Sauerhof in Baden bei Wien, Austria. The group “endorsed the radical Muslim Brotherhood movement behind Khomeini, in order to promote balkanization of the entire Muslim Near East along tribal and religious lines. Lewis argued that the West should encourage autonomous groups such as the Kurds, Armenians, Lebanese Maronites, Ethiopian Copts, Azerbaijani Turks, and so forth. The chaos would spread in what he termed an ‘Arc of Crisis,’ which would spill over into the Muslim regions of the Soviet Union,” writes Peter Dale Scott.

According to Lewis, Arab hatred of the West is not based on colonialism and imperialism, but is rather deep-seated in Islam, which he argued is incompatible with the West and because of this the two are destined to clash. Lewis used the term “Clash of Civilizations,” which he borrowed from the French Nobel Prize-winning author, journalist, and philosopher Albert Camus. Lewis explains the theory in “The Roots of Muslim Rage,” an article he wrote in 1990. He argues that an “irrational but surely historic reaction of an ancient rival against our Judeo-Christian heritage...is no less than a clash of civilizations.”

The “Arc of Crisis” and what became known as “the Bernard Lewis Plan” fomented “Muslim Brotherhood fundamentalist insurrections all along the southern tier of the Soviet Union” during the Carter and Reagan administrations, write Scott Thompson and Jeffrey Steinberg. The key advocate of the policy was Jimmy Carter’s National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski. “Among the fruits of this Lewis-Brzezinski collusion: the February 1979 Ayatollah Khomeini ‘Islamic Revolution’ in Iran, which overthrew the Shah, and sent the once-proud center of the Islamic Renaissance back into a 20-year dark age; and the 1979-1988 Afghanistan War, provoked by Brzezinski’s July 1979 launching of covert support for Afghan mujahideen ‘Contras’ inside Afghanistan—six months prior to the Soviet Red Army’s Christmas Eve invasion.”

Trump Rides the Wave of Islamophobia

“A growing ecosystem of Islamophobia networks is centered around a cadre of Neo-Conservatives who led the United States into the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, as well as advocated for wars against Iran, Libya, Syria, Sudan, and many more in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in Washington, New York, and Pennsylvania,” writes Tony Cartalucci.

“Further in the peripheries, are faux-alternative media cognitive infiltrators like WorldNetDaily run by Joseph Farah, a card-carrying member of the Neo-Conservative war lobby and an associate with many advocates who have played a direct role in the subversion and destruction of Syria. Farah himself is Syrian-Lebanese, and involved heavily in organizations created by the US aimed at the overthrow and reordering of the Levant.

“WND, Pam Geller, Robert Spencer, and many others who lead the American Islamophobia subsidiary, in tandem with their European counterparts, have invested years in fanning the flames of misunderstanding, hatred, fear, and hysteria among Western populations. They do this to both divert from the fact that the very interests they represent are the source of global terrorism carried out by Al Qaeda and ISIS—creations not of Islam, but of US foreign policy, and to create sufficient rhetorical justification for continued American intervention overseas across MENA [the Middle East and North Africa region] and beyond.”

Frank Gaffney is at the forefront of the movement to arouse hatred and fear designed to further extend and expand the war on terror and ultimately realize the objective of the “clean break” plan to destroy not only Arab and Muslim nations, but societies and culture as well.

Gaffney is so radical he was rejected by the Pentagon when he was Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Forces and Arms Control Policy in the Reagan Administration. He is associated with other neocons, including Richard Perle, who rose to prominence as aides of the late Democrat Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson.

Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy (CSP) is described by William Arkin as the “Domino’s Pizza of the policy business.”

After CSP sent a letter to the State Department Inspector General accusing Hillary Clinton aide Huma Abedin of working undercover for the Muslim Brotherhood, a number of Republicans, including John McCain, John Boehner, and Marco Rubio, denounced the group.

Trump and former Republican member of the House, Michele Bachmann, have cited CSP propaganda.

“What Donald Trump did, in [his foreign policy speech], was lay out both an understanding of the existential threat we’re facing—and this, of course, is something Reagan described as every generation’s task, is to confront existential threats to freedom,” Gaffney said. “And Donald Trump said ours is radical Islam,” Gaffney told Breitbart News Daily following Trump’s foreign policy speech.

“Specifically, he called attention to sharia, and sharia supremacism, as the ideological underpinnings of this danger we’re facing, both abroad and at home. And he made a point of saying, as my old boss Reagan did, we need to deal with this threat as, well, the fundamental existential challenge it represents, by using all instruments of national power against it. This really hearkened back to Reagan’s strategy for defeating the last of these threats, namely Soviet communism.

“And he specifically spoke to something that, I’m sure, resonated with you, as it did with me, about this ideological dimension, and the necessity of countering it as well. It’s not enough to go try to defeat people militarily. It’s not even enough to use economic, and intelligence, and information capabilities, as

Reagan did against the Soviets. You've got to go after this whole idea of the legitimacy, and the supremacy, of this hostile ideology.

"I was very heartened to hear Donald Trump talk about the necessity of countering the networks that support radicalization. That's the Muslim Brotherhood's operations here. Those are the mosques, those are the Islamic societies, and cultural centers, and influence operations, and front groups," he said. "God love him for calling them out, and setting forward—in what I hope will be a defining debate for this election—a choice between people who think, 'Hey, we're all good with more of that. In this country as well as overseas, we want to legitimate it, we want to empower it, we want to embolden our enemies,' versus somebody who says, 'No, we're going to defeat them, we want victory over jihad.'"

Gaffney's CSP insists jihadists present a direct threat to America. "We at the Center for Security Policy feel it is important for Americans to better understand—and, then, be able to successfully contend with—those that attempt to destroy or subvert our way of life. As making our nation's enemies' threat doctrines available is a key part of our educational efforts, we are pleased to present the blueprint for the Muslim Brotherhood in America," the CSP website states.

Important key details are omitted. First and foremost, the jihadists who supposedly represent a dire threat to America are almost exclusively Wahhabi Salafists supported by Saudi Arabia and in large part trained by the CIA. Second, the Muslim Brotherhood is funded by Qatar and Saudi Arabia. Beginning in 1941, it began to collaborate with British intelligence and, by the late 1950s, was working with the CIA through Saeed Ramahdan, the son-in-law of the Brotherhood's founder.

Donald Trump's anti-Muslim immigration stand relies on poll data provided by Gaffney. "Most recently, a poll from the Center for Security Policy released data showing '25% of [American Muslims] agreed that violence against Americans here in the United States is justified as a part of the global jihad' and 51% of those polled, 'agreed that Muslims in America should have the choice of being governed according to Shariah [Islamic law],'" a Trump campaign press release reads.

The methodology of the poll has been called into question. "The American Association for Public Opinion Research, a professional organization of pollsters that sets ethical standards for the industry, explains that in opt-in surveys, 'the pollster has no idea who is responding to the question,' and warns that these polls do not have a 'grounded statistical tie' to the population. As a result, estimates from self-selected volunteers are subject to unknown error that cannot be measured.'" Notes Eli Clifton, writing for Foreign Policy.

"In other words, the whole point of a poll is to get a representative sample of a target population—if a poll consists of a self-selecting minority within a group, it can't claim to speak to the broader group's views."

In 2014 Gaffney called for a "war on Shariah" and, writing for Breitbart, said "It is past time to recognize that we are at war not with one group of 'terrorists' or another. Rather, adherents to a doctrine or ideology they call shariah are at war with us. By identifying the political-military-legal ideology of shariah as the defining ideology of those with whom we are at war—much as we did in the past against Nazism, Fascism, Japanese imperialism, and communism—we have a chance of prevailing. And that chance will be greatly enhanced if we bring to bear now, as in the past, not only military but all other instruments of national power."

During the reign of Bush the neocons focused primarily on the exaggerated and often fictional threat of secular Arab leaders, Saddam Hussein and later Bashar al-Assad of Syria, as it pushed its geopolitical objectives largely defined in the "Clean Break" document presented by Richard Perle to the Israeli Likud government of Benjamin Netanyahu.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

The Democrats under Obama, while maintaining the basic precepts of the war on terror, had little use for Republican neocon approach and criticized the invasion and occupation of Iraq, although many of them, including Hillary Clinton, voted in favor of invading the country.

The neocons, working from their think tanks and academic perches, reformulated their “clash of civilizations” theory and underpinned it with heightened and emotionally charged Islamophobia. Like the “clean break” calling for the dissolution and balkanization of Arab and Muslim states, the new formula is designed to benefit the state of Israel.

“The strategy posits Islam as the new threat confronting Western civilization and democratic societies,” writes Hatem Bazian. “In addition, it focuses on terrorism from the Muslim world as the primary threat faced by the West. Israel, as the Islamophobic propagandists assert, has the experience with a long history of confronting terrorism that makes the country the natural leader in this effort. Since Israel’s role in a unipolar world is diminished, the construction of a Muslim menace makes it possible for the small state to cast itself as a major and front-line player in the ‘war on terror’ campaign. Islamophobia is a powerful weapon no less damaging than a missile fired from an F16 plane. It allows Israel the ability to punish the Palestinians while claiming its actions to be in defense of western civilization. Terrorizing Palestinians under the rubric of fighting the global ‘war on terror’ becomes Israel’s go-to instrument to cement and solidify its occupation and standing around the world.”

Keven Barrett, an author and political activist commented on the strategy in June, 2016. “We’re living through a historical period, not only in the UK, but throughout the West and throughout the world where Muslims have been scapegoated,” he told Press TV, an Iranian network. “This has been engineered primarily by Zionists and the major beneficiary is the ‘state’ of Israel, which is apparently the major actor behind the series of false flag terror events beginning with 9/11,” he added.

A report issued by Public Interest Investigations and Spinwatch released in June documents how the Israel lobby and a “transatlantic network” foment Islamophobia. Key players include Sheldon Adelson, an American casino billionaire; Nina Rosenburg, heiress to the Sears Roebuck fortune; Daniel Pipes, a neocon expert in Islamophobia; and Paul E. Singer, an American billionaire.

“I am endorsing Trump’s bid for president and strongly encourage my fellow Republicans—especially our Republican elected officials, party loyalists and operatives, and those who provide important financial backing—to do the same,” Adelson wrote for The Washington Post in May.

Prior to his death in 2014 Republican Richard Mellon Scaife was a generous donor to the neocon inspired Islamophobia network. The Sarah Scaife Foundation, Carthage Foundation and Allegheny Foundation donated nearly \$10.5 million to Islamophobic groups from 2001 to 2012, including \$3.4 million to Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy. The Lynde & Harry Bradley Foundation is also a source of funds for the Islamophobia network, with \$6.5 million in donations from 2001-2012.

“The largest donors to Islamophobic groups are the related nonprofit donor-advised funds Donors Capital Fund and Donors Trust. Donors Capital Fund and Donors Trust allow conservatives looking to contribute to their favored causes to put money in a fund and then direct that money at their own discretion. This structure promises that the donor’s contributions will only ever show up on tax forms as coming from Donors Capital Fund or Donors Trust,” writes Paul Blumenthal. More than \$27 million in money held in the two funds has gone to Islamophobic groups from 2001-2012.

“Now these groups and their beliefs have broken into the mainstream of Republican Party presidential politics. Not only has Trump endorsed a ban on Muslims’ entry to the United States, but both Trump and Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) appeared at an anti-Iran rally co-sponsored by Gaffney’s Center for Security Policy in September. And all of the candidates have pushed for some kind of change to the admittance of

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Syrian refugees to the U.S., including bans on Muslim refugees, a policy promoted earlier in 2015 by Gaffney,” Blumenthal explains.

According to the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and University of California Berkeley’s Center for Race and Gender (CRG), more than 70 foundations, think tanks, and research centers “contribute in some way to Islamophobia in the US, the primary purpose of which ‘is to promote prejudice against, or hatred of, Islam and Muslims.’”

The the CAIR and CRG report notes Trump’s ties to the Islamophobia network. “Donald Trump’s controversial statements are carefully prepared. The foreign policy advisers to the Trump campaign have ‘ties to groups named in the Cair-UCB report’ including the Center for Security Policy. Among his key advisers is Alabama’s Senator Jeff Sessions, described by Truthout as ‘outspoken anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim,’” writes Michel Chossudovsky.

Following the Orlando attack, Sessions said “it certainly looks like another one of the extremist attacks, Islamic extremism... We see apparently today more of these attacks are coming. It’s a real part of the threat that we face and if we can’t address it openly and directly and say directly that there is an extremist element within Islam that’s dangerous to the world and has to be confronted.”

“Let’s not forget that the Orlando terrorist had contacts with those who were in Syria,” Sessions told American Thinker in June. This is a reference to the fact Omar Mateen, the suspect in the Orlando attack, attended a small Florida mosque also visited by Moner Mohammad Abu Salha, said to be a suicide bomber with al-Nusra, a formerly al-Qaeda linked Salafist terrorist group in Syria funded by Qatar. The FBI failed to find any definitive link between the men and so closed an investigation of Mateen.

As noted above, Mateen did not have an operational relationship with the Islamic State or any other Islamic terror group. Reports indicate he was homophobic. "I quit because everything he said was toxic, and the company wouldn't do anything," said David Gilroy, a former coworker who received hateful and homophobic texts sent by Mateen. "This guy was unhinged and unstable. He talked of killing people."

Trump and the War on Islam

Following the Orlando shooting both Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton called for an escalation of bombing raids in Syria.

“We have generals that feel we can win this thing so fast and so strong, but we have to be furious for a short period of time, and we’re not doing it!” Trump told Fox & Friends.

“Are you saying hit Raqqa right now?” asked host Brian Kilmeade. “We’re going to have to start thinking about something,” Trump responded.

“It’s absolute war, but we don’t have uniforms, we don’t know who it is or where they’re coming from . . . And as a country we don’t do anything about it. And we’re going to get smart. It’s only going to get worse,” he told Fox News in June.

In November he advocated violating international law and conducting airstrikes to destroy Syria’s oil infrastructure in retaliation for the terror group stealing oil.

"They have some in Syria, some in Iraq. I would bomb the shit out of 'em. I would just bomb those suckers. That's right. I'd blow up the pipes. ... I'd blow up every single inch. There would be nothing left. And you know what, you'll get Exxon to come in there and in two months, you ever see these guys, how good they are, the great oil companies? They'll rebuild that sucker, brand new—it'll be beautiful."

He told CNN he would do the same in Iraq.

Asked by Anderson Cooper if such a response might destroy the wealth of Iraq, Trump said: "There is no Iraq. Their leaders are corrupt... They're broken up into so many different factions."

This was precisely the objective, although Trump appears to be unaware of it. Thomas Harrington, a professor of Iberian Studies at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut writes “the chaos now enveloping the region might, in fact, be the desired aim of policy planners in Washington and Tel Aviv... One of the prime goals of every empire is to foment ongoing internecine conflict in the territories whose resources and/or strategic outposts they covet.”

Trump said he would send ground troops into Syria and Iraq to protect the oil fields. "You put a ring around them," Trump said. "You put a ring."

He also said "I would love not to be over there... That’s not our fight—that's other people's fights."

In August after the Islamic State moved into Libya, Trump advocated bombing the North African country. "We have no choice but to bomb them. They have taken over Libya. That was another one of Hillary Clinton's duties —they have taken over Libya. No good. We have to bomb them," he told Stuart Varney of Fox Business.

Trump’s remark coincided with Pentagon airstrikes in Libya conducted without congressional authorization or consultation. In January Gen. Joseph Dunford, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told reporters that the US was preparing to take “decisive military action against ISIL” in Libya. The New York Times, usually a cheerleader for war and violent intervention, found the attacks “deeply troubling” and said it represented a “significant progression of a war that could easily spread to other countries on the continent.” In fact, this is precisely the plan and why AFRICOM, the United States Africa Command, was established in 2007.

“I would do what you have to do to get rid of ISIS,” Trump said. "It's a horrific problem. ... We should have never been there in the first place. I was opposed to going into Iraq.” (See above: Trump was at best ambivalent about the invasion of Iraq and later made positive remarks about it.)

"We have unleashed a monster in the Middle East. And, yes, I would bomb them—you have to do what you have to do to get rid of them."

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

There is a grain of truth here—“we” did in fact unleash “a monster in the Middle East,” although Trump and his supporters blame it on Obama and Clinton and ignore the role played by the Bush neocons, the Pentagon, and the CIA.

In March Trump refused to say if he would use nuclear weapons against the Islamic State. “I’m never going to rule anything out,” he said.

“Even if I wasn’t, I wouldn’t want to tell you that because at a minimum, I want them to think maybe we would use them.

“We need unpredictability. We don’t know who these people are. The fact is, we need unpredictability and when you ask a question like that, it’s a very sad thing to have to answer it.

“The enemy is watching and I have a very good chance of winning and I frankly don’t want the enemy to know how I’m thinking. But with that being said, I don’t rule out anything.”

During a phone call with Bill O’Reilly following an attack in Nice, France, Trump said he would declare a “world war” on terrorists and use NATO troops to fight them.

The American people were not consulted before Trump declared he would launch a world war against manufactured terrorism. In November 2015 a Gallup poll found that more than half of respondents opposed sending ground troops to Iraq and Syria to fight the Islamic State. In 2013 a CNN/ORC international survey found a solid 82 percent of Americans oppose the ongoing—and longest in US history—war in Afghanistan against the Taliban, yet another CIA-trained and Gulf Emirate funded terror group. Meanwhile an NBC News/Wall Street Journal/Annenberg poll in 2014 showed a scant 18 percent of Americans believe the invasion of Iraq was worth it. The Iraq war cost more than \$2 trillion and the price tag is expected to rise to around \$6 trillion over the next two decades due to interest and benefits owed to veterans.

In August Trump added a neocon foreign policy advisor to his campaign who is out on the outer fringe of the neocon movement.

Joseph E. Schmitz is a former Inspector General of the Department of Defense and a former executive with Blackwater Worldwide. He fled the Pentagon after he was accused of protecting top Bush officials accused of wrongdoing.

Blackwater, now Academi, the military contractor founded by Eric Prince, played a substantial role during the Iraq War. It is infamous for killing seventeen Iraqi citizens in 2007, the same year the corporation was accused of illegally smuggling weapons into the country. Blackwater did not appreciate being investigated for its misdeeds. In 2007 Blackwater Manager Daniel Carroll threatened to kill Jean Richter, a State Department Investigator.

Schmitz is connected to Gaffney’s CSP, the Islamophobic organization detailed above.

Soon after the announcement The Canary reported Schmitz worked with a Saudi prince to illegally provide arms to the jihadists in Syria. “Schmitz was in direct contact with then Free Syrian Army (FSA) commander Gen. Salim Idris. Schmitz hoped his deal with Gen. Idris would be a first step toward potential future assistance from Blackwater founder Erik Prince himself,” writes Brad Hoff.

Idris, a former Syrian Army commander, was appointed to lead a Salafist dominated military command in 2012. “The unified command includes many with ties to the Muslim Brotherhood and to Salafists, who follow a puritanical interpretation of Islam. It excludes the most senior officers who had defected from Assad’s military,” Reuters reported.

“Idris and [Col. Abdul Jabbar al-Okaidi] were the very men that Joseph Schmitz stood ready to arm through a mysterious Saudi middle man before the whole private venture was reportedly shut down by a CIA official who intervened in Amman, Jordan,” writes Hoff.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Trump has a second fringe neocon in his circle of confidants—Walid Phares.

Phares is associated with the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, a neocon organization that teamed up with the American Enterprise Institute and the Hudson Institute to propagandize America into invading Iraq.

In 2011 Phares became one of several neocon advisors to the Mitt Romney presidential campaign. Other advisers included Eliot Cohen, Robert Kagan, Michael Chertoff, Eric Edelman, John Lehman, Dan Senor, Vin Weber, and Paula Dobriansky.

Phares, a Christian Maronite of Lebanese origin, was associated with the Lebanese Forces in the 1980s.

In the 1970s the Lebanese Forces were part the Kataeb Party, also known as the Lebanese Phalanges Party. Its militia killed 3,500 Palestinians at the Shatila refugee camp in Beirut in 1982 during the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Elie Hobeika, a prominent figure in the Phalanges, served as the Lebanese Forces intelligence chief and liaison officer with Mossad, the Israeli intelligence agency.

In May rumors circulated indicating Trump would name former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani as boss of the Department of Homeland Security.

“It’s my understanding that the two have talked directly (and) I know there have been serious talks on both sides,” an insider said. “I’m told it’s a done deal, but until it’s on paper, I don’t think anyone is counting on anything. Trump is already cutting deals as he moves to solidify his position in the party.”

Giuliani’s take on terrorism basically mirrors that of the neocon wing of the Republican party. During his presidential bid in 2008, the high ranking neocon Norman Podhoretz was Giuliani’s foreign policy adviser. The former mayor of New York has consistently stated the United States needs to be more “proactive” in the war on terror.

In November he discounted the war-weariness of the American people and said tens of thousands of troops should remain in Iraq.

“I don’t care about public opinion; I care about the national security of the United States,” Giuliani told MSNBC. “We should have 30,000 or 40,000 troops in Iraq. If we had had them there consistently, ISIS would never have emerged.”

He also advocated sending troops into Syria. “John McCain warned five years ago we’ve got to go in. We’ve got to go into Syria. We’ve got to close this vacuum,” he said.

Obama should have taken the advice of the neocons, Giuliani argued.

“If President Obama had listened to Sen. McCain and Sen. Graham and a whole group of other people, and had set up a no-fly zone in Syria five years ago, if we had gone in and worked with the Syrian legitimate rebels, if we had not taken our troops out of Iraq and Afghanistan, ISIS never would have emerged.”

“ISIS is an Obama creation,” he insisted.

In early August Trump told the Hugh Hewitt Show he would name John Bolton as his secretary of state. “I think John Bolton’s a good man,” Trump told the radio show host. “I watched him yesterday, actually, and he was very good in defending me in some of my views, and very, very strong. And I’ve always liked John Bolton. Well, we are thinking about it, Hugh. I will say that. We are thinking about it. I mean, the negative is what I told you. But we are seriously thinking about it.”

Bolton, Bush’s ambassador to the United Nations, is a key neocon and his appointment as secretary of state would send a positive signal to neocons who have resisted Trump’s presidential bid.

John Bolton is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, a pro-Israel and pro-interventionist organization based in Washington. AEI was associated with the now-defunct Project for the New American Century, a group that sent a letter to President Clinton on January 26, 1998. The letter, signed

by Bolton, called for the “containment” of Iraq and laid out the WMD lies the neocons would later use to make the argument for a second invasion of a country devastated by years of brutal economic sanctions (ultimately resulting in the death of around 500,000 Iraqi children).

“We are confident that Saddam Hussein has hidden weapons of mass destruction and production facilities in Iraq,” Bolton told the BBC in late 2002, prior to the invasion. In 2005 he leaked classified information about former ambassador Joe Wilson in an attempt to smear him for daring to question Bush’s subsequently debunked claim Iraq had tried to buy yellowcake uranium from Niger. He also helped force out Jose Bustani, the director of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, because Bolton believed Bustani’s inspectors in Iraq would weaken the neocon case for war.

Bolton chairs the Gatestone Institute, a New York-based advocacy organization that serves as a clearinghouse for anti-Muslim propaganda. It was founded by Nina Rosenwald (mentioned above), the heiress of the Sears Roebuck fortune. She has served as a key philanthropic backer of anti-Muslim groups and individuals. In 2008 Rosenwald hosted Geert Wilders, a Dutch politician who founded the International Freedom Alliance, a global coalition of anti-Islamic activists. He has characterized Islam as “not a religion” but rather “the ideology of a retarded culture.”

In 2013 Bolton kicked off a super PAC to “seek out and support candidates for nomination and election to federal office who are committed to restoring strong American national security policies,” in other words, a full restoration of the neocon agenda implemented during the Bush administration. Bolton is steadfastly opposed to the libertarian philosophy of noninterventionism, a fact that should give pause to those Trump supporters who hold libertarian views. “We must be prepared to do what it takes to protect the idea of American exceptionalism and our basic Constitutional priorities—the preservation of which are essential not only to our security, but to our prosperity as well,” Newsmax reported.

The New York Times published an article in April 2015 that claimed Republicans are “more fervently pro-Israel than ever” and said political action committees like the one Bolton established are responsible. It added the drift toward pro-Israel sentiment is “partly a result of ideology, but also a product of a surge in donations and campaign spending on their behalf by a small group of wealthy donors,” including the fiercely pro-Israel Irving Moskowitz (see above) who “spent at least \$825,000” to support the successful 2014 Senate bid of Tom Cotton, an ardent and vociferous pro-war Republican described by Heather Digby Parton of Salon as “Ted Cruz with a war record, Sarah Palin with a Harvard degree, Chris Christie with a Southern accent.” Cotton has a longstanding and close relationship with arch-neocon Bill Kristol.

Bolton is fiercely antagonistic toward Iran and like his neocon cohorts insists the country is developing a nuclear weapon (the United States, its European allies, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and even Israel agree Iran does not have a nuclear weapon, only a civilian nuclear program, and is at best years away from developing a deliverable nuclear warhead). Bolton’s Foundation for American Security and Freedom ran a TV ad in 2015 attacking the mildly libertarian presidential candidate Rand Paul for remarks he made about Iran’s hypothetical nuclear weapons. The ad shows an American family sitting down to dinner when a nuclear explosion occurs. The ad then features a clip from a Rand Paul speech where he declares the United States’ “national security is not threatened by Iran having one nuclear weapon.” The ad concludes with the caption: “It only takes one. A nuclear Iran is a threat to our national security.”

During negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program, Bolton took to The New York Times and advocated attacking the country. “To Stop Iran’s Bomb, Bomb Iran,” Bolton’s headline read. “The inconvenient truth is that only military action like Israel’s 1981 attack on Saddam Hussein’s Osirak reactor in Iraq or its 2007 destruction of a Syrian reactor, designed and built by North Korea, can accomplish what is required. Time is terribly short, but a strike can still succeed,” he wrote.

Donald Trump and the War on Islam

Robert Gates, who was CIA director under George W. Bush's father and later Obama's defense secretary, told the Jewish Federation of Greater Philadelphia Bolton's attack on Iran would be a "catastrophe," and added Iran's "capacity to wage a series of terror attacks across the Middle East aimed at us and our friends, and dramatically worsen the situation in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon and elsewhere is hard to overestimate." Meir Dagan, the former leader of Israel's spy outfit, Mossad, warned an attack on Iran "would mean regional war, and in that case you would have given Iran the best possible reason to continue the nuclear program... The regional challenge that Israel would face would be impossible."

Although the vast majority of neocons oppose the prospect of a Donald Trump presidency, if he is elected they will be able to reignite their total war campaign after John Bolton becomes secretary of state.

Donald Trump: Neocon Trojan Horse for Total War

Considering Donald Trump's foreign policy pronouncements, his willingness to violate international law, his contempt for the war-weariness of the American people, his disregard for the consequences of all-out war against a terror army created by the CIA and its fanatical Wahhabi partners, and his association with a number of neocons—including those on the radical and racist fringe of the movement—his possible victory in November will undoubtedly result in a continuation and escalation of the war on terror. Donald Trump is not, as many of his supporters claim, an anti-war candidate or, as his critics complain, an isolationist. His remarks on the possibility of using nuclear weapons against the Islamic State are particularly chilling.

“The same candidate being cheered on by anti-war commentators is an open advocate of committing more war crimes,” writes Matt Welch. “He favors deliberately targeting the family members of suspected terrorists (‘I would be very, very firm with families,’ he vowed at the December 15 debate in Las Vegas). He wants to expand the use of torture, saying of waterboarding that ‘if it doesn't work, they deserve it anyway for what they do to us.’ Trump's troops will not only be ‘defeating ISIS big league’ but also seizing its oil. He keeps repeating a wholly made-up story about General John Pershing dipping bullets in pig's blood and executing villagers in the Philippines a century ago—and he thinks Pershing's alleged behavior is worth emulating. When confronted at the March 3 debate in Detroit with the possibility that military personnel might refuse to follow orders that violate their oaths to the Constitution, Trump said, ‘They won't refuse. They're not going to refuse me. Believe me.’ The fact that less than 24 hours later he walked his bluster back slightly provides little in the way of reassurance.”

Going into the November election, the American people have two choices, and both those choices will result in war. Early on, Trump attempted to paint himself as opposed to war and an opponent to the invasion of Iraq—a characterization later debunked—but over the last few weeks he has moved closer to the radical fringe of the neocon movement and embraced its hysterical and paranoid vision of America subjugated by radical Islam and forced to obey sharia law.

Donald Trump prefers to view himself as his own man. However, noting his numerous flip-flops and his startling ignorance of history and geopolitics it is completely plausible if elected he will follow the prescriptions of his advisors and expand the war on terror not only abroad, but at home as well.

Kurt Nimmo

August 20, 2016