

Songbird or Superman – You Decide!

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

September 15, 2013

Islamabad, Pakistan.

A Sequel to: [The Dying Songbird](#)

*[Editor's temporary note: This page will remain under construction throughout September and October 2013 as each superman (or songbird) is examined here. **Completed: 6**]*

This compendium collects in one place the author's systematic deconstruction of the biggest names in Western dissent: the Manufactured Dissent. You can make up your own damn mind whether these brilliant names of dissent with their imposing credentials and empire's awards are the Songbird, the Conman, the Superman, the useful idiot, or just the regular run of the mill indoctrinated agent and asset who has been diabolically manufactured to preside on the pulpit of dissent by the Mighty Wurlitzer little differently than how a suicide bomber is led to dream of fair maidens in heaven in expectation of reward for his upcoming villainy.

Before you begin however, you are invited to stare for a few moments at the following photographs of Dr. Joseph Goebbels and his family in their last moments – not sure where this scribe is going by inviting you to ponder the fate of the controllers outside Plato's cave under victor's justice, but here it is. Dr. Joseph Goebbels, the Reichminister for Propaganda and National Enlightenment, only cheated that hangman's noose reflecting: *“For us, everything is lost now and the only way left for us is the one which Hitler chose. I shall follow his example”*.

Witness the ultimate fate of vulgar propagandists who try to make “chootias” (Urdu language inelegance) of their nation:



Caption Nazi propaganda chief Joseph Goebbels with his six children Harald, Hilde, Holde, Hedda, Helga und Helmut (Image source Der Spiegel)



Caption Magda Goebbels poses with her children Hilde, Holde, Hedda, Helga und Helmut (Image source Der Spiegel)



Caption The Goebbels' six innocent children paying the ultimate price for their father being the vulgar propagandist of the Third Reich --- Evidently, only defeat or victory adjudicates who is a propagandist and who isn't, not evidence. Hitler had asserted at the eve of World War II from his mountain top in Bavaria to his generals that he would *'give a propagandist reason for starting the war'* and admonished them not to *'mind whether it was plausible or not'*. *'The victor'*, he had told them, *'will not be asked afterward whether he told the truth or not. In starting and waging a war it is not the right that matters, but victory.'* That unexpected "victory" of hubris eventually caught up with the vulgar propagandists. (Source of quote: American war correspondent William Shirer, writing from Berlin on the eve of World War II. Image source Der Spiegel)

Begin Excerpt

'Don't Be Afraid'

May 1, 1945, in the evening. The daughters and the son were already in bed, but were not asleep yet. "Don't be afraid," their mother said. "The doctor is going to give you a shot now, one that all children and soldiers are getting." She left the room, and Kunz injected the morphine, "first into the two older girls, then

the boy and then the other girls." Each child received a dose of 0.5 cc. It "took eight to 10 minutes."

When the children had fallen asleep, Magda Goebbels went into the room, the cyanide pills in her hand, as Kunz testified. She returned a few seconds later, weeping and distraught. "Doctor, I can't do it, you have to do it," she said. The dentist replied: "I can't do it either." "Then get Dr. Stumpfegger," she said. Ludwig Stumpfegger, who was slightly younger than Kunz, had been one of SS chief Heinrich Himmler's personal doctors.

A week later, Russian coroners performed autopsies on the bodies of the children and concluded that their deaths had "occurred as a result of poisoning with cyanide compounds." The Goebbels themselves had committed suicide outside the bunker, and Stumpfegger died while attempting to break through the Russian lines in Berlin." — [Source Der Spiegel](#)

End Excerpt

'Don't Be Afraid' – either!

Let us take on the [Massa class of Superman](#) and the [Nigger class](#) serving them separately.

“A half truth is a full lie” --- Jewish Proverb

Dissent Top Brand Names Among The Western Massa Class

Background Pre-Reading

[1] The Dying Songbird by Zahir Ebrahim, September 15, 2013, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/dying-songbird.html>

[2] *A Note on the Mighty Wurlitzer – Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

[3] *Preamble Manufacturing Dissent: Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/manufacturing-dissent.html#Preamble>

[4] *The White Man's Burden appears Uniformly Distributed among Jews Christians and Atheists – how can one tell the difference?* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/02/white-mans-burden-uniformly-distributed.html>

Dissent Honor Roll: Top Ten most well known dissent-chiefs in the West

One: [Professor Dr. Noam Chomsky](#)

Two: [Professor Dr. Francis Boyle](#)

Three: Professor Dr. Howard Zinn

Four: Former Hon. Congressman Dr. Ron Paul

Five: Hon. Congressman Dennis Kucinich

Six: [Journalist Dr. Chris Hedges](#)

Seven: Journalist Dr. Robert Fisk

Eight: Journalist Dr. Greg Palast

Nine: Journalist and former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Dr. Paul Craig Roberts

Ten: [Professor Dr. Juan Cole](#)

(sorry if I missed someone's favorite Superman (or Songbird) in the Top Ten)

Honorable Mentions

Eleven: Jeffrey Blankfort

Twelve:

Let's take each Superman or Conman or useful idiot (or Songbird) in turn beginning with the Number One name in Dissent in the world. My former teacher at MIT, who, I like to imagine, was instrumental in my political awakening. But I do not know that for a fact --- as the dead bodies and destroyed peoples from Afghanistan to Iraq, Palestine to Pakistan, and along the 'arc of crisis' in the 'global zone of percolating violence' may also have had something to do with it.



Number One Dissent Superman: Dr. Noam Chomsky

To speak of the eloquence of Superman's dissent (in [The Dying Songbird](#)) and to not mention the name Noam Chomsky would be an intellectual travesty. To egregiously sample the extent of villainy of manufactured dissent that lives off of that profession under establishment cover; is amply rewarded for rehearsing the mantras of power while appearing to dissent with it; is dubiously anointed “arguably the most important intellectual alive” by the instrument of power itself; see for instance: *Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist*, by Peter Schweizer, Hoover Institution.

The Hoover critic quotes Noam Chomsky: “If you look at the things I write—articles for Z Magazine, or books for South End Press, or whatever—they are mostly based on talks and meetings and that kind of thing. But I’m kind of a parasite. I mean, I’m living off the activism of others. I’m happy to do it.” Peter Schweizer further observes: “Chomsky’s marketing efforts shortly after September 11 give new meaning to the term war profiteer. In the days after the tragedy, he raised his speaking fee from \$9,000 to \$12,000 because he was suddenly in greater demand. He also cashed in by producing another instant book. Seven Stories Press, a small publisher, pulled together interviews conducted via e-mail that Chomsky gave in the three weeks following the attack on the Twin Towers and rushed the book to press. His controversial views were hot, particularly overseas. By early December 2001, the publisher had sold the foreign rights in 19 different languages. The book made the best-seller list in the United States, Canada, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, and New Zealand. It is safe to assume that he netted hundreds of thousands of dollars from this book alone.”

(<http://hoover.org/publications/hoover-digest/article/6222>
or <http://hoover.org/publications/digest/2912626.html>)

In *Chomsky Is Citation Champ*, MIT news bulletin, April 15, 1992, the MIT public relations office reported the following statistics: “From 1972 to 1992, Professor Chomsky was cited 7,449 times in the Social Science Citation Index—likely the greatest number of times for a living person there as well, although the research into those numbers isn’t complete. In addition, from 1974 to 1992 he was cited 1,619 times in the Science Citation Index. ... Indeed, Professor Chomsky is in illustrious company. The top ten cited sources during the period were: Marx, Lenin, Shakespeare, Aristotle, the Bible, Plato, Freud, Chomsky, Hegel and Cicero.”

The MIT news bulletin went on to proclaim, quoting a Humanities Librarian at MIT: “it seems

that you can't write a paper without citing Noam Chomsky.”

(<http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/1992/citation-0415.html>)

I won't say touché to that public relations banter from MIT's news office. The matter is self-evident. When one is put on a pedestal as the “citation champ” and is billed as “arguably the most important intellectual alive” – one is naturally visible to all and sundry for more referencing in a positive feedback loop. Most of those published in the Social Sciences are from mainstream scholarship, for whom, evidently, Noam Chomsky stands out as the rebel most extraordinaire. What precisely is Noam Chomsky being cited for? What is that most brilliant contribution to intellectual, moral, political, or literary thought that has put Dr. Noam Chomsky in that statistic in which a contemporary American Jewish scholar is made peer to some of the greatest harbingers of intellectual, moral, political, and literary thought in Westerndom in over two thousand years of its history, including Jesus(!): “Marx, Lenin, Shakespeare, Aristotle, the Bible, Plato, Freud, Hegel and Cicero.”?

Moving beyond the gamesmanship of statistics which can also mean only as much as the number “six million”; or that conjured up by the late American Jewish scholar Samuel Huntington in *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, 1996, to self-servingly justify his specious propaganda thesis in order to seed the “doctrinal motivation” for the 'global war on terror' that exists today: “The violent nature of these shifting relationships is reflected in the fact that 50 percent of wars involving pairs of states of different religions between 1820 and 1929 were wars between Muslims and Christians.” (pg. 210); and “In the 1980's and 1990's the overall trend in Islam has been in an anti-Western direction.” (pg. 213).

If one carefully and rigorously examines Noam Chomsky's many contributions to intellectual thought over his *Lifetime of Dissent* in Social Sciences (ignoring his g-whiz contribution to the field of technical linguistics and to computer science, seminal though these may be, these hardly deserve the plaudits that puts his name on parity with Jesus and Cicero on any metric) – and I have read many of his books and heard many of his speeches, indeed, cut my teeth on his writings and lectures beginning with his foreign policy classes at MIT as an undergraduate student – one is left mercilessly stranded on a deserted island without a canoe.

I begin with reference to Noam Chomsky's most brilliant contribution to intellectualism which was famously published by The New York Review of Books, February 23, 1967, titled: “*The Responsibility of Intellectuals*” (<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/12172>). It is surely among Chomsky's most cited “seminal” works. My far humbler examination of that topic in 2007, on its

fortieth anniversary of publication, titled: *“Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux”*, was turned down by the same New York Review of Books. They simply ignored it.

Begin Excerpt from: Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux

So let's look at someone even more distinguished for guidance who is *'arguably the most important intellectual alive'* in the entire Western Hemisphere; who wrote the seminal piece on responsibility of intellectuals in the latter half of the 20th century titled *“Responsibility of Intellectuals”*, and other derivative works ([4], [5], [6]):

“It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies”
(Responsibility of Intellectuals)

“the responsibility of a writer as a moral agent is to try to bring the truth about matters of human significance to an audience that can do something about them.” (Power and Prospects)

Once again, why must an intellectual *“speak the truth”* and *“expose lies”*? Why must he or she bring the *“truth about matters of human significance to an audience that can do something about them”*? This isn't just a pedantic question. It is the crux of the matter.

The distinguished Noam Chomsky further notes:

“Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions. In the Western world, at least, they have the power that comes from political liberty, from access to information and freedom of expression. For a privileged minority, Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ideology and class interest, through which the events of current history are presented to us....” (Responsibility of Intellectuals)

Sure the Western intellectuals living in free societies *“have the power that comes from political liberty, from access to information and freedom of expression.”* So why must they not use it in the service of the ruling elite, and instead *“seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation”*?

How can the plebeian tell the difference what the scholars are doing? It was indeed Plato, wasn't it, who portrayed the rule of the virtuous 'know it all'; the 'ubermensch', leading the sheep to their manifest destiny – a virtuosity of supermen, that some like Leo Strauss interpret it; a Nietzschean morality that is *beyond good and evil*, one that is wholly utilitarian in serving some vested interests.

Once again, no Occam's razor like clarity is provided by Noam Chomsky either. You may review all three references cited above, and will only come away with the unremarkable comprehension that the intellectual field has been carved up between the exponents of the ruling elite, whom I shall dare refer to as the “high priests” openly serving the interests of power, and Havel-Chomsky self-proclaimed responsibility of being '*irritants*' to that power, whom I shall dare call the “dissenting priests”. It is almost as a kids' game of dividing into two teams to play off against each other, or as in high school forensic tournament of champions having the Affirmative and the Negative, or as in the Parliament having Government benches and its Opposition – both around “*systems of power and its incantations*”, one positing it, the other doubting it, with the people left wondrously watching, often quite incomprehendingly. A cynical view? Please read on.

There is no a priori reason to believe claims to morality by the intellectual, as asserted by Chomsky with the banal phrase “*the responsibility of a writer as a moral agent*”. It is not entirely self-evident why such an assertion must be axiomatic. Or indeed how can it be shown to be continually true beyond mere continued axiomatic assertions.

Except of course, if such self-apportioned responsibility by the intellectual is merely a tool to serve an end, and not an end in itself. Just as it is a tool in the hands of the Machiavellian espousing the morality of supermen, if it becomes a tool in the hands of the intellectual espousing the banal morality, one not beyond good and evil, but specifically only intended to serve the plebeian.

The only rational and comprehensible basis for moral responsibility upon an intellectual, is if they wish to serve the interests of the plebeian peoples, as opposed to merely opposing the elite peoples. The two are not synonymous.

One may oppose the ruling elite for many reasons, including personal ego, self-interests, personal guilt, as an intellectual contest, as an academic lost in the ivory tower of academe writing histories of past crimes that are now *faits accomplis*, none of which necessarily have anything to do with serving the contemporary interests of the plebeian except as a side effect.

Only when the first-principle is serving the plebeian, and only serving the plebeian over one's own self-interests, then, and only then, does such a moral responsibility delve upon the intellectual, and only if they take it upon themselves, and proclaim to do so.

And even when they conscionably take this upon themselves primarily to serve the best interests of the plebeian, there is no assurance that they are telling the truth in order to serve the plebeians' best interests. Indeed, there is no a priori reason to assume one is telling the truth and not merely playing the Ezra Pound game of being part of two or more sophisticated (or simple) lies keeping the plebeians busy guessing which of them might be true.

[Therefore,] an intellectual claiming to be a moralist in the interest of serving the plebeian, must always be under scrutiny by the plebeians – no differently than for a politician claiming to do the same – to ensure that the intellectual is indeed serving the plebeians' best interests, and not their own self-serving ones. Just merely self-proclaimed claims to morality, while perhaps sufficient for one's own conscience, is not a sufficient credential in public life for anyone, as per rational commonsense. Why should an intellectual make any more claims to morality, than any other ordinary person in society?

Thus, what then is indeed the public responsibility of the self-proclaimed moral intellectual – making the deliberate distinction between one proclaiming morality exclusively in the service of the peoples, and any other intellectual. By definition, the former is associated with the “dissenting priest” who claims to serve the interests of the people by dissenting with the ruling elite, the latter is the “high priest” who is quite clearly and visibly aligned with the interests of the *“power and its incantations”*. And they are indeed “priests”, because they each respectively claim axioms of their own.

Only in the public examination of their axioms can they lose claims to priesthood and be stripped naked – as either genuine moralists worthy of public following, or Machiavellis deserving of public stoning.

So what indeed are the dissenting priests' responsibilities towards moral intellectualism? And what are the responsibilities of the plebeian to ensure that the intellectual priests are continually stripped of their unexamined axioms to keep them honest? As one Jewish moralist once put it, albeit in a different context, but I would like to take the liberty of borrowing that very convincing and idiomatic diction here:

“Although the Holocaust inflicted horrible injustice upon us, it did not grant us

certificate of everlasting righteousness. The murderers were amoral; the victims were not made moral. To be moral you must behave ethically. The test of that is daily and constant.”

The “*test of that is daily and constant*”. Indeed.

The test however is only self-administered when one is concerned with one's own conscience. But a scholar's soul is of no concern to the plebeians – how can any outsider ever peer into the blackened abyss of another's soul? The latter may have none! Thus the test is not self-administered when public responsibility is proclaimed by the “dissenting priests”, but one that must be '*constant*', and '*daily*', and administered by the plebeians themselves.

So let's succinctly take the responsibilities of each in turn. This is what a rather pedestrian plebeian, me, demands of the moral intellectuals who appear to be “dissenting priests”. If they purport to serve my interests, then they must cater to my expectations of them. There are obviously no plebeian expectations from the “high priests” of the ruling elite, for they make no bones about whose interests they serve. It is indeed the “dissenting priests” who are of most concern to the plebeians, for they may also be the Trojan Horses deliberately cultivated, like the proverbial sleeper agents of intelligence intrigues, to create a more convincing shadow play for the free-willed plebeians who can otherwise become quite dangerous for the interests of any elite in free democratic societies.

End Excerpt

The following article written in January 2009 in the aftermath of the American presidential elections summarized Noam Chomsky's self-appointed Responsibilities as an Intellectual, as examined by Zahir Ebrahim. The letter written to Chomsky in April 2008 which follows, also asserts the same responsibilities of intellectuals that have not been taken up by the dissent-chief. Other deconstructions are in the References below.

Response to Press TV's Interview with Noam Chomsky

'No change coming with Obama'

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

January 25, 2009.

In an interview given to Iran's Press TV on Sat, 24 Jan 2009, titled "*Chomsky: No change coming with Obama*", while belatedly expounding upon the theme reflected in that title – but unfortunately, only after the predictable fait accompli (see "Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!") when earlier he had advocated to vote Obama (see "In swing states vote Obama without illusions" and Mickey Z) – Noam Chomsky made the following statements in a question on the economic crisis:

“Nobody really knows. I mean, what is happening with the economy is not well understood. It is based on extremely opaque financial manipulations, which are quite hard to decode. I mean, the general process is understood, but whether the \$800 billion, or probably larger government stimulus, will overcome this crisis, is not known.”

Chomsky might not know, but his claim **“nobody really knows” is FALSE**. So is the statement: **“I mean, what is happening with the economy is not well understood.”** And also this: **“It is based on extremely opaque financial manipulations, which are quite hard to decode.”**

Noam Chomsky would be excited to learn that his once nondescript student not only KNOWS, but has acquired the magical decoder that can *“decode the opaque financial transactions”* rather trivially. And he has done just that in “Monetary Conspiracy for World Government”. And gone a step further in “Monetary Reform: Who will bell the cat?” And to not guard his new found knowledge too covetously, he has disseminated that knowledge to all and sundry who might wish to drink from that wellspring of carefully compiled publicly available information in its full context in “Monetary Reform Bibliography”. The latter is subtitled **“A self-study guide for uncovering the agendas behind the economics gibberish”**.

A search of the afore-stated decoder quoted-strings with any internet search engine should solve the greatest source of misery and mystery on the planet rather trivially. It is disturbingly surprising to this scribe that a superlative mind like Noam Chomsky's can't solve such a trivial puzzle, or has been denied access to the magical decoder by the higher providence which sustains him. It is in the same way that without access to a forensic decoder, the "arguably the most important intellectual alive" according to the New York Times, for the past 7 years has continued to blindly rely upon the mantra of the Pentagon and the White House – Bin Laden did 911 and that there is an external enemy called the "Islamists" – but with his ingenious contribution that that's just the blowback of a criminal foreign policy. To his credit, in almost all cases, Chomsky very accurately describes the diabolical themes in the carefully enacted puppetshows, such as how 'big bird is being awfully misanthropic and about to eat the cookie monsters favorite meal', as he has done once again in this Press TV interview.

My Providence, fortunately for me, has been far kinder to my arguably humbler and much inferior mind, or so it would appear. I can see the puppetmasters rather plainly, despite the semi-invisible strings cloaked in massive deception that might dazzle even the 'Amazing Kreskin'. If one is curious to know what is it that a nondescript rather ordinary former student of Noam Chomsky knows that his teacher doesn't, and what compels the student to ponder upon his teacher's amazing 'blindsight' before the world, please see Project Humanbeingsfirst's monthly report on "Financial Terrorism January 2009" and replace Congressman Ron Paul's name with Noam Chomsky's for the passage which begins with:

"Congressman Ron Paul continually resists the temptation of putting his trigger-finger on these crimes against humanity as an inside job! Watch him do his repeat performance also with respect to 911 and the manufactured 'war on terror', as merely the blowback of a reckless foreign policy rather than an inside job with a fabricated enemy,"

Reproduced below following the excerpt, is the relevant portion of Chomsky's interview with Press TV. Either Press TV has limited cognitive and forensic capacities, like my favorite rebel-politician Chavez of Venezuela who held up one of Noam Chomsky's famous books at the UN to draw attention to the criminal excesses of American imperialism but despite the opportunity and the open microphone on the world-stage, did not dare call 911 an 'inside job', nor dare connect the disparate global crises that are calculatingly hurtling the world towards 'one-world' government. Or, arguably, perhaps all have drank from the same globalists' table.

Are these rebel-leaders of dissent, deliberately being circumspect in not proclaiming the grotesque core-truths before the public even when each has huge numbers of fawning followers? Some rather compelling reasons for such inaction were outlined by W. Cleon Skousen in his forensic commentary on Prof. Carroll Quigley's 1966 revelations in "Tragedy and Hope" about the international banking establishment:

'The real value of Tragedy and Hope ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr. Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were "in on the take" and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes. **As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on a world-wide basis.**' (W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, pg. 6)

But what is even more peculiar is that even presumably arch nemesis, like the Iranian government is of the United States government (and vice versa), and its most articulate President Ahmadinijad who is invited and granted visas to visit the United States and permitted to give long platitudinous speeches at the UN and at prestigious American University – speeches that are woefully devoid of any comprehension of Machiavellian political science or sophisticated Hegelian dialects – and who stand to directly benefit from exposing the United States' ruling-elite's fraud of 911 deception and their drive for world-government, remain conspicuously silent.

If one were to judge the Hegelian tree by its fruits, Press TV and the Iranian rulers appear to be in on the complex con-game of manufacturing tension, and that inescapable conclusion simply boggles the mind. In fact, it boggles the mind in no less measure than the discovery that fascism, nazism, and communism, were all manufactured with Anglo-American capital. Its blood-soaked owners traced to financial interests on Wall Street, and to the fraternity of International banksters. The same monied-interests, including many well known names whose descendants have played havoc in the world, had once tried to turn the United States into a fascist dictatorship by attempting to orchestrate a coup d'état with a private army. They were only thwarted by a conscionable US Marines' General whose services they had enlisted, Maj.

General Smedley Butler. The same Anglo-American blood-stained hands are also behind creating and sustaining Israel and its tortuous creed of Zionism, as is repeatedly made self-evident, most recently by the 'harmless' appointment of Sandy Fisher, the deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund, to the post of Governor of the Bank of Israel.

All “isms” of recent modernity, including Bin Laden's “Islamism”, are indubitably manufactured by the diabolical capitalists of the West. Is also “Iranism”? That thought finds some support among the imperial dissidents of the orthodox Iranian regime who repeatedly allege that Ayatollah Khoemenei was brought to power by Western Intelligence (having sheltered and protected him during his exile in France, what other conclusion these hungry homeless folks longing for their palaces can draw), but they are impossible to believe as anything other than the 'Ahmad Chalabis' of Iran.

No, this lack of bold pronouncements from the Iranian leadership – never mind Noam Chomsky or Chavez – when the rising dissident movement and scientific evidence right here in the United States demonstrates that expert controlled-demolition was the only scientifically tenable first-cause of the onset of the WTC-1, WTC-2, and WTC-7 buildings catastrophic explosion/collapse, is at a much deeper and diabolically hidden level. Even before evidence for controlled demolition had accumulated, the complete absence of NORAD's air defenses on the very day of the **“new pearl harbor”** to respond to the hijacked planes in the most armed to the teeth superpower state, most certainly should have indicated to any rational forensic mind that stand-down orders had been issued, and therefore, 911 was an 'inside job'. A military-level precision planned coup d'état on the peoples of the United States by its own insiders, with puppetshows to match. For Iran to not have called it as such, to not have pushed any resolutions to this effect in the United Nations when they have precariously stood at the brink of ostensibly being attacked by both the United States and Israel for the past several years, and not even deriving any propaganda value from it in its own nation's self-defense, is bizarre shortsightedness to say the least (see [“Letter to Editor Press TV with a message to the Iranian Peoples”](#)). Since no genuine statesmen can be so shortsighted in modern politics, and since being gullible patsies and morons does not fit the description, it begs the question why?

Why has even Russia not made such a move – they already experienced Georgia's aggression in Ossetia, and for the past several years have been experiencing NATO's systematic construction of the suffocating ring around Russia's security perimeter - and Mr. Putin is no slouch! He is even a blackbelt judomaster – one who knows how to exploit both the strengths and weaknesses of one's enemy.

The deafening silence among all the present rulers, presidents, prime ministers, military dictators, kings and their surrogates, of all the nations of the planet, speaks volumes in support of Skousen's analysis. Otherwise, for brilliant intellectuals and astute political antagonists to not harvest these things low hanging fruits and use them to their own advantage is outright absurd.

But wait, it might only come unraveled in 50 or 100 years once the world-government is won, and historians and intellectuals get to mint some distinction discovering the pink-panther gloves and rehearsing the *fait accomplis* of what is long-past. Just as they boldly do today of the extermination of the indigenous populations of this continent. It is considered high scholarship to quote from the colonists diaries and to expose how the natives' heads were chopped off for trophies and small-pox was spread among them with Gattling guns finishing them off. Personally, I have no need of such “wise” historians, scholars, intellectuals, theorists, and leaders for whom history has become mindless “*recollections of our past*”, and is not the “*responsibility for the future*”. I surely have no use for master criminals, and those who diabolically aid and abet them in their conquests. And I most assuredly, daily, several times each hour, bring the imprecation of Elie Wiesel upon all of them.

So examine this erudite exposition of the 'katputli tamasha' (puppetshow) without a single reference to 'fiat money as national debt' and the interests paid on it to private banksters in perpetuity (by present and future tax payers of this nation). Nor is there a single reference to the fact that the international banksters outright control the Federal Reserve System who are deliberately shrinking credit just as they did in the years of the Great Depression to calculatingly seed Great Depression II, nor any exposition of why the banksters would want to create a greater financial crises as if it was all a great cosmic mystery (see “[Response to Financial Times Gideon Rachman's 'And now for a world government'](#)”). Instead, some erudite academic gibberish is thrown as red herrings to the hungry searching for answers from the oracle:

“Press TV: Just finally Professor Chomsky, the US economy, of course where you are -that is dominating the news and the lives all Americans and arguably the people around the world- and this 825 billion dollar package. How do you think the Obama people are going to handle this?”

Chomsky: Nobody really knows. I mean, what is happening with the economy is not well understood. It is based on extremely opaque financial manipulations,

which are quite hard to decode. I mean, the general process is understood, but whether the \$800 billion, or probably larger government stimulus, will overcome this crisis, is not known.

The first \$350 billion have already been spent- that is the so-called part bailout but that went into the pockets of banks. They were supposed to start lending freely, but they just decided not to do it. They would rather enrich themselves, restore their own capital, and take over other banks- mergers and acquisition and so on.

Whether the next stimulus will have an effect depends very much on how it is handled, whether it is monitored, so that it is used for constructive purposes. [It relies] also on factors that are just not known, like how deep this crisis is going to be.

It is a worldwide crisis and it is very serious. It is suddenly striking that the ways that Western countries are approaching the crisis is exactly the same as the model that they enforce on the Third World when there is a crisis.

So when Indonesia has a crisis, Argentina and everyone else, they are supposed to raise interest rates very high and privatize the economy, and cut down on public spending, measures like that. In the West, it is the exact opposite: lower interest rates to zero, move towards nationalization if necessary, pour money into the economy, have huge debts.

That is exactly the opposite of how the Third World is supposed to pay off its debts, and that this seems to pass without comment is remarkable. These measures for the West are ones that might get the economy moving again, while it has been a disaster for others.”

The self-evident conclusion can only be seeded in a caveat lector. Can't put one's own brain on hold, never mind how small, just because some mighty oracles speak from the divine mountain. While it may perhaps be arguable that (excerpts are from "*Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux*")

*“It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies”, and
“Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze*

actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions. In the Western world, at least, they have the power that comes from political liberty, from access to information and freedom of expression”, and “the responsibility of a writer as a moral agent is to try to bring the truth about matters of human significance to an audience that can do something about them.”

It is also outright true that:

“There is no a priori reason to believe claims to morality by the intellectual, as asserted by Chomsky with the banal phrase ‘the responsibility of a writer as a moral agent’.”

because it isn't entirely obvious:

“Why may the intellectual not be an exponent of Machiavelli in the service of the powerful, of ‘power and its incantations’, telling ‘Nobel Lies’ to serve the ruling interests? After all, those who run ‘systems’ also need intellectual and doctrinal backbone to carry them out, don't they?”

“Isn't it but manifest empiricism that since the Renaissance that preceded the industrial revolution, with the waning of kingdoms and aristocracies, feudalism and servitude, and the arrival of plebeian norms and free thinking that were the precursors of modern day ‘populist democracy’ in the West, new forms of plebeian intellectual regimentation and willing control (despite that being a nonsequitur) were invented in astute political philosophy to serve the interests of the ruling elite? From Machiavelli's “Prince”, through Nietzsche's “ubermensch”, to Strauss' “Nobel Lies” of modernity, are of course all intellectualism too, and in the very distinguished service of the ruling interests. So what's wrong with such intellectualism?”

Except of course,

“if such self-apportioned responsibility by the intellectual is merely a tool to serve an end, and not an end in itself. Just as it is a tool in the hands of the Machiavellian espousing the morality of supermen, if it becomes a tool in the hands of the intellectual espousing the banal morality, one not beyond good

and evil, but specifically only intended to serve the plebeian.”

And therefore,

*“The test of that is daily and constant”, to be **“administered by the plebeians themselves.”***

Has Noam Chomsky passed this test? The following conclusions on the dissent of Noam Chomsky must surface publicly and be addressed by him directly if his intellectual legacy is not to be despoiled posthumously by charges of co-option. His failure to question the core-axioms of his own ruling-elite repeatedly at the most momentous events in any intellectual's life, is his tacit admission of complicity. From the assassination of JFK (where Chomsky strangely echoed the fundamental mantras of the establishment, of 'lone-gunman'), to 911 (where Chomsky again immediately echoed the fundamental doctrinal mantras of the establishment of 'Bin Laden and his merry band of 19 Muslim men'). And on both occasions, he sophistically reasoned that it didn't matter who perpetuated those monumental terror acts – which have, by the way, dramatically altered the course of human history – when his reasoning hasn't been accepted by the skeptics. Chomsky obviously can't otherwise coherently respond to how did Bin Laden ever orchestrate the collapsing of WTC-7 into its own footprints at near free-fall speed, when no plane hit it (see [“Letter to Noam Chomsky on Steven Jones seminal paper on the destruction of WTC”](#)).

For an honest intellectual who has harped upon the “responsibility of intellectuals’, that WTC-7 sudden collapse inexplicability, among several others (see [Foreword](#), [“Prisoners of the Cave”](#)), should have been sufficient grounds for instantly rejecting the 'Ali Baba' axiom emanating from America's rulers (see [“Ali Baba in Mumbai”](#)). And especially when one has time and again described their malignant take-over of America as a criminal “rogue state” and “terrorist state”. Which rational mind accepts any criminal's and terrorist's testimony when one has already determined them as such? This is way beyond indoctrination. Way beyond mere difference of opinion among hotshot scholars. It is outright deceit of no less measure than the empire's own vulgar circus clowns who peddle its mantras for **“doctrinal motivation”**.

Chomsky called Bernard Lewis a **“vulgar propagandist and not a scholar”** (see interview on [CBC Part 2](#), minute 5:50) for his unpardonable role in having created and perpetuated the mantras of empire for **manufacturing consent** among its sheeple. But Noam Chomsky himself perpetuates the very same axiom as Bernard Lewis, the **“vulgar propagandist and not a scholar”**, that Bin Laden did 911! This perpetuating the same core-lie among the dissent-

space in the guise of critiquing the empire and its excesses, and being the contrarian to the manufacturing of consent and even theorizing about it in Goebbellian terms, is what one might call **manufacturing dissent**. It is far more sophisticated than vulgar propaganda, and requires far greater intellectual prowess and fast footwork to pull it off. It mainly relies on the lack of any long term memory and forensic skills among the followers even though, unlike the majority of masses who fall prey to the manufactured consent, they may have a higher questioning attitude and easily aroused to activism on moral causes. Cleverly controlling this smaller rebel team is the job of manufacturing dissent.

What brilliant dialectics of deception for herding all levels of sheep! Hitler had foreseen no need for the latter when he classified people of any society into three broad categories in Mein Kampf based on their susceptibility to propaganda, and advocated only the former for creating the 'united we stand' in his Third Reich from ***“the crowd of simpletons and the credulous ... when the voting papers of the masses are the deciding factor”*** (see “Weapons of Mass Deception – The Master Social Science”).

But in the Fourth Reich's version, between the high-priests of empire calculatingly **manufacturing consent** (by taking some well worn leaves out of Goebbells handbook who in turn took it from the American Edward Bernays', but it goes at least as far back as Plato's 'Myth of the Cave'), and the high-priests of the dissent space artfully **manufacturing dissent** (an art neglected by Hitler), these intellectuals of left and right, top and bottom, have the entire discourse space nicely constrained by retaining the same damn axioms of empire regardless of where you turn for an oracle. Then the chutzpah of Noam Chomsky – probably laughing at the suckers who lap it up and never apply it to him – to even explain how such constraining is useful to empire:

'The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum - even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there's free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.'

And:

'This "debate" is a typical illustration of a primary principle of sophisticated propaganda. In crude and brutal societies, the Party Line is publicly proclaimed and must be obeyed -- or else. What you actually believe is your own business

and of far less concern. In societies where the state has lost the capacity to control by force, the Party Line is simply presupposed; then, vigorous debate is encouraged within the limits imposed by unstated doctrinal orthodoxy. The cruder of the two systems leads, naturally enough, to disbelief; the sophisticated variant gives an impression of openness and freedom, and so far more effectively serves to instill the Party Line. It becomes beyond question, beyond thought itself, like the air we breathe.'

And:

'Democratic societies use a different method: they don't articulate the party line. That's a mistake. What they do is presuppose it, then encourage vigorous debate within the framework of the party line. This serves two purposes. For one thing it gives the impression of a free and open society because, after all, we have lively debate. It also instills a propaganda line that becomes something you presuppose, like the air you breathe.'

And isn't that amazing, that all these high-priests of scholarship hail from the same heritage as the banksters out to create world-government along with the owners of the presses and the media, and that the New York Times, from among the 200 million Christians in America, and at least a couple of billion in the Western world, never mind the rest of the inconsequential four billion humanity, could only find another Jew to bestow the title of "*arguably the most important intellectual alive*", thus churning the honey for all the overzealous disgruntled flies to gather on from among their own kith? Is there no Christian scholar in the West worthy of such title?

How many backcovers of books has Chomsky adorned that title on, misleading even statesman like Chavez to wave his book in the UN as evidence of imperialism coming from the empire's own top priest?

We find people tripping over themselves to interview Noam Chomsky, and to hear him speak, and what does he end up reinforcing after all the "*sense of free thinking*" is stripped off to zoom into the unstated axioms of his dissent? The same thing as Bernard Lewis – the "*vulgar propagandist and not a scholar*" – "*presuppositions of the system reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate*". And Chomsky imposes that limit on himself to preclude all challenges from anyone in the dissent space who isn't already dismissed as an overzealous 'kook'. His attitude towards 911 researchers and 'truthers' for example is entirely explained under this model of manufactured dissent. (Also see footnote [a10] in "[Monetary Conspiracy](#)")

for World Government” for another example of vigorous dissent packaging the same “*presuppositions of the system*” but to the massive accolades from anyone who watches that performance)

But Noam Chomsky's most egregious crime, as the most highly decorated intellectual of the dissent-space, is the crime of blatant omission. Of not exposing the first-principles of the economic fraud that is entirely based upon the first-principles of the nature and control of money. A control so enormous, and so diabolically astute, that there cannot be one greater. Its consolidation in the private hands of a small group of very identifiable global ruling-families who share Chomsky's Jewish heritage, and whose agenda for world-government is no privileged 'state-secret' but only cloaked in layers of deception, is just ripe for a decorated intellectual to dismantle. And yet, its unraveling has escaped the plethora of Noam Chomsky books that I have read that is filled with myriad of facts and narratives from already published public sources like the New York Times, and which have, incidentally, also made him enormously wealthy peddling his famed dissent (see “Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist”, Hoover Institution).

I am happy to eat crow, many crows, if Noam Chomsky can identify erroneous conclusions on my part and clarify matters convincingly. I am still an ordinary student, still eager to learn. But I don't hold out much promise from a much lauded octogenarian dissent-priest who has already lived his most productive years of dissent and already done much damage, especially since 911 as he traveled the world peddling the axioms of empire underneath the veneer of bashing its imperialism. Noam Chomsky's omissions have been outright criminal and indefensible. His platitudes on the “responsibility of intellectuals” outright hypocritical and laden with sophistry. His description of the crimes of empire entirely meaningless when they maintain the core-lies and never identify the real criminals with an intent to deceive and deflect attention. For ignorance is not a charge that can be credibly laid on the doorstep of Noam Chomsky any more than it can be laid on the doorstep of Bernard Lewis.

As someone who learnt his craft from his teacher, the moral platitudes that the teacher taught, which this scribe genuinely took to heart, make it incumbent upon me to scream that it is high time the victim civilizations, and those men and women of conscience rising to protest the crimes against humanity of their own modern rulers, wizened up to the dialectics of deception.

Stop seeking analysis and solutions from famously manufactured oracles. Socrates only existed in Plato's imagination. Use your own bloody head, however tiny. Six feet under, the

maggots can't tell the size. But we may all live longer and happier before getting to the maggots if we were without our false leaders, without our false scholars, and without our false hope and our false sense of satisfaction that our moral dissent and protests in their traditional style made the whit of a difference to the tyrants or to their plans.

Thank you.

Zahir Ebrahim

**Letter to Noam Chomsky: Steven Jones seminal paper on
the destruction of WTC towers**

From: Zahir Ebrahim

Date: Sun, Apr 20, 2008 at 10:45 PM

Subject: (finally) A scientific publication on how the towers fell

To: Noam Chomsky <chomsky@mit.edu>

Cc: Frank Legge <flegge@iinet.net.au>,

Cc: Ken Ryan <kncryan@msn.com>,

Cc: Steve Jones <hardevidence@gmail.com>,

Cc: "Project Humanbeingsfirst.org" <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

I chanced upon the following today: (<http://www.911blogger.com/node/15081>)

begin quote:

Professor Chomsky wrote to several, who passed it on to me:

“You, or anyone who agrees with you, has a very simple task. Since the evidence is so obvious and compelling, submit an article about it to Science, or Nature, or even Scientific American, or more technical journals, say those in civil engineering, where your article can refute the conclusions of the professional society of civil engineers... To date, no one has been willing to submit an article -- at least, after probably hundreds of inquiries to Truth Movement advocates, no one has been able to mention one...”

end quote

And I thought I should forward you that paper by physicist Prof. Steven Jones et. al. They finally got it published - about how the towers were not felled by 'Ali baba' and his 19 consorts on their flying carpet! The PDF is attached with this email.

I hope you can find some time to review its findings. However the paper that I have personally found the most interesting, is also cited in it - item [13]. It's the very first one Prof. Jones wrote a couple of years ago - Here is the URL for it: <http://tinyurl.com/2rx97n>

The latter one is my favorite paper, after Webster Tarpley's book 'Synthetic Terror 9/11', for the photographs assembled in it by Prof. Jones of molten 'lava flow' defies Pentagon's facile explanations for any rational un-indoctrinated physical scientist (as you might put it too)!

I am cc'ing three of the five authors of the published paper whose emails I have, just so that a direct communication can be established, if you so wish. I would also like to thank them for their persistence - the genuine gadflies - won't you agree?

However, this is no time for basking in the glory of getting a research paper published in a scientific journal on a taboo topic - the war on Iran and Pakistan appear very imminent, and with the crossing of the Nuclear Rubicon, this country itself will likely end up in Martial Law. Never mind what will happen to the “*Global Zone of Percolating Violence*” in the map that Messrs. Bernard Lewis has constructed for the New Middle East that re-partitions my country in the name of “*Clash of Civilizations*”. We are all really on the same page there - I surely think!

The only point of contention, as I perceive it, has been the actual event of 911. You have insisted on accepting the Pentagon's version of it from day one. I have, from day one, been skeptical of an 'Ali Baba' having had the resources to carry it off - especially starting around 10 am (or thereabout) on the very day, 9/11/2001, when Dan Rather on CBS Channel 5 commenting extempore on the horrible spectacle unfolding before him, remarked: *that looks awfully like controlled demolition.* (approx. quote from memory).

In fact, my memory recalls the following full approx. quote: *for the second time today, we see something that looks awfully like controlled demolition.**

[*Footnote Added: The following video clip has yet another statement from Dan Rather, this time also referencing the total collapse of the third building (WTC-7) : “... *amazing, incredible, pick your word. For the third time today, it's reminiscent of those pictures we have all seen too much on television before when a building was deliberately destroyed by well-placed dynamite to knock it down,*” CBS News video clip on WTC-7 “*pull it*” demolition into its own footprint,
http://www.911research.com/wtc/evidence/videos/docs/wtc_7_cbs.mpg ; see editorial: *911 A Fait Accompli – Pay Attention to Political Science!* by Zahir Ebrahim, April 13, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/04/911-fait-accompl-i-payattn-political-sci.html>]

Later on, WTC-7 was actually controlled demolition entirely (and I myself heard Larry Silverstein say “*pull it*” on video interview of him that I found on youtube). There just wasn't time between 10:00 am and 5 pm when WTC-7 was “*pulled*” to plant the cutter-charges to bring it down so expertly into its own foot-print (for the third time that day that 3 tall buildings had collapsed [in] that way), especially for an already burning building and the ensuing chaos, poor visibility, etc. Thus - demolition charges must have been planted earlier - much earlier! Isn't that logic? And that indicates a covert-ops to any un-indoctrinated fair-minded forensic detective!

But irrespective of that, you and I, along with millions of other dissenters world-wide have entirely agreed that it was indeed “*imperial mobilization*” which followed, commencing with the 'algebra of infinite justice' to 'operation iraqi freedom' to whatever abomination that await us today - continually synthesizing “*revolutionary times*” to make what is “*inconceivable in normal times*” finally “*possible*”!

You have however, all along maintained the 'blowback' version for the events of 911 itself, for the 'empire's former crimes. With this hard evidence which is finally published in a scientific journal, as you wanted, and based on how science itself is done, as I learnt at MIT, Dan Rather's words of seven years ago have finally seen some scientific validation. That in itself, of course, does not mean that their research is wholly correct. It only means, to my rather humble mind, that the blatantly obvious evidence of the eye, has found some scientific substantiators as they researched the topic doing 'science'. It isn't entirely conjectures and hearsay anymore.

That is the difference between covert-ops and conspiracy theory - obviously! It is 'conspiracy theory' until after it's a fait accompli, and the famed declassification process and FOIA has made it a field day for historians, at which point, it magically transforms into 'covert-ops' of that abominable "*outlaw*" empire. Well this one just transformed a bit sooner [but not soon enough]! This is the history of 'empire' as I have studied it, as introduced to me by you, starting if I remember correctly, with Nicaragua. But it's one long chain from the 'USS Maine' to '911', each one leading to some "*imperial mobilization*" in the name of fighting "*pirates*".

I am hoping, Prof. Chomsky, that everything you have taught me - including, of observing as a Martian when one is emotionally too close to any situation - you will apply yourself on this very emotional issue, of your own government (or some covert group within that possessed the phenomenal expertise and logistics capability) having possibly done an 'operation canned goods' for pre-meditated "*imperial mobilization*". One possible model of how it could have been done is in Webster Tarpley's book. Again, doesn't mean that's how it was done, only that rationalism and science must continually prevail over 'beliefs'. Model-building to explain complex phenomenon is the scientific-method that I learnt at MIT. That is only what is going on here. I hope you will analyze it accordingly. This work may indeed be flawed, in which case, please do point them [flaws] out constructively so it can be improved.

Please also see my latest oped submission, yes once again, to NYT and LAT - and we both know what their response will be - if you are interested:

"Bin Laden': Key enabler of nuclear attack on Iran–Pakistan"

<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/04/binladen-keyenabler-nuclearattack.html>

Warm regards,

Zahir Ebrahim

References

[a] *Noam Chomsky: A Life of Dissent* by Robert F. Barsky, The MIT Press, July 1998, “Because Chomsky is given ample space to articulate his views on many of the major issues relating to his work, both linguistic and political, this book can also be seen as the autobiography that Chomsky says he will never write.”, <https://mitpress.mit.edu/books/noam-chomsky>

[b] *Chomsky Is Citation Champ*, MIT news bulletin, April 15, 1992, “Recent research on citations in three different citation indices show that Professor Chomsky is one of the most cited individuals in works published in the past 20 years. In fact, his 3,874 citations in the Arts and Humanities Citation Index between 1980 and 1992 make him the most cited living person in that period and the eighth most cited source overall--just behind famed psychiatrist Sigmund Freud and just ahead of philosopher Georg Hegel. Indeed, Professor Chomsky is in illustrious company. The top ten cited sources during the period were: Marx, Lenin, Shakespeare, Aristotle, the Bible, Plato, Freud, Chomsky, Hegel and Cicero.” <http://news.mit.edu/1992/citation-0415>

[c] *Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist*, by Peter Schweizer, Hoover Institution, January 30, 2006, Essay is adapted from the author’s book *Do As I Say (Not As I Do): Profiles in Liberal Hypocrisy* (Doubleday, 2005). <http://www.hoover.org/research/noam-chomsky-closet-capitalist>

Zahir Ebrahim's writings in chronological order on Dr. Noam Chomsky's fabled dissent

[1] *Prisoners of the Cave*, Zahir Ebrahim, maiden book written April-June 2003, <http://prisonersofthecave.org> ; sympathetic reference is made to Noam Chomsky's anti-war intellectualism throughout the book, but the beginnings of shrewd au contraire challenge to Noam Chomsky echoing the same narrative as officialdom on 9/11 is in Chapter 2: <http://prisonersofthecave.blogspot.com/2007/04/chapter-2.html#Challenging-Noam-Chomsky->

911 ; au contraire challenge on Israel-Palestine is in Chapter 3:

<http://prisonersofthecave.blogspot.com/2007/04/chapter-3.html#Question-for-Noam-Chomsky-Israel-Palestine> ; download PDF: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/prisonersofthecave-7th-anniversary-edition-ch9-abridged-04172010-print.pdf>

[2] *The endless trail of red herrings*, Zahir Ebrahim, February 28, 2007, the first formal deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's intellectualism on Israel-Palestine, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/endless-red-herrings.html>

[3] *Responsibility of Intellectuals – Redux: As seen by a Plebeian*, Zahir Ebrahim, March 03, 2007, the first formal deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's narrative of the responsibility of intellectuals as “moral agents”, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/responsibility-of-intellectuals-redux.html>

[4] Zahir Ebrahim's Letter to Noam Chomsky: *Steven Jones seminal paper on the destruction of WTC towers*, April 21, 2008, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/04/letter-noamchomsky-jones-paper.html>

[5] *Response to Press TV's Interview with Noam Chomsky 'No change coming with Obama'*, Zahir Ebrahim, January 25, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/01/respto-chomskys-nochange-obama.html> . The Press TV interview is also evidence of how Dr. Noam Chomsky operates to serve the establishment. By lending credence to the presuppositions of the system that it is a “democracy” when it is most essential to bear witness to its mendacity – when the voting masses can actually take a stand against the presuppositions of the corrupt system itself during elections – and only ex post facto making the obviously ineffective statement of “no-change”, after the matter is already a fait accompli, after the new president has been elected with much fanfare, after conferring much legitimacy to the public's notion of “democratically” elected and representative government. Is the “no-change” really a surprise to Noam Chomsky, to the one anointed as “arguably the most important intellectual alive”? Did the foremost scholar of the West actually expect a significant change from the presidential elections that had him calling the American people to vote in them (with or without illusions)? What's wrong with this picture? Noam Chomsky evidently never found the opportunity to read this scribe's humble editorial: *Some Dare Call it Conspiracy! Are You Among Them?* by Zahir Ebrahim, April 19, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/04/some-dare-call-it-conspiracy-garyallen.html> . This abstruseness is a verifiable Noam Chomsky brand of dissent. It is observable in the lead-ups to American elections where the dissent-chief dubiously argues

that elections are somewhat meaningful (with or without illusions), and people should come out to vote, and not waste their vote on third party candidates but to only vote from among the candidates put up by the two largest political parties in the official two party American democracy! Ex post facto, the scholar makes the banal back-peddling statement of “no-change”! See the alternative that surely leads to change dramatis if dissent-chiefs would only act their own self-proclaimed role as genuine “moral agents” and guide the public correctly on where the ruling power actually resides – not in the White House: *Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!* by Zahir Ebrahim, October 22, 2008, <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/not-voting-is-yes-vote-to-reject-system.html>

[6] *A Note on the Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare* by Zahir Ebrahim, May 31, 2009, see the two sections: *The Hegelian Dialectic Militant Islam vs. Moderate Islam*, and: *The Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

[7] *PAMPHLET: HOW TO RETURN TO PALESTINE THIS DAY FORWARD*, by Zahir Ebrahim, 1st Edition May 15, 2010, 2nd Edition November 2012, expanded into the *PAMPHLET: Undoing The Theft Of Palestine - From Genocide to Genesis in Zero Compromise*, First Edition October 2013, 2nd printing September 2015. This Pamphlet takes the deconstruction of Noam Chomsky's dissent on the Zionist state a step further down the rabbit hole. It brings to light his omissions on the Balfour Declaration which virtually granted the Jewish State to the House of Rothschild; a most sacred name to the Jews that neither appears in the public presses, nor evidently appears to escape from Noam Chomsky's very vocal dissent chords; download pdf: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/pamphlet-undoing-the-theft-of-palestine-zahirebrahim.pdf>

[8] See Zahir Ebrahim's Response to Francis Boyle's '*2011: Prospects for Humanity?*' – *Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/resp-francisboyle-2011-prospects-for.html> , for some uncanny resemblance between the two foremost dissent chiefs of United States of America, the noble Christian warrior of conscience rising to match wits with his Jewish moralist counterpart. And what truths do they share in common? The sacred truths of empire!

[9] *Noam Chomsky: Songbird or Superman – You Decide!* September 15, 2013. A compilation

of Zahir Ebrahim's writings on the Top Ten Dissent Superman of the West and their Top Ten counterparts in the colonized East who follow in their massa's footsteps. Number One Dissent Superman in the contemporary world: Dr. Noam Chomsky, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/songbird-or-superman.html#Noam-Chomsky>

[10] *Open Letter to Noam Chomsky* by Zahir Ebrahim April 09, 2014, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/04/open-letter-noam-chomsky-by-zahirebrahim.html>

[11] *The Cunning Dissent of Noam Chomsky Revisited in 2015* by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2015/12/noam-chomsky-revisited-in-2015-by-zahir.html>

Number Two Dissent Superman: Dr. Francis Boyle

Dr. Noam Chomsky is not alone nor lonely in the Superman herdsman's corridors of manufactured dissent. Witness the second most prominent name in dissent, the Hans Morgenthau student, lawyer and political scientist extraordinaire, groomed at Harvard and University of Chicago, serving as the axial pivot of egregious dissent against the villainy of imperial powers at the International Criminal Court of Justice and the World Court in the Hague, Dr. Francis Boyle.

Like his Jewish confrere Noam Chomsky, the good Samaritan Christian too retains the core lies of empire even while bringing criminal charges against its visible helmsman at the Hague. A mental midget or a brilliant Superman? It is always instructive to adjudicate for oneself. See Zahir Ebrahim's Response to Francis Boyle's '*2011: Prospects for Humanity?*' – *Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!*, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/resp-francisboyle-2011-prospects-for.html> , reproduced below.

The *Open Letter to Francis Boyle, the Moral Law Professor, on the Ignored Iraqi & Afghani Victims of Imperial Mobilization*, by Zahir Ebrahim, January 31, 2010, that follows exemplifies Dr. Boyle's strange focus on – what in computer science is deemed – the “lower order bits”, while omitting to focus on the more significant ones as any sensible scientist, be it in hard sciences or in social sciences, let alone a fair jurist seeking justice, would endeavor to pursue, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/01/letter-francisboyle-iraq-afghan-victims.html> .

**Response to Francis Boyle's '2011: Prospects for
Humanity?' – Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but
no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!**

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Friday, January 07, 2011



After reading Francis A. Boyle's missive with the overarching title "2011: Prospects for Humanity?", I now perhaps begin to fathom why the Ph.D. professor of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law, author of two of my favorite books on informed activism from which I have learnt a great deal:

"Protesting Power: War, Resistance, and Law" and "Biowarfare and Terrorism", does not recognize the real prime-movers of hegemony and 'unlimited imperialism'. By his own admission that he is a Hans Morgenthau protégé, the fog is gently lifting on why Dr. Boyle always only focuses on the state's actions and crimes, never on those who control the state from behind the scenes with their hired front-men and errand boys serving only their narrow interests in the guise of Elected Representatives of the People.

I never understood this before, and wrote letters upon letters to Dr. Francis Boyle rationally pleading with him to focus on the prime-movers, to obviously no avail. Letters like these:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/01/letter-francisboyle-iraq-afghan-victims.html>

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/response-fboyle-jewistan-what-elephant.html>

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/zahirs-letter-fboyle-case-for-treason.html>

Well, it is now clear why Francis Boyle never responded to appeals to look behind the puppetshows of statecraft to directly spotlight the puppetmasters.

Hans Morgenthau, his teacher, principally saw nation-states as the key actors of power. The errand boys running the Pentagon and the White House and the Congress were deemed the real players of power projection. They were implicitly defined as the ruling elite in the military-industrial complex. The calculus of power realism therefore, was principally to be understood in the context of nation-states exercising 'unlimited imperialism' by these power-brokers alone, never the financial oligarchy ruling the super-power nation-state, the United States of America, from behind the scene for their own narrow interests which had nothing to do with nation-state's best interests, let alone the nation's people's best interests.

A strategic omission?

Was this error in calibration of foreign policy calculus deliberate?

Well, where did Francis Boyle study? Chicago and Harvard of course. Do they mention the Federal Reserve System over there? Do they mention *money as debt*, or ever wonder why the hell does a super power have to pay private bankers the interest on the national currency? Do they mention the names of the Rockefeller family donors, unless laudatorily, as when David Rockefeller recently donated \$400 million to Harvard? Do they mention the House of Rothschilds, heaven forbid, except when ordering their champagne by the cart full? Is there some on-going discussion at the Kennedy school of government, or in the political science departments of Chicago, Harvard, and Princeton, of how tax-exempt foundations hiding the immense wealth of the Black Nobility, whom I call the financial oligarchs, actually fabricate the policies for the elected errand-boys and appointed ministers at the Pentagon and the Treasury to execute? Policies which are designed at the CFR and the Trilateral Commission, at the AEI and the hundred think-tanks along the Potomac, to incrementally, and diabolically, lead to Global Governance by breaking up the United States and all nation-states by stages: *"In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion' to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."* And all this agenda wasn't known in the aftermath of World War II? Not in the aftermath of World War I?

Oh really!

See my article:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/12/of-ostriches-and-rebels-zahirebrahim.html>

And by Francis Boyle's own interesting admissions elsewhere of his experience at America's finest universities, it is all the more evident what imperial institutions pursue, and not pursue, in the service of empire. Why would students who study in these imperial institutions, and the professors who teach there, be any more immune from the core assumed axioms of empire which almost become second nature like the air we breathe, than the rest of the intellectuals, engineers, and scientists who willingly help construct empire in the rest of the vast military-industrial-thinktank complex of the West? All share common assumptions, assumption which they leave unexamined, or belittle when brought to the fore. Here is the latest example from the modern epoch, of a Harvard professor seeking greener pastures at Google, The Master Builders of the Technetronic Era – sharing common axioms wherever one looks, albeit at different levels of abstraction based on each individual's role in the imperial system.

Thus, in the dissent-space located in Hans Morgenthau's axiomatic world of which Francis Boyle is evidently a zealot member by his own admission, when nation-state's international policies go awry, become criminal, as in America's many senseless wars of evidently imperialism but with little national gain except to the military-industrial complex coffers due to military spendings, the elected representatives of the people are the first criminals, along with the overt bureaucracy and the visible officialdom. Thus, the analyses of just those visible imperial policies gone awry, and the criminal actors enacting them, in just that singular context of nation-state's "*negotiating*" their power-interests on the Grand Chessboard, is deemed sufficient to explain the entire calculus of hegemony in that worldview.

But is that really sufficient? Or, like the iceberg that shows, is it merely the 10% agenda visible above the surface?

All the examples of imperialism cited by Prof. Francis Boyle in his missive above, from ancient Alexander-Roman-Muslim empires to America's wars today, exactly reflect that principle of officialdom and visible rulers, kings and monarchs, being the main ruling elite of the empire. The overt rulers of empires in all of history that Francis Boyle refers to, were almost always indeed their main ruling elite. They were not like the iceberg. Thus the Hans Morgenthau world of dissent could be applicable to them – if it was permitted to exist at the time under the absolutist powers of the kings.

But is that really the case for the sole-superpower, the United States of America, where **“democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization”**, where **“deception is the state of mind and the mind of state”**, where pretexts for imperial mobilizations are diabolically fabricated and shrewdly harnessed, where the freedoms of Orwell, of Machiavelli, of manufactured consent and manufactured dissent, of social engineering, is their prized gift to mankind?

Only in absurdities, and only for intellectual savants living in the vast immanent spaces of academe with no bearing in empiricism which can otherwise see them terminated of their over-rated services for which they are paid aplenty as professors spitting in the same plate which feeds them; i.e., critiquing the very empire they draw their lucrative salaries from. Dissent of professors on the payroll of empire – can they ever penetrate the semi-transparent veil to reveal the real corridors of power, by definition, except in enacting the shadowplay as in Plato's cave?

And can those living in that Plato's cave ever figure out the reality of what's going on by studying the shadowplay being enacted on the screen for their benefit?

That's what the noble jurist Francis Boyle's life's work has evidently been focussed on – the visible puppetshows enacted on Plato's cave and bringing those actors to justice!

Noam Chomsky easily comes to mind as the one who most closely resembles Francis Boyle when I read statements like these in “2011: Prospects for Humanity?”: *“By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire from the Muslim states and peoples living in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf under the bogus pretexts of (1) fighting a war against international terrorism; and/or (2) eliminating weapons of mass destruction; and/or (3) the promotion of democracy; and/or (4) self-styled “humanitarian intervention.” Only this time the geopolitical stakes are infinitely greater than they were a century ago: control and domination of two-thirds of the world's hydrocarbon resources and thus the very fundament and energizer of the global economic system – oil and gas.”* – but I don't think Chomsky's teacher was Hans Morgenthau.

I suspect Noam Chomsky is almost entirely self-taught in his controlled and very measured dissent, especially of 9/11, **that it was an invasion from abroad**, directly echoing the Pentagon's core-message, with soulful inspiration of dissent drawn from the likes of atheist like Bertrand Russell and the fabians, anarchists, and every brand of rebel except the one who can spell Rothschild, Rockefeller, 'inside job'.

And like the distinguished Noam Chomsky, “*arguably the most important intellectual alive*”, the much respected Francis Boyle among the dissent crowd, too evidently pretends by way of omission that such evergreen statements of the Rothschild's: “***give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws***” is merely folklore at best, and of no immediate pertinence in comprehending the real calculus of real power-projection of nation-states for 'unlimited imperialism' from behind the scenes, because, as it's now clear, his mentor, Hans Morgenthau, too acted in precisely that way, obviously sharing in the same pretenses that nation-states are the principal prime-movers in the exercise of hegemony, and teaching his students the same sense of justice as he had.

Indeed, un-remarkably, all three lauded intellectual savants, Morgenthau, Chomsky, Boyle, share the same core-axioms regarding power inflexion – all deny, by omission, the hidden power of the oligarchic elite which piggy-backs upon the facade of Representative Government to pursue their own private globalist agenda. The following paper by Ola Tunundar of Oslo quotes Hans Morgenthau presenting an ostensibly empirical, but in my view a rather distorted model of the American governance system characterized as such by what it omits more than what it actually states:

“After September 11, the US ‘democratic state’ (characterised by openness, legal procedures and free elections) is forcefully supported by or rather subsumed under a US ‘security state’ (characterised by secrecy and military hierarchy). Much of public life is ‘securitized’¹² and the president and his close advisers are focused on the War on Terror, not on civilian matters. ‘I am a war president. I make decisions ... with war on my mind’, President Bush said.¹³ The security aspect of the state is invading the public sphere as if we were entering a creeping state of emergency. ‘Emergency power’¹⁴ is used to direct the policy of the democratic state. In 1955, Hans Morgenthau wrote about a US ‘dual state’ in a study of US State Department.¹⁵

According to Morgenthau there was both a ‘regular state hierarchy’ that acts according to the rule of law and a more or less hidden ‘security hierarchy’, or what I will call a ‘security state’ (in some countries called ‘deep state’¹⁶) that acts in parallel to the former, while it monitors and controls the former. The latter ‘exert an effective veto over the decisions’ of the regular state, to quote Morgenthau.¹⁷ The ‘democratic state’ and the ‘security state’ always ‘march side by side’,¹⁸ and while the ‘democratic state’ offer legitimacy to security politics the

'security state' intervenes if necessary by limiting the range of democratic politics.

Others would argue that the activity of the 'deep state' or 'security state' not just concerns the veto of democratic decisions but also the 'fine tuning of democracy',¹⁹ for example by 'fostering' the war or the limited war in order to externalize conflicts and provide internal stability. The 'security state' is able to calibrate or manipulate the policies of the 'democratic state'.

The 'security state' decides over life and death, it is always present, and it will act in case of 'emergency'. This apparatus defines when a 'state of emergency emerge'. This is what Carl Schmitt would call the 'sovereign',²⁰ and by 'securitizing' the political life, the democratic state loses its influence.

After September 11, the US administration has securitized what used to be public and tilted the balance in favour of the 'security state'. To many Europeans, the new US policy is difficult to understand. The Guardian and BBC say that the 'Big Brother will be watching America'.²¹ --- Ola Tunundar, 2004, The Use of Terrorism to Construct World Order

Even in that admission of 'security state', there is no admission of an oligarchy. Is it even implied that it exists, and works in its own private interests, as opposed to the nation's it piggy-backs upon? That entire construct is visibly absent from Hans Morgenthau's formulation, just as it is absent from his student's formulation, that a ruling oligarchic power works for its own private agenda, openly proclaiming at the Council on Foreign Relations: *"In short, the 'house of world order' will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great 'booming, buzzing confusion' to use William James' famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault."* (See *Hard Road to World Order*, Foreign Affairs, 1974)

The apparatus of 'security state' in Hans Morgenthau's world is still only nation-state driven, which, in order to effectuate unpopular policies – because *"democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization"* as per Zbigniew Brzezinski's grandiose insights noted in his *Grand Chessboard* – engages in acts in the nation-state's own imperial interests by resorting to non-democratic means of its 'security state'.

Furthermore, Morgenthau presumes like every other patriotic American imbued with the spirit of Americanism, that the democratic state itself is genuine: *“The ‘democratic state’ and the ‘security state’ always ‘march side by side’,¹⁸ and while the ‘democratic state’ offer legitimacy to security politics the ‘security state’ intervenes if necessary by limiting the range of democratic politics.”* Not wanting to write a Ph.D. dissertation here, if there is any doubt that American Democracy, whether as the *‘democratic state’*, or the *‘security state’*, is entirely stage-managed by the errand boys of the oligarchy for their own private agenda, dutifully enacting the policies handed them by the privately funded, unelected, tax-exempt foundations and myriad think-tanks of the oligarchs, please see my analysis and advocacy written before the 2008 elections which examines this virtuous presumption of the scholars of empire spanning the gamut of Left and Right: [Not-Voting is a 'YES' vote to Reject a Corrupt System which thrives on the facade of Elections and Democracy!](#)

In these constrained formulations of Hans Morgenthau, all these are very nuanced but significant omissions. Permit me to enumerate their import lest it be lost on the *‘likkha-parrha jahils’* of modernity (uber-educated Ivy League morons):

- 1) These omissions entirely distort the picture of reality because they fail to identify the real prime-movers who run the superpower under varying abstractions of democracy which the academic pundits, and political scientists, love to write their lofty theses on. Witness Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* for instance, which carries the same bogus spirit of America is a *‘democratic state’*.
- 2) These omissions mask the real causes of world wars, the real causes of *‘clash of civilizations’* and other dysfunctions, and the real purpose behind the apparatus of the national *‘security state’* which can freely employ extra-constitutional means when the *‘democratic state’* reaches its limits of operation, as they *‘march side by side’*.
- 3) These omissions entirely mask the diabolical baby-steps undertaken by both flavor of *‘state’* in synchronous lockstep to achieve only a common agenda, the *‘democratic state’* by signing treaties and enacting laws and statutes, and the *‘security state’* by creating international pretexts and controlling domestic politics.

And what is that common agenda? Is this such a state-secret that brilliant academic savants

need a plebeian to inform them?

Since each of the two state abstractions work for the same oligarchy, their common purpose is primarily the implementation of the oligarchic agenda.

Empiricism confirms that it is for destroying the existing world order in systematic stages through domestic and international crises creation – **“what is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times”** as David Ben Gurion explained the Jewish theft of Palestine and the key Machiavellian modus operandi for all unpopular transformations, re-echoed by PNAC's *Rebuilding America's Defenses* as **“the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event – like a new Pearl Harbor”** – in order to seed a new world order exclusively controlled by the banker oligarchy!

It was the 'democratic state' which enacted in the United States the abhorrent Federal Reserve System in 1913 after the manufactured banking crises of 1900s in the name of banking reform. That gave away the store to the bankers, as per their own admission: **“give me control of a nation's money supply and I care not who makes its laws”**. It was the 'security state' which carried out the 9/11 false-flag operation upon its own nation, like Hitler's 'operation canned goods', in response to which the 'democratic state' declared war on the world with **“either you are with us, or with the terrorists”** and enacted police-state laws labeled 'Patriot Acts' to fight terrorism. But the real purpose of such “revolutionary times” is betrayed in Bertrand Russell's *Impact of Science on Society* where, as the preeminent scholar of the oligarchs, he glibly created justifications: **“World government could only be kept in being by force.”**

As one can glean from this brief deconstruction, it is only to serve the oligarchic agenda of diabolically seeding World Government, and not the national interest of the nation-state's politics, which drives the 'security state' and the 'democratic state' to 'march side by side'.

Evidently, this lesson has been well un-learned by the student of Hans Morgenthau.

Continuing further with the listing of common grounds among these intellectual savants, all deny, by omission again, the existence of black-ops and false-flag events employed to deceive the peoples of the world in order to mobilize for the agendas of the oligarchic elite which often has nothing to do as the long-term best interest agenda of the superpower nation-state itself. From the off-shoring of jobs to the criminal wars since 9/11, all leading America to enormous debt, moral and physical bankruptcy, laid at the helm of the White House! But the terrorist act

of 9/11 itself? Oh, that was the foreign invasion because of which America had to hunker down into *Fortress America*! And whom is Francis Boyle pursuing for Justice? See his *Bush To The Hague campaign for War-Crime: Extraordinary Rendition*, noted in my [letter](#). Whom is Chomsky calling criminal? That's right, only the White House and the Pentagon for their imperial war-making upon Afghanistan and Iraq – and making a fair buck peddling the 9/11 fiction of blowback invasion from abroad in the true spirit of enterprising capitalism. See [Noam Chomsky, Closet Capitalist](#) by Peter Schweizer at the Hoover Institution.

Finally, all deny, by omission once again, that the superpower merely acts as the vassal of the elite, just like the neo-colonized developing nations run by petty dictators and the facade of electoral democracy, act as the vassals of the superpower! Hans Morgenthau, like George Kennan, did not recognize that the Soviet Union was a fabricated Hegelian Dialectic. See George Kennan's PPS 23 for how he staged the Cold War principles in 1948, which later came to be called the Truman Doctrine. But when one reads Antony Sutton and W. Cleon Skousen, as many others including Carroll Quigley, one begins to understand the *National Suicide* and Communism-Capitalism nexus being run by the same oligarchy attempting to create World Government along Karl Marx's manifesto! Never learnt these aspects from Chomsky, even though I learnt of George Kennan's PPS 23 from his writings. Half-truth telling in narratives is a characteristic trademark of these scholars. Recalling my favorite sociologist and novelist Aldous Huxley's insights on crafty silence from his *Brave New World*:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.’ — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

Similarly, today Chomsky and Boyle not recognizing 9/11 was another staged '*operation canned goods*' to seed another World War, a lifetime of perpetual war, the *World War IV*, and continually holding that Islamofascism attacked America from outside, but that America, in its

unbridled imperialism, ***“By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire ...”***, make them out to be cut from the same imperialist cloth as Morgenthau.

But I could not ever comprehend how some stellar scholars of high moral conscience become controlled dissent spewing red herrings – cleverly cultivated by empire to head-off all efficacy in protests by having them focus on the 'effects' and not the prime-mover 'cause', or, identifying the causes incorrectly or somewhere lower in the hierarchy than the root – despite the fact of the matter that they often appeared to be employed and handsomely paid from the same military-industrial-academe coffers they dared to call criminal, and thus, obviously enjoying the quid pro quo!

Now I finally begin to understand, at least in Dr. Francis Boyle's case, why almost all of this moral jurist's public quests for justice remain so severely emasculated. And why does he persist in fingering only the visible flag-bearers of the hidden-only-in-plain-sight-oligarchy who can forever comfortably remain behind the scenes as always, secure from his and everyone else's legal and conspiratorial scrutiny.

Finally I seem to have penetrated the dark mystery of why such a distinguished, moral, and fearless professor, Dr. Francis Boyle, can exhibit such severe myopia that he begins to resemble my former professor Noam Chomsky.

The key which has surely unlocked that transparent door past which I could not see earlier: Dr. Francis Boyle had Hans Morgenthau as his main teacher in life:

'So I commenced my formal study of International Relations with the late, great Hans Morgenthau in the first week of January 1970 as a 19 year old college sophomore at the University of Chicago by taking his basic introductory course on that subject. At the time, Morgenthau was leading the academic forces of opposition to the detested Vietnam War, which is precisely why I chose to study with him. During ten years of higher education at the University of Chicago and Harvard, I refused to study with openly pro-Vietnam-War professors as a matter of principle and also on the quite pragmatic ground that they had nothing to teach me.

In the summer of 1975, it was Morgenthau who emphatically encouraged me to become a professor instead of doing some other promising things with my life:

"If Morgenthau thinks I should become a professor, then I will become a professor!" After almost a decade of working personally with him, Morgenthau provided me with enough inspiration, guidance, and knowledge to last now almost half a lifetime.' --- Francis Boyle in 2011: Prospects for Humanity?

Would it be rude to suggest: Dr. Francis Boyle – get some new teachers!

Lest this cynical Realitiespeak injure priceless sensibilities, appear arrogant, not exude enlightened moderation, nor be deferential enough, it might help one to remember who is daring to speak up while others applaud the dissent-chiefs – the 'untermensch' whose devastated nations and peoples are bearing the full brunt of the moral silence on the first-cause primemovers of all crimes against humanity. Silence on the prime-movers is not only a betrayal, but makes one complicit in the continuation of crimes against humanity and the elongation of the suffering of the victims. By focussing on the effect, the errand boys, and leaving the first-cause, the puppetmasters, entirely occulted from scrutiny for whatever reasons of expediency, only enables more war-mongering, and more crimes against humanity to be committed by the new set of errand boys to come on stage after the current ones have served their term. This is entirely empirical going from President Bush to President Obama.

And where has Dr. Francis Boyle laid his justice eggs at the International Criminal Court? Right – chasing the old retired errand boys, and for what crimes – *Extraordinary Rendition* – never mind indicting the new ones perpetrating new abhorrences as we speak, forget ever mentioning the puppetmasters, and 9/11 as an *inside job* orchestrated to create the right sequence of crises to launch the oligarchs' transformation towards Global Governance. If calling these absurdities of lauded dissent-chiefs which make a mockery of the pursuit of justice, ill-mannered, then, so be it – it is the least a plebe can do as no one who is someone pays any attention to the prime-movers who keep on bleeding the 'untermenschen' to death!

“Protesting Power: War, Resistance, and Law” is surely a categorical imperative of all moral men and women when power is instantiated criminally.

But, solely paying attention to the henchmen and the trigger-pullers while ignoring the prime-movers, is the core unsolved problem. It is what makes protest futile. it is what lends zero efficacy to all moral activism for justice and peace. See “Who is more guilty of monumental war crimes - the prime-movers or trigger pullers?”. This same blindness is what makes all attempts at meaningful reform destined to fail so long as the prime-movers are left intact to protect their turf. See “Letter to Bill Still – Director of The Secret of Oz – How”.

Now, just imagine, if only for a fleeting moment, moral and upstanding citizens, scholars and jurists, activists and rebels, statesmen and congressmen, seeking justice and reforms to benefit all 'untermenschen' and not just their own particular clique and clan, all focussing solely on the prime-movers for a change, each according to their expertise and capacities! I dare say we might yet have an even battlefield. We might be minnows, but, as nature demonstrates to us humans repeatedly: **sharks need minnows more than minnows need sharks.**

Thank you.

Submitted as comment for article: <http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/13950-2011-prospects-for-humanity.html> (Cached)

N.B. April 13, 2013

Also see [Why does Iran need the help of an American Lawyer to file charges at ICJ?](#)

The following statement of Hans Joachim Morgenthau (February 17, 1904 – July 19, 1980) sums up the RealitySpeak behind his prized protégé Francis A. Boyle's moral activism visible in the above deconstruction: **“The statesman must think in terms of the national interest, conceived as power among other powers. The popular mind, unaware of the fine distinctions of the statesman’s thinking, reasons more often than not in the simple moralistic and legalistic terms of absolute good and absolute evil.”** ([wiki](#))

It is a tad convenient that *ubermensch* Hans Joachim Morgenthau did not perceive the elephant in the bedroom – the puppetmasters behind the scenes – in his amoral calculus of power, as most of them post World War I and II down to today, in fact ever since the founding of the Federal Reserve System in 1913, happen to be the Jewish banking power, Morgenthau himself being a Jew. Even a cursory read of Colonel Edward Mandell House's fable [“Philip Dru: Administrator; A Story of Tomorrow, 1920-1935”](#) would have revealed to both Morgenthau and his brilliant law protégé from Harvard, that statesmen and politicians in modern America are mere puppets of the financial oligarchy, the so called *Money Trust* – even if empirical data of hard reality, never mind that establishmentarian academics like [Caroll Quigley](#) themselves boldly revealed the behind the scenes power nexus, was lost upon them. Among other matters Morgenthau taught his prized student gey, were the following “Six Principles of Political Realism” (from [wikipedia](#)):

1. Political realism believes that politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature.
2. The main signpost of political realism is the concept of interest defined in terms of power, which infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics, and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible. **Political realism avoids concerns with the motives and ideology of statesmen.** Political realism avoids reinterpreting reality to fit the policy. A good foreign policy minimizes risks and maximizes benefits.
3. Realism recognizes that the determining kind of interest varies depending on the political and cultural context in which foreign policy is made. It does not give "interest defined as power" a meaning that is fixed once and for all.
4. Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action. It is also aware of the tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action. Realism maintains that universal moral principles must be filtered through the concrete circumstances of time and place, because they cannot be applied to the actions of states in their abstract universal formulation.
5. Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe.
6. The political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere; he asks "How does this policy affect the power and interests of the nation?" Political realism is based on a pluralistic conception of human nature. The political realist must show where the nation's interests differ from the moralistic and legalistic viewpoints."

Like teacher like student!. Dissent emanating from these brilliant American minds remain an integral part of engineering consent --- as this type of dissent in Western society is ab initio designed to be a "collection agency"; to collect the ordinary dissenting popular mind **"unaware of the fine distinctions of the statesman's thinking, reasons more often than not in the simple moralistic and legalistic terms of absolute good and absolute evil."**, around them. It is intended to be ineffective as a measure of democratic public opinion no differently than the palliative which only treats symptoms rather than root cause. To understand why dissent must be manufactured in realpolitik based democratic governance for the **type-2 crowd** who willingly follow any dissenting pied pipers with great moral glee even if on the treadmill of inefficacy, see the extensive case studies by this scribe titled Manufacturing Dissent.

**Open Letter to Francis Boyle, the Moral Law Professor, on
the Ignored Iraqi & Afghani Victims of Imperial
Mobilization**

From: Zahir Ebrahim

Date: January 31, 2010

Subject Re: International Criminal Court Complaint Filed Against Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Tenet, Rice, Gonzales By Prof. Francis A. Boyle

Dear Dr. Francis Boyle:

In reference to your complaint filed with the ICC against the previous errand-boys who occupied the White House, would it be rude to notice that the higher order bits of using 911 to “goosestep the herrenvolk across international frontiers” ; the subsequent “shock and awe” visitations upon largely civilian population-centers and civilian infrastructures ; the decimation of millions of Iraqis/Afghanis ; subverting of the United States into a pre-planned police-state ; fabricating crises upon crises to propose pre-planned solutions in order to systematically usurp national sovereignty as per the diabolical modus operandi set by the Council on Foreign Relations in their own documents: ***“In short, the ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion’ to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.”*** – have all been overlooked to pursue the relatively lower order crimes of “extraordinary rendition” upon a few individuals with the highly dubious statement: *“I doubt very seriously that the Accused would have inflicted these criminal practices upon 100 White Judeo-Christian men.”* ?

We only wish there was one decent 'Christian' man or woman alive in the hallways and beltways of Western academe and among the legal fraternity who might even attempt to capture the angst of the tens of millions of Iraqis/Afghanis still barely alive and who still await someone who will file legal charges against the monumental crimes that have been perpetrated upon them and their millions of murdered kin.

We fervently hope that you, Professor Francis Boyle, might be such a person. That you will file pertinent charges in the ICC, for both culpability and restitution, on behalf of the untold millions already dead in Iraq and Afghanistan, many more suffering with their entire national fabric, ancient heritage, and even their DNA despoiled in a crime so stupendous that ***“it is a mystery whose parallel may only be the one of Sinai when something was revealed to mankind.”***

For surely, it is inconceivable that you make complete obeisance to Western standards of morality by focussing on this lower order crime in the presence of un-addressed higher order monumental crimes – a morality which brazenly asserts from the highest pulpit of law in this land of the free:

“Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrases, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations which give birth to nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending threat by encasing it in a semantic strait-jacket, we must reply that all concepts are relative.” -- Justice Vinson, U.S. Supreme Court, 1951 AD

And as you venture to focus on the higher order real monumental crimes against humanity, we hope you will not remain content by focussing merely on the errand boys. That you will see the connections between the quest for “Global Governance”, fabricated crises from pandemics to global warming, the seeding of “revolutionary times” across the “global zone of percolating violence” to make “imperial mobilization” possible which otherwise is “inconceivable in normal times”, and the “history's actors” who drive war-mongering policies and orchestrate wretched events from their Zion in the Middle East to their Zion in the Western capitals, not the least of which is Washington DC, in the expectation of creating the ultimate “Zion that will light up all the world”.

And that, as you pursue the highest order crimes, you will not shy away from going directly for the jugular of the prime-movers behind the scenes of all the war-mongering 'errand boys' fronting for them in the Western capitals as the duly elected representatives of a duped

Western peoples, including those presently occupying the White House. This was, lamentably enough, already pleaded to no avail in the following editorial when your lonely fraternal brother, Mr. Vincent Bugliosi, courageously asserted that “Murder Trumps Torture”, but inexplicably failed to also simultaneously assert the legal and moral commonsense that prime-movers trump trigger-pullers: Who is more guilty of monumental war crimes - the prime-movers or trigger pullers? April 09, 2009.

Attempted prosecution of state-criminals on 'petty charges' without also prosecuting their criminal aiders and abettors who 'legalize' and propagandistically justify their brazen acts of aggression, and therefore are entirely culpable in toto for “***all the evil which follows***” ; staying silent on punitive as well restitutive compensation for their victims, is a legal sham that is only waiting to be torn down by some courageous people. We hope, Dr. Francis Boyle, that you might be one such precedent setting spark which ignites the moral imagination of many to follow. The world has had enough from the dispensers of victor's justice!

Thank you.

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

ICC Complaint Text URL: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=17091>

Follow-up Letter To Dr. Francis Boyle

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

To: neimpeach@gmail.com; david@davidswanson.org

Cc: Boyle, Francis <FBOYLE@law.illinois.edu>

Date: Sunday, January 31, 2010 6:13 PM

Subject: Bush To The Hague! The Hague Acknowledges Francis Boyle On His Filing Against Bush et al For War-Crime: Extraordinary Rendition

In. Ref To: Bush To The Hague! The Hague Acknowledges Francis Boyle On His Filing Against Bush et al For War-Crime: Extraordinary Rendition
(<http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/node/49647>)

Hello.

In principle, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org supports all effective measures which attempt to bring the entire hierarchy of monumental criminals to fair justice. As is often the case with victor's justice, and with those in the victor civilizations pursuing their notion of justice against the criminals in their midst, the big picture is being silently swept aside in the "Bush to Hague" campaign. It should aptly be "Bush-Obama-Foundations-Banksters to Hague" Campaign.

It is not sufficient, in the view of Project Humanbeingsfirst, to assert that we are doing what we can! All men and women of conscience must endeavor to do what is right starting with the most significant crimes and seeking restitution/compensation for the most significant victims, not just what we can do as with pursuing lower order crimes which is meaningless - a new crop of errand boys are already in-charge committing new monumental crimes while past ones are being pursued on a treadmill. To put efficacy into the matter of stopping crimes against humanity before they transpire, the prime-movers have to be neutered and their enormous power and influence stemming from their infinite wealth terminated. Where is the precedent for that being set? It wasn't even set at Nuremberg when Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, the former governor of the Reich Bank – the bankster who orchestrated the financing for Hitler and enabled his war machine with funding from Wall Street and the City of London financiers – went scot-free!

Therefore, humbly daring to call a spade a spade, the statement of support from Project Humanbeingsfirst for Dr. Francis Boyle's conscionable efforts in the ICC in the "Bush to Hague" campaign is modulo our public statements in the Open Letter to Dr. Francis Boyle. The Letter is at the following URL and also appended below for your reference:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/01/letter-francisboyle-iraq-afghan-victims.html>

If you wish to mention Project Humanbeingsfirst.org in the list of supporters for "BUSH to Hague" campaign, we request that you also provide a URL link to our Open Letter to Dr. Francis Boyle.

Thank you very much.

In keen Solidarity,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

California, United States of America.

Dr. Boyle graciously replied in a “personal comments only” caveated one liner sentence:

From: Boyle, Francis <FBOYLE@law.illinois.edu>

To: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>, neimpeach@gmail.com, david@davidswanson.org

Date: Sun, Jan 31, 2010 at 5:10 PM

Subject: Bush To The Hague! The Hague Acknowledges Francis Boyle On His Filing Against Bush et al For War-Crime: Extraordinary Rendition

No thank you. Fab.

Francis A. Boyle

Law Building

504 E. Pennsylvania Ave.

Champaign, IL 61820 USA

217-333-7954 (voice)

217-244-1478 (fax)

(personal comments only)

References

Zahir Ebrahim's writings in chronological order on Dr. Francis Boyle's fabled dissent

[1] *Open Letter to Francis Boyle, the Moral Law Professor, on the Ignored Iraqi & Afghani Victims of Imperial Mobilization*, by Zahir Ebrahim, January 31, 2010, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/01/letter-francisboyle-iraq-afghan-victims.html>

[2] *Letter to Francis Boyle : A Case for Treason*, by Zahir Ebrahim, October 10, 2010, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/zahirs-letter-fboyle-case-for-treason.html>

[3] *Response to Francis Boyle's Jewistan – What Elephant?*, by Zahir Ebrahim, October 22, 2010, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/10/response-fboyle-jewistan-what-elephant.html>

[4] *Response to Francis Boyle's '2011: Prospects for Humanity?' – Unlimited Imperialism and Nation-States but no Secret Rule by Oligarchy for World Government!*, by Zahir Ebrahim, January 07, 2011, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/resp-francisboyle-2011->

prospects-for.html

[5] *Why does Iran need the help of an American Lawyer to file charges at ICJ?*, by Zahir Ebrahim, April 10, 2013, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/04/why-does-iran-need-help-of-american.html>

Number Six Dissent Superman: Dr. Chris Hedges

At number six in the Top Ten List is the former journalist for the New York Times, Chris Hedges. I discovered Chris Hedges over a decade ago in his brilliant 2002 book: *War is a Force that gives us Meaning*, (New York, Public Affairs). It was fascinating to encounter yet another man of great conscience in the West – being too few and far between has always motivated me to seek out these handful of songbirds with much due diligence. However, I am no longer fooled by snake oil salesmen as I once used to be as a naïve college student pursuing his own American Dream; green behind the ears, I had endeavored to surround myself with people I thought were great teachers, great scholars, and great men of conscience who had the courage to stand up to the tyrannies of empire. The following two responses to Chris Hedges' subsequent writings on the new contemporary War, the “World War IV”, the so called “Global War on Terror”, left me greatly disillusioned with yet another superlative conscience of the West – a permanent favorite of the anti-war “*crowd of simpletons and the credulous*” – turning out to be only the superman craftily lying by omission through his innocent teeth.

Songbird or Superman, or just a superlative useful idiot with a pen being played by the Mighty Wurlitzer like the rest of dissent chiefs in the world, all so “*innocent of knowledge*” despite their high-falutin credentials – credentials to die for in the pursuit of the *American Dream* – that none of them can trivially see their own cold lies of omission --- you decide a decade after 9/11.

Letter to Editor: Chris Hedges omits key truths in 'It's Not Going to Be OK'

February 04, 2009

In the entire 1744 words essay posted by Chris Hedges to truthdig.com on February 02, 2009, and within less than 48 hours which had been reproduced or referenced by at least 92 other locations, the veteran journalist did not once mention the mechanics of the private monopoly cartel of the Federal Reserve System, money as debt, and control of the nation's money supply in the opaque private hands of a demonic cabal deliberately seeding the Great Depression II to provide pretext for all the requisite controls for ushering in world government! Phew! Said it all in one sentence too!

Is the celebrated Chris Hedges, and all those whom he cites in the essay, including the much lauded “arguably the most important intellectual alive”, less knowledgeable than an ordinary nondescript person having only a keyboard, internet connection, and access to public libraries? How can that be? This is the list of distinguished people Chris Hedges mentions who “rang the alarm bells”:

“There are a few isolated individuals who saw it coming. The political philosophers Sheldon S. Wolin, John Ralston Saul and Andrew Bacevich, as well as writers such as Noam Chomsky, Chalmers Johnson, David Korten and Naomi Klein, along with activists such as Bill McKibben and Ralph Nader, rang the alarm bells.”

Wow, that's quite a list, and not a single one of them is quoted for the real sacred cow axioms which seed all the crises in the first place. All the effects are described, but none of the primemover axioms which cause these crises effects, nor what the real overarching globalist agenda really is. Perhaps none of these scholars know anything about any agenda? They are all new-born babies, innocent of Machiavelli 101, innocent of forbidden knowledge, it's all happenstance and shortsighted recklessness of capitalism gone wild for them? The culprit is some vague notion of greedy capitalism, fuzzy corporatism, and jingoistic militarism? No identifiable enemy, nor more crisply identifiable direct primemover cause that can be traced to the effect? None has ever heard of interest-bearing money, and it's monopoly control by private banksters who sit on the very top of the pyramid that is printed on the back of the one

dollar U.S. Federal Reserve Note deemed legal tender and who ***“provide advice on both sides of the balance sheet, and ... do it globally”***? Yes this must surely be true, for in the years I spent at MIT, and the subsequent years I spent reading about each new episode of the crimes of empire, I never heard of such a beast from even Noam Chomsky!

The following is the Financial Terrorism News Letter For January-February 2009:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/01/newsflash-financialterrorism-jan2009.html>

and the following is the Monetary Reform Bibliography put together by an ordinary person without fancy academic titles or accolades from the New York Times:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/10/monetary-reform-bibliography.html>

I invite you to publish both the News Letter and the oped length Introduction from the aforementioned Monetary Reform Bibliography to provide a counterpoint to all the said scholars' erudite craftsmanship. And I further humbly request that the distinguished Chris Hedges either kindly put this plebeian scribe straight on these really complex matters which apparently I have got entirely wrong, or explain the imperial omissions through which any un co-opted man and woman can drive a tank blindfolded.

Chris Hedges used to be among my favorite writers and I have enjoyed his book “War is a Force that Gives us Meaning”. I hope he will continue to teach and enlighten, continue to probe and unravel in order to uncover effective remedies that can save humanity from the cataclysms to world government, but not according to Huxley's crafty wisdom which almost all respected chroniclers of the crimes of empire inexplicably follow:

“Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects... totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have by the most eloquent denunciations.”

Thank you,

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Response to Chris Hedges' amalgam of half-truths:

'A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe'

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

September 13, 2011 | Revised September 17, 2011

“Our brutality and triumphalism, the byproducts of nationalism and our infantile pride, revived the jihadist movement. We became the radical Islamist movement’s most effective recruiting tool. We descended to its barbarity. We became terrorists too. The sad legacy of 9/11 is that the assholes, on each side, won.” --- Chris Hedges, Truthdig.com, September 11, 2011, [A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe](#)

What rubbish. I have been convinced for a long time that prominent dissent-artists like Chris Hedges are part of the problem. Why? Because people like him continually lend credence to something called “*Islamist movement*” and its “*most effective recruiting tool.*”

With Chris Hedges award-winning brand-name, all websites publish him, including Truthdig.com which incidentally has never published any submission of my original writing that I have ever submitted to them. With his brand-name, Chris Hedges has continually [manufactured dissent](#) (<http://tinyurl.com/manufacturing-dissent>) since 9/11 while retaining the core-lies and core-axioms of empire.

Thus, while decrying “*Our brutality and triumphalism*”, he manages to lend credence to its [counter-insurgency operations](#) (<http://tinyurl.com/manufacturing-insurgency>) against “*the jihadist movement*” as something existential rather than diabolically manufactured, lamenting: “*The sad legacy of 9/11 is that the assholes, on each side, won.*”

One side Chris Hedges discloses as: *“Our brutality and triumphalism”*. That is the truth. Which is the other side? According to Chris Hedges, it is *“the radical Islamist movement”*! That is a full lie. Together it constitutes a half-truth for perception management. As per a Jewish proverb, *a half-truth is a full lie!*

The journalist par excellence, Mr. Chris Hedges, in his full lie, did not state the empirical fact that the Western oligarchy is using *“Our brutality and triumphalism”* to usher in one-world Government by inventing both sides of the Hegelian Dialectic. This fabrication is subsequently openly used to justify global governance – even the Financial Times (<http://tinyurl.com/And-now-for-a-world-government>) is calling for it using the Hegelian Dialectic as the most natural justification, and both empiricism and the EU president coldly confirming it.

Perhaps Chris Hedges is only blind? After all, only morons, the deaf, the dumb, and the mute win prizes and accolades from empire... right?

Niet!

Empire also fabricates dissent-chiefs to lead the dissentstream just as much as they fabricate pontiffs to lead psyops dissemination to the mainstream. They are both merely the contrasting tunes of the Mighty Wurlitzer (<http://tinyurl.com/mightywurlitzer>). It is the Mighty Wurlitzer that spins the yarn that 9/11 was an invasion from abroad reinforcing the core-axioms of the Pentagon, the White House, and the Western State Allies in the 'War on Terror', that there is some natural reality to “militant Islam” which attacked America. While echoing that core-lie, the dissent is the *blowback mantra*, and the bold admission of **reactionary excesses** that because of *“Our brutality and triumphalism, the byproducts of nationalism and our infantile pride”*, *“We [have] become terrorists too”*.

That show of conscience collects many conscionable people in the society around them who also object to *“Our brutality and triumphalism”*. It is empire which lends these collection-agents respectability and credibility.

Indeed, the reactionary excesses of the sole superpower leading to domestic police-state and international barbarism, is the foundational mantra of virtually all respectable Western dissent. I.e., dissent which is officially anointed and not dismissed outright as 'conspiracy theory' (<http://tinyurl.com/anatomy-of-conspiracy-theory>). In the tightly controlled Left–Right discourse space, it is deemed high-minded scholarship to challenge these reactionary excesses of the sole superpower and to lay them at the doorstep of short-sighted escalation of chauvinistic

foreign policies fueled by the war-profiteering motives of its military-industrial complex.

Virtually one hundred percent of what is deemed respectable Western dissent espouses this foundational axiom. It works well because it draws upon selective empiricism couched in omissions to demonstrate its veracity. But a half-truth is still only a full lie. That full lie works like this:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. **By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an “iron curtain”** between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals. But silence is not enough. If persecution, liquidation and the other symptoms of social friction are to be avoided, the positive sides of propaganda must be made as effective as the negative.’ — Aldous Huxley, Preface (circa 1946) to *Brave New World*, 1931, Harper, pg. 11

Both sides of propaganda are thus put into effect. The mainstream chiefs enact the big lie and repeat it endlessly for the positive side of propaganda. The dissent-chief enact the negative side of propaganda by calculated omission of certain subjects, and by omitting to draw logical conclusions from them because they no longer have to --- the facts have been omitted from the “respectable” discourse space altogether. It is wonderful how this is used to provide the illusion of the free press and free society by both the mainstream press and the so called alternate press:

“The smart way to keep people passive and obedient is to strictly limit the spectrum of acceptable opinion, but allow very lively debate within that spectrum – even encourage the more critical and dissident views. That gives people the sense that there’s free thinking going on, while all the time the presuppositions of the system are being reinforced by the limits put on the range of the debate.”
— Noam Chomsky

This is exactly the same controlled-dissent genre of lauded pontiffs of dissentstream spanning the gamut from Messrs. Ron Paul (<http://tinyurl.com/RonPaul-NWO-Asset>) to Noam

Chomsky himself (<http://tinyurl.com/Hegelian-Dialectic-Dissent>) et. al. on the Left-Liberal-Libertarian nexus, to Foxnews-Right-wing-Religion-Intelligence-State-worship-Patriotism nexus. I am not sure which compartment Francis Boyle (<http://tinyurl.com/francisboyle-2011-humanity>) falls into but it is just as systemic there as elsewhere.

I invite Truthdig to publish the examination referenced below written by a Muslim, yours truly, belonging to the 'untermensch' civilization bearing the full brunt of Chris Hedges' admission that "*We became terrorists too,*" and "*We Are What We Loathe*".

Such banal statements can perhaps win Mr. Hedges multiple Pulitzer prizes for their profundity --- precisely because these neither inform nor educate to the degree necessary for unraveling the entire Hegelian Dialectic, lest it spawn a real resistance movement with teeth singularly focussed on the puppetmasters orchestrating the "*clash of civilizations*". This style of dissent-lite only enables introducing and sustaining *beneficial cognitive diversity* for the purpose of defocussing the energies of conscionable peoples – its primary objective – until fait accompli.

This same learned journalist, and his other confreres in the news media, academe and think-tanks, will be writing all about it in the one-world government and laughing their way to more accolades for their ex post facto brilliance. This is the quid pro quo offered by *history's actors* to the scribes for playing along with platitudes and inconsequential punditry:

'We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality — judiciously, as you will — we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.' — Senior Bush Advisor, The New York Times, October 17, 2004

The real sad legacy of 9/11 is the matrix which intelligent people like Chris Hedges et. al., have woven to keep the American public perpetual *prisoners of the cave*.

While it is true that the martial military-industrial culture created in the United States can superficially be characterized by "*War Is a Force that Gives Us Meaning*", that meaning is neither accorded by its peoples, nor by the unnatural puppetshows they are forced to endure from body-bags to bankruptcies, but enforced upon America by its ruling oligarchy which profits from the mayhem enroute to accomplishing their global governance. The dissent which echoes the axioms of empire is working for the same interests.

Here is a link to my article which takes a forensic look into the **Dynamics of Mantra Creation: Islamofascism**, to demonstrate the villainous half-truth and outright deception embedded in Chris Hedges' manipulative narrative:

[Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation](#)

Or more in-depth deconstruction:

[Anatomy and Architecture of Modern Propaganda Techniques for Psychological Warfare](#)

I hope that minimally at least, the same websites will publish my forensic counterpoint analysis in response to this emotional fluff piece they have put up on the tenth anniversary of 9/11 so that their vaunted pontiffs like Chris Hedges, if genuinely misled themselves, will become more informed and stop unwittingly mis-informing other people. That's a stretch of course --- for how can an award winning NYT reporter be misled on any matter? Surely the awards aren't for *"lowering what Mr. Churchill calls an "iron curtain" between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable"*? And the world wonders why Americans are the most ignorant peoples on earth! These *prisoners of the cave* can perhaps do with a little bit less protection by the guardian angels of high-morality who decide for them what's fit to print and what isn't. Only the New York Times admits to it openly --- all else are damn liars and hypocrites who do the same under the pretense of freedom of the press. I am sure they also *sleep holily in bed*. (Reference to Macbeth 5:1:47-49: 'Yet I have known those which have walked in their sleep who have died holily in their beds.')

Finally, I hope Chris Hedges will offer a riposte other than his characteristic silence to my analysis if I am mistaken. He had previously replied with the same eloquent exuberance for this challenge: [Letter to Editor: Chris Hedges omits key truths in 'It's Not Going to Be OK' February 04, 2009](#).

Thank you.

References

Zahir Ebrahim's writings in chronological order on Chris Hedges' fabled dissent

[1] Zahir Ebrahim, Letter to Editor: *Chris Hedges omits key truths in 'It's Not Going to Be OK'*, February 04, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/02/letter-chris-hedges-its-not-okay.html>

[2] Zahir Ebrahim, *Response to Chris Hedges' amalgam of half-truths 'A Decade After 9/11: We Are What We Loathe'*, September 13, 2011, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/09/response-chris-hedges-decade-after-911.html>

Number Ten Dissent Superman: Dr. Juan Cole

At number ten in the Top Ten list is a mongrel scholar of empire, Dr. Juan Cole, professor of Middle Eastern something or the other at the University of Michigan, and author of *Informed Comment*, a learned blog read by some of the milder anti-war aficionados of the West.

The following letter to Dr. Cole, to which his response was the expected thunderous silence, identifies his obvious omissions. For a professor of Middle Eastern this and that Studies at a prestigious American public university, to omit the facts that follow, demonstrates either a useful idiot, or a superman. Clearly not a songbird despite the pretensions to lofty dissent – for no songbird can ever be willfully incognizant of the standards established at Nuremberg to selectively hang the front-running political harbingers of the Third Reich; despite being largely driven by victor's justice, these international standards today against aggression and war-mongering. with or without propaganda cover, are still sufficient to hang the front-running political harbingers of the Fourth Reich.

Which is perhaps why the un-strange silence by a wholly establishmentarian academic, paid for from the coffers of empire at a public university, playing low-level ex post facto dissent with empire and collecting around him all the naïve mainstream college grads and young mainstream professionals suffering the early birth-pangs of a nascent conscience and searching for meaning in an imperial world of relative morality. That morality which many youngsters in the West still find mutedly abhorrent despite the overtly ubiquitous “United We Stand” drive for conformist thought, was articulated most elegantly by a former justice of the United States Supreme Court:

“Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations which give birth to nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending threat by encasing it in a semantic strait-jacket, we must reply that all concepts are relative.” -- Justice Vinson, U.S. Supreme Court, 1951.

Dr. Juan Cole is in the Top Ten list because he singularly captures, as an insipid and not very profound template, virtually all of mainstream scholars' “respectable” shadow play at dissent for the benefit of the mild-mannered mainstream malcontent in which all the presuppositions of

the establishment are once again maintained in toto as the sacred axioms. These controllers grab the vast majority of burgeoning consciences among the twenty something mainstream “crowd of simpletons and the credulous” for whom the seasoned dissent-chiefs like “arguably the most important intellectual alive”, Noam Chomsky, or the late Howard Zinn, are just too radical, or too far on the left, or just too Jewish. A peaceful American convert to the Bahai faith who loves everyone is just peachy for herding this crowd. The unshakable faith in “Israel’s right to exist”^{*} further endears this mild form of dissent to the American public mind, swimming as it is from its cradle to its grave in the Zionist controlled populist muck, willfully aided and abetted by both the Superman and the useful idiot.

Footnote * Dr. Juan Cole wrote in his wonderful study of *the new McCarthyism* on American Campuses in 2005, registering his modest concern against the organization called Campus Watch then being run by Daniel Pipes and David Horowitz to squelch any adverse debate on the Zionist State in the American academe: “When I have taught the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict at the University of Michigan, I have had fair numbers of Arab-Americans, Muslim-Americans and Jewish-Americans in my class. My class evaluations have overall been good to excellent, but I always have a handful complaints from both sides. Some Arab-Americans blast me for naively accepting key claims of Zionism **when I argue for Israel’s right to exist.**” Juan Cole, *The New McCarthyism*, published April 23, 2005 by Salon.com, <http://commondreams.org/views05/0423-20.htm>

Biographical Note: Juan Cole is a professor of modern Middle Eastern and South Asian history at the University of Michigan and the author of "Sacred Space and Holy War" (IB Tauris, 2002).

Nuremberg:
The grotesquely dancing trumpeting elephant in the
newlywed's bed!

(and still ignored)

Zahir Ebrahim

April 10, 2008.

© Project Humanbeingsfirst™. Permission granted to use freely as per copyright notice.

Document ID: [PHBFZE20080410](#) URL: <http://humanbeingsfirst.org>. | [Print](#) | [PDF](#) | [Comment](#).

To: Juan Cole

From: Zahir Ebrahim | Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Subject: Nuremberg: The grotesquely dancing trumpeting elephant in the newlywed's bed

Date: April 10, 2008

In Ref. to: <http://www.juancole.com/2008/03/unger-iraq-war-was-conspiracy.html>

“... Cheney and the neocons effectively created an alternative national security apparatus to circumvent, sabotage and subvert the \$40 billion a year that the nation spends on intelligence and to disseminate false intelligence about Saddam that would create a basis for war.”

“... and scores of other articles to see that the neocons had been hoping to start the war for roughly a decade before it actually began. ...”

“... that all this could have been the result of mere ineptitude.”

“no ... black propaganda or part of a disinformation campaign that was intentionally done to mislead the American people into supporting a war.”

“... the neocons had deliberately gamed the system. As their policy papers show, they knew they wanted to start the war long before the administration took office and in order to do so they knew they had to control intelligence. That's why Wolfowitz, Perle, and Eliot Abrams began making semi-secret trips to Austin as early as 1998 to convince Bush that an invasion was necessary. That's why, in December 2000, they tried to put Wolfowitz in as head of the CIA. And that's why, when that didn't work, they moved him to the Pentagon where he oversaw the creation of the Office of Special Plans which was in charge of putting out phony intelligence.”

“... we went to war not because of intelligence failures, as X seems to think, but because of intelligence successes--successful black propaganda operations, successful disinformation operations--that were deliberately designed to mislead the American people.”

“As to why, again, ...”

It is a pity that in that entire conversation, the word “Nuremberg”, the word “aggression”, and the words “supreme international crime” do not appear. The “why” of course in that last sentence is immaterial, not much differently than the 'why = quest for “Lebensraum” and 'why = “Eretz Yisrael” still are – just in a different piece of geography, and more sophisticatedly.

In this erudite space of scholars, academics, and 'uber' intellectuals, please permit this humble interjection from a mere plebeian when the following is rehearsed for their profound memories because unfortunately, there is no Justice Robert H. Jackson today to re-assert the definition of “aggressor” to the spectating world that is busily chasing this and that red herring [as victims of the 'technique of infamy'] while the grotesquely dancing, trumpeting, naked elephant shits in the world's midst:

'An “aggressor,” Jackson proposed to the [Nuremberg] tribunal, is a state that is the first to commit such actions as “invasion of its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State. ... If certain acts of

violation of treaties are crimes, they are crimes whether the United States does them or whether Germany does them, and we are not prepared to lay down a rule of criminal conduct against others which we would not be willing to have invoked against us.” ’

Indeed, it is further pertinent to refresh one's imperial memory that the United States Chief Prosecutor at Nuremberg Tribunals had gone on to establish that the overt-acts of aggression, and not the tortuous justifications behind these acts, is what hung the Nazis:

“The intellectual bankruptcy and moral perversion of the Nazi regime might have been no concern of international law had it not been utilized to goosestep the Herrenvolk across international frontiers. It is not their thoughts, it is their overt acts which we charge to be crimes.”

And that these overt-acts of aggression, as argued by Justice Jackson, contained within them, “*all the evil that follows*”. That the first primal aggression was:

“the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole”.

All of the murderous turmoil unleashed in the world since America's “*goosestep[ping] the Herrenvolk across international frontiers*”, which is plainly visible for all to see requiring no speculations, and the apportioning of all the commensurate blame for the horrendous toll upon the 'wretched' nations across the “*Global Zone of Percolating Violence*”, Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, and soon Iran, Pakistan, Syria, accordingly, rests entirely with the sole superpower which constructed its own 'operation canned goods' as its “*new pearl harbor*” for the premeditated “*supreme international crime*” of “*imperial mobilization*”.

Indeed, if the U.S. Chief Nuremberg War Crimes Tribunals Prosecutor Justice Robert H. Jackson were alive today, and he hadn't merely been handing out a 'victor's justice' to the despicable harbingers of the Third Reich when he stated the blatant obviousness of their premeditated intent to commit “*supreme international crime*” of aggression: “***The plans of Adolf Hitler for aggression were just as secret as Mein Kampf, of which over six million copies were published in Germany***”, he would blanketly also re-assert to the equally despicable harbingers of the Fourth Reich the equally blatant obviousness of their premeditated intent to re-commit the same “*supreme international crime*” of aggression: ***The plans of the aggressor for aggression were just as secret as the 'PNAC' on the 'Grand***

Chessboard' that were freely available for download on the Internet, and in major bookstores.

The only significant difference between the two “*supreme international crime[s]*”, as far as anyone can un-emotionally ascertain, and which is amply documented, is that the Nazis didn't get the opportunity to rewrite history as the present day 'ubermenschen' are busily engaged in doing, with willing connivance of their intellectuals, newspaper editorial writers, and various and sundry lower order newsmedia 'circus clowns'.

Furthermore, most obviously, this time around, the vast majority of the Jews and the handful of mastermind Judeofascists among them, are the Reich's best friends, aiders, supporters, sympathizers, and even its overarching master strategists, instead of the object of its wrath! The handful of courageous and inspiring exceptions, gadflies, and men and women of uncommon chutzpah, duly noted.

And finally, the Third Reich never enjoyed the “*full spectrum dominance*” and unopposed unipolar supremacy that enables the present Reich to exert its “*Primacy and Geostrategic Imperatives*” unfettered and unchallenged.

Gentlemen, and gentlewomen, and whichever other species might lurk here in the shadows, the alpha and omega of the matter rests right there. If interested in further clarity on the matter, please see: <http://courttv.com/archive/casefiles/nuremberg/close.html>

[*Editor's note: The above link to Nuremberg transcript is dead; search for Nuremberg Closing Argument transcript on the internet with “Nuremberg Robert Jackson Closing Arguments”]*

And while one is busily deflected writing books and other profound prose - [Nuclear Attack on Iran appears imminent!](#)

For once, could the genuine intellectual gadflies of America kindly try to prevent a pending fait accompli rather than always be concentrating their expertise on that which has already become one? There is hardly any kind of strategic 'solution-think' transpiring anywhere. Almost all are fixated with ad nauseum rehearsing crime stories or merely reciting current events.

How about some uber solutions that can possibly preempt “*imperial mobilization*” and deter the impending “*supreme international crime*” of nuclear holocausting Iran? Or are intellectuals “*as moral agents*” merely there only to rehearse histories and offer platitudes?

Where are the solutions guys? Or at least an analytical postmortem of why you can't come up with solutions? What are the impediments? For that too can possibly point to some solution-spaces.

If your next pay-check depended on you proposing some 'solution', and then 'shipping' a product based on it, and you only get paid if it 'sells', how might you begin to think differently?

If your product is to derail “*imperial mobilization*” and you are in a startup – what's the system architecture, et. al.? That model is pretty close to when it is one's moral imperative! But it is indeed quite far when one is merely playing intellectual games.

In case you are interested: [Responsibility of Intellectuals - Redux](#)

Thank you.

Zahir Ebrahim

[Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

P.S. Some text is excerpted from [Wakeup to the grotesque reality of the 'Grand Chessboard'](#)

References

Zahir Ebrahim's writings in chronological order on Juan Cole's fabled dissent on *Informed Comment*

[1] Zahir Ebrahim, Letter to Juan Cole, *Nuremberg: The grotesquely dancing trumpeting elephant in the newlywed's bed! (and still ignored)*, April 10, 2008, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/04/nuremberg-elephant-in-bedroom.html>

[2] *Response to Juan Cole's 'King's Anti-Imperialism and the Challenge for Obama'*, by Zahir

Ebrahim, January 19, 2009, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/01/respto-juancole-obama-anticolonialist.html>

The “Nigger” by Malcolm X

There was two kind of slaves.

There was the house Negro and the field Negro.

The house Negro, they lived in the house, with massa. They dressed pretty good. They ate good, cause they ate his food, what he left. They lived in the attic or the basement, but still they lived near their master, and they loved their master, more than their master loved himself. They would give their life to save their master's house quicker than their master would.

The house Negro, if the master said 'we got a good house here', the house Negro say 'yeah, we got a good house here'.

Whenever the master would said we, he'd say we. That's how you can tell a house Negro.

If the master's house caught on fire, the house Negro would fight harder to put the blaze out than the master would. If the master got sick, the house Negro would say 'What's the matter, boss, we sick?' We sick!

He identified himself with his master, more than his master identified with himself.

And if you came to the house Negro and said 'let's run away, let's escape, let's separate', the house Negro would look at you and say 'man, you crazy! What you mean separate? Where is there a better house than this? Where can I wear better clothes than this? Where can I eat better food than this?'

That was that house Negro.

In those days, he was called a house nigger. And that's what we call him today, 'cause we still got some house niggers runnin around here.

This modern house Negro loves his master. He wants to live near him.

He'll pay three times as much as the house is worth just to live near his master, and then brag about 'I'm the only Negro out here. I'm the only one on my job. I'm the only one in this school.' You're nothing but a house Negro!

And if someone come to you right now and say 'let's separate', you say the same thing that the house Negro said on the plantation:

'What you mean separate? From America? This good white man? Where you gonna get a better job than you get here?'

I mean this is what you say. 'I ain't left nothing in Africa'. That's what you say.

Why, you left your mind in Africa!

On that same plantation, there was the field Negro.

The field Negro, those were the masses. There was always more Negroes in the field than there was Negroes in the house.

The Negro in the field caught hell. He ate leftovers.

In the house they ate high up on the hog. The Negro in the field didn't get nothing but what was left of the insides of the hog.

They call them chetlands nowadays. In those days they called them what they were, guts!

That's what you were, a guteater. And some of you are still guteaters!

The field Negro was beaten, from morning till night.

He lived in a shack, in a hut. He wore cast-off clothes.

He hated his master. I say, he hated his master.

He was intelligent.

That house Negro loved his master. But that field Negro, remember, they were in the majority, and they hated their master.

When the house caught on fire, he didn't try to put it out, that field Negro prayed for a wind. For a breeze!

When the master got sick, the field Negro prayed that he died.

If someone come to the field Negro and said 'let's separate, let's run.' He didn't say 'Where we going?' he said 'Any place is better than here'.

We got field Negroes in America today.

I'm a field Negro. ---- Malcolm X, [Listen Speech](#)

Dissent Top Brand Names Among The *Nigger* Class – Pakistan

Background Pre-Reading

[1] *THE NIGGERS OF PAKISTAN*, by Zahir Ebrahim,
<http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2011/09/16/the-niggers-of-pakistan-by-zahir-ebrahim/>

[2] FAQ: What is an Intellectual Negro?, by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/02/what-is-intellectual-negro.html>

[3] The Background Pre-Reading for the preceding Massa Class, minimally at least some familiarity with *The White Man's Burden* and *The Mighty Wurlitzer* without which the Eastern mind simply cannot get its head wrapped around the plague of the ubiquitous Intellectual Nigger imported from the West.

Dissent Honor Roll: Top Ten *Intellectual Nigger* Dissent-chiefs of Pakistan most well known in the West

One: [Physicist Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy](#)

Two: [Lawyer Dr. Rafia Zakaria at Amnesty International USA](#)

Three: Politician Imran Khan

Four: Journalist Hamid Mir

Five: Journalist Fatima Bhutto

Six: Scholar Dr. Aisha Siddiqa and *Military Inc.*

Seven: Former Director ISI, Gen. Hameed Gul

Eight:

Nine:

Ten:

(sorry if I missed someone's favorite Intellectual Nigger (or Songbird) in the Top Ten)

When dissecting manufactured dissent, one would be sorely remiss in not dismantling the long list of proverbial Intellectual Niggers who take his and her cue from the *massa* and are equally rewarded for corralling the *field niggers* of their own nation in the same 'United We Stand' direction from all directions. Though often brown in complexion, this lot too speaks with a heavy white American Ivy League accent, and is altogether white in conformist thought despite its tall claims to avant-garde dissent against the *white man's burden* before its own flock.

Virtually all nations of the East today need some inoculation against this pernicious plague imported from the West. Consider this the first doze for the most pathetic people on earth – my own – the Pakistanis.

Shafted since birth in its own red blood, today Pakistan has been self-servingly turned into the “Terror Central” that George W. Bush Jr. as the President of the United States had clairvoyantly prophesied in 2007. The brilliant Yale graduate had subsequently also had the remarkable foresight for the following prognostication reported in the Malaysian press on April 13, 2008, before his seamless handing off the baton of the global superpower leading the perpetual 'Global War on Terror', over to the incumbent President Barack Obama: “If another September 11 style attack is being planned, it probably is being plotted in Pakistan, and not Afghanistan.”

That narrative is experienced daily by the ordinary Pakistanis in suicide bombings and target killings. It is continually echoed by the finest minds and presses in Pakistan spanning the gamut of narrative from its establishment manufacturing consent to its Intellectual Niggers manufacturing dissent – and from whose consistent echoing of the *massa's* propaganda there is simply no escape for the public mind.

Before we take each fabricated dissent Superman or Conman or useful idiot (or Songbird) in turn from the Top Ten list, the term Intellectual Nigger (my neologism) needs a definition. As already examined in the Pre-Reading References above, the term *House Nigger* is the most generous neologism due to Malcolm X, to refer to *Uncle Tom*. In his Autobiography, Malcolm X defined what he meant by it:

Begin Excerpt from FAQ: What is an Intellectual Negro?

'Today's Uncle Tom doesn't wear a handkerchief on his head. This modern,

twentieth-century Uncle Thomas now often wears a top hat. He's usually well-dressed and well-educated. He's often the personification of culture and refinement. The twentieth-century Uncle Thomas sometimes speaks with a Yale or Harvard accent. Sometimes he is known as Professor, Doctor, Judge, and Reverend, even Right Reverend Doctor. This twentieth-century Uncle Thomas is a professional Negro ... by that I mean his profession is being a Negro for the white man.' -- (Malcolm X, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*, 1964, 1999 hardcover edition, Chapter *Black Muslims*, page 265)

Well, that description of the colonized mind turns out to be not all that modern, even though it accurately captures the modern Uncle Tom among all peoples. Witness the following statement in his speech before the English Parliament in 1835, by Lord Babington Macaulay who devised the new education policy for the Indian sub-continent – the Jewel in the Crown of the British Empire:

'We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern, --a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect.' -- (Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay, *Minute on Education*, 2nd February 1835, [page 8](#))

Martin Luther King Jr. also offered a timeless description for the Negro which today transcends skin color and complexion in its empiricism:

'The white establishment is skilled in flattering and cultivating emerging leaders. It presses its own image on them and finally, from imitation of manners, dress, and style of living, a deeper strain of corruption develops. This kind of Negro leader acquires the white man's contempt for the ordinary Negro. He is often more at home with the middle-class white than he is among his own people. His language changes, his location changes, his income changes, and ultimately he changes from the representative of the Negro to the white man into the white man's representative to the Negro. The tragedy is that too often he does not recognize what has happened to him.' -- (Martin Luther King Jr., *A Testament of Hope*, [page 307](#), [read online](#))

The “Intellectual Negro”

Many more complex shades of the 'Negro' have been cultivated in modernity than the ones Malcolm X and MLK had been exposed to. One new shade that I have been grappling with for some time is the “**Intellectual Negro**”. This new shade of the servile Negro which escaped the experiences of the civil and human rights struggles of the American black leaders, has become ubiquitous among Muslims today, especially among Pakistanis, Afghans, and Arabs. Indeed, among all nations along the '*arc of crisis*' in the '*global zone of percolating violence*'.

This kind of Negro is familiar to us under the nom de guerre '**fabricated dissent**', a pernicious variant of 'native informant'.

This Negro, the “Intellectual Negro”, is very sophisticated, and often very intelligent with advanced academic and/or public credentials. This Negro will appear to hector the white man and the white man's establishment, while still managing to echo the white man's core-axioms.

In other words, the intellectual Negro will appear to be an outspoken voice of dissent in favor of the downtrodden and the oppressed, typically from the 'left-liberal' nexus, but will still devilishly manage to echo the massa's core message. Not to deprive the Hegelian Dialectic of its power to sow confusion, he and she equally exist on the 'right-conservative' nexus.

End Excerpt

Let us begin with probably the best scientific mind of Pakistan in dissent. While his contribution to theoretical physics on the world stage may remain in doubt in the public mind until the Nobel prize in physics is announced, there is no question of his contribution to dissent in Pakistan for which the Nobel Peace prize is surely in the offing. He is also the only *Muslim, an atheist and a Pakistani**, as far as I am aware, to have been invited to represent the “Good Muslims” at the 9/11 Memorial Museum site that is to replace (or has already replaced) the WTC towers demolished on September 11, 2001. If memory serves, his notable presence by invitation at the Museum was noted in an email communication to the scribe in the summer of 2007 when the two were still on speaking terms.

Footnote * The absurdity of representing something called the “Good Muslims” by a self-avowed “atheist” is evidently no more a non sequitur for the superman mind than the self-identification: “*Jew, an atheist and a Zionist*” by the late professor of sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem who also rose to play an academician's fabled dissent in Israel, Dr. Barauch Kimmerling; see *My Holiday, Their Tragedy*, 2002, cited and deconstructed in: *The*

endless trail of red herrings, by Zahir Ebrahim, Feb. 28, 2007,
<http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/endless-red-herrings.html> . Relatedly, the many non-invisible interconnectedness of the axes of powers behind the scenes in the creation of the two religion based states of modernity, the Jewish State and the Muslim State, can be gleaned most easily in: *The Search for Historical Truth: Partition of India and Palestine*, <http://pakistan-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/indian-independence-act-1947.html#Editor-Notes> ; also see *Sacred Cow: Allama Iqbal - marde-momin or superman?* By Zahir Ebrahim, where more uncanny parallels are examined.

Number One Intellectual Nigger of Pakistan: Dr. Pervez

Hoodbhoy

The best way to introduce the brightest theoretical scientist of Pakistan, my co-alum from MIT with several MIT degrees, is perhaps with the following revealing anecdote. Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy sent me an article he had written (and I forget which one it was) sometime towards the end of 2007 when we were working closely as confreres on (abstractly) dismantling Pakistan's Higher Education Commission's several boondoggles in Pakistan. I spontaneously remarked to Dr. Hoodbhoy, something to the effect: "if your name wasn't on the article and someone asked me to guess who might be its author, I would have immediately replied Daniel Pipes"!

The poster-boy of Western dissent in Pakistan; the loudest exponent of caution against the "Threat Within" from "militant Islam", or "Islamism" as he likes to call it, which George W. Bush Jr. too, as the then President of the United States, warned in 2008 was becoming "Terror Central" from whence: "If another September 11 style attack is being planned, it probably is being plotted in Pakistan, and not Afghanistan"; and the most earnest exponent of nuclear-free South Asia with clear backing from the American Embassy in Islamabad such that Pakistani Intelligence, in the land where its peoples fearfully go to sleep at night not knowing where they might wake up the next day or who will be in charge, cannot even touch him for all his nuclear bashing of Pakistan's supposed crown jewels; my former confrere has not spoken to me since I called him Daniel Pipes' mouthpiece.

Of all the dissent-chiefs I have spewed endless verbiage upon in great disappointment and disillusion, after Dr. Noam Chomsky, Pervez Hoodbhoy, also his student, is perhaps my biggest delusion. Delusion because I have continued to hope that my fellow countryman is only a mistaken fool with only half-a-brain, the superlative left-half, and not a Superman. But I reached the dubious realization a while back that Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy is neither a fool nor a Superman. He is an Intellectual Nigger instead. And for that unfortunate state of being, perhaps my former friend may be forgiven his specious echoing of the massa's "truths" – for that's what the Intellectual Nigger does naturally, often without being aware of it.

The following is reproduced from my article referenced in Pre-Reading, *The Niggers of Pakistan*. It succinctly sums up many yards of verbiage penned by this scribe on Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy's dissent. That dissent is but an echo of Noam Chomsky and many others of the

massa's class across the board in Pervez Hoodbhoy's fabled "leftwing" dissent.

THE NIGGERS OF PAKISTAN

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Begin Excerpt

As for Pervez Hoodbhoy's lofty demonstration of leftwing compassion for "*Aafia Siddiqui, our new-found dukhtur-e-millat (daughter of the nation)*", see its deconstruction identifying all the omissions in the professional intellectual Negro's narratives in deep servility to the massa – when he could have been the strongest ally for his victim:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/07/flashback-remembering-dr-aafia-2011.html>

Pervez Hoodbhoy's show of fearless rebellion against the forces of imperialism is of course predicated on his theory of "leftwing politics" which he most articulately expounded in his already mentioned ode to the Hegelian Dialectic: [Between Imperialism and Islamism](#). Like a learned physicist Hoodbhoy first postulated the problem, thusly:

"Many of us in the left, particularly in Southasia, have chosen to understand the rise of violent Islamic fundamentalism as a response to poverty, unemployment, poor access to justice, lack of educational opportunities, corruption, loss of faith in the political system, or the sufferings of peasants and workers. As partial truths, these are indisputable. Those condemned to living a life with little hope and happiness are indeed vulnerable to calls from religious demagogues who offer a happy hereafter in exchange for unquestioning obedience.

American imperialism is also held responsible. This, too, is a partial truth. Stung by the attacks of 11 September 2001, the United States lashed out against Muslims almost everywhere. America's neoconservatives thought that cracking the whip would surely bring the world to order. Instead, the opposite happened. Islamists won massively in Iraq after a war waged on fraudulent grounds by a superpower filled with hubris, arrogance and ignorance. 'Shock and Awe' is now

turning into 'Cut and Run'. The US is leaving behind a snake pit, from which battle-hardened terrorists are stealthily making their way to countries around the world. Polls show that the US has become one of the most unpopular countries in the world, and that, in many places, George W Bush is more disliked than Osama bin Laden.”

That Pakistani house nigger's problem articulation of course exactly parrots the blowback mantra of the massa in the West. See my response to Chris Hedges where the massa's controlled dissent is carefully dissected and dismantled:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/09/response-chris-hedges-decade-after-911.html>

Having firmly played the massa's own Hegelian Dialectic of Dissent, which incidentally is what makes getting visas and sabbaticals a trivial matter for Pakistan's most favored leftwing brown-sahib of the American Embassy in Islamabad: ***“I belong to the fortunate few who can get a visa,”*** Hoodbhoy offered his specious solution space of “leftwing politics” --- the key purpose of the Americans for cultivating this house nigger in Pakistan. The main task of *“cognitive infiltration”* to introduce *“beneficial cognitive diversity”* (sic!) among Pakistan's Muslim public, right alongside “Moderate Islam” as the Hegelian counterpoints to “Militant Islam”, to orchestrate internal clashes and divisions in the name of being peace-makers (see verse 2:11 of the Holy Qur'an which warns of precisely this age-old villainy: *“And when it is said to them, Do not make mischief in the land, they say: We are but peace-makers.”*), in Pervez Hoodbhoy's own words:

“The role of the left

Between the xenophobes of the West and the illogical fundamentalism in Muslim societies, the choices keep getting grimmer. A mutually beneficial disentanglement can only be provided by humane, reasoned and principled leftwing politics.

Looking down at planet Earth from above, one would see a bloody battlefield, where imperial might and religious fundamentalism are locked in bitter struggle. Whose victory or defeat should one wish for? There cannot be an unequivocal preference; each dispute must be looked at separately. And the answers seem to lie on the left of the political spectrum, as long as we are able to recognise

what the left actually stands for.

The leftwing agenda is a positive one. It rests upon hope for a happier and more humane world that is grounded in reason, education and economic justice. It provides a sound moral compass to a world that is losing direction. One must navigate a course safely away from the xenophobes of the US and Europe – who see Islam as an evil to be suppressed or conquered – and also away from the large number of Muslims across the world who justify acts of terrorism and violence as part of asymmetric warfare.

No 'higher authority' defines the leftwing agenda, and no covenant of belief defines a 'leftist'. There is no card to be carried or oath to be taken. But secularism, universalistic ideas of human rights, and freedom of belief are non-negotiable. Domination by reasons of class, race, national origin, gender or sexual orientation are all equally unacceptable. **In practical terms, this means that the left defends workers from capitalists, peasants from landlords, the colonised from the colonisers, religious minorities from state persecution, the dispossessed from the occupiers, women from male oppression, Muslims from Western Islamophobes, populations of Western countries from terrorists, and so on."**

Pervez Hoodbhoy used that **"humane, reasoned and principled leftwing politics"** for which: **"No 'higher authority' defines the leftwing agenda, ... It provides a sound moral compass to a world that is losing direction"** to admirably defend a frail and defenseless woman he cynically called *"our new-found dukhtur-e-millat"* in sympathy with his massa's verdict on her without an iota of **"humane, reasoned and principled"** examination of the matter. We see that Pervez Hoodbhoy goes right along parroting his massa, he reproduces their facts, their data, their analysis, and their conclusions, in the guise of being their antagonist – the clever Intellectual Nigger!

But not cleverer than even an ordinary field negro who can administer a single knock-out punch with one hand tied behind his back. Which is why the house niggers tend to lurk only in the shadows of the massa, only dare to engage in WWF style wrestling with their confreres beholden to the same massa and its many instruments who all know how the game is played, and not venture out into *free space* where the field negroes dwell. As the lovely Pakistani singer Sanam Marvi boldly remarked without hesitation on mainstream Pakistan television to

the bs of her interlocuter: “*chootia bana rahe ho?*” (Indelicate Urdu phraseology for “trying to make a fool of me with your fcking bs?”)

End Excerpt

Three Points of Agreement with the Distinguished Physicist Pervez Hoodbhoy

Letter To Editor,

March 25, 2009

Zahir Ebrahim, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org, United States of America

I cannot but help completely agree with the greatest Pakistani physicist Pervez Hoodbhoy whose unsurpassed political brilliance routinely penetrates all that ails Pakistan. He is once again quoted in the foreign press, in this instance, this morning's New York Times in their Mighty Wurlitzer's neurolinguistic programming piece “**U.S. Weighs Sharif as Possible Partner**”, March 25, 2009, astutely observing:

“Nawaz Sharif is a reflection of Pakistani society,” said Pervez Hoodbhoy, a physicist and a critic of current government policies. “He is silent on what matters most: the insurgency. What we need is a leader.”

The three fantastic points of agreements I have with prodigy scientist Pervez Hoodbhoy are entirely captured in that one short passage. It is quite an honor for me to have such a distinguished Pakistani physicist reflect my own humble contentions which no instrument of the patricians will otherwise ever bother to quote or cite, for a lowly plebeian can seldom find a place-setting at their high Tea Parties:

1: “Nawaz Sharif is a reflection of Pakistani society,”

Undoubtedly, the Pakistani society was galvanized by Nawaz Sharif's catalyzing chutzpah to finally overcome their years of apathy to courageously assert: ***I have had it up to my neck and am not going to take it anymore.*** Felicitations to the Pakistani society were noted in the Open Letter to Aitzaz Ahsan of March 16, 2009 (<http://tinyurl.com/dcovnf>).

2: “He is silent on what matters most: the insurgency.”

Indubitably, ***“Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects... totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have by the most eloquent denunciations.”***

Pervez Hoodbhoy's insightful lament on silence about *“what matters most”* I am sure, principally stems only from his idealistic concerns of its propagandistic impact on social discourse as expressed by Aldous Huxley above, and therefore, must also include all pertinent omissions of crucial significance, including those noted in the OPEN LETTER TO NAWAZ SHARIF – THE ROAD AHEAD March 17, 2009 (<http://tinyurl.com/c5vpfu>):

- a) never asserting that stopping the drone attacks from Pakistani territories is your mandate;
- b) never asserting that Pakistan military's job is to defend the nation and its peoples from external threats and not to wage war upon its own innocent peoples, men, women, and children, at the behest of, and payment from, those threatening the country's very existence;
- c) never asserting that the 'war on terror' is a manufactured fiction that is sinking Pakistan into oblivion;
- d) never asserting that 911 was a false-flag operation to create the pretext for a “New Pearl Harbor” to enable pre-planned “imperial mobilization” enroute to 'one-world' government;
- e) and most importantly, never unequivocally asserting that this is NOT PAKISTAN'S WAR and that we must DISENGAGE NOW!

3. “What we need is a leader.”

Agreeing with Pervez Hoodbhoy once again in what is palpably a universal truth, the dire urgency for an co-opted national leadership before the existential question of **“To be or not to be”** is unequivocally answered by the hectoring hegemons on their terms, is un-apologetically spelled out in The Day After – American Agenda for Pakistan March 21, 2009 (<http://tinyurl.com/ctdbps>).

The fact that these remarkable three points of agreement are not insignificant for the future of Pakistan, is demonstrated by the same New York Times article which further elaborated on how Machiavelli is to be employed by the native-informants to harness the public's sentiments in order to credibly foster the American Agenda:

'Maleeha Lodhi, a former Pakistani ambassador to the United States, said Washington's suspicions of Mr. Sharif might actually be helpful. "He is sufficiently distanced from the United States to be a credible partner in the eyes of Pakistanis," she said.'

Not to have the emerging leader be outshined by a mere former ambassador, the New York Times also cites Mr. Nawaz Sharif as voluntarily being part of the American equation provided all his buttons are pressed in the right order:

'Mr. Sharif, in a recent interview, emphasized the similarities between the approach he would take toward militancy and that currently being discussed in Washington, including separating the Taliban, whose members can be talked to, from Al Qaeda, whose adherents cannot.'

And to doubly ensure that any newly installed legal maestro wouldn't be an impediment to the American Agenda in Pakistan, the New York Times further notes what those right buttons might be:

'Aitzaz Ahsan, the leader of the lawyers' movement, said it would not be difficult for the United States to work with Mr. Sharif. On March 15, the Sunday of the protest, Mr. Ahsan accompanied Mr. Sharif in a two-and-a-half-ton, bulletproof Land Cruiser, as the men were swamped by crowds.

Their time together, Mr. Ahsan said, revealed an important characteristic about

Mr. Sharif that Washington should know. “He’s about personal relationships,” he said. “If you befriend him, you can get him to move mountains.” ’

Indeed, **“If you befriend him, you can get him to move mountains”** to foster the American Agenda.

Thank you.

Pervez Hoodbhoy's own words and writings as the celebrated dissenter – judge for yourself to what extent the presuppositions of empire and its “doctrinal motivation” seeded in “Islamofascism” are echoed verbatim in Hoodbhoy's fabled dissent

[1] *After the Terror Attacks of September 11, Two Opinions, Black Tuesday - The View From Islamabad*, by Pervez Hoodbhoy, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, Bulletin 18 - Supplement 2, URL: <http://www.inesap.org/bulletin18/bul18supp.htm>

[2] *Between imperialism and Islamism*, by Pervez Hoodbhoy, Himal Southasian, October-November 2007, URL: <http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2009/10/cacheof-pervez-hoodbhoy-between-imperialism-and-islamism.pdf>

[3] *Pakistan The Threat From Within*, by Pervez-Hoodbhoy, PSRU Brief 13, May 23, 2007, URL: <http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/cacheof-pervez-hoodbhoy-pakistan-the-threat-from-within-psru-brief13-may232007.pdf>

[4] Interview with Pervez Hoodbhoy, *Islam and Science Have Parted Ways*, printed by Daniel Pipes' Middle East Forum, MEF, <http://www.meforum.org/2593/pervez-amirali-hoodbhoy-islam-science>

[5] Pervez Hoodbhoy, *Islam's arrested development*, The UK Guardian, November 25, 2009, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2009/nov/25/islam-science-muslims-religion>

Footnote 1: Pervez Hoodbhoy's echoes of empire's mantras that are also echoed verbatim by

the Trojan Horses implanted among Muslim organizations in the West who have today infiltrated, and totally dominate, virtually all Muslim political representation in the West, such as CAIR, The Council on American Islamic Relations, is amply deconstructed in my response to the 2011 CAIR Report, titled: *CAIR Documenting Islamophobia on the rise in the USA – Calling CAIR to Account for its Omissions*, by Zahir Ebrahim, July 04, 2011, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/07/cair-report-islamophobia-rising-usa.html>

Footnote 2: The Hijacking of the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation which unites Pakistani Niggers with the Jewish neo-con masses like Bernard Lewis, Samuel Huntington, Daniel Pipes et. al., is fully fleshed out in the article: *Hijacking the word 'Islam' for Mantra Creation*, by Zahir Ebrahim, <http://faith-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/08/hijacking-word-islam-mantra-creation.html>

Footnote 3: See the dismantling of American Journalist Chris Hedges in the massa section for more analytical details on the “*truth about matters of human significance*” also craftily omitted by the Intellectual Niggers.

Biography Pervez Hoodbhoy Ph.D.

The following biographical note is from the *Middle East Forum*, a Zionist neo-con Quarterly, presumably of the Jewish Islamophobe Daniel Pipes (op. cit., footnote [4]). They love to promote any intellectual Negro who will profoundly echo, in any convolution, the white man's burden encapsulated in the doctrinal craftsmanship of Jewish scholars like Bernard Lewis, in books such as: “Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror” and “What Went Wrong? The Clash Between Islam and Modernity in the Middle East”:

'Pervez Amirali Hoodbhoy (b. 1950) is one of South Asia's leading nuclear physicists and perhaps Pakistan's preeminent intellectual. Bearer of a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology , he is chairman of the department of physics at Quaid-e-Azam University in Islamabad where, as a high-energy physicist, he carries out research into quantum field theory and particle phenomenology. He has also been a visiting professor at the University of Maryland, College Park, and was visiting professor at MIT and Stanford. For some time, he has been a frequent contributor to Britain's leading intellectual journal, Prospect. His extracurricular activities include a vocal opposition to the political philosophy of Islamism. He also writes about the self-enforced

backwardness of the Muslim world in science, technology, trade, and education. His many articles and television documentaries have made a lasting impact on debate about education, Islam, and secularism in Pakistan. Denis MacEoin interviewed him by e-mail in October 2009.'

Number Two Intellectual Nigger of Pakistan: Dr. Rafia Zakaria

Convince People of Absurdities and get them Acquiescing to Atrocities: The Enduring Power of Machiavellian Political Science

Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Wednesday, April 07, 2010

Another case study of the brilliance of Machiavellian Political Science

Once the hectoring hegemons have created a core-lie and got people to believe or accept it, namely, that 'war on terror' is real and “*our war*”, then many truths within the core-lie can be fabricated, and also are created due to their own natural dynamics with proper black-ops channeling to mobilize insurgency and then officially fighting it as “*counter-insurgency*”. A cook-book recipe for fabricating “*revolutionary times*”, for indeed, “***what is inconceivable in normal times is possible in revolutionary times***”! A self-sustaining system dynamics comes into existence which is closely managed and continually harvested to sustain “***imperial mobilization***”.

These dynamics are the puppetshows of harvest that Rafia Zakaria is commenting on in her DAWN article of [April 07, 2010](#): “Reinventing the Taliban”, while she is strategically silent on the core lie itself:

“Yet to view the controversy as an isolated case connected only to the veracity of the events depicted in the video would be to miss the trajectory of the transformation being planned for the Taliban by the political and military leadership of the country. With the completion of the Pakistan military’s Rah-i-Nijat offensive in Swat, and the near culmination of operations in North Waziristan, the endgame of a long and bloody counter-insurgency operation is

now visible.”

Rafia Zakaria is obviously quite [un]familiar with the vulgar propagandists' crucial tool in their vast arsenal of behavior modification tool-chest:

'The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls and “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.' --- Aldous Huxley in the (circa 1946) Preface to his 1931 novel Brave New World

So, I ask Rafia Zakaria to refute the core-lie as unraveled by this scribe in the following [letter to editor](http://tinyurl.com/native-informants) (<http://tinyurl.com/native-informants>) using her most compelling of logical rebuttals if she believes my deconstruction to be false. Or, explain her silence on the core-lie. Because, I do believe, vulgar propagandist she is not!

But I will take a bet that contrary to my belief, she won't because she is, perhaps inadvertently, part of the same con-game of introducing “*beneficial cognitive diversity*”, as are all the rest of the native-informants and house negroes of Pakistan whose new crowned queen of hearts appears to be this Samar Minallah.

Convince people of absurdities and get them acquiescing to atrocities – and here we have them turning a blind eye to the greatest atrocity of them all: “*the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole*”, from which “*all the evil that follows*” is therefore on the account of those who “*goosestep the Herrenvolk across international frontiers*” with the show of first-aggression by the “*invasion of its armed forces, with or without a declaration of war, of the territory of another State*”.

Any law professor who does not know their Nuremberg – well, perhaps it is only the same old 'likkha-parrha jahils' of modernity coming out of America's top IVYs and becoming the 'Epsilon Semi-moron' to 'Alpha' administrators in the class hierarchy of the Brave New World of Atlas

Shrugged.

From Huxley to Orwell to Russell to Strauss to his mistress Ayn Rand, all have not been merely prescient, but rather have explained the actual blueprint of the future reality of totalitarian scientific dictatorships where commonsense is replaced by zerosense, and moralsense by secular-humanism!

Thus, one may repeatedly rehearse the deconstruction of evolving puppetshows and burlesque adventures of Alice in Wonderland, as does this scribe, over and over and over again, but the *history's actors* have already moved on ex post facto to create the new reality for Alice. Each time incrementally inching the world closer and closer to the overarching endgame of central totalitarian dictatorship in a world government, while we are merely left to just study what they atrociously did in the previous puppetshow:

'We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.' --- Senior Bush Advisor, The New York Times, [October 17, 2004](#)

Such is the power of Machiavellian political science!

Source URL Article: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/04/enduring-power-of-machiavellian-polysci.html>

Zahir Ebrahim Responds to Rafia Zakaria's and Amnesty International's Call for 'prosecution of Taliban leaders for war crimes'

By Zahir Ebrahim | [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Preamble

September 25, 2010

The following letter is Project Humanbeingsfirst's overly polite August 11, 2010 response to jurist doctor [Rafia Zakaria J.D.](#), General Secretary, Board of Directors Amnesty International USA, on her enacting absurdities upon absurdities in the service of empire – and against her own peoples in Pakistan and the United States.

This latest round is as the General Secretary at Amnesty International, charging the fabricated enemy for war crimes against humanity right out of [George Orwell's recipe](#) for convincing a people to continue fighting and dying in the perpetual war against the *dark murdering armies of Eurasia*, without even mentioning the Hectoring Hegemons who militarily invaded other nations and are routinely committing war crimes while [admitting it publicly!](#) Her previous round at foisting imperial absurdities upon the plebes among mankind as the empire's "[House Negro](#)" was examined in [Letter to Editor: The politics of 'Reinventing the Taliban' goes through a core-lie!](#) April 07, 2010.

Can Rafia Zakaria J.D., also a candidate for Ph.D. in political science, be so *innocent of knowledge* like the rest of the tens of millions of mainstream Americans who were easily misled into "United We Stand" with their hectoring hegemons? Can she really be so *Newspeak* blind to the distemper of hegemony as a jurist and political scientist, so damn innocent in the ways of Machiavelli and her own field of study? On the

path to imperial glory, did she become so averse to the pain and suffering of the 'untermenschen' in Iraq and Afghanistan that she cannot see what the United States has done to those poor defenseless nations for its **“imperial mobilization”**? Or, does she rightly know which side her bread, accolades, appointments, and lucrative career is buttered?

The inescapable conclusion, at least for those not sitting on the fence, is that only such *uber learned peoples* shamelessly groveling for fame and fortunes at the feet of the “massa” are congenially appointed to the various prestigious Board of Directors of empire's own instruments of social engineering. Like Daniel Pipes was once appointed to head the Institute for Peace by President George W. Bush. The difference though being that both the latter are among the “massa” themselves, laboriously carrying the **“white man's burden”** to the 'untermensch' as their **“la mission civilisatrice”**, to benevolently give to the barbarians a more civilized **“moderate Islam”** instead of their abhorrent **“militant Islam”** which attacked America on 9/11. It is understandable that the ruling elite would engage in such *Newspeak* based on their overarching agenda to subvert their own democracy which, in the absence of **“conditions of a sudden threat or challenge to the public's sense of domestic well-being”**, remains **“inimical to imperial mobilization”**. For immigrants from the land of the 'untermensch' to echo the hectoring hegemony's message, is akin to joining them in their mission as the **“merchants of aggression.”**

Watch the following merchants of aggression, despite their hubris and their *Newspeak*, eventually take their **“final plunge in ignominy”** in another epoch as the victors vociferously claimed the objectivity of their justice: **“they are crimes whether the United States does them or whether Germany does them”**! Changing epochs does not change the nature of the crimes of aggression which constitutes the **“supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole”**.

If the Taliban are guilty of war crimes, then, by the very definition of war crimes, those who invaded their nation are far more guilty

of a more heinous crime, one which contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole!

But of course, no hectoring hegemon and their associate chanting the various Mighty Wurlitzer tunes, at the peak of their hubris can ever think of themselves suffering that day of ignominy – as is amply evidenced in the following statement of the United States' own Supreme Court Justice in 1951, right after the victor's justice had been juridically administered with great fanfare to the vanquished at Nuremberg: ***“Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrases, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations which give birth to nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our Government in the face of impending threat by encasing it in a semantic strait-jacket, we must reply that all concepts are relative.”***

Victor or victim, all in the world must know and be continually reminded of, that baboons wear no clothes even when they may steal the white man's sunglasses to look cool. Today, the baboons, white, brown, black and stripped, have stolen some clothes to pass themselves off as hominids concerned with the plight of their victims. They come to you weeping at the funeral demanding justice after having killed off your family. And they come to you as the **“peace makers”** after creating the most mayhem on earth! While the baboons may try to lie to themselves in the mirror, we know what they are.

So I can at least agree with Rafia Zakaria and the Amnesty International on their profound conclusion, if not their analysis, that ***“Unless the international community takes a stand on this issue, Afghan civilians will continue to believe that they will be abandoned by the world and left to endure another regime of barbarism.”***

To: Rafia Zakaria <rafia.zakaria@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Amnesty International calls for prosecution of Taliban leaders for war crimes

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Date: Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 12:15 PM

In reply-to: On Wed, Aug 11, 2010 at 11:45 AM, Rafia Zakaria <rafia.zakaria@gmail.com> wrote: My post on our blog today: <http://blog.amnestyusa.org/middle-east/taliban-leaders-should-be-prosecuted-for-war-crimes/>

Hello. Yes. The higher order bit of the matter further requires you go up the hierarchy of war criminals, and not only try to hold monumental criminals accountable for past crimes, but also prevent future ones:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/04/vanilla-or-chocolate-icing-ondevilscake.html>

I never received your response to this [an article version of emailed [Letter to Editor April 07, 2010](#)]

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=18560>

which challenged your narrative and showed it to be an absurdity!

Why not show that challenge to be itself an absurdity if you think it absurd enough to not even respond?

As for Amnesty International [article appended below], I am persuaded by my study of empire and its statecraft to conclude that this organization and many others like it are merely controlled dissent, playing controlled opposition while employing genuine persons seeking justice, presumably like yourself, being made a gullible patsy. See this Open Letter and please examine it in the context of Machiavellian political science – one of creating treadmills for

dissent to run on, really fast, and brilliantly get nowhere:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/12/open-letter-to-amnesty-international.html>

In fact, empiricism indicates that Amnesty International has become, or always was since its inception, merely another tune of the Mighty Wurlitzer – what that is is explained in the following article in case one is unfamiliar with the statecraft of deception [[original article](#)]:

<http://pubrecord.org/special-to-the-public-record/8151/wikileaks-and-the-mighty-wurlitzer/>

Sincerely,

Zahir Ebrahim

[Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

Source URL Letter: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/09/zahir-responds-rafia-zakaria-amnesty.html>

PDF with Rafia Zakaria's Article: <http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/zahir-ebrahim-responds-to-rafiyakaria-amnesty-international-preamble-sept252010.pdf>

Biography Rafia Zakaria J.D

Ph.D Candidate in Political Theory/Comparative Politics,

Indiana University_Bloomington

Columnist DAWN Pakistan

General Secretary, Board of Directors Amnesty International USA

<http://amnestyusa.org/board-of-directors/zakaria-rafia/page.do?id=1641064>

Epilogue

The facts, evidence, and analysis, rests.

But you make up your own damn mind who is the songbird and who is the superman!

The fate of the superman is adjudicated in the images at the very beginning – irrespective of victory or defeat we are now mercifully able to tell who is the prostitute and who isn't – whence, as victor's justice, it finally gets to be administered by the victors to the defeated, and whose own supermen are applauded as the “peace makers”. The fate of the songbird was demonstrated by Socrates. There is no applause. No invitations to dinner.

The author, a justice activist, formerly a Silicon Valley systems architect (see engineering patents at <http://tinyurl.com/zahir-patents>), founded Project Humanbeingsfirst.org in the aftermath of 9/11. He was, mercifully, most imperfectly educated in the United States of America, which might explain how he escaped the fate of “likkha-parrha-jahils” mass produced from its vast manufacturing consent complex with all his neurons still intact, and still firing on all cylinders. Bio at <http://zahirebrahim.org>. Email: humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com .

Source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/09/songbird-or-superman.html>

PDF: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/songbird-or-superman-you-decide-by-zahirebrahim.pdf>

First Published (Rev 0 as work in progress) on Sunday, September 15, 2013 11:45 pm | Last Updated Wednesday, December 23, 2015 04:00 AM 29870 96