

© 2020 Rafiq Islam

This is an open-access article distributed under the CC-BY 3.0 License.

The Science of Fascism within a Democratic Framework: Part 1: Delinearized History of US Presidency

Rafiq Islam

Adjunct, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada

ABSTRACT

No USA president in history has received as much opposition as Donald Trump has from all three components of the Establishment, namely the financial establishment, the political establishment and the corporate media establishment. The election of Donald Trump to the office of presidency is marked with dozens of historical first events that are anything but lackluster, yet a bleak picture of Fascism has been painted to describe Trump. This is an extraordinary piece of disinformation, as no modern president has been more consistent in plainly saying what he will do regarding US military and geopolitical goals, both outside and in office. This, even though his stated position is clearly opposite to the wishes of the dominant cabal, supported by both parties, and to US foreign policy since WWII. USA history is not very long, but Trump presidency and his inaugural speech marked a historic starting point for this 'democracy'. Every sentence of Donald J. Trump's inaugural speech was a departure from diplomacy. Knowing what diplomacy actually means, it's a great step toward transparency. It is the best thing that happened in US political history. It is no surprise the Media established completely flipped, the political establishment gasped, and the financial establishment started to conspire a different strategy (George Soros declaring he wants Trump presidency to fail). In the mean time, the typically apolitical science and technology establishment declared Trump completely unfit for the office that he has just been elected to. Trump's inaugural speech that contained phrases like, "It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget, that whether we are black or brown or white, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots", was in sharp contrast to how Abraham Lincoln viewed America, when he said, "I, as much as any other man, stand in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race... I have no

purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races." Trump's embrace of humanity and righteousness was reminiscent of Prophet Muhammad's last sermon at the pilgrimage, where he said over 1400 years, "An Arab is no better than a non-Arab, and a non-Arab is no better than an Arab; a red man is no better than a black man and a black man is no better than a red man – except if it is in terms of piety." Yet, Trump took oath of office swearing on the bible used by Abraham Lincoln.

In this two-part paper, the key research question answered is what Trump presidency stands for. In answering this question, the first part deconstructs some of the dominant theories of Fascism. Then, a delinearized history is constructed in order to understand how democracy, as applied in USA, has an inevitable outcome of achieving the same goals as a Fascist regime. The concept of religious extremism, including "Islamic terrorism" or "radical Islam" is also discussed with relevance to 'war on terror'. The history of US presidency then shows that the office of presidency is used as a tool to advance a Fascist agenda, albeit being packaged as USA exceptionalism. The ground is set for part 2 that analyses the rise of Trump and the demise of DNC integrity, followed by deconstruction of various allegations against Trump.

Keywords: Donald Trump, US Presidency, Fascism, Technocracy

1 Introduction

The 2116 US presidential election cycle has been unprecedented by even US standards. Various forms of cognitive dissonance have been invoked to come up with conclusions. First, thanks to various levels of disclosures by WikiLeaks, it was concluded that Senator Bernie Sanders supporters cost Hillary Clinton the election. The same fact regarding WikiLeaks disclosure was used to put the blame on the Russians and Putin, who were accused of 'interfering with the US election process'. Of course, this comical suggestion¹ had to imply that Donald Trump's campaign team must have collaborated with the Russians, hence must have been involved what could form a ground for serious charges, such as treason, spying and others. In the mean time, a new mantra was also brewing - Trump's mental health mandate a coup or impeachment, even before Trump took office on January 20, 2017. Former president Obama, whose track record in every issues of contention is far worse than what Trump was even proposing, is elevated to the level of a Saint, with the CIA and NSA and mainstream press suddenly becoming liberal's saviours. The same Liberal entity that once treated President G W Bush with contempt and called him a 'war criminal' are now cuddling up to Bush², his former speech writer, David Frum calling Donald Trump worse than 'a slaveholder' and the 'worst human being ever to enter the presidency'. Liberals who seemed more angry at Hillary Clinton and DNC only a few weeks ago are now railing against Trump with a strident chorus of hate and vitriol.³ Even soft-spoken Senator Bernie Sanders is calling Trump a liar, often making comments such as, "President Trump cannot continue to lie, lie, lie. It diminishes the office of the president and our standing in the world." Yet, other narrative is about Trump setting the clock back to a fascist agenda. It is no

small irony when one is reminded of Secretary Hillary Clinton, who previously told in Ohio that Trump's refusal to accept defeat was unprecedented and lectured the entire USA with such statements as, "Now make no mistake: by doing that, he is threatening our democracy," "But we know in our country the difference between leadership and dictatorship, right? And the peaceful transition of power is one of the things that sets us apart."

At present, Liberals, both mainstream and 'Bernie bro' group are talking Trump in the same vein as fascism. More interestingly, even the mainstream Republic party members as well as typically apolitical entities, such as scientist or financial communities are raising 'concern's about the direction the country is going. Even neoconservatives, such as columnist Robert Kagan posited Trump as a fascist, declaring, "This is how fascism comes to America, not with jackboots and salutes (although there have been salutes, and a whiff of violence) but with a television huckster, a phony billionaire, a textbook egomaniac 'tapping into' popular resentments and insecurities, and with an entire national political party — out of ambition or blind party loyalty, or simply out of fear — falling into line behind him."⁴

In this paper, we briefly summarize what fascism stands for in scholarly terms. We then offer a delinearized history of US presidency and examine the agenda that got Donald Trump elected to the office of presidency. These facts are tallied against the accusations made against Trump in order assess the real motive of the accusations.

2 Fascism and modern political history

Fascism is a term that became familiar with the rise of Hitler's nationalist party. However, until now, the origin of fascism remains a matter of debate. Few recognized the link between nationalism and fascism, while many took shot at left or right to attribute fascism as the inevitable outcome of fringe movements from both left and right⁵. However, it is widely recognized that fascism cannot adapt to democracy⁶. It is important to understand the relationship between nationalism and fascism.

Fascism is commonly understood as a nation-wide belief that a particular nation is superior. Originally, this notion of 'nation' was bound by ethnicity, then it became comingled with race, culture, and finally religion. Germans and Italians are examples of nations that relate to an ethnic group(s). Israel and Pakistan (that ceded from British India in 1947), and South Sudan are examples of nations based on religion. There could be other denominations of a nation, such as language (e.g. Bengali nationalism, German nationalism), but most of modern countries are not formed on a clear basis of such concept of nation, including USA and Canada. However, fascism requires a sense of national superiority that is through the state.⁷ For instance, for the Italian Fascist Party and the German Nazi Party, they both sought out national superiority. Italy led by Mussolini had the expressed intention to "guide the material and moral progress of the [Italian] community."⁸ When Hitler wrote his vision as to reinstate Germany as the "the culture-founder of this earth", there was nothing more than a fundamental assumption of inherent supremacy of

the Germans⁹. The camaraderie formed in the common hubris of a superior nation in Fascism trumps every other considerations of civic society¹⁰.

At least at the outset, a Fascist state is anti-democratic and totalitarian. It doesn't allow democratic institutions, including multiparty systems to flourish. However, one must be weary of the fact that multiparty system itself doesn't guarantee democracy in its scientific system as it is quite possible to have a multi-party system that all serve the same interest of the Establishment that is not erected by a democratic process, even though people are involved in elections. A Fascist state is totalitarian because the decision making process is controlled by the dictator, albeit often packaged as the 'will of the people'. As pointed out by Carsten¹¹, Hitler referred to Parliament as a "twaddling shop", meaning it was a worthless exercise in practical sense. Here, one should note that in western parliamentary democracy, where parliamentarians are bound to vote along the party line (e.g. Canada), the parliament has little significance over a 'twaddling shop' status. A fascist state is considered to be totalitarian because its citizens cede all controls to the state¹². Once again, we see that any democratic state that controls its citizens through media, education, consumerism, and religions is susceptible to becoming a totalitarian regime¹³.

2.1. Religious extremism and Fascism

European version of Christianity in its various form has been anti-Conscience and as such has failed to reflect the will of the people as well as any definitive will of God¹⁴. It is no surprise that the mindset of crusaders is reflected among extreme right parties in Europe. They both share ideological aspects of fascism¹⁵. They promote the same agenda as the Fascists in terms of immigration policies¹⁶ and overall notion of superiority of respective nations¹⁷. It is to be noted here that European version of extreme right doesn't have the 'nation of immigrants' aura around them and the anti-immigration slogans do not distinguish legal immigrants from illegal immigrants. In fact, none of them even recognizes people of non-European origin as a citizen that is entitled to all privileges of the citizen. So, when Jean-Marie Le Pen, leader of the FN (Front National) in France, said, "1 million unemployed- this means 1 million foreigners too many,¹⁸ she wouldn't count citizens of North African origin as French, lumping them to 'immigrants', even when they were citizens for generations. Excuses for holding such condescending beliefs are also further proof that fascism has to accompany some sort of racism. One such justification is that "immigrants" would ruin national culture by preserving their own customs, which are presumably inferior to those of the host country¹⁹. This mindset eventually leads to fear in the form of xenophobia and soon national resentment toward immigrant in particular and 'others' in general become the driver of the political agenda. Various misinformation, such as, welfare benefits going preferentially to immigrants or minority groups and immigrants are more prone to be violent and commit crimes, etc. fan mass hysteria, and the nation as a whole start to follow what Islam et al. called the 'fear model'²⁰ at a personal level. With this fear model, a national state of self deceit and depression sets in increasing vulnerability to form a fascist state. It is often stated that a weak democracy is required for fascism to rise under such culture of fear and resentment²¹. As we shall see in this paper, this statement is not accurate and in fact, ultimately the 'fear model' can only lead to fascism in true scientific sense, often disguised as democracy.

For instance, Mackel²² argues,

“The democratic conditions within which these parties operate ultimately do not allow fascism to flourish. Democracy is more deeply entrenched during the contemporary era than it was in the post-World War One era. While Nazis and Fascists managed to overthrow the democratic regimes in their countries, there are now supranational and national barriers that discourage this from happening.”

The problem with this narration is, Nazis didn't ‘overthrow’ any democratic regime. They did nothing outside of the democratic forum. The second problem is that today with the Establishment firmly in control of all political parties, the mainstream media, and financial institutions, a fascist regime is hardly needed. In fact, the level of government control that is quite clearly in place today is far more stringent than the Nazi era control. The fact that the extreme right parties²³ operate in countries that are part of the European Union is no solace because as Brexit has taught us the lesson that belonging to EU is not something that guarantees anything. Also fallacious is the notion that the mindset of modern democracy is such that the right wing parties have to citizens’ expectation and thus remain democratic. Whatever fascism aspires to accomplish, including control of the general public, forced indoctrination, thought control and others can all be accomplished within the framework of democracy. Fascism in Germany didn't collapse because of democracy, but indeed it was democracy that set the stage for Fascism. Today, the scenario hasn't changed as it is perfectly legal within a democratic perimeter to pass any law, however obtuse and oppressive, to pass without the threat of judicial intervention, which is part of the democratic establishment. Religious extremism plays a peculiar role because religion enjoys the ‘freedom of religion’ protection but there is no standard to determine if a group is acting as per the religious right. In fact, this standard is entirely arbitrary in Christianity due to the fact that there is no religious scripture that can be considered to be universal²⁴.

However, it is true that democracy changes the nature of the expressed goals of extremist parties. The new modus operandi avoid focusing on a populist leader who embodies the will of the people. Instead, new parties with fascist aspirations obscure the agenda behind ‘will of the people’. In essence, the only thing that changes from a typical fascist approach is how Fascism is packaged. This form of fascism can indeed survive quite well under the guise of democracy and share power with other parties with similar agenda. In summary, they emerge as Fascists in disguise.

2.2. ‘Radical Islam’ and Fascism

Even/though 9 11 is synonymous with “islamic terrorism”, this narration is older in the context of Israel. Terrorism has long been the chief demonizing marker that Israel and the United States have used in their wars against Arab states and peoples who have stood in the path of their imperial ambitions.

“While it may be true—and probably is—that not all Muslims are terrorists, it also happens to be true that nearly all terrorists are Muslim.” - Dan Gillerman, Israeli Ambassador to the UN, March 7, 2006

Israel has led the way in charting this course. With massive propaganda, the Zionists succeeded in equating the Palestinian resistance with terrorism. In no Western country did this propaganda encounter greater success—including Israel itself—than in the United States. Most liberal Americans—and a few leftists—argued that Palestinian terrorists threatened Israel’s existence.

After the capitulation of Egypt at Camp David, Israel pursued more lofty ambitions. The original dream of a Pax Israelica, stretching from Morocco to Pakistan, now seemed within reach. Only the newly emerging Islamist forces in the region—notably, in Iran—now stood in its way.

Islam²⁵ pointed out that in every epoch, political elites have controlled major avenues of the legal and political arena, redefining fundamental values and rights. During Palestinian-Israeli conflict, any force of resistance was equated with “Islamic terrorism”. This word gained great traction after 9/11 terror attack. Jihad that is understood as legitimate resistance against oppressive regime was equated with terrorism and ‘Islamic terrorism’ and ‘Islamic fascism’ became the buzzword of the decades that would follow 9/11. After terror attacks and other “excitement inducing” information found on the media, the observers—we in the west—consider reiterating our stance on toleration and views on whether or not Islam is really a “peaceful” religion. This has been a source of great deal of confusion. As Mackel²⁶ points out, the conditions within which the extreme right national-populist parties operate are deemed comparable with Islamic movements, radical Islamic movements being considered to be identical to fascist movements. Although the Nazi Party’s extermination of Jewish people appears to be religious persecution, being Jewish was considered a racial, rather than a religious, trait. To determine whether radical Islam is a manifestation of fascism, one must analyze its ideology, and that analogy is made available in ample proportions, albeit with a great deal of disinformation.

Islam²⁷ pointed out that liberal narration of Islam often conflate true Islam with right-wing Christian demagogues and thus with fascism. This conflation is rooted in the fact true Islam, as in prophet Muhammad’s time seek out absolute control of the state, albeit within the confine of Islam. Here, absolute refers to strict adherence to the rights and privileges offered by the Qur’an. As such, an Islamic state is anti-Democratic because mere fact that a majority supports a policy doesn’t get any brownie point unless the first criterion of righteousness is fulfilled. As such, the state imposes *sharia*, or Islamic law, rather than democratic laws. Also, these laws are not negotiable but their applicability can be determined by the head of state (Caliph), who himself assumes leadership by virtue of his righteousness or divine authority as opposed to receiving mandate through public majority. Theoretically, the two sets of laws can overlap, in that sharia principles are also democratic principles. However, that doesn’t make them equivalent, as has been pointed out by Islam²⁸ as well as Sardar²⁹, who wrote, “Power within the framework of the Qur’an is trust, an *amana*. It is both a trust from God as ‘God grants His authority to whoever He pleases’ (2:247) and from people who have been consulted and entrusted the role of leadership to a particular individual. The leader is thus responsible for this trust to both: to God in the Hereafter; and to the people in this world. If this trust is not handled properly, it should be handed back diligently and without violence: God commands you [people] to return things

entrusted to you to their rightful owners, and, if you judge between people, do so with justice' (4:58)."

This observation changes the entire paradigm. At a personal level, this amounts to what Aristotle called 'ideal life' with more thrust toward honor, and intellectual reflection than to seeking pleasure, in order to reach some sort of superiority. While modern philosophers recognized that this notion is in conformance with Plato's, few if any have sought out consistency in this approach. For instance, if the purpose of life is determined a priori, which would then turn intellectual reflection into conscientious participation within a society. Plato as well as Aristotle understood this 'vice' as something driven by desire, which is inherent. It's not because of the propensity to sin (similar to what is stated as 'original sin'), it is rather because humans have this inherent weakness to take the short cut, which leads to deciding on a short-term approach. Qur'anic principles describe this notion as being a test, which is inherent to the purpose of life for all humans³⁰. Every such test has both individual and political component in it. Figure 1 shows how the balance between individual liberty and regulatory control is made. At the end, what we have is optimization of two contrasting trends. If regulatory control is increased, one is not expected to have any accountability and a test loses its meaning. On the other hand, if individual liberty is excessive, then it leads to anarchy and, at the same time, accountability skyrockets, making it impractical for humans to survive the tests with their limited ability. The intersection of these two graphs represents the optimum that in Aristotle's word is the 'middle of the extremes' and '*Ummatul wassata*' (the group of middle path) in the Qur'an.




Figure 1. Good behaviors in humans lie within optimum regime of individual liberty.

Human behaviors, therefore, are subject to conscious awareness of individual liberty and social responsibility, both being governed by an external standard, which is known as divine injunction.

Notwithstanding false claims of divinity, this standard is essential to human good behavior and without such standards, there is no ground for any discussion of the purpose of life, morality or even consistent set of ethics. According to Aristotle, political science is the science that studies the good for humans. This leads us to Aristotle's conception of government and society. In brief, Aristotle believed that societies can only survive and flourish if there is some basic agreement about issues of private morality. This notion, however, cannot move further without clarifying what standard must be applied to define morality³¹. European post Thomas Aquinas philosophers showed little interest in determining what standard applies to define morality. Instead, they have moved toward putting themselves as the standard, irrespective of their non-secular (e.g. John Locke) or secular (e.g. Thomas Hobbes) stand³². This notion has permeated through US socio-political culture that presented such paradoxes as allowing individual moral and religious pluralism while claiming that US was founded on certain Judeo-Christian values. Islam et al.³³ have demonstrated that none of these notions has any scientific footing and is not amenable to historical accuracy.

Table 1: Comparison of Islamic state and a fascist state

Points	Fascist state	Islamic state
1	Absolute power to dictator	Absolute power to Creator
2	Dictator's manifesto the source of laws and policies	Qur'an the source of laws and policies
3	Power concentrated to the most corrupt	Power concentrated to most righteous
4	Pragmatism dictates motivation	Long-term success dictates motivation
5	Supreme authority to the Establishment	Supreme authority to the most righteous
6	No individual liberty	Optimum individual liberty
7	Accountability in this world	Accountability in hereafter
8	Totalitarian state	Minimum Intervention of state
9	Most popular rises to power	Most righteous rises to power
10	Leader cannot be removed	Leader can be removed in case non-compliance with <i>shariah</i>
11	Controls all aspects of life, such as the social, cultural, economic, and political in order to gain control over people.	Takes holistic approach, providing guideline over all aspects of life, but giving personal freedom to privacy. Qur'an (49:12) prohibits spying on fellow citizens.

12	Goal of world dominance achieved through aggression	Casus belli is strictly related to self defence of the Islamic state
13	National identity is the prime consideration	Righteousness is the prime consideration

Table 1, which draws upon recent research findings of Islam,³⁴ shows how Islamic state is diametrically opposite to a fascist state. In fact, the optimum point (intersection of the two curves) is Islam, whereas the fake version of it is Fascism. This observation is starkly different from mainstream Eurocentric writers that fail to cognize with deductive logic³⁵. It turns out that Fascism is just deregulated corporatism, which itself is a regurgitated form of Dogma that once unleashed waves of Crusades, whose agenda fits perfectly the agenda of dreaded Fascist manifesto. As for democracy itself, it's absurd and tragic that it's taken people 40 years just to start realising what their elected governments have given them. As such, Islam is simultaneously undemocratic and anti-Fascist³⁶. Islam is submission to the will of Allah, who is the only entity that is both external and universal simultaneously, whereas Democracy is allegedly submission to the will of the majority. The former one is a true claim³⁷, backed with Qur'an and book of hadith, whereas the latter is a false claim. For instance, at no time Democracy represented the will of the majority, it's the small minority that sets up the show and the majority rubber stamp it. Nothing has changed from the Imperial era.

3 Delinearized history of US presidency and government control

Plato said, "Strange times are these in which we live when old and young are taught falsehoods. And the one man that dares to tell the truth is called at once a lunatic and fool." Few question the notion that this 'strange times' is now when it comes to politics. Fewer understand the meta data that go behind these 'strange times', even fewer appreciate how this 'strange times' have pervaded all aspects of our civilization for centuries, and practically no one sees this as a problem has a non-Pragmatic solution.

Many dislike the current system but few see the big picture and the direction that our civilization is moving and none can tell us how to fix the system.

According to former U.S. President George W. Bush, the Department of Homeland Security in Washington, DC and many others, the maintenance of beliefs by any individual that counter officially accepted views is a personality disorder of such toxicity as to mandate deployment of an entire system for attacking the psyche of such individuals until they "crack" or are destroyed. As a 2006 article in the Sunday New York Times Magazine disclosed, this was indeed the object of an elaborate and carefully-planned program of government-funded research. As part of this research, an entire regime of randomized psychological "torturetesting" of people was launched and justified as an effort to catch lies and liars in general on the basis of refining and overcoming the defects

of polygraph technology in particular. To grasp the decadence implicit in this proposition, consider the underlying logic of this matter launched during the Bush Administration and continuing to date:

Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists (MAJOR PREMISE)
Those who are with us never lie (MINOR PREMISE); therefore
All liars must be terrorists and all terrorists must be liars (CONCLUSION)

This Bush model is contextually important for this paper as with Trump the entire Bush clan, including GW Bush has unleashed a series of unflattering commentary on Donald Trump, making GW Bush particularly praiseworthy by the liberal media³⁸. We argue that the infamous Bush model has been operation throughout US presidency. In our recent work, we analyzed the *modus operandi* used by all US presidents and concluded that the systematic disinformation by the government has become progressively more toxic, albeit less transparent.^{39,40}

Islam et al.⁴¹ argued that the modern day United States government is involved deeply and Extensively, covering all sectors of entities, namely the financial establishment, the political establishment, and the media establishment — sometimes as director, other times as financier and guarantor. Such a state of affairs has come about one of the most important results of a congressional-military-industrial complex of seemingly infinite plasticity over the last seven decades following the Second World War. The corporate façade of this set of structures seems very new. On delinearizing the actual history, however, it becomes apparent that this vast complex sits atop the post-colonial foundations on which the United States of America was erected in the last quarter of the 18th century. It was in this period following the American colonists' victory over the British occupier that the true corporatization of politics was completed.

The monarch was replaced by a "The president" who would essentially still possess all the essential executive powers run the show, that is to control the military, determine foreign policy, command the "executive departments," and making lifetime appointments to the all powerful federal courts. Using chicanery, bribery, and other ruses, along with propaganda, the Federalists were able to induce specially created state conventions to ratify the Constitution. Little did the people know at the time that once their state joined the New Order it could be blocked from a thousand directions should it ever attempt to never leave. We have examples of such system starting from George Washington. As soon as he was elected president and assumed power of the presidency, he and his éminence grise, Alex Hamilton, began to establish a national bank, taxes, tariffs, a standing army, and all the other impositions the colonists had rebelled against under George III. In the conditions of the war for independence and its aftermath, however, the popular memory of the British colonizers' treatment of its American subjects was generally tolerant whereas punishments meted out by the Washington junta against those who fell afoul of its laws were widely resisted. Thus for example, when a revolt broke out in Pennsylvania against the national tax on whiskey — the "Whiskey Rebellion" of 1794 — George Washington responded by leading 13,000 troops into the state to crush it. The army of the Second Republic enabled the new regime to put down dissent far more effectively than could the British in 1775 or

Taxachusetts in 1786. Moreover, the American people had been propagandized into believing that, whatever happened, they were simply governing themselves. This was the Big Lie that took root sufficiently that the populace allowed the imposition of a far worse tyranny almost anything imposed by the British outsider. Of course, the likelihood of being hanged as a traitor to the state has served as a means of dampening the spark of Liberty down the ages.

A delinearized history makes it clear that George Washington was a rich man — not unlike Silvio Berlusconi today — whose wealth enabled him to construct an ongoing international role as an important statesman to reckon with, not unlike Silvio Berlusconi today. Gardner⁴² described the financial status of George Washington whose real worth at time of death was \$25.9 billion, taking fourth place in the Forbes list of seriously wealthy Americans. Bill Gates is in first place at \$59 billion, Warren Buffett in second at \$39 billion, and Larry Ellison of Oracle fame gets the bronze medal with a \$36 billion stash. Washington's \$25.9 billion sneaks him in just ahead of Christy Walton of the Wal-Mart chain. The first president is in rich company. There, unlike what he claimed to be the case⁴³, George Washington's success came through his half-brother, 14 year older Army officer, membership in the Masonic lodge, engineered marriage with a rich widow, and numerous shady deals that have all the hallmarks of a mafia-like entity.

The next figure to approach Washington's iconic standing, Abraham Lincoln, was the person that said, "I, as much as any other man, stand in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race... I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races (still a backwoods Illinois politician and lawyer but married to Mary Todd, daughter of a wealthy & politically highly-connected family of slaveowners, 1858). These were not the saviors of human rights and civic dignity, they were simply the new Crusaders, obsessed with Money, Sex, and Control. So, why did they ever do anything that could touted as 'positive'? Abraham Lincoln gave the answer by himself. He wrote:

My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union, and is not either to save or to destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it, and if I could save it by freeing all the slaves I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that. What I do about slavery, and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save the Union; and what I forbear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union. (Letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862)

As Thomas DiLorenzo⁴⁴ and a number of non-court historians have conclusively established, Lincoln did not invade the Confederacy in order to free the slaves. The Emancipation Proclamation did not occur until 1863, by which time opposition in the North to the war was rising despite Lincoln's police state measures to silence opponents and newspapers. The Emancipation Proclamation was a war measure issued under Lincoln's war powers. The proclamation provided for the emancipated slaves to be enrolled in the Union army replenishing its losses. It was also hoped that the proclamation would spread slave revolts in the South while southern white men were away at war and draw soldiers away from the fronts in order to protect

their women and children. The intent was to hasten the defeat of the South before political opposition to Lincoln in the North grew stronger. DiLorenzo (2002) points out: "Lincoln spent his entire political career attempting to use the powers of the state for the benefit of the moneyed corporate elite (the 'one-percenters' of his day), first in Illinois, and then in the North in general, through protectionist tariffs, corporate welfare for road, canal, and railroad corporations, and a national bank controlled by politicians like himself to fund it all."

Lincoln was a man of empire. As soon as the South was conquered, ravaged, and looted, his collection of war criminal generals, such as Sherman and Sheridan, set about exterminating the Plains Indians in one of the worst acts of genocide in human history. Even today Israeli Zionists point to Washington's extermination of the Plains Indians as the model for Israel's theft of Palestine⁴⁵.

The trend of luring US Presidents to control the general public continues today,⁴⁶ when Donald Trump tops the list with a net worth of \$3.7 billion. However, Donald Trump's exception is, he had never held a public office prior to being elected the President.

In all, USA was created primarily and essentially as a business, an ongoing and expanding corporate enterprise with windfall profit. At present, it has become a wonderful profitable entertainment industry. It is no surprise that the State Department, the Department of Defense, the Pentagon and all of the armed forces have large and active sales organizations to promote their latest war. The industry offers guaranteed growth, excellent return on your investment - and an ongoing narrative. This most amazing 'war business', coupled with the chemical and pharmaceutical industries, has become the most profitable business for which in investment or real capital is required. Thanks to the democratic government institutions, the taxpayers foot the bill and provide the bodies.

So, amass all the wealth? It is clearly to gain more and more control over the public, then in turn repeating the accumulation cycle. In this process, both the media and the religious institutions have played a great instrumental role and been able to operate without interference owing to freedom of expression and religious freedom provisions in the constitution. With the media, the primary method of social control had been through the creation of narratives delivered to the public through newspapers, then radio, then TV, and now through computers, cell phones and any other gadget that can convey information. This reality has given rise to an obsession among the power elite to control as much of this messaging as possible. The information age has given previously unthinkable access to the general public. The media establishment takes the various narratives pushed by the State Department, the White House, Pentagon, NATO and other agencies pushing various narratives to sell the American people and other populations on how they should view U.S. policies, rivals and allies and process them as 'facts', thereby turning propaganda into reality.

While such modus operandi has been in place for the longest time, the Reagan era took this obsession to a new low. In the early 1980s when the Reagan administration sought to override "the Vietnam Syndrome," a public aversion to foreign military interventions that followed the Vietnam War. To get Americans to "kick" this syndrome, Reagan's team developed "themes"

about overseas events that would push American “hot buttons.” The Information age had just dawned on us.⁴⁷ Equally significant has been the spying⁴⁸ on US nationals, both overseas and in USA⁴⁹.

This process has created a society of conformists, including the mainstream media and activist groups. The very survival of any of these entities depends on their conformity to the official narration of every event of significance. This conformity has been costly to the American national interests.. For instance, the disastrous Iraq War, which has cost the U.S. taxpayers over \$1 trillion, led to the deaths of some 4,500 American soldiers, killed hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, and unleashed chaos across the strategic Middle East and now into Europe. Most Americans now agree that the Iraq War “wasn’t worth it.” But it turns out that Official Washington’s catastrophic “group thinks” don’t just die, they simply morph into something more sinister. well-deserved deaths.

So, when the public caught on to the Iraq War deceptions, the neocon/liberal-hawk pundits just came up with a new theme to justify their catastrophic Iraq strategy, i.e., “the successful surge,” the dispatch of 30,000 more U.S. troops to the war zone. This theme was as bogus as the WMD lies but the upbeat storyline was embraced as the new “group think” in 2007-2008.

Then we entered the Obama era.

3.1. The Nadir of Democracy

On the last of his presidency, President Obama was briefed on the impending war in African, involving Senegal, Gambia, Nigeria, and others. It's pathetically tragic final act of the First "son of a Muslim" Nobel Peace Laureate US President, who didn't know Islam or Peace. On his last day in office, there was a regime change in Africa⁵⁰.

When George Soros picked up Obama, then a 1st time Junior Senator of Illinois to lead the 'most powerful nation', some were surprised. After all, this son of an African "Muslim" was known as friend of Palestine. His empathy for Palestine paralleled that of Nelson Mandela's and his contempt for Zionist oppressors was something like Desmond Tutu's. More remarkably, unlike Mandela or Tutu, he didn't have a Christian heritage. By both scientific and cultural definitions (in Islam every child is born Muslim and in Muslim culture, son of a Muslim man is a Muslim, no matter who the mother is), Obama would be a Muslim. This would mean he would know what Islam is, at least anyone even remotely familiar with the Arabic word knows, one of the two meanings of the word "Islam" is 'peace'. Of course, this Obama knew about the Peace, just like Ariel Sharon knew about peace making. It was no small irony that Obama shared another trait with Mandela and Tutu, he did win a Nobel Peace Prize. Also first was the fact that he received the Nobel Prize entirely based on the promise of 'hope'.

But, why did Soros want him to be the President?

A Canadian author and social scientist, Gary Zatzman said to the author at that time when everyone thought Obama was far less likely to be the nominee than Jesse Jackson, "You see, they have ravaged all the Middle East, now it's Africa's turn and what better person to do the killing than a son of Africa". Hindsight is 20/20, but this was 2006.

If history should remember Obama, it should remember him as the son of Africa that ravaged Africa⁵¹. Never before there was such sustained attack against civilians as there was in Yemen. Never before democracy was so savagely massacred as was in Egypt. Never before in history, the weakest and the most vulnerable of all were so extremely brutalized as in Somalia.

Never before in history, a peaceful country was turned into a civil war hotspot as done in Libya. Libya is a special kind of cruelty. Gaddafi was one of the most faithful and useful stooges of USA. Nothing mattered and for that matter even Ambassador Stevens had to go, just like the United States Ambassador to Pakistan, Arnold Raphel as well as General Herbert M. Wassom, the chief of the U.S. military mission in Pakistan had to disappear. In the mean time, no one took notice that the estranged former wife of Ambassador Raphel was still active in US covert operation strategies.

How ironic that all countries invaded during Obama were African and all countries that suffered savage killings of innocent civilians were also Muslim. Indeed, Obama's brand of Peace of Islam is the same brand that sees Ariel Sharon as the man of peace and prophet Muhammad as the terrorist. The time to call Israel the fountain of Democracy and USA the defender of truth has arrived.

In summary, US political system has been all about money and the bank,⁵² in which presidents have been used as a tool. Whenever there was any non-conformance, the financial establishment cracked down on the president until submission. The case in point is Andrew Jackson. During his administration (1829–1837), Anti-Bank Democrats were mobilized in opposition to the national bank's re-authorization on the grounds that the institution conferred economic privileges on financial elites, violating U.S. constitutional principles of social equality. They considered the Second Bank of the United States to be an illegitimate corporation whose charter violated state sovereignty, posing an implicit threat to the agriculture-based economy dependent upon the Southern states' widely practiced institution of slavery. With the Bank charter due to expire in 1836, the President of the Bank of the United States, Nicholas Biddle, in alliance with the National Republicans under Senator Henry Clay (KY) and Senator Daniel Webster (MA), decided to make rechartering a referendum on the legitimacy of the institution in the elections of 1832. When Congress voted to reauthorize the Bank, Andrew Jackson vetoed the bill. This was the first move by a president that took side of the "farmers, mechanics and laborers" against the interest of the financial establishment. In the presidential campaigns of 1832, this 'bank war' was the central issue in mobilizing the opposing anti-Bank Democrats and National Republicans. Jackson and Biddle personified the positions on each side. Jacksonians successfully concealed the incompatibility of their "hard money" and "paper money" factions in the anti-Bank campaign, allowing Jackson to score an overwhelming victory against Henry Clay. Such success

by a president is unprecedented. It would turn out that such move stood right up until the Democratic Woodrow Wilson corruptly sold out to get himself elected and in 1913 signed the Federal Reserve Act, which he regretted to his dying day. Of course, it is claimed that Woodrow Wilson received the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in establishing the League of Nations but one would have to be very naive not to realize that awarding him the prize was almost certainly far more connected with his much earlier corrupt support for the Federal Reserve Act than with his support for the short lived League of Nations.

It is no surprise that the same pro-Establishment politicians that treat President Donald Trump with utmost contempt see President Andrew Jackson as a villain. Former Secretary, Robert Reich wrote:

“Last night in Nashville, Trump laid a wreath on Andrew Jackson’s tomb. One of Trump's first decisions as president was to move a portrait of Jackson into the Oval Office. He has opposed replacing Jackson's image on the \$20 bill with Harriet Tubman. Jackson was a populist but he was also a racist. He forced Native Americans out of the South, explaining to Congress that “Established in the midst of another and a superior race, and without appreciating the causes of their inferiority or seeking to control them, they must necessarily yield to the force of circumstances and ere long disappear.”

Jackson doesn’t belong on the \$20 bill or on the wall of the Oval Office. Nor should he be honored and emulated by a president of the United States.”

Reference to Jackson as being racist is rich. All US presidents were racist, including Abraham Lincoln, as we have established earlier on in this paper. Moreover, no President is more deserving of a place on US paper money than Jackson because he stood for nothing if not opposition to ceding control of the currency to private, largely foreign interests and to ensuring that it was backed by more than a hope and a prayer. Robert Reich represents the Nadir of hypocrisy of the left.

3.2. The role of media

Possibly the most toxic legacy of President Obama would go down in history is his administration completely incapacitated investigative journalism and turned MSM into a propaganda machine of the left. President Obama and his administration have been the driving force in this manipulation of public opinion with the MSM marching at the Whitehouse drum beat. Instead of the transparent government that Obama promised, he has ran one of the most opaque, if not the most secretive, administrations in American history.

Besides refusing to release the U.S. government’s evidence on pivotal events in these international crises, Obama has prosecuted more national security whistleblowers than all past presidents combined.

That repression, including a 35-year prison term for Pvt. Bradley/Chelsea Manning and the forced exile of indicted National Security Agency contractor Edward Snowden, has intimidated current intelligence analysts who know about the manipulation of public opinion but don't dare tell the truth to reporters for fear of imprisonment.

Yet numerous "leaks" were routinely published by MSM and they were all vetted, approved, or actually planted by the Obama administration. These "leaks" were part of the propaganda, made to seem more trustworthy because they're coming from an unidentified "source" rather than a named government spokesman.

From NATO's Gen. Philip Breedlove to the State Department's Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy Richard Stengel, the manipulation of information is viewed as a potent "soft power" weapon. It's a way to isolate and damage an "enemy," especially Russia and Putin.

Putin also assisted Obama on another front with another demonized "enemy," Iran. In late 2013, the two leaders collaborated in getting Iran to make significant concessions on its nuclear program, clearing the way for negotiations that eventually led to stringent international controls.

These two diplomatic initiatives alarmed the neocons and their right-wing Israeli friends. Since the mid-1990s, the neocons had worked closely with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in plotting a "regime change" strategy for countries that were viewed as troublesome to Israel, with Iraq, Syria and Iran topping the list.

Putin's interference with that agenda – by preventing U.S. bombing campaigns against Syria and Iran – was viewed as a threat to this longstanding Israeli/neocon strategy. There was also fear that the Obama-Putin teamwork could lead to renewed pressure on Israel to recognize a Palestinian state. So, that relationship had to be blown up.

The detonation occurred in early 2014 when a neocon-orchestrated coup overthrew elected Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich and replaced him with a fiercely anti-Russian regime which included neo-Nazi and other ultra-nationalist elements as well as free-market extremists.

Ukraine had been on the neocon radar at least since September 2013, just after Putin undercut plans for bombing Syria. Neocon Carl Gershman, president of the U.S.-government-funded National Endowment for Democracy, wrote a Washington Post op-ed deeming Ukraine "the biggest prize" and a key steppingstone toward another regime change in Moscow, removing the troublesome Putin.

Yet, during the Ukrainian coup, The New York Times and most other mainstream media outlets played a role similar to what they had done prior to the Iraq War when they hyped false and misleading stories about WMD. By 2014, the U.S. press corps no longer seemed to even pause before undertaking its expected propaganda role.

So, after Yanukovych's ouster, when ethnic Russians in Crimea and eastern Ukraine rose up against the new anti-Russian order in Kiev, the only acceptable frame for the U.S. media was to blame the resistance on Putin. It must be "Russian aggression" or a "Russian invasion."

When a referendum in Crimea overwhelmingly favored secession from Ukraine and rejoining Russia, the U.S. media denounced the 96 percent vote as a "sham" imposed by Russian guns. Similarly, resistance in eastern Ukraine could not have reflected popular sentiment unless it came from mass delusions induced by "Russian propaganda."

As early as 2012, the Corbett report revealed the way the media has become a part of the US government propaganda scheme⁵³. The report stated:

To understand this seeming paradox, we must first understand the centuries-long history of how media has been used to whip the nation into wartime frenzy, dehumanize the supposed enemies, and even to manipulate the public into believing in causes for war that, decades later, were admitted to be completely fictitious.

3.3. The role of technology

The technology is facilitating government control is undeniable. At the same time as the internet was put in place decades ago, the digital integrated circuit (IC) was introduced as a highly engineered commodity, the end-result of a process requiring enormous capital investment in highly specialized technical means. At the same time, this process can produce countless billions of components: only other monopolies can compete against such infinitesimal unit costs of production, the result of vast economies of scale.




Figure 2: Charting the evolution of integrated-circuit technologies and applications(From Zatzman and Islam⁵⁴)

Figure 2 illustrates some of how the integrated circuit (IC), as the central technology that made possible the transition from what looked originally like an “age of information technologies” into what is widely called the “Information Age”, came to be applied in political-economic reality. All items with a diagonally-shaded background are technologies, not necessarily, or confined to, specific products; the double-bordered items indicate actual commodities and technologies in the marketplace, the former displayed in a horizontal shading pattern; arrowheads point to actual applications of the technology; diamond-heads indicate seminal ideas for an entire genus of applications of the technology; the “military” as a branch-point to start a further, entirely separate chart is marked with a circular dot. A point in common among the technical applications charted above is that, at the point where a user engages the technology, a programmable interface had been inserted in which either a human user would select from a range of preset options and combinations, or – in a more industrialised context – an operator could select another program that does this selecting.

This chart documents where and how IC technologies can be applied to provide programmable switching capabilities across a wide spectrum of applications, starting with industrial process control, certain consumer appliances, microprocessors (the central processing units, or CPUs, of “thinking”, “intelligent” or otherwise “smart” machines), and very-large-scale ICs. The latter was crucial for the development of “smart” weapons. Microprocessors, as CPUs for computing devices, enabled the production and marketing of entire computers as portable units.

Thus, from the chart, it emerges that the essence of this technological development and its evolution was not that machines in general became “smart”, but that, as workers creating all this technology and its applications, people’s economic relations to one another became more social. The significance of this chart is therefore manifold. It immediately smashes two very widespread myths to smithereens: first, nothing inherently “post-industrial” is taking place, and second, production of goods is not being displaced by provision, or provisioning, of services. Behind the notion that the spread of digital information technologies marks the dawn of a “post-industrial” era in which production of services prevails over production of goods, is something else. The underlying idea is that the nature of this era in history has changed such that

Today, it is well known that US military has been developing software that will let it secretly manipulate social media sites by using fake online personas to influence internet conversations and spread pro-American propaganda. Recently, a Californian corporation has been awarded a contract with United States Central Command (Centcom), which oversees US armed operations in the Middle East and Central Asia, to develop what is described as an "online persona management service" that will allow one US serviceman or woman to control up to 10 separate identities based all over the world.

The project has been likened by web experts to China's attempts to control and restrict free speech on the internet. Critics are likely to complain that it will allow the US military to create a false consensus in online conversations, crowd out unwelcome opinions and smother commentaries or reports that do not correspond with its own objectives.

It also calls for "traffic mixing", blending the persona controllers' internet usage with the usage of people outside Centcom in a manner that must offer "excellent cover and powerful deniability".

The multiple persona contract is thought to have been awarded as part of a programme called Operation Earnest Voice (OEV), which was first developed in Iraq as a psychological warfare weapon against the online presence of al-Qaida supporters and others ranged against coalition forces. Since then, OEV is reported to have expanded into a \$200m program and is thought to have been used against jihadists across Pakistan, Afghanistan and the Middle East.

Recently, Petraeus's successor, General James Mattis, told the same committee that OEV "supports all activities associated with degrading the enemy narrative, including web engagement and web-based product distribution capabilities". Centcom confirmed that the

\$2.76m contract was awarded to Ntrepid, a newly formed corporation registered in Los Angeles. It would not disclose whether the multiple persona project is already in operation or discuss any related contracts.

In his evidence to the Senate committee, Gen Mattis said: "OEV seeks to disrupt recruitment and training of suicide bombers; deny safe havens for our adversaries; and counter extremist ideology and propaganda." He added that Centcom was working with "our coalition partners" to develop new techniques and tactics the US could use "to counter the adversary in the cyber domain".

3.4. The aphenomenal model for decision making and absolute control

The process of aphenomenal or prejudice-based decision-making is illustrated by the inverted triangle, proceeding from the top down (Figure 3). The inverted representation stresses the inherent instability and unsustainability of the model.

The source data from which a decision eventually emerges already incorporates their own justifications, which are then massaged by layers of opacity and disinformation. It is a top-down model designed to produce decisions based on self-interest and short-term gains, entailing an inevitable resort to planted stories, cover-ups, and justification. On an institutional scale, this model starts off with a set of policies that are designed to produce filters that transform 'facts' into a series of disinformation, which can only prove the effectiveness of the original policy. French psychiatrist, philosopher, and visionary, Frantz Fanon (1925–1961) wrote in *Black Skin, White Masks*, "Sometimes people hold a core belief that is very strong. When they are presented with evidence that works against that belief, the new evidence cannot be accepted. It would create a feeling that is extremely uncomfortable, called cognitive dissonance. And because it is so important to protect the core belief, they will rationalize, ignore and even deny anything that doesn't fit in with the core belief."




Figure 3. Aphenomenal modeling process⁵⁵ (from Islam et al., 2015).

The disinformation referred to here is what results when information is presented or recapitulated in the service of unstated or unacknowledged ulterior intentions. The *methods* of this disinformation achieve their effect by presenting evidence or raw data selectively, without disclosing either the fact of such selection or the criteria guiding the selection. This process of selection obscures any distinctions between the data coming from nature or from any all-natural pathway, on the one hand, and data from unverified or untested observations on the other.

4 Conclusions

Based on the analysis offered in this first part of a two-part paper, the following conclusions can be reached.

1. Fascism is an ideology that strives to establish superiority of a nation, irrespective of the standard or justification used to assert superiority.
2. Goals of fascism and US-style democracy are the same in terms of gaining government control over public life.
3. All but one US presidents conformed to the 'policy taker' role of the president.
4. 'Radical Islam', a dysphemism of true Islam, is the only ideology that opposes Fascism and is simultaneously anti-Fascism and anti-democratic.
5. US politics in particular and democracy in general are built on an aphenomenal model that is simultaneously anti-knowledge and anti-conscience.

Notes

- ¹ Anthony Hall and M. Rafiq Islam, The Nadir of Hypocrisy, *American Herald Tribune*, 2016.
- ² Kyle Smith, After years of liberal hate, George W. Bush is getting the respect he deserves, *New York Post*, January 28, 2017.
- ³ Shehab Khan, *The Independent*, January 21, 2017.
- ⁴ Dylan Matthews, I asked 5 fascism experts whether Donald Trump is a fascist. Here's what they said, *Vox.com*, May 19, 2016.
- ⁵ Robert Lynn Fuller, The Origins of the French Nationalist Movement 1886-1914, 2012, Jefferson, NC:MacFarland & Co. Inc. Publishers, 2012.
- ⁶ Katharine A. Mackel, Fascism: A Political Ideology of the Past, *The Inquiries Journal*, VOL. 2 NO. 11, 2010.
- ⁷ Walter Laqueur, *Fascism Past Present Future*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1996, 25.
- ⁸ Benito Mussolini, "The Ideology of the Twentieth Century," *International Fascism: Theories, Causes and the New Consensus*, Ed. Robert Griffin, London: Arnold, 1998, 254.
- ⁹ Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1971 [1925], 293.
- ¹⁰ Kevin Passmore, *Fascism A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 31.
- ¹¹ F.L. Carsten, *The Rise of Fascism* 2nd ed., Berkley: University of California Press, 1980, 134.
- ¹² Cit op 7, 35-36
- ¹³ Cit op 6
- ¹⁴ See M.R. Islam, G.M Zatzman and Jaan S. Islam, *Reconstituting the Curriculum*, New York: Scrivener-Wiley, pp. 44-55 for a detailed discussion.
- ¹⁵ Cit op. 6
- ¹⁶ Cit op. 7, 132
- ¹⁷ cit op. 10, 90
- ¹⁸ Cit op. 7, 132
- ¹⁹ *ibid*, 107
- ²⁰ Jaan S. Islam, G.M. Zatzman, and M.R. Islam, *Greening of pharmaceutical engineering, Volume 3: Applications for Mental Disorder Treatments*, New York, Scrivener-Wiley, 2017.
- ²¹ Cit op 6
- ²² Cit op 6
- ²³ such as the French National Front (FN) of France, the AN (Alleanza Nazionale) of Italy, the BNP (British National Party) of the United Kingdom, and the FPO (Austrian Freedom Party) of Austria.
- ²⁴ Jaan S. Islam, *True Islam, Jihad and Terrorism*, New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- ²⁵ *ibid*

²⁶ cit op 6

²⁷ Jaan Islam, 2016.

²⁸ ibid

²⁹ Ziauddin Sardar, *Reading the Quran: The Contemporary relevance of the sacred text of Islam*, Oxford: Oxford/University/Press.

³⁰ [He] who created death and life to test you [as to] which of you is best in deed - and He is the Exalted in Might, the Forgiving (Qur'an 67:2)

³¹ Jaan S. Islam, *Political philosophy of the east and the west*, Vernon Press, 2017.

³² ibid

³³ Islam et al., *Greening of Pharmaceutical Engineering*, 2015

³⁴ cit. op. 24

³⁵ ibid

³⁶ Jaan Islam, No, Shariah is not compatible with western values, *Forbes*, Oct. 6, 2016.

³⁷ "And if you obey the majority of those upon the earth, they will mislead you from the way of Allah..." [Quran 6:116]

"And whoever seeks a way of life other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him, and in the Hereafter he will be one of the losers." [Quran 3:85]

³⁸ Washington Post, "George W. Bush Paints Dark Picture of American under Trump," https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/02/28/george-w-bush-paints-dark-picture-of-america-under-trump-i-dont-like-the-racism/?utm_term=.62a0a373e36b.

³⁹ M.R. Islam, J.S. Islam, G. Zatzman, M.A.H. Mughal, *Greening of Pharmaceutical Engineering*, New York: Scrivener-Wiley, 2015.

⁴⁰ M.R. Islam, G.M. Zatzman, J.S. Islam, 2013, *Reconstituting the Curriculum*, New York: Scrivener-Wiley, 2013.

⁴¹ Cit op. 5

⁴² A.G. Gardner, How did Washington make his millions? *C W Journal*, Winter, 2013.

⁴³ Washington wrote: "My mother was the most beautiful woman I ever saw. All I am I owe to my mother. I attribute all my success in life to the moral, intellectual and physical education I received from her."

⁴⁴ DiLorenzo, T., *The Real Lincoln: A New Look at Abraham Lincoln, His Agenda, and an Unnecessary War*, Random House LLC, 2002.

⁴⁵ Brendan O'Neill, Israelis don't care that we hate them. But they'd like to know why Travels in the Millwall of the Middle East, *The Spectator*, March 15.

⁴⁶ Justin Fox, George Washington Had Business Interests, Too, *Bloomberg.com*, Nov. 22, 2016.

⁴⁷ 1. William Blum's encyclopedic work, *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions since World War II* (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1995) summarizes CIA intervention in foreign countries.

⁴⁸ Coleman McCarthy, "The Consequences of Covert Tactics" *Washington Post*, December 13, 1987.

⁴⁹ Vankin and John Whalen's *The 60 Greatest Conspiracies of All Time* (Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1997) is a good read on the history of US government control of its own citizens.

⁵⁰ <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/01/gambia-president-adama-barrow-takes-oath-senegal-170119170745954.html>

⁵¹ The Independent, "How Obama Came to Bomb Seven Countries in Six Years," <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/peace-president-how-obama-came-to-bomb-seven-countries-in-six-years-9753131.html>.

⁵² Roger Lowenstein, *America's Bank: The Epic Struggle to Create the Federal Reserve*, New York: Penguin Books, October 18, 2016

⁵³ James Corbett, *Faking It: How the Media Manipulates the World into War* Corbett, 2012, available at <https://www.corbettreport.com/faking-it-how-the-media-manipulates-the-world-into-war/>

⁵⁴ G.M. Zatzman and Rafiqul Islam, *Economics of Intangibles*, New York: Nova Science publishers.

⁵⁵ From Zatzman and Islam, 2007, who coined the term 'aphenomenal' to describe the implosive model.